

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**  
 VOL. II - No. 7. Saturday, February 12, 1937  
 Published every week by the  
**SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.**  
 at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
 Telephones: Local Office: GRamercy 5-9142  
 National Office: ALgonquin 4-8547  
 Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for 6  
 months. Foreign: \$2.50 per year. Bundle order  
 3 cents per copy. Single copies 5 cents.  
 All checks and money orders should be made  
 out to the Socialist Appeal.  
 Entered as second-class matter September 1,  
 1937 at the post office at New York, New York,  
 under the Act of March 3, 1879.  
**MAX SHACHTMAN**  
 Editor.  
**HAROLD ROBERTS** **FRANK GRAVES**  
 Associate Editors.  
**BOB BROWNE**  
 Business Manager.

**A. F. of L. Expulsions**

The decision of the A. F. of L. Executive Council to expel the United Mine Workers and two other international unions, is a reactionary blow at the prospects of peace in the ranks of organized labor and a blow at organized labor itself. The fossilized bureaucrats assembled in Miami, their vision circumscribed by the narrow horizon of craft unionism into which they split the American workers for years, simply would not reconcile themselves to the living, unchallengeable reality constituted by the successes of industrial unionism under the banner of the C.I.O. Goaded especially by Republican Party stooges like Hutcheson, who fear the development of an independent political movement of labor, they have put one obstacle after another in the path of unity. Even their thoughts on the subject have been dominated by the consideration of how many thousands of members they can split off from the existing industrial unions so as to enlarge their per capita power in the obsolete craft union set-up and to keep the power of craft unionism dominant in the organized labor movement.

The move for unification, which still represents the best interests of labor in the United States, should not be slowed down for an instant because of the Miami decision. On the contrary, it calls for an even more vigorous assertion of the rank-and-file's demand that the split in the labor movement, especially in face of the critical situation in industry, be promptly overcome—not at the expense of industrial unionism, to be sure, but rather with guarantees of the unassailable rights, proved a dozen times over in struggle, of the industrial form of organization.

**The War In The Far East**

China's 450,000,000 people cannot be whipped and driven into slavery by the Japanese imperialists—provided these millions rise up and fight against their would-be enslavers.

During seven months of the Sino-Japanese hostilities, the invaders of China have been able to score a number of important military victories—because the Kuomintang rulers, aided by the Stalinists, have held the masses back from the struggle. Japan's war machine is now concentrated

on the task of effecting a junction between the invading forces in North China and those in the Yangtze region. Success for this venture will mean virtual Japanese control of all territory between the Great Wall and the Yangtze at least as far west as the Peiping-Hankow Railway.

And still there is no indication of any attempt being made by the Kuomintang to mobilize the masses against the invaders. A Shanghai dispatch to the N. Y. Times on February 5 brings this fact into bold relief. Says the correspondent:

"Despite the announcements in Hankow concerning the enthusiasm for continued mass participation in prolonged hostilities, the Kuomintang Rightists (those who make government policy - Ed.) oppose such a policy if it means greater freedom for the masses, agrarian reforms or basic domestic housecleaning which the former Communistists advocate. According to a version widely believed here, the Kuomintang fears the common people more than it fears the Japanese and would compromise with Japan if moderate terms were offered."

The Times' correspondent thus confirms what has been pointed out by us almost from the commencement of the war, and he is by no means a Trotskyist.

Kuomintang - Stalinist leadership of China's struggle is bankrupted. But the struggle itself is far from ended. In the coming phase the masses must move to the forefront to spell out the doom of imperialism and all its native allies.

**Keep Gerson, Mr. Isaacs!**

The American Legion, the Catholic Church, and even the Sons of the American Revolution have called upon Manhattan Borough President Isaacs, upon Mayor LaGuardia and Governor Lehman to have Simon W. Gerson, ex-reporter of the Daily Worker and Communist Party functionary removed from his appointed position of assistant to President Isaacs.

However Popular this new Front may seem to many, we respectfully decline to support it. In fact, our brows are knit in puzzlement at the to-do that is being made around Mr. Gerson's case.

Is Mr. Gerson's Americanism being challenged? We don't know what ship his forebears came over on or what their XVIIIth, XVIIIth or XIXth Century Americanism was. But we are ready to give expert testimony on the flawlessness of his XXth Century Americanism.

Is his loyalty in question? There is no more frenzied supporter of the American form of government, of the present government itself, than Mr. Gerson and his political associates. And we say that if Mr. Roosevelt has the right to public office, Mr. Roosevelt's most ardent advocates also have.

His honesty and civic pride? Imagine questioning those qualities in a Stalinist! Why, we know of no politician, from the days of Richard Croker to those of Tin-Box Farley, who has greater moral probity. Patriotic fervor? Gentlemen, you ought to hear him warbling the Star-Spangled Banner! It's enough to put to shame the satchems of Tammany Hall, whose whiskey tenors are notoriously poorly adapted to that soul-stirring anthem.

A Communist? Forsooth, forsooth, and flappodoodle! Of Gerson's type of communism (or socialism), the late Elbert H. Gary once said: "We are all socialists now."

Mr. Isaacs, keep Gerson!

**Little Men Fume, Let Off Steam**

are feeling the big squeeze. Caught inescapably between the crushing weights of the two great class forces, they can only complain and whimper. With no program of their own, the best they can accomplish is to patch up second-hand versions of the program of their masters. Roosevelt showed his usual political skill by giving them this mass Conference in which they could let off steam.

These Little Business Men feel in their own lives the heavy hand of the big corporations. Their program incorporated their timid and absurd gestures against finance-capital, following the lead already given by Roosevelt during the month preceding. "We urge the strengthening and enforcement of all laws seeking to curb monopolies," says plank 13. "We oppose a surtax on 'small business' closely held corporations," adds plank 21. We "urge approval of legislation designed to curb destructive competition of chain stores," says plank 12, speaking plaintively for all the single-store proprietors present at the Conference.

**Party and Press**

The Socialist Workers Party is one of the bright spots on the Appeal horizon.

He has increased the Chicago bundle order by 50 per cent and promises to double it in the near future. He has made regular payments on back bills and kept up payments on current bundle orders. He has also started a subscription drive which has already brought in more subs than we have received from any other local since the Convention.

Hats off to Chicago and Karl Shier! Now, let's get going all over the country with the slogan "Double the Appeal circulation by April 1st."

**Socialist Appeal**  
 116 University Place  
 New York City

Date .....

I enclose \$..... for which please send me the Socialist Appeal. One year—(\$2.00); Six Months—(\$1.00).

I enclose \$..... as my contribution toward building the Socialist Appeal.

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

perhaps they can curry favor by turning fire against the common enemy. After all, are not their five and ten and twenty employees, with their inordinate demands and unionization and collective bargaining, driving them to the wall as effectively as the monopolies?

**Want Labor Curbed**

So plank after plank calls for the repeal of the Wagner Act, condemns any wage and hours Bill whatever, wants unions made more "responsible," asks exemptions from the Social Security Act, insists on broadening of the Income Tax Base. The Big Business

**A More Than Apt Pupil**



The above cartoon is reproduced without permission and without apology from the "Daily Worker" of three years ago. Even more timely now than it was then, it offers its own comment on the present-day policies of the Communist Party summed up by Earl Browder in his famous "New Republic" article: "In our country the task is to organize effective support behind the President's policy."

**What Is Collective Security?**

BY JAMES BURNHAM

The current war program of the Stalinists is summed up in the phrase, "Collective Security." Earl Browder's half of the New Republic debate with Charles A. Beard, subsequently reprinted in The Daily Worker, is entitled "For Collective Security". The Communist Party has recently issued several pamphlets with the same title. We must enquire further into the true meaning of Collective Security.

At first glance, the program of Collective Security seems reasonable and practical to many people. "Clearly," argues Browder, "in this relation of forces, there does exist the possibility of preventing the spread of war, and of extinguishing the wars going on, provided the peace-loving 90 per cent can arrive at a concerted program of action, at least to a degree in some relation to that of the concerted action of the Triple Alliance of the 'anti-Communist' bloc of fascist states.... Considering the economic resources of the war-makers, it would clearly be sufficient to bring them quickly to a halt if the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union should jointly declare an embargo upon all economic transactions with the aggressors...."

How can anyone object to such a calm and virtuous proposal? No wonder Browder is indignant at the scoundrels who insist on criticisms!

**TO SOLIDIFY VERSAILLES SETTLEMENT**

Collective Security was the plan for accomplishing just this solidification. All of the nations (united in the League) were to take joint steps against any nation which might attempt to break through the existing imperialist division. In addition, it was of course understood that collective action would above all be exercised against a bid for power by the working class of any nation—which would naturally be the greatest of all threats against the existing imperialist division.

It was as if two coalitions of gangs had been fighting for control of a racket. The winning gang, having consolidated its victory, decreed that henceforth "peace and order" were to reign over Brooklyn. All the gangsters together would take collective action against any rival gang which attempted to muscle in. And, of course, similar collective action would likewise be taken against any group of honest citizens who tried to break up the rackets themselves.

In the case of the gang, it is clear enough that Collective Action is hardly the answer to the problems of good citizens. Their interest is to smash all of the gangs, and to get rid altogether of the rackets.

"PEACE" TO PROTECT IMPERIALIST GANGSTERS

The case of the imperialist powers is exactly the same. Even if Collective Security could preserve "peace," that would mean simply protecting the dominant imperialist positions of the Anglo-French bloc; protecting their right to exploit the major part of the world; safeguarding their rule of starvation and terror in India, the Near East, Indo-China, Africa; guaranteeing for eternity their right to the exploitation and oppression of the workers in the home countries.

The workers have absolutely no interest in the preservation of any imperialist division whatever, no matter what nation or group of nations a given division favors. Their interest is to overthrow the whole imperialist system; and, if mankind is not to revert to barbarism, to do so in the shortest possible time. The

**ORIGIN OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY**

But let us, approaching this as all questions from the point of view of the interests of the working class, ask: First, even assuming that Collective Security might preserve peace, is it a correct program; and, second, whether it can in fact preserve peace—or whether it is even designed to preserve peace. The answer to both of these questions requires a brief account of the origin of the idea of Collective Security.

The idea of Collective Security is not an invention of Browder, nor of Litvinov nor of Stalin. It arose in the camp of the Allied Powers during the latter part of the War of 1914-18, and was part of the basis for the construction of the "Versailles system." Its chief early advocate was Aristide Briand, the renegade from socialism who became during that time an outstanding spokesman for French imperialism.

The theory of Collective Security was as follows: The Allied Powers had won the war, and taken for themselves the rich spoils of conquest. France and Great Britain, particularly, being satisfied with the results, glutted with colonies and other

**THE FIFTH WHEEL**

By LEON TROTSKY

The so-called International Workers' Association (A.I.T.), representing the Anarcho-Syndicalist groupings in various countries, convened in Paris from the 8th to the 17th of December. As is well known, the only large section of this International is the Spanish C.N.T. All the other organizations (Swedish, Portuguese, French, Latin-American) are completely insignificant in size.

Of course, even a small organization can be quite significant if it has an independent revolutionary position which anticipates the future development of the class struggle. But, as can be seen from the brief account printed in the "Information Bulletin of the A.I.T." (No. 67 of the German edition, "Boletin de Informacion"), the special congress in Paris ended with the full victory of the politics of Garcia Oliver, i.e., the politics of capitulation to the bourgeoisie.

**Manage Bourgeois State**

During the past year a few Anarchist publications, especially the French, have mildly criticized the Spanish C.N.T.'s methods of action. There are quite enough bases for this criticism: instead of building stateless Communism, the leaders of the C.N.T. became ministers in a bourgeois state! This circumstance did not, however, hinder the Paris congress of the A.I.T. from "approving the line of the C.N.T." In turn the leaders of Spanish Anarcho-Syndicalism explained to the Congress that if they had betrayed the socialist revolution in the interests of saving the bourgeoisie, that was merely due to "insufficient solidarity of the international proletariat."

The congress invented nothing new: all reformist betrayers have always laid the blame for their betrayal upon the proletariat. If social-patriots support their "national" militarism, it is, of course, not because they are lackeys of capital, but because the masses are not "matured yet for real internationalism." If the leaders of the trade unions appear as strike-breakers, it is because the masses "have not matured" for the struggle.

**No Criticism Heard**

The account does not say a word about revolutionary criticism at the Paris congress. In this respect, as in many others, the gentlemen Anarchists fully imitate the bourgeois liberals. Why let the rabble hear of differences among the higher circles? This can only shake the authority of the Anarcho-bourgeois ministers. It is very likely that in answer to the "left" criticism from the French anarchists the latter were reminded of their own conduct during the last imperialist war.

We have already heard from some Anarchist theoreticians that at the time of such "exceptional" circumstances as war and revolution, it is necessary to renounce the principles of one's own program. Such revolutionists bear a close resemblance to raincoats which "leak" only when it

**FDR Peace Talk Belied By Acts**

(Continued from page 1)

remacy in the capital ship category.

5. Hearings were begun in Washington on a bill introduced by A. J. Dimond, representative of Alaska, demanding "protection" of the \$46,000,000 salmon fishing industry in Alaskan seas. The bill would have the United States government assert sovereignty over hundreds of miles of ocean now regarded as international and would order the confiscation of all Japanese ships found in these fishing preserves.

**Hitler Stalls In Army-Nazi-Feud**

(Continued from page 1)

an understanding between Germany and England, for which the latter has been working and to which the former is not at all averse, would signify the disruption of the present line-ups, not only at the expense of Italy but also of the Soviet Union. That this is far from excluded is seen from the extremely reserved attitude of the British towards the German shake-up and the feeling in London that it should cause them little concern.

**Incidents Will Follow**

"I am gravely apprehensive," Dimond said, "that unless suitable legislation is passed, there will be armed conflict in the Bering Sea." He said the fishermen would take up arms themselves unless the government stepped in.

Said Representative Sirovich of New York: "I would send up bombing planes, torpedo planes, and ships and drive them out of these waters."

Here is a fertile field for future "incidents" which will be used to the fullest extent in whipping up war sentiment.

Lower East Side Labor Forum "THE CRISIS AND THE UNEMPLOYED" Speaker: NEIL HARRISON (Chairman—W.A.A.—Loc. 15) FRIDAY NITE FEB. 11 at East Side Labor Center 159 Rivington St. (Near Clinton) Admission FREE

**Martin Attacks CP War Mongers**

(Continued from page 1)

Martin is absolutely correct. For the Stalinists, Communism is just a label covering a political line and activities which are entirely harmful to the workers and their organizations. The revolutionary socialists certainly are opposed to all red-baiting from whatever quarter it comes. One way to deliver a blow at the red-baiters is to expose the Stalinist patriots for what they are—vicious enemies of the working class masquerading in the guise of friends.

By taking a step in that direction, by revealing the rule or ruin policy of the Stalinists in the unions, by exposing their treacherous social-patriotism and all the vicious practices flowing from it, Home Martin has rendered a valuable service to the labor movement.