

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. II - No. 10. Saturday, March 5, 1938
Published every week by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

MAX SHACHTMAN
Editor.
HAROLD ROBERTS FRANK GRAVES
Associate Editors.
BOB BROWNE
Business Manager.

Safeguard Trotsky's Asylum!

Once again the right of asylum for
Leon Trotsky, great leader of the world
revolutionary movement, is being threat-
ened by the forces of reaction. The speech
delivered last week by Lombardo Toledano,
Stalin-inspired leader of the Mex-
ican Confederation of Labor, was the
opening gun in the newest campaign to
drive Trotsky from his refuge in Mexico.

Toledano's provocatory and contemptible
speech preceded by but a few days
the announcement of the trial of all re-
maining representatives of the leading
cadres of Russian Bolshevism whom
Stalin has at last decided to murder. The
connection is all too obvious. Stalin will
feel freer to go through with his latest
frame-up trial if he knows that Trotsky
is either interned, or—better yet—his
voice stifled in death.

With Toledano's aid the Stalin murder
gang hope to force President Cardenas
to expel Trotsky from Mexico, thus, once
more, making him easy prey for the
assassins of the G.P.U. But they mis-
calculate. As in the past, all honest and
enlightened men will rally to the defense
of the exiled revolutionist against the
counter-revolutionary Stalinists. The
movement for his defense is already un-
der way. Let us build a protective wall
of iron solidarity around Leon Trotsky!

The hounding of Trotsky is not some-
thing new. Ever since 1929, when he was
driven from the Soviet Union into exile
in Turkey, the bloodhounds of the G. P.
U. have been baying on his trail. In
August, 1936, just as the infamous Zin-
oviev-Kamenev trial was getting under
way, the Norwegian government, under
pressure from Moscow, silenced him by
internment.

Again today, with another infamous
trial in progress, the frame-up managers
in Moscow want Trotsky silenced. This,
and this alone, is the explanation for
Toledano's attack on the pre-eminent
leader of the Fourth International. An
aroused and indignant world movement,
intent on defending Trotsky against his
persecutors and traducers will defeat
this newest scheme of the Moscow assas-
sins.

That Letter

What none of the capitalist news-
papers has taken the slightest notice of,
much less emphasized, with regard to
the Stalin letter to the young Kursk
communist Ivanov, is its relation to the
foreign policy of the Soviet bureaucracy.
From this standpoint, the letter is of
signal importance.

For the past three years, the whole
foreign policy of the Soviet Union and
the strategy of the Third International,
has been oriented towards a united front
of all the "democratic" countries against
the "fascist aggressors".

Only the other day, in a speech at the
University of North Carolina, Soviet
Ambassador Troyanovsky made a pub-
lic appeal for an alliance among the
United States, France, England and the
Soviet Union—the four "great democ-
racies"—for the preservation of the
peace of the world.

With the Communist International,
this took the form of the People's Front
policy, which was aimed at bolstering
up capitalism in the "democratic" coun-
tries as the price for its existing or pro-
spective military alliance with the Soviet
Union.

France was regarded as already a
close ally of Moscow and defender of
its territorial integrity; England and the
United States were regarded as being
on the very verge of becoming an ally.

In pursuance of the same line, the
Soviet bureaucracy became the most
sturdy and vociferous proponent of the
discredited nest of pirates that sails un-
der the flag of the League of Nations.

This whole marvelous combination,
however, was based on hope and illusion
and not on the realities of imperialist
politics and the class struggle. For, in
the past year especially, and most par-
ticularly in the past couple of months, it
has become as plain as a pikestaff that
the imperialist bandits of both the "de-
mocratic" and the fascist camps are much
more interested in coming to an under-
standing among themselves, a settlement
of their dispute for a time at least, than
in defending the abstract ideals of "de-

mocracy" or the concrete boundary lines
of the Soviet Union.

This trend reached a sensational cli-
max in the Eden-Chamberlain dispute
that followed upon the virtual annexa-
tion of Austria by Hitler. The great
"democracies" proved very little con-
cerned with outward political forms, and
Chamberlain rushed to arrive at an ac-
cord with Italy as a preliminary to the
achievement of a Four-Power Pact—
England, France, Germany and Italy.

And the Soviet Union? And collective
security? And the independence and in-
tegrity of Ethiopia? They are all lost in
the shuffle and bustle of the imperialist
powers to improve their respective posi-
tions.

That explains why, in a political-pro-
grammatic document devoted to the
question of the defense of the Soviet Union,
Stalin has not one single word to
say, not even a remote hint, about the
standard formulae which have been daily
repeated as slogans by the Stalinist
party and diplomats for the past few
years. Nothing about the League of
Nations, the famous "pebble in the road
of war." Nothing about collective secu-
rity hitherto the loudest cry of the Sta-
linist patriots. Nothing about the united
front of the "democracies" and nothing
about the People's Front.

And the reason for this eloquent sil-
ence lies in the complete, patent and un-
disputable bankruptcy of Stalin's foreign
policy.

England is ready to come to a settle-
ment with Italy and Germany. The lat-
ter are not unwilling. Why and how is
this possible? Because it would give
England a release from Europe and en-
able her to concentrate all her forces
against Japan's challenge to her domi-
nation of Asia. As for Germany, an agree-
ment with England (and consequently
with France, which plays no independ-
ent role on the continent and can play
none) would mean that she could turn
her full attention to the East, that is,
against the Soviet Union.

The net result of the "statesmanlike",
the "practical", the "realistic" policy of
Stalin, has been to maneuver the Soviet
Union into a more isolated and imperil-
ed position than she has occupied for
more than 15 years. And the Stalin let-
ter is an implicit recognition of this
sorry fact.

Does the letter herald a turn in policy?
Yes, a forced one. Not towards revolu-
tionary internationalism—Troyanovsky
is 100% correct in ridiculing such an
interpretation. Stalinism is incapable of
a revolutionary line. But it means, in all
likelihood, the beginning of the end for
the pet slogans of the Stalinist People's
Front. Already Walter Duranty, unoffi-
cial spokesman for the Kremlin, has an-
nounced that the "collective security"
slogan is being discarded by Moscow.
What a cruel blow at Browder this will
be, and what difficulties it would present
to any man who did not, like him, have
a flexible spinal column!

But whatever may be the exact nature
of the turn, it is evident that Stalin has
reached the end of a blind alley. The
danger to the Soviet Union has been
enormously enhanced. It can be saved
from the accumulated threats to its ex-
istence only by the independent class
action of the world proletariat. To or-
ganize this action—there lies the great
task of the Fourth International.

Labor's "Friends"

Two "liberal" Congressmen—Representative
John T. Bernard of Minnesota and
Representative John M. Coffee of
Washington—have resigned from the
Non-Partisan Committee for the Defense
of Fred E. Beal as a result of "revela-
tions" concerning the frame-up leader of
the Gastonia textile strike which ap-
peared last week in that organ of truth and
enlightenment, the Stalinist Daily Work-
er.

Both these gentlemen won their seats
in Congress with the aid of labor votes,
accorded them because of their supposed
labor sympathies. They are prepared to
play ball with any labor organization
and to associate themselves with any
labor cause which evidences a capacity
to roll up working-class votes on election
day. In the defense organization built
to aid Beal in his fight for liberty against
the labor-hating Bourbons of the South,
they scented a chance for vote-catching.

Now along comes the Communist
Party and its Daily Worker, proclaiming
Beal an "enemy of the people" be-
cause he has engaged in honest criticism
of the murderous Stalin dictatorship in
the Soviet Union and its army of corrupt
allies in this country. The two Congress-
men promptly resign from the Beal Com-
mittee without making the slightest ef-
fort to verify the Stalinist accusations
against Beal.

If and when these labor champions
appear for re-election, their services in
deserting a genuine labor fighter in his
hour of need will doubtless be remem-
bered gratefully by the Stalinist ma-
chine, which is intent on stilling the
voice of Beal—an opponent of Stalinism
and all the rottenness for which it stands
—by having him railroaded to jail for
twenty years. All the more reason for
the genuine friends of labor to stand
firmly and unflinchingly behind Beal in
his fight for liberty.

How Not To Fight War

An Editorial Statement

History has shown that in democratic imperi-
alist nations the pre-war period is a time of the
mushroom growth of pacifist sentiments and or-
ganizations. Indeed, as Lenin more than once
pointed out, this development must be understood
at bottom as an integral part of the war prepara-
tions themselves.

Confronted with widespread and genuine anti-
war feelings among the masses, the pacifist ideas
divert these feelings into channels entirely harm-
less to the imperialist interests. The anti-war
spirit is blocked from finding its only effective
outlet in an anti-capitalist direction. The masses
are ideologically disarmed, and turned over to
"peace leaders" who are simply the hypocritical
fronts of imperialism. When the time comes for
serious business, they are ripe for plucking by the
war makers.

The present "Keep America out of War" move-
ment is thus a significant and normal sign of the
times. This movement has not yet, of course,
taken final form; but it is already well enough
characterized by what has happened up to now.

SPONSORS OF MEETING
SUDDENLY DISCOVER A "PROGRAM"

It was started by the Lovestonites and the Alt-
man-Thomas Socialists as a desperate effort to
rehabilitate their hopelessly decaying political for-
tunes—though it is already getting out of their
hands. Its origin was handed in the typical man-
ner of "innocent" stooge organizations, reminis-
cent of the classic Stalinist maneuvers in this
field. A miscellaneous group of writers, preach-
ers and liberals was called together in Thomas'
house to "talk over" what steps might be taken
"against the war." A proposal was made to sponsor
a public meeting in New York on March 6, at
which individuals with various points of view would
speak against the war and against collective secu-
rity. A small committee was selected to handle
"details."

The New York meeting was paralleled by meet-
ings in arrangement for Philadelphia, Cleveland,
and other cities. The modest sponsoring committee
for a New York meeting finds itself part of a va-
gued "national organization" which now talks about
a "national congress." Under the disguise of a
"call" for the New York meeting, the sub-commit-
tee issues a political program for the sprouting
organization, and calmly signs to this program the
names of all of those who had for one reason or
another agreed to sponsor the meeting—some-
how, in the great majority of cases, forgetting
the one "detail" of consulting the sponsors about
the call to which their names was signed.

FIND THEMSELVES FARTHER
RIGHT THAN AMERICAN LEAGUE

Ironically enough, in this way many individuals
in the past noted for their principled opposition to
the Stalinist American League against War and
Fascism find themselves part of a setup distin-
guished from the American League in its early
stages only by being much further to the right.

The "Keep America out of War" Committee, let
it be clearly noticed, is in no sense whatever a
United Front. It is a political bloc of various ten-
dencies and individuals: Socialist, Lovestonite,
some anarchists, liberals, preachers, Quakers, writ-
ers of a dozen shades of opinion, a few labor bu-
reaucrats. Like all such blocs it is based not upon
a plan for joint specific actions (as would be
the case with a united front) but upon a political pro-
gram.

This program, as tentatively given in the call
to the New York meeting is naturally not "final"
in precise verbal form. Nevertheless, a program
of the same general type therein given follows
necessarily from the whole conception of this
movement as well as from its social composition.
Analysis of the program in the call to the meeting
is therefore legitimate evidence in judging the
character of the movement.

This program, however much it may reflect pre-
vailing anti-war moods, is thoroughly deceptive
and reactionary. To begin with, the central slogan,
"Keep America out of War"—which is also
used as the name for the organization—can be
the source only of the gravest illusions. When taken
in conjunction with the last statement in the call

"We can keep America out of war if American
citizens (sic) act as one!"—it is a blatant lie, and
a gross deception of the very masses whose anti-
war feelings the Committee aims to exploit.

INFER THAT ROOSEVELT MIGHT
FORSAKE DRIVE TOWARD WAR

"The President himself," says the call, "has
declared no clear program of war and peace..."
Thus the inference is permitted that the President
may actually be persuaded to head for peace. This,
at a time when the President has set his course
openly and ruthlessly toward the war! The reason
for this sentence is, of course, to leave room
in the organization for certain types of New
Dealers (including the Ludlow-bloc Congressmen)
who would not allow a direct attack on the chief
leader of American imperialism.

Similarly, no direct and specific attack is made
on any individual or organization! Evidently no
feelings are to be hurt by the "Keep America out
of War" movement! It will be one big happy
family in search of Peace.

Throughout the document the words "our" and
"we" are used in a manner to which no patriot
could take exception: "...we do not need a bigger
army or navy to protect our shores." This is quite
in keeping with the addressing of the call "To the
Citizens (our holds) of New York." There is not
a mention of "workers", classes, or the class struggle
in the entire call. There is not a line about the
struggle against capitalism, which, evidently,
is presumed to have no connection with the struggle
against war. And among the sponsors of this
call are many who have in the past had harsh
things to say about People's Frontism!

Among the programmatic planks is to be found
the following: "5. American cooperation for inter-
national peace—but no alliance with any nation
or group of nations for war..." This is inserted,
apparently, to make room for "respectable" ad-
vocates of collective security who are uneasy about
their present Stalinist company (at the time, by
the way, when Stalin himself is preparing to throw
collective security over).

This program corresponds accurately to the he-
terogeneous Lovestonite-to-New Deal social com-
position of the movement. (It was not at all an
accident that no one representing the revolution-
ary position of the Socialist Workers Party was
asked to participate, and that the suggestion of
one Committee member to invite an S. W. P.
speaker for the public meeting was vigorously
rejected.) The speakers list for the public meet-
ing sums up neatly: Thomas and Wolfe for So-
cialists and Lovestonites; Homer Martin as the
"labor figure"—the same Martin who last week
announced through the Scripps-Howard Press de-
votion to a war in "defense" of the United States;
the New York Post columnist, Ernest L. Meyer;
the retired liberal, Oswald Garrison Villard; the
former liberal and present opponent of all "gov-
ernment interference in business," John T. Flynn;
Senator LaFollette in person to represent the
New Deal; and the inevitable retired general of
all pacifist medleys—this time Major General Wm.
C. Rivers. An appropriate crew to handle such a
ship! For Thomas and Lovestone it is clear that
defensists and patriots are their natural allies in
the fight against war.

MOVEMENT IS BLOW AT
REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR

One must speak the truth plainly on the issue
of war. The "Keep America out of War" move-
ment is in no respect a blow at the war and the
war-makers. It is a blow at the revolutionary
struggle against war. It is a device for the decep-
tion and disorientation of the people, above all
of the workers. That is the truth.

The struggle against the war is the struggle
against capitalism. The way to fight the war is
to make the workers' revolution, and that is the
only way to fight it. This is the truth; and
whoever hides this truth is guilty of crime and
treachery against the people. We propose to pro-
claim this truth from the housetops, and to ex-
pose at every turn those who seek to manipulate
the anti-war feelings of the masses in precisely
the way to sell them out most hopelessly and
tragically to the war-makers.

New Stalin Frameup
Trial Opens In Moscow

(Continued from page 1)

In the brief period of the fal-
ling out between Stalin and
Bukharin, when the latter was
putting out feelers to Zinoviev
and Kamenev, who had mean-
time repented and recanted,
Trotsky wrote several articles
in the press showing that it was
utterly impermissible for the
Left wing to make a bloc against
Stalin with the Bukharinist Right
wing.

Bukharin Friend of Gorky

The accusation of murder in
the case of Gorky, Menzhinsky
and Kulybshev strains the wildest
imagination beyond the break-
ing point. What earthly
reason Bukharin, for example,
who was a warm personal friend
of Gorky, would have for murder-
ing him, cannot be ascertained.
Just the contrary, he would, if
anything, go out of his way to
preserve Gorky for he, like every-
body else, knew that Gorky fre-
quently intervened to restrain
Stalin from too violent measures
against all opponents, real and
fancied.

Litovsk peace treaty which Ger-
many was imposing upon Russia,
Bukharin and a whole group of
Left Communists, as is known,
opposed signing the treaty. So,
for a time, did Stalin. Bukharin
later revealed, in an article in
the Moscow Pravda in 1932, that,
jokingly, he and some of his
supporters had suggested to the
opponents of the treaty, that Len-
in be kept in custody for a few
days so that a revolutionary war
could be launched against Ger-
many and Lenin could be pre-
vented from pressing for the
signing of the treaty. The whole
story, known for at least 15
years to the Soviet public, was
dismissed as an anecdote. The
charge about a plotted assassina-
tion, is a sheer and despicable
invention, characteristic part
of one of the most infamous frame-
ups in history.

Assumption Absurd

If it were true, one would have
to assume that both in the case
of Trotsky and Bukharin, of
Rykov and Rakovsky, Lenin work-
ed together with them as his
closest associates in the party
and in the government for five
years, without having the ele-
mentary intelligence to discover
their perfidy. In Stalin's case,
one would have to assume that
he worked together with Trots-
ky and Rakovsky for as many
and more years, and with Buk-

Chinese Trotskyists
Fight G.P.U. Methods

(Continued from page 1)

extermination of the Trotskyist
traitors in China."

Another Frame-Up

The Daily Worker, transplanting
the provocations of the
Chinese Stalinists to American
soil, reported Monday from
Hankow that a man named
Chang Mu-tao, "the Chinese
Trotskyist," has been arrested
and is facing trial for treason,
having been "caught red-handed"
while trying to signal Japanese
warplanes raiding Linfing, Eighth
Route Army headquarters in
Shansi province." In Chang's
home, the report says, were found
73 hand grenades, eight revolvers
and 742 cartridges... "as well as
a supply of Trotskyist literature."
We nail this story to the mast-
head as yet another in the long
list of frame-ups being perpet-
rated by the counter-revolution-
ary Stalinist. Our comrades in
Shanghai, who on the spot are
exposing Stalin's frame-ups on
Chinese soil, have given us Chang
Mu-tao's political biography.

Who is Chang Mu-tao? A
Trotskyist? No! He is an agent
of the G.P.U. Once a member
of the Chinese Communist Party,
he quit the ranks several years
ago but never completely severed
his connections with the Stalin-
ists. For some time, we are in-
formed, he acted as the repre-
sentative of several reactionary
North China warlords. Just be-
fore the outbreak of the Shang-
hai fighting in August, 1937, he
approached the Communist
League with an offer to donate
\$100. Recognizing this offer for
what it was, our Chinese com-
rades instantly declined it.

The Old Technique

Here we discern the time-
honored methods of Stalin's G.
P. U. "Obviously," our Chinese
comrades write, "the Stalinists
attempted to utilize Chang Mu-
tao to prove that the Communist
League accepts gifts from the
Japanese imperialists. More than
likely, Chang's proffered gift
came from Moscow's ample cof-
fers." If and when Chang is
brought to public trial for "treason,"
he will doubtless tell the
world in his "confession" that
the Chinese Bolshevik-Leninists
actually accepted the money.

Preparation of the Stalinist
campaign against the revolution-
ists in China was signaled by
an article published by Wang
Ming in the November, 1937 is-
sue of the Communist Interna-
tional, wherein he wrote: "...dur-
ing the Sian events (the refer-
ence is to the kidnapping of
Chiang Kai-shek in December,
1936—Ed.), the Japano-Trots-
kyite agents, led by the bandit
Chang Mu-tao, tried their utmost
to foment war between Nanking
and Sian.... The Trotskyites,
headed by the thrice contemptible
renegades, Huang Ping and
Chang Mu-tao, received \$50,000
monthly from the Japanese secret
service in North China.... to
conduct wrecking work.... The
Trotskyists Hsui Lun-shan, Chen
Sui-tsia and the bloodstained as-
sassin Chen Chuo-san (or He-
Chin) use Japanese money to pub-
lish special newspapers and pe-
riodicals in Shanghai in which
they spread all kinds of slander
against the Communist Party,
Kuomintang, and all anti-Japan-
ese mass organizations."

Who Are They?

Who are these other "Trotsky-
ites" named by Wang Ming?
Our Chinese comrades identify
them all and expose at one blow
the falsifiers and their criminal
amalgams.
"The Trotskyist" Huang Ping,
like Chang Mu-tao, they write,
"is an ex-Stalinist and one of a
countless number who not only
capitulated to the Kuomintang
but betrayed many of his old
comrades. He was a member of
the Central Committee of the

Chinese (Communist Party. Ar-
rested in 1932, his statement of
capitulation was published in
1934 by the Kuomintang in a
unique pamphlet entitled Trans-
formation (Tschuan Bian), which
is a veritable bible of Stalinist
capitulators.

"The Trotskyist" Hsui Lun-
shan was expelled from the Com-
munist League of China in 1931.
He subsequently joined the Blue
shirts, Chiang Kai-shek's strong-
arm gang, and became editor of
the China Times at Shanghai. He
is now in Hankow. Of all the
Trotskyists named by Wang
Ming, Hsui Lun-shan is the only
one who ever held membership
in the Communist League, and he
was expelled more than six years
ago.

Exposed Moscow Trials

"The Trotskyist" professor,
Chen Sui-tsia, formerly of Fuh
Tan University in Shanghai, is
politically unconnected. Entirely
upon his own initiative he wrote
an appraisal of the Moscow
trials which was published by the
Oriental Press in Shanghai. His
book, wherein he concluded that
the trials were frame-ups, was
suppressed by the Kuomintang
government at the request of the
Soviet embassy.

The Trotskyist Chen Chuo-
shan was an active member of
the C. P. some years ago.

Trapped by Kuomintang spies
who were assisted by Stalin-
ist traitors, he refused to cap-
itulate although threatened
with death. He was lined up for
execution with several others, but
miraculously escaped death when
the bullets struck him in non-
vital parts. Threatened again
with execution, he finally capitu-
lated to the Kuomintang, was set
at liberty, and lived thereafter
in political obscurity in Shanghai.
He is the author and translator
of many Marxist works. Although
he remained loyal to them at the
moment of death, the Stalinists
now denounce him as a 'blood-
stained assassin.' Such is Stalin-
ist gratitude to the few faith-
ful among their members. Such
are the Trotskyists accused by
Wang Ming!"

Truth Proclaimed

The brazen slanders and falsi-
fications of Wang Ming are be-
ing answered by our Chinese com-
rades. In a long programmatic
letter published in the Shanghai
Evening Post of January 7, the
Chinese version of which appear-
ed in the vernacular
newspaper, Ta Mei Wan Pao,
they proclaimed anew their re-
volutionary, unconditional sup-
port of the war against Japan-
ese imperialism, while character-
izing in the sharpest terms the
ignominious and treacherous ca-
pitulation of the C.P. to the re-
actionary regime of Chiang Kai-
shek and the reactionary Stalin-
ist campaign against revolution-
ists. Calling for the mobilization
and arming of the Chinese masses
as the only means of driving out
the imperialist invaders, the let-
ter concludes:

"Our position with regard to
the present war is crystal clear.
It is consistent with our views
as expressed in published pro-
grams during the past ten years,
in our contemporaneous publica-
tions, with our activity in the
struggle today. The current
methods of abuse, slander, frame-
up, and assassination now in un-
ashamed vogue among the inter-
national parties of the Comintern
find their expression in China in
Chen Shao-yi's slander, which,
because of our increasing in-
fluence, will grow like a fester as
it has in other countries. It is
clear that an integral part of
Chen Shao-yi's mandate from
Moscow returning him to China
includes the intensification of the
slander campaign against us.
Such slander, such provocations,
such vile and dishonest methods
neither can nor will stop our
struggle against Japanese im-
perialism."

Letters from Our Readers

In the Painters' Union

Dear Editor:
Permit me to write in your
newspaper about what has occur-
red in the Painters' Union.
Under the Communist Party
leadership things are beginning
to be stirred up again. More than
ever, the members of Local 848
are feeling it. Never in the 35
years of the local's existence and
under any administration has a
thing happened which has oc-
curred now. We will soon be
afraid to attend meetings.
Local 848 has always been a
progressive local for all alike.
Every member had the right to
express himself against the lead-
ership without fear. Even Com-
rade Weinstock and his fellow-
Stalinists, when they were bar-
red from every other local, found
a welcome in 848.
But now under the Communist
Party administration the local is
not the same. When a member

gets up to speak against Weinstock
he is hissed and booed
until he is forced to sit down, as
if it were a conspiracy.

Lately Weinstock has brought
into the union a new element of
members, especially in 848, where
opposition against his leadership
is growing stronger. Naturally,
this new element are Weinstock's
supporters who don't attend all
meetings but know just when to
show up.

When the members have an
important problem upon which
they want to vote, and the Stalin-
ites feel it is going to be against
their favor, they start a distur-
bance until a fight breaks out—
with the aid of the new members
who immediately reach for their
knives as a writer reaches for
his pen. If these fights are not
stopped in time, there will be
plenty of bloodshed.

S. Loyal
Local 848.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Monthly Marxist Magazine

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO

THE SOCIALIST APPEAL