

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

VOL. IV—No. 44 Saturday, November 2, 1940

Published Weekly by the  
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Editorial Board:  
**FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN**  
General Manager:  
**RUTH JEFFREY**

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.  
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle  
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents  
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

“Registered as second class matter December 4,  
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.”

**FIGHT WITH THE  
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY**

**ON THE WAR FRONT:**

For:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, under control of the trade unions.
2. The establishment of special officers' training camps, financed by the government and controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
3. Confiscation of all war profits—all company books to be open for trade union inspection.
4. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
6. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces—Down with Jim Crowism.
7. An end to secret diplomacy.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.

**AT HOME:**

For:

1. A job and decent living for every worker.
2. Thirty-thirty—\$30 weekly minimum wage—30 hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
3. \$30 weekly old age and disability pension.
4. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.
5. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
6. A twenty-billion dollar Federal public works and housing program to provide jobs for the unemployed.
7. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
8. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
9. A Worker's and Farmer's Government.

**The Main Question**

The trade unions are demonstrating increasing concern over the problems posed by the onset of universal military conscription.

In an effort to cope with some of these problems, several measures have been instituted or proposed by various unions. Many unions have established dues exemptions for drafted members in order to maintain their union status. Steps are being taken to protect conscripted members against lapse of union insurance policies. Union contracts are being drawn up to include a clause guaranteeing the immediate return of jobs to union conscripts upon completion of their military service. Union leaders and ranks are opposing discrimination in draft exemptions and are sharply protesting the anti-labor composition of the draft boards.

All of these union policies are worthy—so far as they go. Yet they fail to deal with the main problem: *How does organized labor propose to defend the interests of the unionists while they are in the military machine?*

It is all very well for a worker to feel that his union membership will be safeguarded while he is in the armed forces, that his insurance will be maintained, that he has the minimum assurance of a job when—and if—he returns. *But how about the fact that after years of bitter combat in driving back the open-shop regime in industry, the drafted union man must now submit to an even more vicious open-shop rule in the army?*

The drafted workers are being thrust into the grip of reactionary officers who are accustomed to treat the ranks like dirt. The rights and needs of the common soldiers rarely concern the well-paid lickspittles scrambling for promotions in the officers corps. These bourgeois career-men would not hesitate, as in the last war, to toss away the lives of the worker-soldiers like rubbish in adventurist actions which add up only to another stripe on some major's sleeve.

What means of protest against bad food and shelter do the unions offer the worker-recruits? What means of defense do the unions propose

against the spite and venom of contemptuous and labor-hating disciplinarians with unlimited power of court-martial? How do the unions expect to maintain the principle of the union wage while millions of workers and their dependents must accept existence on the \$21 and \$30 monthly pay now tossed like a dry bone to the army privates?

Yet, even these immediately vexing evils fade into insignificance before a more ominous and far-reaching menace: *the use to which the armed forces will be put if the present officer caste continues to dominate the military machine.*

The army and navy are as much the tools of the possessing class as the National Guard. (Every union man loathes the National Guard as a strike-breaking agency employed by the boss government against the workers.) The army officers are schooled by official manuals which openly declare one of the prime purposes of the federal armed forces to be the quelling of “domestic unrest”. In the language of the boss-class, “domestic unrest” means any struggle of the workers for their rights.

That the present military staffs will be ready and eager to smash the workers' struggles is certain. Drawn largely from the ranks of the middle-class and rich; trained in exclusive military colleges which drill them in caste superiority; quick to kowtow and connive in order to win promotion, the present officers are in natural accord with the aims of the financial and industrial magnates.

The only aim of the ruling class is to safeguard its property interests and exploit labor to the fullest degree. That is why the present military heads, in the exact manner of their French counterparts, will not hesitate to surrender to and even support the vilest reaction and fascism in order to protect the possessions of the rich at the expense of the lives of the workers and soldiers.

We are most insistent that the workers, confronted with universal militarism, war and reaction, must have full training in the use of arms. But the workers must have union rights and conditions in the armed forces. And they must be able to influence the course and direction of their armed struggles. To secure these ends, we propose:

*Military training of the workers, financed by the government, under the control of the trade unions.*

*The establishment of special officers' training camps, financed by the government and controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.*

The measures proposed so far by union leaders tend merely to answer the problems of the worker after he is demobilized. Our program answers the real problem, the problem of the worker WITHIN the boss-ruled armed forces.

**Significant Words**

What are we fighting for? asks British labor. Inarticulate, unorganized, the opposition to imperialist war is nevertheless spreading. In distorted form it manages to exert its pressure upon the military dictatorship now ruling Great Britain.

“Britain and her allies are determined to produce a just order in Europe,” Minister of Labor Ernest Bevin told the restless British workers in a radio broadcast October 25; “and to recreate it on the basis of freedom, free association and equality. We will never tolerate again masses of unemployed or poverty. We will not recognize privilege or place. A juster scheme of things is our aim.”

Significant words! Labor wants an end to war and capitalist dictatorship be it fascist, military, or democratic. The government finds itself obliged to appeal to this sentiment in order to keep the workers fighting a little longer. But the government thereby only succeeds in strengthening this sentiment.

The British workers, like the workers of the other imperialist nations dragooned to fight the capitalist war for domination of the world market, will find their way in the coming period to the program of the Fourth International.

And this program, pointing the way to socialism; the society of the future, will make it possible for the workers to really bring about what they want, an end forever of unemployment, poverty, and privilege.

**Hands Off the C. P.**

The action of the courts in banning the Communist Party from the ballot in New York can be taken by the class conscious worker in no other way than as a blow directed at the labor movement as a whole. We say this without making any concession to Stalinism.

Revolutionary opposition to Stalinism was initiated by the Trotskyists and has been led by them for seventeen years. We speak with full authority as the most intransigent foes of Stalinism.

Why, then, do we oppose the removal of the Stalinists from the ballot? The answer is simple. The ban issued by the New York courts may be the first step in general repression of workers' organizations, as the United States plunges into the second world war. As such the ban must be opposed by every trade unionist and friend of labor.

But more directly, the act of the courts can lend the Stalinists a halo of martyrdom and refurbish their false authority among the workers as a revolutionary party. This possible result is the most perfidious and dangerous threat to the labor movement since it would strengthen the position of Stalinism.

The job of crushing Stalinism as a political force cannot be farmed out to capitalist reaction. Labor itself must cleanse its ranks of the Stalinist influence. That is why we say to the capitalist courts, hands off the Communist Party!

**Leon Trotsky and the Anniversary of October**

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

The Russian Revolution continues to live in two ways. It lives because nationalized property continues to exist within the Soviet Union. It lives also by virtue of the existence of an organized section of the working class devoted to the task of defending the Soviet Union through the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the extension of the October Revolution throughout the world.

Leon Trotsky's analysis of the nature of the Soviet Union as a degenerated workers' state makes it possible for us to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution knowing that not all of its achievements have been destroyed. Trotsky's defense of the principles underlying the Russian Revolution is responsible for the existence of a movement devoted to those principles and therefore able to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

And therein lies the greatest of all of Trotsky's great contributions to the cause of working-class emancipation.

Trotsky's analysis of the nature of the Soviet Union and the causes for its degeneration is the most important single factor in preventing the advanced section of the working class from giving way to the deep disillusionment that demoralized such a large section of the group formerly connected with the revolutionary movement.

The idealistic interpretation offered by the middle-class intellectuals amounts to this: “The Revolution failed because cunning and unscrupulous people pushed aside able idealists. Every revolution must meet the same fate. Hence there is no use to struggle for the socialist revolution.”

In contradistinction to the idealistic interpretation of the middle-class intellectuals, Trotsky furnished us with a materialistic explanation of the nature of the Soviet Union and the causes for its degeneration. This is not the place to go into a detailed explanation of that analysis. A bare outline will suffice to indicate the tremendous difference between a Marxist and an idealistic approach to this all-important social problem.

What was the main social conquest of the Russian Revolution? The nationalization by the proletarian state of the means of production. Have the new property relations created by the Revolution been destroyed and has private property in the means of production been re-established? The answer is in the negative.

True, the political superstructure has been radically altered since the Revolution. The democratic rule of the masses in all Soviet institutions has been destroyed. The backwardness of the country, the death of the best proletarian elements during the Civil War, the weariness of the masses, the failure of the proletarian revolution to arise in the more advanced countries, enabled the bureaucracy to concentrate all power in its hands and destroy all forms of Soviet democracy. But nationalized property still remains and the bureaucracy depends for its existence on nationalized property.

The social rule of every class can and does assume different political forms. The capitalist class can and does rule under democratic, monarchical and fascist forms. Proletarian rule must have democracy in order to achieve its objectives but that does not mean that under certain historic conditions and for a certain length of time the rule of the working class cannot be represented through the dictatorship of a bureaucracy or even of an individual.

Then why, asks the superficial person with an air of profundity, do you blame Stalin if conditions made his victory possible? For the same reason that we place the blame upon the imperialists of the different nations for the imperialist war even though we recognize that, in the last analysis, imperialism and not the imperialists are responsible.

**DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION**

Trotsky is not the only one responsible for the existence of nationalized property in the Soviet Union. To him, of course, history will allot a tremendous share of the credit for the Revolution which was the cause of nationalized property coming into existence. Trotsky, however, is responsible for the fact that we understand the nature of the Soviet Union at the present time.

And it is our knowledge of the nature of the Soviet Union that gives so much more meaning to our celebration of the anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

Above all Trotsky drew logical conclusions from his basic premises. To consider the Soviet Union as a workers' state meant to assume an obligation to defend it in any struggle against the forces of imperialism, even though the Stalinist bureaucracy was guiding the destinies of the workers' state, and even though the bureaucracy committed a political crime in initiating the struggle. Any other conclusion would make the concept of workers' state completely meaningless from the point of view of a political attitude towards the Soviet Union.

The major part of his writings in the last nine months of his life dealt with the controversy then

raging in the ranks of our party. In essence his polemics against the minority that split away from the ranks of the Fourth International was a continuation of his struggle against those who denied the character of the Soviet Union as a workers' state.

Fortunate indeed was our party, and consequently the whole revolutionary movement, that the GPU did not succeed in murdering Trotsky before the controversy between the majority and the minority of the Socialist Workers Party took place. Trotsky's articles against the minority-splitters constitute some of his most powerful polemical writings.

Reduced to its simplest terms the question involved in the struggle was: Should a Marxist party defend higher forms of property relations against lower forms? Stated in this manner (and that is the only correct way of stating it) it becomes difficult to see how it was possible for such a controversy to occur in a Marxist party. But the circumstances were such that a group composed mainly of middle-class intellectuals lost its bearings and, under the pressure of the democratic bourgeoisie, it adopted a purely idealistic position.

**FOUGHT AGAINST THE STREAM**

Most of those who, because of their disillusionment with the Soviet Union under Stalinist control, rejected the theory that the Soviet Union was still a workers' state, did not end there. Their disillusionment brought them to the point of breaking with all the fundamental principles of Marxism.

Repelled by the ugly totalitarianism of the Stalinist bureaucracy the middle-class intellectuals confused the bureaucracy with the workers' state and with the socialist revolution and rejected all three.

In this period of reaction the revolutionary movement would have been completely demoralized and destroyed (to be revived no one knows when) had not Trotsky been with us to fight fiercely and effectively against this reactionary disillusionment and on behalf of the principles that made the Russian Revolution possible.

Did any one of the disillusioned intellectuals attempt to show that there was an effective substitute for revolutionary Marxism? They had nothing to offer except—bourgeois democracy. Some talk about “democratic socialism” but essentially their theories reduce themselves to defending bourgeois democracy.

Rejecting the principles of the Russian Revolution the disillusioned ones could find nothing better to embrace than capitalist democracy. In the very period when that democracy was proving its complete impotence in solving a single major problem confronting mankind! In the very period when history placed before us the sole alternatives of fascism or proletarian democracy, the disillusioned ones began to crawl back to the bosom of the bourgeois democracy that was being destroyed before their very eyes.

From this the disillusioned intellectuals jumped to the conclusion that any disciplined party must of necessity degenerate regardless of social conditions. Because Stalin chronologically followed Lenin therefore Stalinism is the logical and inevitable outcome of Leninism.

**ONLY THE LENINIST PARTY CAN WIN!**

It devolved mainly upon Trotsky to shatter every one of the arguments which the intellectuals attempted to present. Consciously he saw it as his duty, in the midst of disillusionment and reaction, to save the best elements for the proletarian revolution to come.

In this task personal friendship or previous services to the proletarian movement counted for naught with Trotsky. Every one who dared raise any doubts and thus weaken the revolutionary movement felt the lash of his pen. To him the socialist revolution was everything and its achievement was impossible without a Bolshevik party—democratic, centralized, disciplined. The very mistake that he made in his early years on the question of such a party made him all the more determined to prevent others from making similar mistakes.

Against the disillusionment of the intellectuals he pitted his Marxist analysis of the period in which we are living, his explanation of the reaction, his undying faith in the proletarian revolution, his firm conviction that only a disciplined party grounded on the principles of revolutionary Marxism could achieve that revolution.

To educate the vanguard in the midst of the deepest reaction the working class has ever passed through and to keep that vanguard loyal to the principles of the Russian Revolution were Trotsky's tasks. The very existence of our party is eloquent testimony that he accomplished those tasks.

Celebrating the anniversary of the Russian Revolution without accepting and defending the principles underlying that Revolution is impossible. That we are celebrating the anniversary of that Revolution at the present moment when all around us rage pessimism and disillusionment is due solely to the work of Leon Trotsky.

**An Army Major Tells Some Truths**

By ART PREIS

A devastating indictment of the officer caste in the army has just been made by an authoritative spokesman, Major Malcolm Wheeler-Nicholson, in his book, “Battle Shields of the Republic” (Macmillan Co.), published last week.

His chief charge is directed against the promotion system in the army, which is based not on capacity to lead troops in battle but upon favoritism and seniority.

The young officer out of West Point is sent to an army post where he is buried in pure paper-work, records and red-tape routine reports. He has no urge, the book states, to study the problems of modern warfare.

The chief concern of the young officer is not the readiness of his unit for battle, but securing a favorable “efficiency report” from his colonel; for his promotion is based on seniority and the good graces of his superior officers.

The basis of the colonel's “efficiency” report is personal opinion. As a result, the young officer must play up to the colonel's prejudices and wangle his way into the same social circles. Major Wheeler-Nicholson cites the case of a lieutenant who received an unfavorable “efficiency report” after his dog chased the cat belonging to the Colonel's wife.

As a result of this system, the Major points out, most of the officers reaching high rank—by the process of stepping into dead men's shoes and pulling all the strings—are amateur diplomats first of all, and rarely first-class soldiers. In addition, their entire training has been in paper-work administration, and they are wholly unfitted for leadership in real war.

The book makes thoroughly clear the corruption and connivance which characterizes the army regime.

In addition, Major Wheeler-Nicholson asserts that the same system is in force in the Reserves and National Guard, where the officers are even more inadequate. He maintains that the average officer in the American Reserve or National Guard knows less about war than the average German private.

A most serious effect of the present army system, as the book points out, is that the officers are brought to high rank when they are already too old. The general officers average about 60 years in age, almost exactly that of the French and British generals who failed against Hitler. The heads of the Nazi army average but forty-five.

**CIVIL WAR OFFICERS WERE DIFFERENT**

The North might have lost the Civil War if Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Emory Upton, James H. Wilson and Alexander Mackenzie had not finally been placed in command of the Union Armies. The average age of these six when they took command was thirty-three years, and not one was forty-five at the end of the war. Wheeler-Nicholson states that if the present system had been in force back in 1863 not a single one of these brilliant military men could have become a general, for the system does not permit promotion for ability, only demotion for demerit—which most often means failing to smooth some officious general the right way.

This system can provide only the type of army leadership which abandoned the French workers and soldiers to the mercy of the Nazi.

But all is not lost, according to an article in the October 18 issue of United States News, an “inside” political dope-magazine for Wall Street. The evils pointed out by Wheeler-Nicholson, begrudgingly acknowledged by the News, will be changed.

**“REFORMS” THAT CHANGE NOTHING**

According to the News, promotion from the ranks has become a definite part of the future army program. Special schools are being planned to prepare enlisted men—not draftees—for commissions. But not all enlisted men. The plan provides that any enlisted recruit may enter one of these schools after a year of regular training—“if he has a college education”. This contemplated reform may provide a lot more paper-work officers from the ranks of the well-to-do who can afford to send their boys to college, but gives little hope for competent leadership where the bullets fly thickest.

The U. S. News article also reveals plans to reduce the snobbishness and “stuffed-shirt” attitude of the officers. The officers are being encouraged to become more close to the ranks, but, “Of course” this does not mean “drinking and chumming with them.” Just an occasional pat on the head!

This new attitude is not motivated by genuine sympathy for the ordinary recruit. Oh, no! The article makes this clear when it states, “Operation of a tank or plane with three or four men cramped into a tiny cockpit leaves the officer-in-charge little inclination to be thought a ‘stuffed shirt’ by the mechanics on whose skill his life may depend.”

Harsh martinet discipline is to go also. According to recent instructions from the army high command, new recruits are not to be given disciplinary confinements—“where such punishment can be avoided”.

Instead, a more inspiring influence will be employed to keep the recruits in line. Says the U. S. News, “The Army is relying on the women's influence. Now each army post is to have a post matron or ‘mother.’” Come, son, tell mother all!

This balderdash proposed as reforms for the army ruling system merely adds further proof of the hopeless weaknesses of the whole officer system. It cannot be otherwise. For the present army command is an extension of the ruling regime of the degenerate capitalist system. So long as the boss class runs the army it will move heaven and earth to close the doors of the officers corps to the talented workers and tested union fighters.

Capitalist war is exactly like capitalist economics: we go to war to get the peace to get the strength to go to war to get the peace, etc., etc.

**Celebrate the 23rd Anniversary of the  
RUSSIAN REVOLUTION  
FRIDAY, NOV. 8th  
8 P. M.  
IRVING PLAZA  
Irving Pl. and 15th Street, New York City**

**SPEAKERS:  
JOSEPH HANSEN  
Former Secretary to Leon Trotsky**

**FARRELL DOBBS  
National Labor Secretary**

**MURRY WEISS  
Organizer, Local New York**