

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

Vol. III, No. 40 June 9, 1939

Published twice a week by the  
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8647

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Single copies: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 5 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.  
Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for six months; \$2.00 for one year.

Reentered as second class matter February 16, 1935, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN  
Associate Editors: HAROLD ROBERTS, FELIX MORROW  
Staff Members: EMANUEL GARRETT, JOSEPH HANSEN  
Business Manager: S. STANLEY

**FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:**

1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty! \$30-weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An Independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.

**Minnesota Acts**

Labor in Minneapolis, and in its Twin City sister, St. Paul, has set the pace more than once for the working class movement of this country. This is especially true of the teaming crafts, who have blazed a trail for labor progress throughout the Northwest.

True to this tradition was the militant demonstration of 5,000 workers in the Twin Cities which took place last week and is reported elsewhere in this issue. The workers manifested their determination not to lie down quietly while the cynical ruling class and its legislative agents continue to cut the relief scale to the bone and to throw additional thousands off the rolls every month.

The unemployed—the millions of them who continue to suffer after almost ten years of the crisis—have no way out of their increasing misery save by fighting aggressively in an organized manner. They are faced literally with a fight for life. Passivity, crawling, whining, begging for favors, hoping for miracles—those will only result in reducing them to ever lower levels.

It's organized, militant struggle—or starvation.

If the Stassens and Roosevelts, the Republicans or Democrats, do not encounter stormy resistance from the unemployed, they will just continue to cut and cut and cut, so that capitalist profits and the war machine may grow and grow and grow. Nothing can be expected from the rival relief-cutters.

The workers—employed and unemployed—must take things into their own hands. No one will save them from wretchedness but themselves. Let them mobilize their invincible strength to:

- Open the idle factories!
- All war funds to the unemployed!
- A Twenty-Billion Dollar Public Works and Housing program!
- A job and a decent living for every worker!
- Expropriate the 60 Families!

**Refugees in Cuba**

There are few more harrowing stories of anguish and persecution than that of more than 900 Jewish refugees from Germany—men, women and children—who are kept in the purgatory of the liner *Saint Louis* in Atlantic waters, between the inferno of fascist Germany, from which they were driven, and what they hoped was the paradise of Cuba, which has refused to admit them.

From the Nazi swine, the Jewish victims of the "Aryan supermen" expected nothing but what they got. But they did look forward to the government of Cuba to provide them with a haven. They thought that Cuba, unlike Germany, was a "modern democracy" where racial discrimination and anti-Semitism were not tolerated. Instead they found a regime which repulsed them with the same brutality with which they were driven from Nazi Germany.

The *Daily Worker* feels rather embarrassed by the whole incident. Not so much for the sake of the refugees, but because it puts the new Stalinist hero, Col. Fulgencio Batista, military dictator of the "Cuban democracy," in a dastardly light. All they find it possible to say about the Cuban regime is this—referring to the anti-Semitic campaign of the reactionary

Havana press: "Under this pressure, Cuban officials unfortunately weakened and rescinded the original order of admission."

They unfortunately weakened—these brave, tough military heroes of democracy! They weren't weak when they murdered scores of revolutionary workers and students. They weren't weak when their machine-guns, pistols and sabres mowed down their radical opponents. But "unfortunately" they were weak when the anti-Semitic jackals began to howl.

Do not think for a moment that the Stalinists will therefore weaken in their love and admiration for Batista. Not at all. They'll continue to burn incense before him. They'll continue to send hacks like Mike Gold to write drunken paeans of publicity about the delights and charms of Batista's rule.

Why? Because Batista is one of Roosevelt's good boys. Why? Because Roosevelt is for a new War for Democracy and so are the Stalinists.

And what, in the face of the Interests of Democracy, does the fate of a few hundred miserable refugees amount to?

**Mooney and Beal**

Tom Mooney spent some of the best years of his life in a California penitentiary. He was railroaded to prison by the reactionary "open shop" interests on the West Coast in one of the most abominable frame-ups known to modern history. He was set free when the protesting voices of the workers in this country and elsewhere could no longer be ignored.

A few thousand miles from Mooney's old prison cell, clear across the country, sits another victim of frame-up justice. He is the courageous, militant textile worker, Fred E. Beal. He was one of the fearless pioneers who sought to bring unionism to the bitterly exploited workers of the South. He led that magnificent strike struggle of the North Carolina textile slaves in Gastonia about ten years ago. The Bourbons determined to get him; and they did. Like Mooney, Fred Beal was railroaded to prison on a trumped-up charge.

The difference between the Mooney and Beal cases lies in the fact that Beal is being kept in jail not only by the textile barons, but with the connivance of the Communist party and its dirty hirelings. The Stalinists cannot forgive him for having expressed himself so frankly and critically about conditions in the Soviet Union which he was able to observe while he lived and worked there. They have been engaged in actively sabotaging any effort to obtain Beal's release. They have cynically trampled underfoot the most elementary principles of labor solidarity.

Mooney now is free. Fred Beal is not. We would like to see Tom Mooney, the most renowned class-war prisoner of our time in this country, raise his voice in a call to all labor to fight for Beal's freedom.

The War Department announces the award of a contract calling for 814 army trucks, to cost over \$1,000,000. This is the largest single contract for motor vehicles made in a number of years. The one and one-half ton trucks will be used by National Guard units all over the country for quick mobilization and rapid transportation in any emergency. That is, whenever the workers get the idea of striking for better working conditions.

**"Good Neighbors"**

Speaking at a dinner for 1,500 prominent business men at the World's Fair, Secretary of Commerce Harry L. Hopkins clarified for their benefit what President Roosevelt means by his "good neighbor" policy in Latin America. He described in detail the lucrative fields of investment south of the Rio Grande, and the need for increasing economic penetration of those fields.

But the United States must recognize the rights and the feelings of the inhabitants of these countries to make their own laws and control their economic development. Hence the "good neighbor" policy: greater domestic management of foreign-financed enterprises in Latin America, a domestic management which will welcome the "participation" of United States imperialism.

The agreement signed recently by Roosevelt and Dictator Somoza of Nicaragua exemplifies the general policy described by Hopkins.

Instead of subduing the Latin American people by armed force imposed from the outside in the shape of battleships and marines as has been only too frequently the procedure in the past, local murderers like Somoza—bloody violent dictators thirsty for Uncle Sam's patronage—will be furnished with arms and financial support to reduce their country to the status of a company town dominated by United States imperialism. This is the long-range program described by Hopkins.

When Roosevelt says "good neighbors" he means good colonies.

**Stalin's Decree on Agriculture Is Indication of Conditions in USSR**

Pointing to the Growth of "Landlord Peasants" at the Expense of the Collectives, the Decree Exposes an Omnipotent and Widening Crack in Stalinized Soviet Economy

(Continued from Page 1)

A certain farm the shortage of labor caused by the members engaged in individual enterprise had resulted in failure to build the necessary farm structures, in allowing mown hay to rot in the fields and in necessitating a cost of 12,000 rubles for cattle feed. As a result the great bulk of honest collective farm members received only 90 rubles each for a year's work while one "pseudo collective farmer" earned more than that by a day's work repairing somebody's porch. (Repairing whose porch, by the way? Certainly not the honest collective farmers, who hadn't earned enough to pay for the repairs.)

**THE REAL EXTENT OF COLLECTIVIZATION**

How deep and widespread the individualized farming has become is even more strikingly shown by the proposals in the decree for correction. A minimum number of work days to be spent on the collective farm, as against days on individual holdings, is set. Presumably this minimum is well over the number now being spent, else there would be no point to the decree. In most sections, according to the *Times* report, the minimum is eighty days; sixty days in the northern and central district; and a hundred in the cotton growing regions.

These figures are in the highest degree remarkable. Leaving aside the farms which are not yet collectivized even in name, they mean that even

if the norm of the decree is fulfilled, the allegedly collectivized agriculture of the Soviet Union, the great "triumph of Stalinist realism," would be in actuality only a fourth or a fifth collectivized. There is no other way to interpret the figures. Whatever the legal forms employed, if the agricultural population spends only a fourth or a fifth of its working time (evidently much less, in fact) at collectivist production and the rest at individual production, then agriculture is only to that extent collective.

This seems a curious state of affairs for a country where socialism has already, we are told, been definitely achieved and where there are no classes. It seems, also, a rather negative result to have achieved after the wiping out of five or ten million peasants in order to complete the Stalinist program of collectivization.

**TERROR NO SUBSTITUTE FOR MACHINERY**

As a penalty for violation of the decree, expulsion is provided. "This decree will fit in with the program that the government has already launched for transporting peasants to sparsely populated regions, especially the Volga and the Far East." Once more the terrible fate of being driven to the wastelands by the whips of the G.P.U. hangs over the peasants who come into the disfavor of the bureaucracy.

Two considerations come at once to mind after reflection upon this new decree. In the

first place, it proves once again—what, in truth, needs no more proof—that the agricultural problem cannot be solved bureaucratically. Not all the decrees of the Kremlin nor all the guns and isolators of the G.P.U. can in the long run get anywhere. The peasants return to their individual plots not, as the *Times* correspondent imagines, because of "the age-old instinct for private profit," but because of the frightful mismanagement of the collectives by the central and local bureaucracy, because of the failure to provide sufficient of the machinery upon which large-scale agriculture depends, and because of the entire failure to give the peasants an adequate return in manufactured goods. It is the disproportion and breakdown in Soviet economy and polity generally that brings about the reversion in agriculture to more primitive forms.

At the same time, the conditions indicated by the decree indicate a widening and ominous crack in the Soviet economy. The more successful of the individually operating peasants (above all, the "landlord peasants" so casually referred to in the decree) are members of a class, a class alien to the proletariat and capable in a time of open crisis of becoming the backbone of a revisionist movement. The centrifugal forces in Soviet life, present in any case from the nature of the country and its isolation but fostered and advanced by Stalinism, strain ever closer to violent explosion.

**Letters Show How Spain's Cause Was Sacrificed and for What**

That Stalin was directly responsible for the suicidal policy imposed on the Spanish workers and peasants is now proven by letters laying down that policy and signed by Stalin himself, sent to the then Premier Caballero and now released by Caballero's associate, Luis Araquistain.

Published in facsimile in the *New York Times*, June 4, Stalin's letters reveal that the policy of keeping Azana and other traitors in power, appeasing the Chamberlain and Daladier governments, giving the factories and land back to the treacherous capitalists and landowners and thus crushing the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses, was dictated to the Loyalist government by Stalin, under threat of cutting off the skimpy Russian supplies if Stalin's orders were not obeyed.

The most important letter was written December 21, 1936, at a time when the revolutionary struggle against Franco was still strong. The factories were then in the hands of the workers' committees, the land had been seized and was being tilled by the peasants' collectives and councils, the workers' militias were still the backbone of the armed forces, and even though they formally sat in the government, no real power was being wielded by the bourgeois Azanas and Barrios who had facilitated Franco's rising and who were ready to yield to him. Stalin's letter demanded a reversal of all these revolutionary measures against Franco:

**DESTROY REVOLUTION. WAS STALIN'S DEMAND**

"It is above all necessary that the government should be assured of the continuance of Azana and his group in power, doing everything possible to help them overcome their hesitation. This is necessary in order to prevent the enemies of Spain from considering her as a Communist republic, and to forestall thus their open intervention, which constitutes the greatest danger for republican Spain."

Thus ordered Stalin. He was obeyed. With the result that Azana's group used their governmental power to betray the cause of Loyalist Spain, finally going openly over to surrendering to Franco. The same Azana-Stalinist combination accepted the "non-intervention" fraud which directly facilitated the intervention of Germany and Italy.

Stalin ordered the factories and land returned to the Spanish and foreign bourgeoisie. The only decrees specifically proposed by Stalin for the peasantry, significantly, refer to "the question of taxes"—in

other words, instead of giving them the land, the peasants were to get the usual bourgeois panacea of "more equitable" taxes.

As for the factories, Stalin declared:

"It would be necessary to attract to the side of the government the small and middle bourgeoisie or, in any event, to give them the possibility of taking a neutral position, favorable to the government, protecting them against attempts at confiscation and guaranteeing them, within possible limits, freedom of trade. Otherwise these groups will become fascists."

The "middle bourgeoisie"—i.e., the native industrial overlords—were already fascist, and returning them to their economic power enabled them to sabotage Loyalist struggle against Franco. And to enforce this policy, Stalin's agents crushed and assassinated and imprisoned the flower of the Spanish proletariat.

**STALIN'S "THEORY" TO JUSTIFY COUNTER-REVOLUTION**

In advancing this counter-revolutionary program, Stalin embellished it by a "theoretical" introduction: that "the Spanish revolution plots its course, different from many viewpoints from the course followed by Russia. This is determined by the difference in social, historical and geographical conditions and by the needs of the international situation, different from those the Russian revolution had to contend with." Just precisely what are these differences? Stalin does not

say. His ponderous generalization merely provides the peg to conclude that "the parliamentary way"—i.e., bourgeois road—is best for Spain.

Not "the needs of the international situation" were served by this vicious travesty of Marxism, but the needs of Stalin's Bonapartist clique, who fear nothing in the world so much as the fresh breath which would flow into Russia from a successful proletarian revolution elsewhere.

In presenting Stalin's letter Araquistain seeks to absolve Caballero from responsibility for collaborating in this foul policy. The truth is very different. Stalin's letters were sent to Caballero when, as Premier of Loyalist Spain, he was working hand in glove with the Stalinists, when the Stalinist press was proclaiming Caballero internationally as the "Spanish Lenin" and he in turn had delivered into Stalinist hands the control of the Spanish Socialist Youth, the U.G.T. (General Workers Union), the key positions in the armed forces, etc. Only by recalling the identity between Caballero and his associates and the Stalinists at that time can one understand the frankness with which Stalin transmitted his "advice" signed by his own hand.

The rats are falling out among themselves. They are telling the truth about each other. The terrible defeat in Spain is a warning: free yourselves from the stranglehold of Stalinism, workers, or you will share the fate of the Spanish people.

**WORKERS' FORUM**

**THIS IRISHMAN STOOD HIS GROUND**

Editor:  
I went down to Washington and Essex Streets with three other comrades and started to sell Appeals. Along comes a big Irish cop and tells me to move on because I can't sell there since I'm "disturbing the people going by and yelling too much." I answer him by stating that I have the right to sell because I had a permit to sell on the streets. He answers that he doesn't care if I have a permit. Then he went further and said that no Irishman can sell the *Socialist Appeal* from Moscow (!) and (me being an Irishman) I'd better move on or he'd pull me in. I came back at him with the Bill of Rights and the Constitution and said I'd have him investigated. Then I pulled out a pencil and paper and asked for his name

and number. A crowd had gathered and were with me against the cop. A few workers yelled out that if it was *Social Justice* or the *American* it would be o. k. He asked for my permit and started looking it over. Then he called another cop for a brain trust session.

About 100 people were crowding around and the cops asked me to please stop talking loud as I was attracting too much attention. During all this I was selling the *Appeal* and shouting our slogans against Fascism and how to fight it with Workers' Defense Guards. Finally, the two cops came out of their huddle and told me it was o. k. to sell.

Then they went away and many workers commended me for my stand against the cops. Many of the workers bought Appeals.

Comradely, J. T. Boston

**Their Government** By James Burnham

On June 1 the Administration completed a very shrewd partisan maneuver by forcing a record vote in the House of Representatives on the Townsend Plan. There are probably less than a dozen Congressmen who really favor the Townsend Plan. However, in many sections of the country, especially in New England and the Middle West, the Republicans found it convenient and even necessary to make an opportunistic bid last autumn for the support of Townsend's followers. During the election campaign, Republican candidates pledged themselves, openly or by implication, to the Plan.

The expectation of the Republicans was doubtless that a day of reckoning on the pledge could be indefinitely postponed. The Plan could, in accordance with a usual custom, be buried in Committee. Or, at worst, if it came to the floor, the cowardly method of avoiding a record vote, now common in the House, could be employed.

But here was an opportunity made to order for all sections of the Democratic Party, constituting a majority. The Republicans have been trying to make big propaganda on the issue of "economy". They are also, many of them, pledged to the huge "extravagance" of the Townsend Plan. Very well. Force a record vote on the Plan. Then the Republicans are in a perfect dilemma: if they vote against the Plan, they have broken their pledges and lose the Townsendite support; if they vote for it, they explode their own economy issue.

The parliamentary jockeying went on for weeks. The record vote was forced; and, since the dilemma was genuine, there is no doubt that by it the Republicans were thrown for a loss.

**The Times Is Morally Indignant**

The Plan received 97 affirmative votes, including one-third of the Republican votes in the House. The *New York Times* the next morning devoted its lead editorial to the outcome. "The Townsend Plan Bill," the *Times* begins, "has been defeated in the House by a vote of 302 to 97, and the country is doubtless expected to breathe easier." The *Times* dismisses the Plan itself with an economic flourish: "The Townsend Plan is utterly fantastic. It would call for an astronomical expenditure by the Federal Government in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000,000 a year. If any attempt were made to raise such a sum by taxation it would lead to economic chaos."

But this economic argument is, as often, not decisive for the *Times*. It is to a moral argument against the Plan that the *Times* makes its final appeal. The point is well worth pondering:

"Even if the plan were workable it would impose a monstrously unfair distribution of income. It would place crushing taxes on our population with its average per capita income of about \$550 a year in order that less than one-tenth of that population should receive per capita incomes of \$2,400 a year."

The injustice of such income arrangements is, apparently, self-evident to the editors of the *Times*.

**Let Not the Right Hand . . .**

But the editors of the *Times* failed, perhaps, to read carefully the contents of their own paper that morning. If they had turned to a page preceding that on which their editorial appeared, they would have found an instructive news report dealing with incomes for the year 1937.

There they would have discovered that for the year 1937 forty-nine individuals in the United States reported to the Treasury Department net incomes in excess of one million dollars. When it is recalled that the net income figure is arrived at after a hundred and one deductions for taxes, contributions, exemptions, credits, pseudo-losses and all the other devices thought up by high-priced lawyers, the excess over one million dollars must be very considerable indeed. One individual, even with all deductions, reported a net income of over five million dollars for that year.

Now, if we apply the very same reasoning that the *Times* used in proving the Townsend Plan unjust, we seem to be led inexorably to a remarkable conclusion.

The million-dollar-plus incomes are admittedly possible because of capitalism, or what the *Times* sometimes calls the "system of free enterprise". So, using the argument of the editorial, we are compelled to say: "Even if capitalism were workable it would impose a monstrously unfair distribution of income. It would place crushing burdens on our population with its average per capita income of about \$550 a year in order that less than .00004% of that population should receive per capita incomes of \$1,000,000 plus a year."

**And As for Economics**

So much for the moral argument. But the economic argument which the *Times* uses against the Townsend Plan applies no less fully against the system which the *Times* so solicitously defends. Could any system be more "utterly fantastic" than one which destroys food which people need to eat, throws millions who want to work out of jobs, shuts factories while goods are everywhere needed, suppresses inventions and new techniques, plunges all mankind into wars from which no one but a handful of super-financiers benefits?

The *Times* estimates that the Townsend Plan would cost the Federal Government \$20,000,000,000 a year. But according to the government's own figures, capitalism costs the people at least five times this, at least \$100,000,000,000 a year: this figure being the difference between the actual output of goods and services and that which the productive plant of the country is immediately capable of.

The editors of the *Times* had better be more careful of the arguments they use. They might suggest ideas that would be most awkward for, among others, the editors themselves.

Billy Rose, the Broadway impresario, meets the problem of feeding an elephant by giving him candy bars before the regular meal. He found this cut down the beast's appetite considerably. We may expect the Relief Administration to look into this matter shortly.

The number of men involved in the newly instituted British conscription plan was estimated at about 310,000 annually, not counting reductions due to exemptions, i.e., of cripples, imbeciles, and those sons whose parents are too well heeled to have their kids risk their skins.