

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

Vol. III, No. 93 Saturday, December 16, 1939

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

Editors:

FELIX MORROW MAX SHACHTMAN  
General Manager: Assistant Manager:  
MARTIN ABERN SHERMAN STANLEY

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.  
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Single copies: 5 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

Reentered 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 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—\$0-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.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

**Trotsky and Dies**

The announcement in the press that Leon Trotsky accepted an invitation to appear before the Dies Committee has caused a good deal of comment. The Stalinists, who in the persons of Browder and Foster, voluntarily appeared before the Dies Committee to slander the "Trotskyites", are piously objecting to Trotsky appearing to reply. In addition, however, more honest people have written us asking for an explanation as to how it is possible for a representative of revolutionary Marxism to appear before a reactionary committee. There are also complaints that to condone the appearance of Trotsky before the Dies Committee would constitute a reversal of policy on our part.

In the first place it should be understood that the reports in the press as to the contents of Trotsky's projected testimony are ninety per cent false. Elsewhere in this issue we publish Trotsky's own statement to the press, which makes it quite clear that the sensational stories published by the American press were invented in their home offices. He will offer neither secrets nor "documents", nor will he have a word to say about the situation in Mexico or the rest of Latin America. He will speak only under the proposed conditions: in reply to references made to him by witnesses before the Dies Committee, and in answer to questions submitted in advance about the history of Stalinism.

Now what possible objections can there be to taking advantage of the platform of the Dies Committee in order to expose and discredit the most malignant disease the labor movement has ever been infected with?

Because Dies is a reactionary and wants to utilize his committee for reactionary purposes? We of course insist that he is one of the most reactionary figures in the political life of this country, and we shall continue our struggle against his committee and its reactionary purposes. But since when is a revolutionary Marxist prohibited from appearing before any parliamentary committee, no matter how reactionary, in order to explain things to the public from his own point of view? Only a sterile radicalism that is afraid of itself would dictate opposition to such a policy.

Would we refuse to send representatives to Congress because we recognize Congress is a reactionary body? And is there any difference between a Congressional investigating committee and Congress itself? If we had a representative of our party in Congress he would make a serious attempt to become a member of such a committee in order to bring his own point of view into the investigations.

It is true that on some occasions the *Socialist Appeal* contained articles, dealing with the appearance of renegades before the committee, that

contained some careless formulations from which it could be deduced that we are opposed to any revolutionary appearing before the committee. We did not distinguish in a sufficiently clear manner the appearance of ex-revolutionaries before the committee with the appearance of a revolutionary. But in an editorial written as a reply to a letter received from Joseph Zack—published in the Oct. 20 issue of the *Appeal*—we corrected whatever incorrect formulations occurred in a previous issue.

"Revolutionists," we then wrote, "have not only appeared in the past, either voluntarily or under compulsion, before governmental bodies, but even in capitalist courts. In every such case, what was decisive was the capacity in which they appeared and the attitude they took when they spoke."

The important thing to consider is not the appearance before a reactionary committee but what one's purpose is in appearing and the content of one's testimony.

To expose and discredit Stalinism before the working masses is the sacred duty of every revolutionist, and not to take advantage of the forum offered even by a reactionary committee would constitute a violation of that duty.

We are confident that any worker reading the testimony of comrade Trotsky (if he should actually be permitted to appear before the committee), will be freed of all doubts as to the wisdom of his appearance there from the standpoint of the interests of the international working class which he has always served.

**FDR On Minneapolis**

On Friday, July 14, in the midst of the nationwide WPA strike, Roosevelt permitted the press to quote him directly, a rare event. He said, addressing the WPA workers: "You cannot strike against the government." Emboldened by the most direct possible support from the president, the police everywhere proceeded to clamp down on the strikers. The evening of the day Roosevelt made his statement, police—aided by FBI agents scattered among the pickets and disguised as strikers—attacked a Minneapolis WPA picket line, killing unemployed Emil Bergstrom and wounding a score of others. Then followed Attorney General Murphy's order to his Minneapolis office to initiate prosecutions of the WPA strikers, resulting in the indictment of 162 and—so far—three trials and 33 convictions on the charge of "conspiracy" against the government and its laws.

On Tuesday of this week a reporter at the president's press conference made a reference to the Minneapolis events, and to proposed marches, in Ohio and elsewhere, in protest against the cutting off of relief. Whereupon the president repeated his prohibition of strikes of WPA workers—and went further. "Workers on WPA relief projects have no right to strike against the Federal Government, nor to create a disturbance or disrupt the peace," President Roosevelt said today. (New York Times, Dec. 13)

That means: you can't strike, you can't march, you can't hold demonstrations, you can't arouse public attention to the plight of the WPA and relief workers, if you're a WPA worker. You can organize, said the president; but you can't do any of the things which labor organization means.

After his July 14 statement, strikers were killed and wounded and others railroaded to jail. What will happen after this new statement? More repressions and persecutions are in prospect against the labor movement.

It has become thoroughly clear that every single move of the Roosevelt administration against the labor movement must be fought back. Above all this is true of the Minneapolis cases. Labor can permit the convictions in the three WPA trials to stand only at its peril.

Every labor organization in the country can and should participate in the fight against the Minneapolis frameups. Get the facts presented on every union meeting floor; adopt resolutions denouncing the prosecution, and send copies to Roosevelt and Murphy and to the AFL-WPA Defense Committee, c/o Central Labor Union, 18 N. 8 Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota. See to it that every union paper tells the story. Do everything you can to make workers understand that the Minneapolis prosecutions are a foretaste of the war-time oppressions which are planned against the labor movement.

**POOR MANNERHEIM!**

"The White Guardist generals, including Mannerheim, were deprived of virtually all economic and political power when their estates were confiscated and divided. Mannerheim has played no role whatever in politics for many years."—The Socialist Call, Dec. 16.

Yes, Mannerheim has been reduced to commander-in-chief of the Finnish armies.

By Dwight Macdonald

**SPARKS IN THE NEWS**

**Not Fit to Print**

Those who read the midnight edition of the N. Y. Times for Friday, December 8, found on page 5 a story headlined, "ANTI-WAR SENTIMENT IN U.S. RISES, GALLUP SURVEY FINDS." Readers of later editions found this news story still listed in the index, but, on turning to page 5, they discovered the story had been removed. Nor was it to be found elsewhere in the issue.

The Times is famous for its boast, "All the News That's Fit to Print." The anti-war story apparently was judged by the editors less fit to print than the following items, all of which appeared in the later editions on page 5: (1) Princess Hohenlohe leaves England after losing her suit against Lord Rothermere; (2) the first death of a woman in the Royal Air Force is recorded; (3) a lengthy story headlined, "LONDON DOCKS HUM DESPITE NAZI MINES."

**"To Make the World Safe for Kaiserism"**

The last war was fought to get rid of the Kaiser. This war—according to certain conservative statesmen now in the British cabinet who are talking of setting up again the imperial throne of the Hohenzollerns—is being fought to bring back the Kaiser. "Plus ça change, plus c'est le même chose," say the French, which means, "The more things change, the more they remain the same." Or, American style, "No matter how you slice it, it's always baloney."

**Perfidious Albion**

The same British ruling class circles which now are fighting the war to restore the Hohenzollerns, not so long ago were the loyal allies of the Nazi regime. The Bank of England, for example, was for years notoriously friendly to the Nazis, taking the lead in extending to Hitler the vast credits he needed to complete his rearmament program. Then Hitler marched into Czechoslovakia, and the British ruling class suddenly "awoke" to the fact that his plans for expansion would inevitably come into conflict with the British Empire, and that the real threat to their class interests came from Nazi Germany and not from Stalinist Russia. There followed the momentous change of political orientation which culminated in the outbreak of the war.

The rupture between the Nazis and the bankers of London, however, is not as complete as you might think from listening to Winston Churchill's speeches. According to a recent issue of *Uncensored*: "Today, three months after the

outbreak of war, the Bank of England is accepting German paper as collateral for loans to British banks. Since Britain still regards German credits as sound, it is quite possible that she may sell German paper to neutrals—for example, to Swiss bankers who have already made credit agreements with the Germans—and thus help promote a lively trade with Germany." It is an especially confusing twist, in this most perplexing of all wars, that the great New York banks refuse to accept German notes and securities as collateral for loans, and in fact have been trying desperately to liquidate the \$50,000,000 worth of German paper they held at the outbreak of war. Thus the bankers of belligerent England show more confidence in and friendship towards the Hitler regime than do the bankers of "neutral" America.

**Stalin's Automata**

Something I have thought a good deal about, especially in the last few months, is the effect on individuals like Browder and Molotov and other Stalinist mouthpieces of having to give expression continually to lies—and lies, furthermore, which any child can see are in contradiction to other lies they have uttered a few weeks earlier. It is notable that Stalin is no orator, that he rarely breaks his silence, at least not for publication. Shrewdly, he leaves to his puppets the spirit-destroying task of formally justifying in public the cynically opportunist twists of "the general line."

The recent public utterances of Molotov and Browder would make one ashamed of the human species—were it not clear that such politicians by now can hardly be considered men. A century ago a French nobleman named De Custine travelled widely in Czarist Russia and wrote a perceptive book about it. His description of "the human parts of the grand machine of state" applies also to their successors of present-day Russia.

"Such parts," writes De Custine, "acting under an influence which is not in themselves, like the wheel-work of a clock, are called men in Russia! The sight of these voluntary automata inspires me with a kind of fear: there is something supernatural in an individual reduced to the state of a mere machine. If, in lands where the mechanical arts flourish, wood and metal seem 'almost human', under despotisms, human beings seem to become as instruments of wood. We ask ourselves what can have become of their superfluity of thought? And we feel ill at ease to think of the pressure that must have been exerted on intellectual creatures before they could have been reduced to mere things."

**Stalin's Real Crime In Finland**

(Continued from Page 1)

the Soviet ambassador and withdrawal of Soviet recognition, i.e., the immediate preliminaries of war. But alongside these familiar warriors, many new ones have been lined up in these last few days, for with the imperialist support to Finland goes a tidal wave of chauvinist pressure here at home to line everybody up for the war. Yesterday's pacifists and "anti-war" fighters—Roger Baldwin and Norman Thomas are typical specimens—are out there side by side with Hoover and Roosevelt yelling for their side. This is the inevitable prologue to the big push on all fronts: the collapse into "democratic" patriotism of all the "high minded" radicals and liberals of the stripe of the Keep America Out of War Committees.

**Don't Cross the Picket Line!**

The Soviet Union, in the last analysis, is a great trade union which went further than any other trade union; it actually got rid of the Russian capitalists altogether, but not of the international capitalist class. But like so many unions, it has fallen into the hands of agents of the class enemy, the world imperialists. Our attitude toward it is like our attitude toward unions in this country which have degenerated at the hands of agents of the class enemy. John L. Lewis and Bill Green are agents, lackeys of the capitalist class. The only way to regenerate the unions they bureaucratically dominate so ruthlessly, is to drive them out of the unions and put in a clean, militant leadership. We want to clean out Lewis and Green here, and Stalin there.

But meanwhile? Meanwhile, in spite of their corruption, these unions get into big struggles with the bosses. Because we hate and abhor John L. Lewis and all that he stands for, we don't therefore go out and cross the picket lines of the United Mine Workers! If we did, the miners would call us scabs, and they would be right. That goes for the Soviet Union too. We want to clean out Stalin, and under the most fearful conditions of repression our comrades in the Soviet Union are working with might and main to that end. But meanwhile? Against the bosses—the imperialists—they support the union in spite of its leadership, in spite of their irreconcilable hostility to Stalin's annexation of Finland and the whole degenerate Kremlin scheme of things from which this latest crime flows.

Here in America our chief task is to prevent the war-makers from utilizing the Finnish events to plunge this country into war against the Soviet Union. To carry out that task we have to clearly explain what is happening, and in that process a prominent place must be given to exposing the crimes of Stalinism before the working class. But all that we say and do about Finland has this fundamental purpose today: to fight against the war-makers here at home.

**JUST OPENED! JUST OPENED!**

Lower Lexington Avenue's latest and most original ARMENIAN Restaurant. Our delicious food and native unsurpassed pastries are prepared daily on our premises. Your first visit will assure your return visits. The taste of the food and prices of the food—both will satisfy you. You are welcome with your friends any day at **Anmah's Armenian Restaurant** 110 Lexington Avenue Between 27th & 28th Sts. Take IRT Local to 28th St. Murray Hill 4-7826 Operated by: ANMAHIAN AND SINAMIAN

**Behind the Lines**

(Continued from Page 1)

could not be replaced by Japanese-Soviet friendship."

It becomes clear that Washington has now definitely informed the Japanese that they have to choose between playing the American game against Russia or facing American naval might in the Pacific. For Japanese "cooperation" in a war against the Soviet Union, the Americans are apparently ready to pay a fairly stiff price at China's expense, to recognize Japan's "special position" in East Asia.

During the last two months the Japanese government has been divided on which course to follow—with Russia and Germany against Britain and the U.S.A., or with the latter against Russia. Powerful elements among the militarists have favored the former policy, as giving the army a powerful lever in dislodging Britain from its entrenched positions in China.

The orientation toward Russia has already moved quite far. As we know, the truce ending the border warfare in the Far East was signed the day before Russia invaded Poland. Since then negotiations have been continuing for a broader accord and last Friday a border demarcation commission met at Chita, in Far Eastern Siberia.

However, the Russian invasion of Finland has introduced a fresh factor in the situation. For the first time the Japanese militarists as provided with an opportunity to see the Red Army in action on a scale larger than the Japanese ever dared provoke in the Far Eastern border fighting. Military men all over the world are narrowly watching the Russian military performance in Finland, but none more attentively than the Japanese.

And the Russians are not exactly giving an impressive demonstration of their military effectiveness. Instead the world is getting a glimpse of the extent to which the purges and the dislocation of Soviet economy has affected its military strength.

**Their Government**  
The Annual 'Congress Of American Industry'

Anthropologists have carried out many interesting studies of a widespread historical phenomenon which they sometimes call "cultural lag." A cultural lag occurs, to take a simple instance, when a set of ideas, relevant to a particular social context, persist as beliefs in the minds and words of men when that context has disappeared. In the new context, the ideas are a carry-over from an earlier cultural situation.

No group in society is altogether exempt from such cultural lags. As I read, last week, the reports of the proceedings of the annual "Congress of American Industry," sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, I regretted that no anthropologist has as yet taken as his subject for examination this authoritative group of American business-men, to place in his textbook alongside the examples he gives from the life of primitive tribes.

These men, so "practical," ruthless and flexible in their business conduct, are in a true sense of the word primitive in their entire ideology. Their system of general ideas continues to be merely a re-hash of the concepts of the "classical economics" of a century ago, referring to the early stages of industrial capitalism, without the slightest significant relation to contemporary society. Not a single one of them is capable of giving any scientific or philosophic illumination to the problems of today, not even to their own problems. Their ideas are as outmoded as would be a chemist's who talked about "phlogiston" or an electro-physicist who argued about an "electrical fluid." Their ideal is, in their own words, that of "normal economic processes, unhampered by artificial restraints": the ideal, that is, of the immediate followers of Ricardo.

**The Wisdom of our Masters**

This year's Congress of American Industry adopted, with a unanimous flourish, a grandiose "Platform of the Congress of American Industry," the Magna Charta, presumably, of the N.A.M. Few recorded documents have ever been emptier.

There is no lack, of course, of self-confidence: "It must be made clear to the public that industry's enlightened self-interest is linked inextricably with the welfare of all of these other elements and with the welfare of the nation of the whole."

Nor any absence of tried and trusted phrases: "Industrial management must continue to do all in its power to keep alive the faith of the public in the traditional American principles of free enterprise, as the guarantor of individual opportunity and security."

But, incredible as it might seem, the entire platform does not mention in a single word or phrase either unemployment or the war! Nor, indeed, is there any concrete analysis of anything.

Yet, from another point of view, this Platform is not without a purpose, and this purpose at the same time explains why it cannot be other than stupid.

Eight requisites for achieving the "goal" of industry are listed. The first two of the requisites are as follows:

- "1. Maintenance of individual initiative and free enterprise. . . .
- "2. Recognition of the social value of the profit motive as a powerful incentive to all productive effort and of the economic need for profits in industry sufficient to maintain and expand existing enterprise."

These are the polite words in which business-men refer to capitalism. Placing these two requisites as first in achieving their goal means simply: for us, capitalist private property rights come first, and everything else is subordinated to them, everything else will be sacrificed to them.

With this as their central purpose, they could not possibly go on to any scientific analysis of the economy. If they did, they would only be able to prove that unemployment, starvation, misery, war, national and international chaos are what follow from their purpose; they would have to expose themselves to the public, and—what is painful for many of them—also to themselves. Therefore, they can only fall back on vague generalities and the slogans of Adam Smith.

The cultural lag in the ideas of these men symbolizes accurately the fact that the men themselves and the purposes which they try to fulfill in the world have come into insurmountable conflict with any sane and decent plan for the re-organization of society in the interests of mankind as a whole.

**The N.A.M. and Washington**

There is another notable feature of the Platform and, for the most part, of the speeches at the Congress. As compared with former years, the tone is extremely mild. From 1935 until last year there were always a number of bitter attacks on the Roosevelt administration and its policies. This year, the administration was hardly mentioned, and objections to its policies took the form usually of friendly advice rather than sharp criticism.

There seem to be two chief reasons for this important change. In the first place, these men, so stupid in general ideas but shrewd in practical affairs, know that the New Deal is buried. They do not, like Dubinsky or Hillman or the New Leader, bury their heads in a dream of the past, when it comes to a problem of dollars and cents. They are well satisfied with the Roosevelt reaction of the last year, so far as it has gone to date. Naturally they still have their demands: one of the planks in their platform is their way of calling for abolition of the closed shop. But the bogeyman of Roosevelt as a "serious threat to business," which haunted some of them, is by now dispelled.

And, secondly, they are, in their own way, worried about the war. Their fears were expressed by Ernest T. Weir, who has spoken similarly on several occasions during recent months. Dimly they grasp their terrible dilemma: that they, the rulers of America, cannot live without plunging the nation into the war; and yet that they may not find themselves and their system still living when the war is over. They do not know how to solve this dilemma, which is in fact insoluble. And many of them are beginning to believe that they will have to turn the war-job over to Roosevelt, who seems so confident that he can handle it.

**Stalin's Invasion of Finland Speaker: James P. Cannon**

**MASS MEETING!**

**WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20th, 8 P. M. at Hotel Diplomat - 108 West 43rd St., N.Y.C.**

Auspices: SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY, (Fourth International)

Admission: TWENTY-FIVE CENTS