

Build Workers Defense Guards!

Socialist Appeal

Official Organ of the Socialist Workers Party, Section of the Fourth International - Issued Twice Weekly

Workers of the World Unite!

VOL. III, NO. 31

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1939

Set up and Printed by Union Labor. Application for Label Pending

3c a Copy

LITVINOV OUSTER BID TO HITLER

Legislators of 'Left' and Right Unite to Slash Relief Funds

Landon Nods Accord On Diverting Money To War Preparations

(Special to the Socialist Appeal) WASHINGTON, D. C.— It is a remarkable fact that, with both houses of Congress in daily session, a message to that body from the President has remained unmentioned upon for over a week. And it was a message on future W.P.A. policies!

President Roosevelt's message of April 27, proposing a W.P.A. budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, is indeed being treated like a sacred cow. And for these reasons:

1. The Republican "economy bloc" is so pleased with the President's message, which fulfills their fondest desires in slashing relief appropriations, that they abstain from too enthusiastic praise of it, lest they compromise the President by revealing the actual united front which exists between them against the W.P.A. workers.

Republicans Thank Roosevelt The Republicans demonstrated their gratitude to Roosevelt by aligning themselves with him in foreign policy, through the May 3 speech of Alf Landon, the Republican party's leader.

That speech would never have been made had Roosevelt not paid to the Republican-Democratic "economy bloc" the price of slashing the W.P.A. And since Roosevelt today subordinates everything else to his war preparations, he considered it a small-enough price to pay, especially since he will cut anything in sight in order to find ready money for speeding armaments.

W.A.A. Silent 2. The so-called "left wing" of the New Deal is mum because like the President they put the preparations for war before all else. In any other period, it would be fantastic that, for example, the "Workers' Alliance"—allegedly the national organization of W.P.A. workers—should say not a word of criticism of a President who engineers the discharge of nearly one out of two W.P.A. workers.

But the Workers Alliance is in the firm grip of Stalinist leadership. The Stalinists solved the embarrassing problem of the President's relief message by the silence of the tomb.

Covering Up Roosevelt And when, in accordance with that message, Col. Harrington ordered the mass dismissals to begin, the Daily Worker, central organ of the Communist Party, achieved the feat of writing an editorial in it which mentioned neither Roosevelt nor his W.P.A. officials!

Deliberately ignoring the fact that the present dismissals are taking place in view of the President's proposals and that the New Deal bloc in the Senate and House joined the Woodrum-Byrnes "economy bloc" in an amicably-arranged compromise on the last deficiency appropriation for this year, the Daily Worker of May 4 says:

"The newspapers yesterday carried a revealing and crucial item: 200,000 more workers to be fired from W.P.A. by May 8, with another 200,000 dismissals in June. These firings are the results of the savage slashes made by Woodrum and the other Tories in the President's appropriation."

The President says in black and white: I want the rolls reduced to 2,000,000 by July 1. (Continued on Page 2)

F.D.R.'s War Against the Unemployed

Shoulder to shoulder with the Republican "economy bloc", President Roosevelt has thus far dealt the following blows to the W.P.A. workers:

In eight months he cut down the W.P.A. rolls from 3,350,000 to last week's figure of 2,800,000—550,000 workers and their families—more than 2,000,000 people—thrown into the streets.

Another million were condemned to pauperism on May 2, when Col. F. C. Harrington, W.P.A. Federal Administrator, ordered 200,000 more W.P.A. workers dropped from the rolls by May 8.

This slash was but the first in a series to be carried out by July 1, to bring the rolls down to the figure of 2,000,000 provided by President Roosevelt's relief message of April 27 to Congress.

Roosevelt's message proposed a one-third slash in the W.P.A.—from the current year's budget of \$2,250,000,000 to one for the year beginning July 1 of \$1,477,000,000.

If Roosevelt's proposals become law, 43% of those on the W.P.A. rolls in October—nearly one out of every two—will be dropped from the rolls.

Of those still on the rolls now, one out of three are still to be dropped, by Roosevelt's plans.

The 2,000,000 remaining will receive an average wage of \$13 weekly on the basis of Roosevelt's proposed figures.

Is Congress To Stay In Session?

AN EDITORIAL

On Thursday, Senator Bankhead, a leading spokesman of the Administration, introduced a resolution to adjourn Congress sine die on June 15th.

The meaning of this move must be brought home to every worker.

During the four months since the present session began, Congress has done just two things: in cooperation with the White House it has carried through a brutal drive against the unemployed; and at the dictate of Roosevelt and the War and Navy Departments it has voted the largest armament appropriations in this country's peace-time history.

Roosevelt and Congress figure that these two matters of relief cuts and armament appropriations can be finished up satisfactorily in the next month.

After that time Roosevelt wants Congress out of the way in order that he can advance his war plans without the slightest risk of interference from any misguided Congressman or Senator who, whether because of his own beliefs or pressure from his constituents, may not yet be 100% sold on the new War for Democracy.

Roosevelt is afraid that the anti-war pressure of the people might find some echo in the halls of Congress or in the Congressional committees. He doesn't want to take the chance of any kind of investigation into his secret diplomacy, any obstruction to his free hand in maneuvering on the international front.

From the past record, he would have little enough to fear if Congress remained in session from now until doomsday. These contemptible, cowardly legislators have sat like sheep and voted, as a rule unanimously, every dollar demanded for the war machine. And the rest of the time they have lopped every cent they dared from the relief funds.

But the majority of Congress, on its side, is anxious to get out of the spotlight of Washington. They want to shove responsibility for the war and the relief cuts from their own shoulders. They are afraid that if they stay in session, they will be more exposed to the anger of the people directed against the war and the W.P.A. slashes. The workers are being shown what can be expected from a boss government: war and starvation. A serious program for peace and food and jobs will take a workers' government, a workers' Congress and a workers' President, to put it across.

But we should not let these scoundrels get away with their present move without putting them squarely on the spot.

Let the people demand:

Keep Congress in session, and compel it to vote the popular will for a peoples' referendum on any war!

Keep Congress in session, and demand that it transfer all war funds to the unemployed!

Open the files of the State, War and Navy Departments, and show the people the steps whereby we are being led into the war!

Keep Congress in session, and compel it to vote the funds to provide a job for every worker!



Reproduced without Apology from the New Masses, December 15, 1936.

The Problem of the Ukraine

by Leon Trotsky

The Ukrainian question, which many governments and many "socialists" and even "communists" have tried to forget or to relegate to the deep strongbox of history, has once again been placed on the order of the day and this time with redoubled force. The latest aggravation of the Ukrainian question is most intimately bound up with the degeneration of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern, the successes of fascism and the approach of the next imperialist war. Crucified by four states, the Ukraine now occupies in the fate of Europe the same position that was once occupied by Poland; with this difference—that world relations are now infinitely more tense and the tempos of development accelerated. The Ukrainian question is destined in the immediate future to play an enormous role in the life of Europe. It was not for nothing that Hitler so noisily raised the question of creating a "Greater Ukraine" and likewise it was not for nothing that he dropped this question with such stealthy haste.

A Question that Must Not Be Ignored

The Second International, expressing the interests of the labor bureaucracy and aristocracy of the imperialist states, completely ignored the Ukrainian question. Even its left wing did not pay the necessary attention to it. Suffice it to recall that Rosa Luxemburg,

for all her brilliant intellect and genuinely revolutionary spirit, found it possible to declare that the Ukrainian question was the invention of a handful of intellectuals. This position left a deep imprint even upon the Polish Communist party. The Ukrainian question was looked upon by the official leaders of the Polish section of the Comintern as an obstacle rather than a revolutionary problem. Hence the constant opportunist attempts to shy away from this question, to suppress it, to pass over it in silence, or to postpone it to an indefinite future.

The Bolshevik party, not without difficulty and only gradually under the constant pressure of Lenin, was able to acquire a correct approach to the Ukrainian question. The right to self-determination, that is, to separation, was extended by Lenin equally to the Poles and to the Ukrainians. He did not recognize aristocratic nations. Every inclination to evade or postpone the problem of an oppressed nationality he regarded as a manifestation of Great Russian chauvinism.

After the conquest of power, a serious struggle took place in the party over the solving of the numerous national problems inherited from old Czarist Russia. In his capacity as People's Commissar of Nationalities, Stalin invariably represented the most centralist and bureaucratic tendency. This evinced itself especially on the question (Continued on Page 2)

"WAR ON JAPAN FOR CAPITALIST MARKETS!"

On May 2, at a dinner meeting of representatives of American Chambers of Commerce abroad, C. H. French, vice president of the Chinese-American Foreign Trade Council, called for war against Japan. His reason? To "protect" a future \$1,000,000,000-a-year market in China and the Philippines. Mr. French declared that the industrialization of China would turn over to American capitalists within the next generation a steady export trade worth at the minimum, \$750,000,000 a year—if the capitalists of Japan don't seize China first.

"America stands ready to fight if necessary to protect her trade with Great Britain," argued Mr. French. "Does not every consideration of self-interest demand that we be equally ready and prepared to protect our trade with a country which, if permitted to retain its sovereignty is destined to become our greatest all-time customer of the future?"

If the Japanese capitalists succeed in barring the United States capitalists from the Chinese market, then, says Mr. French, they stand to lose their monopoly in the Philippines too, worth

potentially \$250,000,000 a year.

"We shall in such case eventually be obliged to wage a war of 'self-defense' infinitely costly to us in both blood and treasure."

The millions of soldiers whose blood will be spilled in the fast approaching world war will come not from the small handful of dissolute stockholders who now control industry, but from the teeming ranks of the workers and farmers who sweat at the point of production.

The fabulous treasure that

Timing Startles War-Bent World Capitals

Litvinov's Head Marked for Ax as Stalin Puts an End to "Collective Security" Overtures to Anglo-French Bloc

By HAROLD ROBERTS

The sudden removal of Maxim Litvinov from the Foreign Affairs Commissariat at the most critical phase of the Anglo-Soviet negotiations marked Joseph Stalin's latest bid for an understanding with Adolf Hitler.

The purge of Litvinov has long been a foregone conclusion. One after another his chief assistants and his principal ambassadors in key posts abroad have fallen under the bloody ax of Stalin's purge. Litvinov hung on by the shreds of his international reputation. After Munich, when his whole

carefully-nourished system of "collective security" fell to pieces, it became plain that Litvinov was headed for an early one-way visit to the cellars of Lubyanka Prison.

It was not, therefore, the actual dismissal of Litvinov which caused surprise, consternation, glee, or furrowed concern in all the capitals of the war-bent capitalist world. It was the timing of the blow that gave it such startling significance.

FORD LAUNCHES PHONY PLAN OF INSURANCE

Anti-Labor Magnate Hopes to Stave off Unionization Drive

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)

DETROIT—Following the lead of General Motors, which instituted two loan schemes last December for its more than 200,000 employees, the Ford Motor Company announced the inauguration of an insurance plan to cover its 110,000 employees in the country.

Under this insurance plan, Ford workers may take out a \$1,500 life insurance policy. The company will pay half of the cost and all arrangements will be handled exclusively by the Ford Employees Social Service.

Why are the automobile magnates suddenly so worried about the social welfare of their employees? Why do they display this tender solicitude concerning the auto workers' lives? Are not Ford and General Motors the same companies who spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for stool pigeons, strike breakers, tear gas and guns to destroy the union organizations of the automobile workers in their plants?

Does not Ford support the largest private strike-breaking agency, the Ford Service Department, in order to terrorize his own employees and prevent them from forming a union of their own choosing? Does not Ford refuse to this day to bargain and recognize the United Automobile Workers of America? Yes, this is all as true today as it was six months or a year ago!

Won't Give Relief

The Ford Insurance scheme will no more provide security and safeguard the lives of the automobile workers than the spurious lending schemes of General Motors. The Ford men, working under the constant pressure of the inhuman Ford speed-up, earning on an average less than \$1,000 per year, subject to constant unemployment and discharge, will not get the necessary relief (Continued on Page 2)

Stalin's Game

Litvinov was the diplomatic symbol of Stalin's effort from 1934 to 1938 to line himself up with the Western imperialist powers in a bloc against Hitler. It took Munich to prove dramatically the utter bankruptcy of that policy. After Munich Stalin renewed more boldly the attempt he had never fully abandoned to come to some kind of understanding, tacit or otherwise with the Hitlerite Reich.

In the fresh war crisis that has been permanently boiling since March, Stalin's whole diplomatic game has been played for the purpose of bargaining tentatively with Britain and France as a means of making a German-Soviet understanding look more attractive to Hitler. At the same time he left the road clear for actually entering the Anglo-French bloc in case Hitler remained unpersuaded.

Moscow's Reply

Thus when Great Britain, retreating in panic from its Munich orientation, asked Russia to join in its system of "guarantees," the Moscow government replied with a sweeping proposal for a hard and fast alliance under conditions which would compel France and Britain to be actually carrying out their end of the bargain before Russia had to budge. The Moscow counter-proposal also apparently sought to include Japan along with Germany as a prospective object of the alliance's operations.

At this the British demurred. They fancy the Russians, not themselves, in the role of chestnut pullers. Moreover the Poles and Rumanians—already guaranteed by England and France—and the Bulgarian and Yugoslavian dictatorships—whom the British are trying to draw in—were inclined to wonder whether absorption by the Reich was not preferable to "aid" from the hated and feared Soviet state.

Hitler's Counter-Offensive

Meanwhile Hitler showed that he was fully capable of countering the Anglo-French diplomatic drive with an offensive of his own. Aiming directly at Poland, Hitler proceeded to put his gun at the heads of the Baltic states with a view to cutting Poland off. But far more important than the Baltic states is the position of the Soviet Union. A German-Soviet bargain would completely doom Poland and leave the Anglo-French coalition helpless as far as Central, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe is concerned.

Poland, let it be remembered, is another of the state-monstrosities created at Versailles. Its territory was carved out of Russia, Germany, Aus- (Continued on Page 3)

In the Trade Unions

By B. J. WIDICK

A rubber worker asked us to explain why the A.F.L. top leadership is so vehemently opposed to the present Wagner Labor Relations Act.

The best source of explanation lies in the A.F.L. leadership itself.

In the current issue of the A.F.L. weekly news letter, William Green's fight against the Wagner Act is made clear, although, of course, the reasons given are mainly reactionary. Just as the A.F.L. bureaucracy fight against the Act is reactionary.

The Nub of the Question

"Many craft unions are threatened with dissolution and destruction by Board decrees," the A.F.L. declares. It refers, of course, to decrees of the National Labor Relations Board operating under the Wagner Act.

For example, in the Friedman case the employer manufactured both clothing and gloves. They were separate departments. Glove making has always been a separate craft during the entire history of organized labor.

The glove makers were practically one hundred per cent members of the A.F.L. glove workers union. The majority of the clothing workers were members of a clothing workers union not affiliated with the A.F.L. A dispute arose over representation.

The clothing workers requested the Board to fuse the glove workers and declare them one unit. . . . The Board did so.

"In a recent decision (Finch case) the Board went so far as to hold that a carpenter who had voted for his A.F.L. union could not refuse to be represented by a C.I.O. liquor distillery workers' organization."

The A.F.L. statement significantly adds, "Everyone knows that in this country there are countless plants where single A.F.L. craftsmen, such as stationary engineers, electricians, carpenters and the like, are employed."

That brings us to the crux of the matter. It is absolutely inevitable that the N.L.R.B. "favor" industrial unions since collective bargaining is on a plant wide basis. We are for that policy 100 per cent.

Against Labor's Interests

Industrial union interests won over craft interests in both cases cited by the A.F.L. statement. We remember how 14 A.F.L. craft unions were replaced in the Akron rubber shops by one industrial union. The workers benefitted more under industrial unionism.

But the threat to their craft positions and their placing of craft interests above the interests of the labor movement as a whole, causes the A.F.L. top leaders to struggle against any legislation or policy which even indirectly favors industrial unionism.

The fact that the A.F.L. statement mentions as an example the incident of a carpenter is not accidental. Bill Hutcheson, carpenters' union president, is leader of the diehard clique in the A.F.L. council. His blind and selfish craft interest makes him the leader of the A.F.L. opposition to the present Wagner Act. Since his union has 300,000 members, his voice has been very powerful in A.F.L. council meetings. Hutcheson, whose role in the labor movement we explained recently in a column, is determined to preserve his bureaucratic privileges at all costs.

And, by the way, the A.F.L. opposition to Edwin Smith, N.L.R.B. member, is not a "mistake" as commonly supposed. He happens to be strongly in favor of "one collective bargaining agency" for a plant. Industrial unionism, in other words. That is why Green centered so much fire on him.

The A.F.L. proposal to replace the present three man board with a five man board, along with other amendments, is a maneuver to make the N.L.R.B. pro-craft union if possible.

Blind bureaucrats like Hutcheson would even prefer no legislation and at least the abolition of the Wagner Act to anything which is not favorable to their reactionary philosophy.

Legislators Unite to Force Relief Slashes

PUSH WAR PLAN AT EXPENSE OF NEEDY WORKERS

(Continued from Page 1)

The Daily Worker says: it is not the President talking. Slaviservility can go no further. Having linked their fate to Roosevelt's foreign policy, the Stalinists must support him in everything.

Less brazenly linked, but in end result no better, are the A.F.L. and C.I.O. leaders. They live on memories of the spur to unionization provided by the N.R.A. and the Wagner Act, and are blind to what has happened since Roosevelt gave up hope of solving the economic crisis by internal measures and turned his face to conquest abroad. To secure the necessary solidarity of the capitalist ruling class for such a war for world mastery, Roosevelt has joined them in whittling down to meaningless proportions the former concessions in labor and relief legislation.

Workers Will Answer

But in Washington one sees only bureaucrats: governmental, labor and Stalinist. Down in the ranks and even higher up, in the local leadership of the labor unions which must daily cope with the needs of their membership, things are stirring. Isolated reports of W.P.A. demonstrations as yet reflect this stirring only in part.

Regardless of what Bill Green and John L. Lewis and Earl Browder want, the workers who feel on their own backs the cost of the pro-Roosevelt policies of their leaders are still in need of food and shelter for themselves and their families.

Yipsel "Jobs for Youth" Campaign Wins Support

Two Organizations Endorse Campaign Committee's Program of Aid to Nation's Locked-Out Generation

By W. R. MANUEL

The fortnight-old "Jobs for Youth" campaign, initiated by the "Jobs for Youth" Campaign Committee and supported by the Young People's Socialist League (4th International), gained momentum last week when two organizations voted their full support to the Committee's program of immediate aid for the nation's locked-out generation.

Boston's North Shore C.I.O. council endorsed the program at its last meeting, as did the Urban League of St. Paul, Minn., leading negro organization of that city.

Chicago Youth Respond

A Chicago N.Y.A. occupational conference held at Marcy Center on April 21 was thrown into an uproar when Arthur Retchin, member of the local Y.P.S.L., took the floor to demand conversion of N.Y.A. into W.P.A. Youth Projects, transference of the two billion dollar war budget to finance the projects and immediate assistance to all needy students.

The conference, called by the Stalinist American Youth Congress and local business men, was being smothered with "personality development" blarney when Retchin's dramatic speech jolted the youthful audience to its feet and in a moment 400 ringing young voices were rocking the rafters with "we want jobs—not talk." After the session was over Retchin was deluged with requests for information about the "Jobs for Youth" campaign.

In a statement calling for

So You Hate No Money—Then to Jail with You

(Special to the Socialist Appeal)

AKRON, O., May 3.—That sublime capitalist justice which allows the rich and the poor alike to eat out of garbage cans was demonstrated here today in all its majestic righteousness.

City Council Member William B. Ridgeway was convicted of manslaughter after the car which he was driving killed a woman. He was also convicted of drunken driving. A total jail sentence of one year in the county workhouse and a fine of \$250 have been imposed.

But high-powered legal talent tied up the case until the Court of Appeals last week upheld Ridgeway's conviction. During the eight months elapsing between the original conviction and the ruling of the higher court, Ridgeway continued to serve in council.

Last month a 22-year-old W.P.A. worker in Barberton, industrial suburb of Akron, was convicted of drunken driving because he had drunk two glasses of wine.

He was immediately thrown in jail. His finger prints led to the discovery that he had escaped from a North Carolina torture chamber, otherwise known as a prison. He had been sentenced to seven years in prison for stealing 12 cartons of cigarettes from a box car, and had escaped after serving two years of the sentence.

The W.P.A. worker made his way to Barberton, married and has a two-month-old daughter. He still bears welts and scars on his body from the terrible beatings administered by the prison guards. When first arrested in North Carolina, he was strung up—his wrists were tied above his head to cell bars

FORD LAUNCHES PHONY PLAN OF INSURANCE

(Continued from Page 1)

The Ford leopard has not changed his spots. Old Hank has not grown generous overnight. He is not out to help his employees, but to tie them up more closely to the Ford management. Every Ford worker will be so obligated to the company, that he will not dare move or breathe, lest he lose his insurance investment. The Ford plan is just like the nefarious schemes of the old coal and iron kings who enslaved their wage earners by constantly keeping them in debt to the corporation.

Union Needed

First and foremost the Ford workers must organize a strong union of their own. They must win recognition and bargaining rights. The Ford workers, with such a union organization, can in cooperation with all other automobile workers, begin a serious, well-planned campaign to reduce unemployment in the automobile industry and provide economic security for all automobile workers. This can be achieved by a great drive to establish the 30-hour week with no reduction in pay throughout the automobile industry and the establishment of a minimum \$2,500 annual wage for all automobile workers.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

—for eight hours.

He is now being held pending extradition charges while "law and order" is being upheld in its usual "impartial" manner.



"The May Day issue of the APPEAL was great! It pointed home the necessity of a relentless revolutionary program. It was a shot in the arm for the working class! Need I say that I am convinced that the Fourth International has the only revolutionary program?"

"Send me at once six more issues of the May Day APPEAL."—A. C. of Green Bay, Wisconsin.

WE EXTEND OUR APOLOGIES:

Through error the May Day greetings sent in by the Toledo branch and the East Chicago, Indiana branch were omitted.

We offer our apologies to the comrades of these branches and assure them that their greetings were appreciated equally with those that were published.

APPEAL POSTER NOW IN MAILS:

The new Appeal poster has been completed and is already in the mails.

This is to be used only for branch and union headquarters and is to be worn by comrades who sell the paper in the streets.

They are not to be taken home by anyone and used to decorate their mantel-pieces.

no matter how great the temptation is!

We also want to urge all branches who appreciate the work carried on by the Appeal Poster Shop to make use of it and also to send in donations that will help purchase new equipment, tools, etc. With about \$50.00 more we can have an even finer poster shop that will serve the entire party.

Subscriptions have fallen off sharply the past two weeks and we are wondering whether it will continue. Every effort must be made to bring our weekly average back to 50, where it stood before. Here's the list for this past week:

FOREIGN	6
New York City	4
California	3
Chicago	3
Pennsylvania	3
Washington, D. C.	2
Wisconsin	2
Ohio	1
Indiana	1
Missouri	1
Total	26

The only bundle order increase came from abroad in London where the Pioneer Bookshop increased its order from 12 to 18 per issue.

FOUR DIE IN NEW YORK TENEMENT HOUSE FIRE

Four baby boys were burned to death Tuesday evening when a fire broke out in an old-law tenement at 28 Lewis Street, New York City. The youngest was two years old, the oldest six. Material damage was listed as "slight," but the four children died.

In the opinion of the firemen present (N. Y. Times, May 3),

had the fire occurred later at night the building might have gone up in a torch-like blaze and the fire trapped many of its occupants before they could reach safety."

Only buildings that are unsafe for human habitation "go up in a torch-like blaze." In New York City, there are 64,000 "old-law" tenements, not one of which is fit to be lived in. Yet hundreds of people do live in them because there are no other homes they can afford.

Legislature Ducks Issue

The State legislature is now pressing for adjournment on May 12, less than a week hence. For a long time nothing had been heard from Albany about the five bills designed to implement the \$300,000,000 appropriation authorized by the voters last year for slum clearance and erection of low-cost housing projects.

Now, with the session virtually over, there is at long last a conference to consider a slum clearance program. But there is considerable doubt that any action will be taken. The "people's representatives" shy from courting the disfavor of their constituents by casting negative votes on housing proposals. But they shy, too, from sanctioning the appropriation and thus antagonizing the landlords and the moneyed interests they so slavishly serve. Better, they figure, to adopt the policy of just doing nothing.

Meanwhile, raging fires continue to take their horrible toll of lives of baby boys and baby girls, and men and women, young and old.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FORUM—"Can the Democracies Stop Fascism?" Speaker, Neil White. Auspices: Socialist Workers Party (Downtown Branch). Time: Sunday, May 7th, 8 o'clock. Place: Downtown Labor Center, 51 East 7th Street.

FOR RENT—Attractive 3-room furnished apt. Frigidaire & incinerator. \$30 per month. 129 East 4th St. Gillsinsky. QRchard 7-5439.

The first semester of the Karl Liebknecht School of the New York Division of the Y.P.S.L. having been successfully concluded, the Y.P.S.L. educational department is now opening the "second term."

The Liebknecht school is featuring a new course which ought to prove very attractive to both party and Y.P.S.L. members. It is a four lecture course in the History of the Revolutionary Youth Movement. The lectures will be given by Martin Abern, manager of the New International, Max Shachtman, editor of the Appeal, Ernest Erber, editor of the Challenge of Youth and Nathan Gould, National Secretary of the Y.P.S.L.

Other courses are:
 Folkdancing: 5 weeks, Saturday, 12 to 1—E. Lifshitz (Beginning May 13).
 Elements of Marxism: 6 weeks, Saturday 1 to 2—E. Erber.
 Y.P.S.L. at Work: A course in organizational principles: 6 weeks, Saturday, 2 to 3—Irving Bern, national organizational secretary of the Y.P.S.L.

All classes are held at 51 East 7th Street, N. Y. C.

THE PROBLEM OF THE UKRAINE --- By Leon Trotsky

(Continued from Page 1)

of Georgia and on the question of the Ukraine. The correspondence dealing with these matters has remained unpublished to this day. We hope to publish a section of it—the very small section which is at our disposal. Every line of Lenin's letters and proposals vibrates with an urge to accede as far as possible to those nationalities that have been oppressed in the past. In the proposals and declarations of Stalin, on the contrary, the tendency to bureaucratic centralism was invariably pronounced. In order to guarantee "administrative needs," i.e., the interests of the bureaucracy, the most legitimate claims of the oppressed nationalities were declared a manifestation of petty-bourgeois nationalism. All these symptoms could be observed as early as 1922-1923. Since that time they have developed monstrously and have led to outright strangulation of any kind of independent national development of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

The Bolshevik Conception Of Soviet Ukraine

In the conception of the old Bolshevik party Soviet Ukraine was destined to become a powerful axis around which the other sections of the Ukrainian people would unite. It is indisputable that in the first period of its existence Soviet Ukraine exerted a mighty attractive force, in national respects as well, and aroused to struggle the workers, peasants, and revolutionary intelligentsia of Western Ukraine enslaved by Poland. But during the years of Thermidorian reaction, the position of Soviet Ukraine and together with it the posing of the Ukrainian question as a whole changed sharply. The more profound the hopes aroused, the keener was the disillusionment. The bureaucracy strangled and plundered the people within Great Russia, too. But in the Ukraine matters were further complicated by the massacre of national hopes. Nowhere did restrictions, purges, repressions and in general all forms of bureaucratic hooliganism assume such murderous sweep as they did in the Ukraine in the struggle against the powerful, deeply-rooted longings of the Ukrainian masses for greater freedom and independence. To the totalitarian bureaucracy, Soviet Ukraine became an administrative division of an economic unit and a military base of the U.S.S.R. To be sure, the Stalin bureaucracy erects statues to Shevchenko but only in order more thoroughly to crush the Ukrainian people under their weight and to force it to chant paean in the language of Kobzar to the rapist clique in the Kremlin.

Towards the sections of the Ukraine now outside its frontiers, the Kremlin's attitude today is the same as it is towards all oppressed nationalities, all colonies, and semicolonies, i.e., small change in its international combinations with imperialist governments. At the recent 18th Congress of the "Communist Party," Manuilsky, one of the most revolting renegades of Ukrainian communism, quite openly explained that not only the U.S.S.R. but also the Comintern (the "gyp-joint," according to Stalin's formulation) refused to demand the emancipation of oppressed peoples whenever their oppressors are not the enemies of the ruling Moscow clique. India is nowadays being defended by Stalin, Dimitroff and Manuilsky against Japan, but not against England. Western Ukraine they are ready to cede forever to Poland in exchange for a diplomatic agreement which appears profitable at the present time to the bureaucrats of the Kremlin. It is

a far cry from the days when they went no further than episodic combinations in their politics.

Stalin, Hitler and The Ukraine

Not a trace remains of the former confidence and sympathy of the Western Ukrainian masses for the Kremlin. Since the latest murderous "purge" in the Ukraine no one in the West wants to become part of the Kremlin satrapy which continues to bear the name of Soviet Ukraine. The worker and peasant masses in the Western Ukraine, in Bukovina, in the Carpatho-Ukraine are in a state of confusion: Where to turn? What to demand? This situation naturally shifts the leadership to the most reactionary Ukrainian cliques who express their "nationalism" by seeking to sell the Ukrainian people to one imperialism or another in return for a promise of fictitious independence. Upon this tragic confusion Hitler bases his policy in the Ukrainian question. At one time we said: but for Stalin (i.e., but for the fatal policy of the Comintern in Germany) there would have been no Hitler. To this can now be added: but for the rape of Soviet Ukraine by the Stalinist bureaucracy there would be no Hitlerist Ukrainian policy.

We shall not pause here to analyze the motives that impelled Hitler to discard, for the time being at least, the slogan of a Greater Ukraine. These motives must be sought in the fraudulent combinations of German imperialism on the one hand, and on the other in the fear of conjuring up an evil spirit whom it might be difficult to exorcise. Hitler gave Carpatho-Ukraine as a gift to the Hungarian butchers. This was done, if not with Moscow's open approval then in any case with confidence that approval would be forthcoming. It is as if Hitler had said to Stalin: "If I were preparing to attack Soviet Ukraine tomorrow I should have kept Carpatho-Ukraine in my own hands." In reply, Stalin at the 18th Party Congress openly came to Hitler's defense against the slanders of the "Western Democracies." Hitler intends to attack the Ukraine? Nothing of the sort! Fight with Hitler? Not the slightest reason for it. Stalin is obviously interpreting the handing over of Carpatho-Ukraine to Hungary as an act of peace.

For a Free, Independent Soviet Ukraine!

This means that sections of the Ukrainian people have become so much small change for the Kremlin in its international calculations. The Fourth International must clearly understand the enormous importance of the Ukrainian question in the fate not only of Southeastern and Eastern Europe but also of Europe as a whole. We are dealing with a people that has proved its viability, that is numerically equal to the population of France and occupies an exceptionally rich territory which, moreover, is of the highest strategic importance. The question of the fate of the Ukraine has been posed in its full scope. A clear and definite slogan is necessary that corresponds to the new situation. In my opinion there can be at the present time only one such slogan: **A united, free and independent workers' and peasants' Soviet Ukraine.**

This program is in irreconcilable contradiction first of all with the interests of the three imperialist powers, Poland, Rumania, and Hungary. Only hopeless pacifist block-

heads are capable of thinking that the emancipation and unification of the Ukraine can be achieved by peaceful diplomatic means, by referendums, by decisions of the League of Nations, etc. In no way superior to them, of course, are those "nationalists" who propose to solve the Ukrainian question by entering the service of one imperialism against another. Hitler gave an invaluable lesson to these adventurers by tossing (for how long?) Carpatho-Ukraine to the Hungarians who immediately slaughtered not a few trusting Ukrainians. Insofar as the issue depends upon the military strength of the imperialist states, the victory of one grouping or another can signify only a new dismemberment and a still more brutal subjugation of the Ukrainian people. The program of independence for the Ukraine in the epoch of imperialism is directly and indissolubly bound up with the program of the proletarian revolution. It would be criminal to entertain any illusions on this score.

Soviet Constitution Admits Right of Self-Determination

But the independence of a United Ukraine would mean the separation of Soviet Ukraine from the U.S.S.R., the "friends" of the Kremlin will exclaim in chorus. What is so terrible about that? We reply. The fervid worship of state boundaries is alien to us. We do not hold the position of a "united and indivisible" whole. After all, even the constitution of the U.S.S.R. acknowledges the right of its component federated peoples to self-determination, that is, to separation. Thus, not even the incumbent Kremlin oligarchy dares to deny this principle. To be sure it remains only on paper. The slightest attempt to raise the question of an independent Ukraine openly, would mean immediate execution on the charge of treason. But it is precisely this ruthless hounding of all free national thought that has led the toiling masses of the Ukraine, to an even greater degree than the masses of Great Russia, to look upon the rule of the Kremlin as monstrously oppressive. In the face of such an internal situation it is naturally impossible even to talk of Western Ukraine voluntarily joining the U.S.S.R. as it is at present constituted. Consequently, the unification of the Ukraine presupposes freeing the so-called Soviet Ukraine from the Stalinist boot. In this matter, too, the Bonapartist clique will reap what it has sown.

Against Imperialism and Moscow Bonapartism

Naturally an independent workers' and peasants' Ukraine might subsequently join the Soviet Federation; but voluntarily, on

conditions which it itself considers acceptable, which in turn presupposes a revolutionary regeneration of the U.S.S.R. The genuine emancipation of the Ukrainian people is inconceivable without a revolution or a series of revolutions in the west which must lead in the end to the creation of the Soviet United States of Europe. An independent Ukraine could and undoubtedly will join this federation as an equal member. The proletarian revolution in Europe, in turn, would not leave one stone standing of the revolting structure of Stalinist Bonapartism. In that case the closest union of the Soviet United States of Europe and the regenerated U.S.S.R. would be inevitable and would present infinite advantages for the European and Asiatic continents, including of course the Ukraine, too. But here we are shifting to questions of second and third order. The question of first order is the revolutionary guarantee of the unity and independence of a workers' and peasants' Ukraine in the struggle against imperialism, on the one hand, and against Moscow Bonapartism, on the other.

For an International Discussion

This appears to me the correct policy in the Ukrainian question. I speak here personally and in my own name. The question must be opened up to international discussion. The foremost place in this discussion must belong to the Ukrainian revolutionary Marxists. We shall listen with the greatest attention to their voices. But they had better make haste. There is little time left for preparation!

April 22, 1939.

By Dwight Macdonald

SPARKS IN THE NEWS

"Stagecoach"

As I noted here several weeks ago, the film *Stagecoach*, didn't please the editors of the *N. Y. Times* who objected to its treatment of American history because it presents the banker as a rascal and the town woman as a heroine. But last night I happened to see the film, and I must report that, whatever its deficiencies as patriotic propaganda, it is the most entertaining and exciting movie I've seen in a long time. *Stagecoach* is a straight old-style "Western," with the usual characters—comic stage-driver, lean and saturnine gambler, picturesque-drunk-who-has-been-better-days, hearty-voiced sheriff, handsome and inarticulate "good" bad man, dance-hall-girl-with-golden-heart, etc.—and the usual climax in a terrific fight with Apaches which ends with the last-minute arrival of the Federal cavalry, bugles blowing and flags streaming. But these ingredients, properly treated, can make excellent cinema: the "Western" has naturally speed, action, and pictorial splendor, which is why it is the one kind of movie that has been made steadily and in quantity ever since the days of Edison's nickelodeon. *Stagecoach* is about the best Western I remember seeing. It owes its quality largely to the direction of John Ford, who several years ago made an excellent film from Liam O'Flaherty's book, *The Informer*. In this film, as in that, Ford shows himself a master at building up suspense. The Apaches here, the Irish Republican Army there, make their sinister, waiting presence felt all through the film—and the final explosion of action is as well done here as the Black and Tans' house raid was in *The Informer*.

Reviyals

While I am on the subject of movies, I might note that those who are interested in the cinema, as I am, as something more than a way to kill an evening, will shortly have a chance to see the cream of the best collection of old films in this country, that of the Museum of Modern Art. The Museum has arranged a series of thirty revival programs, which it will begin to show on May 11, and which will be repeated throughout the summer, up to October 1. Four of D. W. Griffith's greatest films will be shown: *The Birth of a Nation* (May 13), *Intolerance* (May 14), *Broken Blossoms* (May 15), and *Way Down East* (May 16). Other specially notable revivals are: *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (May 17), *Murnau's The Last Laugh* (May 23), *Von Stroheim's Greed* (May 24), *Pabst's The Love of Jeanne Ney* (May 29), *Von Sternberg's Underworld* (June 2), *Milestone's All Quiet on*

the Western Front (June 4), and LeRoy's *Little Caesar* (June 6). The showings will be at the Museum (11 West 53rd St., New York City), will be continuous afternoons and evenings, and will be free to all who pay the 25 cents admission charge to get into the Museum itself.

Ten Months of Evianism

Last July all the "democratic" powers sent delegates to the Evian Conference to devise ways and means of helping refugees from Nazi Germany. The Conference set up the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees, which has now been functioning ten months with practically no results. The chief villain here is England. The British delegation to Evian did its best to kill the whole business then and there. Failing, the British at least got their man, Lord Winterton, who happens to be a known anti-Semite, made titular head of the Refugee Committee, and the headquarters located in London. When early in February, the American, George Rublee, resigned as active director of the Committee and another Englishman took his post, it was clear that the long drawn-out pretense of "doing something about the refugees" was about to be given up.

The Evian Committee's obituary was written in a Berlin dispatch from Otto D. Tolischus in the *N. Y. Times* for April 25. Commenting on the complete breakdown of arrangements for receiving Jewish refugees into other countries, Mr. Tolischus writes: "The hopes for easier emigration that the German Jews had pinned on the Evian Committee and on George Rublee's negotiations with the German government have failed to materialize thus far. Little if anything has been done to create the machinery agreed upon between Mr. Rublee and the German government, and the general impression in German-Jewish quarters is that the main responsibility for this rests neither on the German authorities nor on the general war scare but on a certain lack of interest in those British quarters put in charge of the Evian committee's work." The refugee question, all hypocritical moralizing to the contrary, is a matter of economics pure and simple. Germany wants to rid herself of the burden of the Jews, and to strip them of their property in the process. (The only class of Jews the Nazis discourage from emigrating are surgeons, who will be useful in patching up the by-products of the next war.) And the cause of what Mr. Tolischus bluntly calls "the steadily increasing disinclination of other countries to accept virtually penniless refugees."

The New Leader, May Day and War

By FELIX MORROW

Before the events of May Day pass into history, let us emphasize the meaning of one of them: the May Day issue of the *New Leader*, weekly organ of the Social Democratic Federation. There were those who characterized us as factionalists when, a year or more ago, we pointed out that the Social Democrats were heading for open and brazen support of Roosevelt's war plans. I am not revealing a confidence when I record that, only a month or two ago, in private conversation, Sidney Hook protested my characterization of the Social Democrats as warmongers and sought to indicate profound differences among leaders on this key question. I trust that he, and James Rorty, and others who remain anti-war in their convictions but still contribute to the *New Leader*, will examine its May Day issue.

The front page is given over to a cartoon reprinted from the *St. Louis Post* dispatch: two hands, that of the Statue of Liberty and that of a fascist salute, confronting each other; and under the cartoon is an editorial: "We Or They." The "we," of course is the all-inclusive we of social-patriotism: Roosevelt and Landon, the bosses and the workers, all constituting "the American people." The editorial concludes: "There can be no further toleration of international machine-gun politics."

ONEAL "REVISES"—TO REMAIN HIS OLD SELF

The back page has another cartoon: An arm entitled "U. S.," with a mailed fist, "adequate defense," directed against the figure of "international gangster." The title of the cartoon is: "THE ONLY LANGUAGE HE UNDERSTANDS." The cartoon serves as illustration for an article by James Oneal, editor of the *New Leader*, entitled "Difference between '17 and present crisis creates need for revised Socialist attitude towards war."

Mr. Oneal doesn't have to revise much; the records do not indicate that he was a serious opponent of war in 1917, and if he dares to say differently, I should enjoy giving that record, notably the belly-crawling conduct of him and his closest collaborators, Louis Waldman and Algernon Lee. The opposition to war in 1917 came not from these cowards, but from the left-wingers who stood on the program of the Russian Revolution. Oneal has little to revise now; as ever, he follows in the footsteps of Scheidemann and Noske.

Mr. Oneal would have us relegate to the scrap-heap Marx's dictum that the workers "have nothing to lose but their chains." "We now know," says Oneal, "or should know, better." For "Our democracy is worth a fight"—which Oneal perverts to mean that the fight that is worth-while is that in which the workers shall serve as cannon-fodder for the big imperialist powers.

WAR-TIME DICTATORSHIP WON'T HURT

As an able politician, Mr. Oneal understands the crucial question: that the masses cannot be mustered into service "for democracy" with any plausibility in the face of the war-time regime which is already outlined in the Industrial Mobilization Bill. Mr. Oneal therefore argues that we must surrender freedom in war-time because it only "means temporary restriction of the freedoms I have discussed," and that "to identify centralization of power in war time with totalitarianism is ridiculous."

In a series of articles the *Socialist Appeal* has already described the regimentation of labor which is to begin when the war breaks out. The measures planned by the government go far beyond anything instituted by Wilson in 1917. But the fundamental issue lies still deeper. We got some democracy back after the last war—we also got Palmer raids and mass arrests and prison sentences, etc.—but we cannot accept even Mr. Oneal's guarantee that we will get some democracy back again after the next war.

If the totalitarian powers are defeated in the coming war a series of revolutions in those countries will undoubtedly follow; and the role of France and England as hangmen of revolutions (1917-1923) will now become America's, England and France were able to play that role with impunity because the workers of those two countries, shackled to their rulers by the "labor leaders" in the war, were too weak to prevent their masters from destroying the European revolution in Germany and Austria and Hun-

gary. At the very least then, if we follow Oneal's path the American workers will repeat the road of the English and French of that period.

But if America does not emerge as master of the world? Then we follow the road of Germany: capitalism saved from the revolting masses by the protection provided by the Social Democratic leaders who were welded to the capitalists by collaboration in the war; and having been saved, but unable to pay the overhead costs of democracy, the capitalists as soon as possible resort to fascism. That is the road of Oneal's teachers, which he now propagandizes for in America.

I have only referred to two of the war-mongering features in the *New Leader's* May Day issue. But the whole issue reeks of them. Leon Dennen—who passed by a natural-enough process from Stalinism to Social Democracy without even skirting the revolutionary field—postures as one "wholly on the side of those who believe that the Nazi beast must be stopped with all the means at our disposal." In previous issues Charles Yale Harrison had already made the journey into the camp of chauvinism. A prominent feature of the issue is the *Easter Manifesto* of the Labor and Socialist International, calling for war. Fittingly, it is followed by an article by Wilhelm Sollmann, one of the German Social Democratic leaders responsible for the crushing of the German revolution of 1918-19. The *New Leader's* May Day is, in short, a dedication to imperialist slaughter.

BRITISH DRAFT PLAN MEETS IRISH PROTEST

A powerful wave of resentment against the proposed plan of Great Britain to conscript Irishmen who live in the Six Counties of the North is at present sweeping all Ireland. Even Premier de Valera, who long ago abandoned the revolutionary struggle for the complete national independence of Ireland, was forced to speak out strongly against the plan in the Dail Eireann this week. Only followers of former Premier Cosgrave, pro-British stooge, demanded that Irishmen enlist in the British army to defend "democracy."

"We claim the whole of Ireland as a national territory, and conscription of Irishmen in that portion of the country we will regard as an act of aggression," said de Valera.

"Such a threat," he continued, "would be intolerable and anybody anxious for good relations between nations must realize that such a threat was so."

De Valera knows full well that he would suffer the fate of John Redmond and the old Nationalist Party when they pledged the support of Ireland to Britain in the last war on the promise of home rule which was never fulfilled until the Civil War forced Britain to grant it.

However, it is possible that De Valera is merely trying to bargain with Britain for political control of the Six Counties in the North and in return would attempt to line up the Irish workers and farmers in the British Army.

De Valera has time and time again proved that he is ready



MAXIM LITVINOV



VYACHESLAV MOLOTOV

Litvinov Ousted In Bid to Hitler

Hitler it can prevent any German-Soviet deal from going through. At the same time, the British diplomats may extend themselves as never before to draw Russia into their camp, for it is also part of Stalin's purpose, in purging Litvinov at this juncture, to give Britain a "final warning" to meet the Russian terms or else lose out entirely.

Poland's Position Except as a buffer between themselves and the Germans, the Russians have no great interest in the preservation of Poland. On the contrary, with the revival of the Great Russian tendencies in the Stalin regime, it is not at all inconceivable that a German-Soviet agreement would include plans for another Polish partition.

Aside from this, however, there are far broader strategic and political considerations involved. By making terms with Hitler, Stalin could help pit the Anglo-French coalition against the German-Italian bloc and remain situated himself—even if only temporarily—on the sidelines. From Hitler's point of view, the "neutralization" of Russia—again only temporarily—would increase his chances against his Anglo-French rivals. That is why such a deal has so profound an inner logic and that is why both Stalin and Hitler, each in his own way, is cautiously reaching out for it.

At the party congress in March, Stalin openly offered Hitler a bloc and decried the "war-mongers" in the "democracies." In his Reichstag speech on April 28, Hitler demonstratively refrained from his customary attacks on Russia and on "Bolshevism." On May Day in Moscow the bellicose speeches of Voroshilov and others were notably lacking in any direct references to the Reich. At the same time, almost unnoticed in the rush of events, Russia has been easing the situation on its eastern front by new transitory agreements with Japan and Manchukuo both.

The Psychological Moment Last week the British were about to send new proposals to Moscow for a modified pact. Lord Halifax was scheduled to meet Litvinov at Geneva on May 15. It is easy to see that Litvinov would be the most ardent partisan of reaching some agreement with England and France, thereby carrying out the fundamental orientation assigned him by Stalin and at the same time saving something from the wreckage of his previous "collective security" set-up. It was precisely at this juncture that the ax fell on his neck and Litvinov passed from the scene, probably forever.

London and Paris were badly frightened. Berlin was quietly jubilant. Chamberlain began to talk about a "non-aggression" pact with Hitler and supporters of the "appeasement policy" at once again raised their heads. In other words, London is trying once more to see if by a fresh deal of some kind with

Hitler it can prevent any German-Soviet deal from going through.

At the same time, the British diplomats may extend themselves as never before to draw Russia into their camp, for it is also part of Stalin's purpose, in purging Litvinov at this juncture, to give Britain a "final warning" to meet the Russian terms or else lose out entirely.

Stalin's Weakness In these days, however, there are many slips between the de-sires and the pacts. Stalin is trying, in his own distorted fashion, to repeat Lenin's policy of 1918, of playing off one imperialist coalition against another. The fatal difficulty for Stalin is that he sits himself on a precarious perch of his own making. He has sapped the resources of the revolution, shivered and shaken his entire apparatus, disorganized the economy of the country, and demoralized its armed forces by the catastrophic purges of the last three years.

Divorced from Workers The other even more fundamental weakness that dogs him now is the complete divorce between the Soviet government and the masses of workers and farmers of the capitalist nations. He abandoned the policies and methods of the proletarian revolution for a mess of imperialist pacts which proved worthless even before the war broke out. Now he fumbles for new pacts and can no longer establish any identity with the interests of the Soviet Union in the minds of the war-menaced millions of workers in the world.

Thus sapped internally and isolated externally, Stalin rides to his own doom whatever the outcome of the over-cunning diplomatic maneuvers between the rival camps of imperialism. The great question that remains to be solved in the conflicts of the future is whether the Russian people will in time free themselves of the Stalinist oligarchy and find the way to join with the workers of the rest of the world in making the coming war the final war of capitalism and the opening of a new epoch of world-wide liberation for all the oppressed.

The Downfall Of Litvinov

The Meaning of Stalin's Latest Move in the Light of the War Crisis

Hear the Answer by
JAMES P. CANNON
FRIDAY, MAY 12, at 8 p.m.
IRVING PLAZA, Irving Pl.
at 15th Street
Adm. 25c—Unemployed Free
Auspices: Local New York,
S. W. P.
Make this Date a MUST!

MEN AND WOMEN OF LABOR

OUT OF THE PAST

By EMANUEL GARRETT

JOHN BROWN

(May 9, 1800—Hanged, Dec. 2, 1859)

"But when the scaffold bore its fruit, and the dead hero's heart was cold, the pulse of humanity once more began to beat; the timid, the coward, the time-server, the helpless and the weak looked on the brave cold clay, and from a million throats a cry for vengeance was lifted to the stars. Men cried from the hustings to wake a sleeping world."—(Clarence Darrow)

It all depends on your point of view. If you're smug, conservative, satisfied with things as they are, John Brown was a blood-stained madman. If human liberty means more to you than anything else, if oppression and slavery make you want to go out and do something about it, then John Brown was a glorious figure who did the right thing in the wrong way, but who nevertheless did do something.

"Old Brown of Osawatimie" was, it is true, possessed by a single idea. But that idea was ownership of man by man is intolerable.

Born in Connecticut of a poor, farmer family which was ardently abolitionist, Brown lived under straightened circumstances all his life. Without formal schooling, he got a fairish education by reading. Never a success, he shifted from business to business. Several times he set up tanneries and sold them either at a profit or a loss. For a time he speculated in land. Such money as he made he used almost wholly for his cause. Never at any time did he have enough money for the proper care of his large family.

Striking Out for Emancipation

The conflagration of the Civil War was in the making. Two rival systems of economy—plantation or industrial—were staging the preliminary contests of a battle for power. Out in Kansas the pro-slavery and anti-slavery forces were disputing the issue of entering into the Union as a Slave or Free State, disputing by means of guerrilla warfare. Brown followed his sons out to Kansas where he led a group of free-staters organized by his sons in Osawatimie.

"Border Ruffians" from the neighboring state of Missouri periodically invaded Kansas and attacked Free State advocates. These "Border Ruffians" sacked the city of Lawrence. Brown avenged Lawrence by massacring a family of five slave-staters. In retaliation Osawatimie was set on fire.

Brown's great plan was meanwhile maturing in his mind. Financial backing he secured from various individuals in the east. Finally, in preparation for the decisive deed he called a convention of his men in Chatham, Canada. He explained his scheme to them: a base was to be established in the mountains of Virginia and Maryland to which slaves could flee. Others, white and Negro, would join the community to create a Free State under the Constitution. The exact details of achieving this end he did not work out until later.

As "Shubel Morgan" he returned to Kansas. Branded an outlaw, a reward was placed on his head by the President of the United States. To escape being caught, Brown fled with his

sons to Canada. In 1859 he returned to the States, and rented a farm five miles from Harpers Ferry to which his band of men came.

On October 16, he gave the order to proceed with the attack on Harpers Ferry which was to serve as a signal for Negro revolt. The immediate objective was the arsenal.

News of his attack spread like wild-fire. The local militia was quickly roused, and blocked his retreat into the mountains while Brown made a stand with his band and some prisoners in an engine house. By dawn the next day, Colonel Robert E. Lee arrived with his marines and attacked the engine house. Brown's two sons were shot down at his side. Brown's forces held out as long as they could.

When the marines succeeded in breaking through Brown's fire, they pounced on him viciously. He who had spared his prisoners, perhaps even contributed to his defeat by his humaneness, was beaten into a bloody ball. Brown and those of his comrades who had neither been killed nor escaped were arrested. Scarcely pausing for breath the government rushed him to trial.

Immortalized on the Gallows

Throughout the trial, Brown lying in a cot maintained his dignity and defiance. He knew the sentence that was to be passed on him and he was ready: "I am worth more to die than to live." Virginia's Governor Wise commented: "He is a bundle of the best nerves I ever saw cut and thrust and bleeding and in bonds."

Sentence was passed on November 2. "Now if it is deemed necessary," he told the court, "that I should forfeit my life for the furtherance of the ends of justice, and mingle my blood further with the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave country whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel and unjust enactments, I say, let it be done."

Brown was led to the scaffold. As he approached he slipped his last written words into the hands of a guard: "I John Brown am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land: will never be purged away; but with Blood. I have as I now think: vainly flattered myself that without very much bloodshed it might be done."

Two years later very much more blood was indeed shed. For four years armies battled to decide questions of power, and in that conflict it was decided in law that chattel slavery was doomed.

Brown had found few friends for his exploits. Even those who stood against chattel slavery were horrified by his deeds—their spirit was alien to an understanding of a man completely possessed by a desire for freedom. A few, like the poet Emerson, did see his worth—saw in him a rare, "a pure idealist of artless goodness" such as history produces every so often to impel the movement of great events.

Brown went down to defeat—yes, that is true, but only in a limited sense. We would have chosen other means, organized differently, appealed less to God. But no thrust at freedom is wasted. John Brown may be "mouldrin' in his grave" but his spirit goes marching on.

New Branches of the Workmen's Sick & Death Benefit Fund

are now being formed in your community. If you or your union organization are interested in joining the oldest working-class fraternity for

- SICK & ACCIDENT BENEFITS
- MEDICAL CARE
- HOSPITAL AID
- LIFE INSURANCE
- RECREATION . . .

(All features furnished at rates based on cost)

write to

WORKMEN'S SICK & DEATH BENEFIT FUND
714 SENECA AVENUE, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Workmen's Sick & Death Benefit Fund is 55 years old. Started in 1884 by a group of trade unionists, it has assets of over four million dollars. Men and women between 16 and 54 years of age and in good health are eligible. Every member is obligated to pledge support to organized labor. The branches meet monthly, where the business is transacted in a democratic manner.

SOCIETY NOTES

Romantic Dowager Comes To Untimely End

With the death of Mrs. Maryon Andrews Brugiere Deming Cooper Hewitt McCarter in New York City, one of the most romantic and fabulous careers in stockholding circles came to a close the other morning.

First acclaimed in hoity-toity society as a popular Southern belle, Maryon Andrews in rapid succession married and divorced five millionaire stockholders.

Reputed in France to be the "greatest woman gambler," once after a gay party she was invited to become the piece de resistance in the harem of the Shah of Persia. On one of her frequent relaxations on palatial ocean liners she wore a diamond-studded anklet valued at \$100,000.

She insisted that her manner of living required an income of not less than \$250,000 a year.

In 1936 the world gasped when her 21-year-old daughter, who was born out of wedlock, charged her mother with having had a "sterilization" operation performed upon her without her consent in order to tighten the mother's hold on a \$100,000,000 trust fund set up by the girl's multi-millionaire great-grandfather.

The dowager was only 55 when she died suddenly of apoplexy of the brain. She is survived by two other children and her stock holdings.

Recommend 1,000 Men Be Thrown Out Of Theater Beds

LOS ANGELES, Calif., April 25.—City officials today recommended throwing 1,000 men on relief out of their beds after hearing a lengthy report from Fire Chief Ralph Scott in which he described the filth prevailing in all-night theaters where men on relief spend their nights instead of in higher-priced flop houses.

Out of the \$18 a month allowed these unfortunate unemployed must come rent, food, medical attention, clothing. In order to get more for food, they spend midnight to dawn in all-night theaters. They are often ill and feverish from hunger, smoke cheap tobacco, spit on the floor, doze fitfully in uncushioned theater seats while ancient films unwind repeatedly before them through the night.

The practice was caustically characterized by President Clyde C. Shoemaker as "a disgrace to Los Angeles and dangerous to life and property."

The city officials recommended that an ordinance be adopted to close down these particular theaters at an early hour, but unable to offer any concrete suggestions as to where to herd the 1,000 men after they are thrown out on the streets, asked for a report from the social service department.

As yet no other place has been provided the men to sleep.

SOCIALIST APPEAL
 Vol. III, No. 31 May 9, 1939
 Published twice a week by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N
 at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
 Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Subscriptions: 2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
 Foreign: 3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
 orders: 2 cents per copy in United States; 3
 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single
 copies: 3 cents.

Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: 1.50 for
 six months; \$3.00 for one year.

Reentered as second class matter February 16,
 1939, 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 wage 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

Presto Change!

As predicted in the columns of the *Socialist Appeal*, the capitalist government of the United States has decided that it has no reason for changing its policy toward Bolivia, despite the fact that its dictator came out openly and declared Bolivia to be a totalitarian state subject only to his personal whims.

No less an authority than Secretary Hull has confirmed the *Appeal's* prediction. In his press interview on May 1, Hull stated that he thought the form of government in Bolivia has remained intact in every sense and he noted that the same officials as before are still in power.

He added that there was no state of new and changed conditions that would call for action by the State Department.

The *Socialist Appeal* not only knew this before Hull admitted it last Monday but has been consistently publicizing the fact for some time. What is new is Hull's admission that the Roosevelt government knew all the time that Bolivia was an absolute dictatorship even though Roosevelt listed it as a republic; and that Busch's recent coup d'etat did nothing but openly acknowledge the totalitarian realities even though he decided to change his name back to a republic again.

A country can be oppressed by the most violent and bloody dictatorship, openly acknowledged by the dictator in power himself. But if he lines up with Roosevelt for the coming war—Grand Vizier Hull will lift a crisp dollar bill, strike him thrice across the haunches, and presto change! he will be a noble "republic" with Western democratic institutions to help defend.

It should be a great comfort to the common people of the United States to know, as they lie dying on foreign battlefields in defense of capitalist profits, that it is so easy to change a dictator into a democracy.

When War Comes

"If this country ever goes to war," asserted Colonel J. H. Burns, executive officer to the Assistant Secretary of War, "it must be prepared to do so with the most efficient killing and devastating machines mankind has ever devised and in quantities corresponding to the mass production capacity of the present age."

With this perspective, he goes on to state in his report to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on May 2, the War Department has planned to place 1,000,000 American farmers and workers under arms within three months after the Roosevelt government orders mobilization for war.

Already, he continued, nearly 10,000 factories (at present controlled by capitalist stockholders) have accepted production schedules prepared by the War Department showing what is expected of their workers when the conflict starts.

Roosevelt's administration has prepared everything for war down to the last murderous detail. Only one thing is lacking—the consent of the people. But Roosevelt intends to overcome this obstacle too. War cannot be waged without cannon fodder.

Roosevelt will not allow the people the chance to say NO in a popular referendum on war. He realizes very well that no one in his senses would

voluntarily face the most efficient killing and devastating machines mankind has ever devised. That is why his War Department is working out its diabolical plans to FORCE the people into the army by means of the DRAFT.

Couldn't Be Worse?

Anyone who still inclines toward the view that the coming war is to be fought for idealistic reasons, that it will be a war to preserve democracy, or what have you, should ponder well the remarks of a British broker of The City.

Said the broker, as quoted by Frank C. Hanighen in the *New York Post* of May 2: "War would be terrible. But, after all, I'm coming to feel that it couldn't be worse than what we're going through. . . (Clients) simply won't put money into new projects, with such an uncertain future. But if war came—Well, there would have to be investments in plants which supply munitions. Lots of investments. . . As I said before, things couldn't be worse in case of war."

Things couldn't be worse, says the London broker. Millions of men will be killed. Millions more will be maimed for life. Millions of children will be orphaned, wives bereft of their husbands, mothers bereft of their sons. Not to speak of the devastation of a continent. But—and this should certainly be cause for rejoicing to the soldier whose flesh and entrails will be torn by bullets—there will be new investments. Lots of them. And lots of profits, too, for the brokers, the bankers and the financiers.

Who said this won't be a war for the defense of democracy, and for religion, and for a whole bunch of noble ideals?

Flint's Nine Hundred

The other day 900 families in Flint, Mich., who had been struggling for months to exist on the two-and-a-half cent meals allowed them by relief authorities were wiped off the rolls. No clothing, no food, no homes, no work!

These 900 families came originally from the hills of Kentucky and Georgia, the farms of the middle west, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Wisconsin, ten to fifteen years ago to sell their labor to the big Flint auto moguls.

When the auto moguls had wrung the maximum possible profit from the sweat of these American workers, they dumped them into the streets to fight for the pitiful dole dribbled out by the government.

Now the relief authorities have dumped them again into the streets. Henceforth they must eat the cake generously provided by Roosevelt from Flint's garbage pails—if the relief authorities and Flint's auto moguls have their way.

This is the "American way"—as the capitalists interpret it. But it is not the way of the working class to lie down peaceably and die from hunger without putting up a fight.

Already Flint's 900 families are joining hands with the insecure and exploited auto workers in joint struggle for the right of everyone to a job at wages high enough to provide a decent standard of living.

Together they are echoing the slogans:
 All war funds to the unemployed!
 Thirty-thirty—30 hours maximum a week at \$30 minimum wage!
 Open the gates of the idle factories!

The Fear of Youth

At the 158th annual communication of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, Grand Master Dana B. Hellings made a strong appeal to the 1,500 delegates that they recruit new members to Masonry from the youth of America.

There is a growing tendency, he deplored, particularly among the young people to look upon Masonry with indifference. He exhorted the delegates to "electrify" the Masonic movement by recruiting young men.

The reason for the indifference of American youth toward Masonry is given by the officers of the lodge itself. "Freemasonry," said Mr. Hellings, "rests fundamentally on faith in God and active good-will toward men."

But American youth has lost faith in a God who always seems to be backing the political programs of capitalism; and active good-will toward men is not easy to summon when the future offers no prospect save unemployment, starvation, war.

Freemasonry like any other religion has nothing to offer youth except oppressive rituals, gild buttons, and a bundle of hollow phrases tied with the red, white and blue ribbons of patriotism. No organization that attempts to embrace both bosses and workers can offer anything else.

Youth must build its own organizations—fighting revolutionary organizations that will struggle to smash the capitalist system of scarcity and replace it with the socialist system of plenty.

The day when youth will take the road to socialist revolution in the United States is close at hand. The fat bosses who dominate the Freemasons can well tremble at the specter of American youth rising invincibly with the working class to sweep away forever the oppressive system which Masonry defends.

How to Break Strikes---Courtesy Of the War Department's Experts

In the I.M.P. the Generals Have Worked out a Rigid Dictatorship over Labor that Makes Strike-Breaker. Bergoff's Activities Look Like the Work of an Amateur

By HAL DRAPER

Pearl ("I Break Strikes") Bergoff is a piker compared with the United States Government. The War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan, approved by Roosevelt, includes among other things a blueprint for strike-breaking in time of war.

The War Department has figured out and incorporated a half-dozen and more ways in which strikes in wartime may be "legally" smashed, over and above the ordinary methods which the bosses' government employs during peacetime.

As J. Ramsay MacDonald wrote in his book "National Defense," the World War has established that "an efficient military camp must have an obedient workshop behind it." The "planning experts" in the War Department do not rely on the advance promises of civil peace and servility which are made by Bill Green and John L. Lewis, knowing that these labor fakers may not be able to "deliver." While the War Department proudly announces that it looks to the "patriotism" of industry to insure its cooperation, it obviously does not put any faith in the patriotism of the workers.

Control over labor will be in the hands of a War Labor Administrator appointed by the President. The I.M.P. specifies that he shall be "an outstanding industrial leader who is thoroughly familiar with the problems entering into the relationship of employer and employee and who is capable of dispassionate judgment in their solution." (In a later revised version, this was edited to "an outstanding citizen. . .") The Administrator will dispassionately select his own aides. There will be a Labor Division of the War Industries Administration, with no labor representative on it, consisting solely of representatives of government departments and war boards.

HANDPICKED LABOR REPRESENTATION

The "labor representation" comes in the Advisory Council. Here labor will have the privilege of having five representatives to balance an equal number of the bosses' men, with the Labor Administrator presiding in his officially dispassionate way. Just to make sure, the labor "representatives" are to be handpicked by the government. The Council will meet only on the call of the Administrator, from time to time. And when it meets, its job is to debate the problems assigned to it, such as collective bargaining, "measures to prevent grievances of employees or employees, whether ac-

tual or imaginary, from interfering with production," wage and hour standards, etc. Since such debates take time, the Administrator has a perfect right to act meanwhile as he sees fit. Then if and when the Advisory Council comes to any decision, he can still act as he sees fit.

1. The strike-breaking ace of the I.M.P. is the "selective service" draft. Summed up, it requires that: men 18-45 register; a local board of "outstanding citizens" appointed by the governor sifts them and allocates some to the front; others are given a "deferred status" if classified as needed to work at home. The latter are called the "unorganized militia." The War Department has stated that "a deferment once made is not final. . . and any man can be reclassified and called when circumstances require."
NO "FREE AGENTS" DURING WAR

Or as Bernard M. Baruch, the chief "theoretician" of the I.M.P., has put it: "No matter what the grounds for your deferment may be, unless you are faithfully, continuously, and usefully employed in a capacity and for an enterprise determined by the Government to be essential to the prosecution of the war, your deferment will be cancelled and you will immediately be called for service with the colors."

Baruch has added: ". . . this does not say, however, that men not under military discipline are free agents in war. The Government cannot say, 'Work here, work there,' or 'Work for Mr. A.' But it can say—as it did say in 1918: 'Work or fight!' That principle was barely invoked, but it was and is capable of immense expansion. . . The draft of men for industrial employment is not only impossible. It is wholly unnecessary. The work or fight method is a better way. It is compatible with our institutions and far more effective than any chain-gang or impressment that could be invented." (Baruch's emphasis.)

2. The second method is the direct draft of labor—i.e., "assigning members of the 'unorganized militia' to work where they are told under military orders, and making them liable to court-martial if they do not. This is publicly rejected by Baruch in his statement above, but there is no doubt that it is part of the War Department's perspective, to be used when necessary though avoided if possible. Secretary of War, Woodring was so indiscreet on one occasion as to confide to the press in a regular interview that the War Department will "favor a labor draft." And the

I.M.P. bills are carefully drawn up so as to permit this measure, even though it is not explicitly stated.

Publicly, the I.M.P. men are coy on the subject. An interviewer asked Assistant Secretary of War, Johnson: "How about conscripting labor?" He replied: "No! But if the war became a 'big war' there is no doubt that some form of guidance would be put in effect. By that I simply mean that essential industries could not be permitted to languish because men preferred to loaf rather than work. That's all."

3. Side by side with this goes military supervision within the walls of the factory. The I.M.P. bills provide for the induction into government service of "all individuals in management or control of any industrial organization." What this means is shown by the fact that the War Department has already quietly distributed more than 14,000 reserve army commissions to top-rank manufacturers, executives, bankers, etc.

4. This same provision can be interpreted also to apply to union leaders, who may be considered to be in control of an "industrial organization." Even if over draft age, therefore, they may be forced to enter the government service, in order to integrate the trade union movement into the war machine.

5. The President can also by decree extend military control over all "industrial organizations" and individuals involved in "public service" industries. This is a provision which would especially affect the railroad unions.

6. In one little-known case in the World War, in a lumber strike in the Northwest, soldiers in uniform were used as scabs to take the place of strikers. There is nothing to prevent this from happening again, on a large scale if necessary.

7. Finally the President is empowered to issue any rules and regulations he sees fit to implement the general aims laid down in the bills. Violation of any such rule and regulation carries the same punishment as violation of the law itself: \$100,000 fine and/or one year in jail. There are no limitations to this rule by decree.

Trade-unionists and workers who have heard the talk about the next crusade "to make the world safe for democracy" should remember the remark of Senator Lee, member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee:

"Colonel Taylor (American Legion agent—H.D.) is correct when he says that when our nation goes to war our form of government must become a dictatorship, with the President the Commander-in-Chief."

Passport Trial Finds Defendants Guilty; Had GPU Connections

By NAT LEVINE

NEW YORK—Aaron Sharfin, Ossip Garber and Edward Blatt were found guilty by a jury in Federal Court of a criminal conspiracy to forge and fraudulently obtain American passports for eighteen men and women, among them the Moscow-imprisoned Robinson-Rubens couple.

Despite the fact that throughout the trial the tie-up of the defendants of the G.P.U.—Russian Secret Service—was completely suppressed by the prosecution, Judge Goddard declared after conviction that "the defendants apparently have foreign connections," and raised bail to \$5,000 pending sentence on Tuesday, adding that "under the circumstances the sum is not excessive."

Prosecution Had Facts

Judge Goddard's reference to the "foreign connections" of the defendants is corroborated by information in the hands of the prosecution and other sources:

1. Ossip Garber is described as a "rabid Stalinist" in affidavits by people who frequented the Garber home, and as "communistic" by the testimony of his brother-in-law, Mr. Harry Schwartz.
2. Aaron Sharfin was or is a member of the Communist Party, New York District, section 15, unit 12 and was active in the now-dissolved Stalinist Unemployed Councils in the Bronx.
3. Edward Blatt moved in an exclusive circle of well-known Stalinists, among them David Mankoff and Dorothy Terris, and made a trip to the Soviet Union in 1936.
4. Blatt arranged for the receipt of the phoney passports with a number of Stalinists at either their homes or their places of work, among them:

5. Miss Helen Ravitch, of the Drama Travel League at 12 West 46 Street. Miss Ravitch is a member of the Stalinist International Workers Order and is the wife of Dr. Solon Bernstein, for many years the personal physician to William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party.
6. Mr. Isidor Schlanger, Blatt's brother-in-law, of 308 East 79 Street, who admitted from the witness stand that he was very friendly with Miss Ravitch.
7. Edward Peterson, of 568 Walton Avenue, Bronx, at whose home the fugitive defendant John Blank boarded. Peterson and Blank were members of the Latvian Unity Society of the Stalinist International Labor Defense.
8. When it became necessary for the G.P.U. agent, Adolph Arnold Rubens, to secure a business reference as a front for his secret activities, he commandeered the Magazine "Literary America," operated by Imre Kline, alias Kenneth Huston, a Stalinist whom certain trade union leaders believe to be a G.P.U. agent. Prior to his appearance in court, Kline-Huston was last seen in Minneapolis between March and July 1938, his appearance in that city coinciding with the Stalinist attempt to engineer a frame-up against the General Drivers Union. Kline disappeared from Minneapolis after the Drivers Union launched a \$500,000 libel suit against the Daily Worker.
9. That the three defendants have connections with the G.P.U. was indicated by their refusal to take the witness stand in their own behalf. They thus deprived the prosecution of the opportunity to cross-examine them, and presumably this was worth certain conviction as a result of prejudicing the jury by failing to defend themselves. To have pursued a real battle for acquittal, the three men would have had to take the stand, a prospect which the G.P.U. vetoed from the very beginning. That the three men fully expected their own conviction was illustrated by their tight-lipped, unemotional acceptance of it when the jury brought it in.
10. Not only was the failure of the defendants to take the witness stand inspired by a fear of incriminating disclosures, but the G.P.U. wished to reserve to itself at a later date the business of supplying the political labels. This was clearly foreshadowed when Mrs. Rubens refused the proffered aid of Loy W. Henderson, at that time Secretary to the American Embassy in Moscow. Mrs. Rubens' refusal of American aid indicated that she was cooperating with the G.P.U. which at that time was preparing the Radek-Bukharin Show Trial. The Rubens couple were to be used, and may still be used, as "Volunteer Confessors" to a "plot" against Stalin, parading themselves as "Trotskyists." The "Trotskyist" angle was foreshadowed at the time of the couple's arrest in Moscow when the Soviet Embassy in Washington declared to the press that the Rubens might well be Trotskyists."

**IN
CORNER**

By Max Shachtman

The New Masses of May 9 has finally given the official Stalinist answer to Walter G. Krivitsky's series of articles in the Saturday Evening Post.

The reply is a crushing refutation of the sensational charges made by Krivitsky against the Stalinist regime and the G.P.U. and under the impact of the blow we are almost ready to apologize for having been taken in by Krivitsky to the extent of reproducing excerpts from his articles in our columns. To do the New Masses Justice—and God knows it deserves it—we reprint its point-by-point exposure of Krivitsky in full:

"General Krivitsky, you are Shmelka Ginsberg.
 "You were never a general. You cannot even use a rifle.
 "You never set eyes on Stalin or Voroshilov.
 "You are an Austrian, hailing from old Franz-Josef's Podvoletchiska. Your middle initial G. stands for Ginsberg.
 "You first turned up in Paris where you are a notorious bon vivant, denizen of the night clubs, and always in the dough. You invented your title and name for Paris journalism when you promised to 'tell all.'
 "Those who know you well will snicker at the idea that your mind can absorb an iota of politics—the nights in Paris are said to be too long. You are just the kind of adventurer that the infamous Yagoda would pick for his anti-Soviet dirty work.
 "You cannot even write. Isaac Don Levine, a lily in his own right, ghosted the articles. They made a fine product—Krivitsky, out of Levine, for the Saturday Evening Post. It is an open secret that Suzanne LaFollette, Trotskyist stalwart, is lending Levine a hand in preparing the material for a book. Curtis Brown, Inc., are the agents of Isaac Don Levine, Suzanne LaFollette and/or 'General Krivitsky.' If anybody still wants the book he can get it for \$500.
 "New Masses has the facts.
 "That's about all."

And it's a good thing for the New Masses that it is "about all," for the paper it uses would surely have torn at the folds if an additional ounce of this putrid garbage had been added.

A Few Questions

Krivitsky's articles in the Post, and in the European press last year, contained a mountain of annihilating evidence against the Kremlin assassins and their unspeakable misdeeds. Member of the Soviet Communist Party since the Civil War, head of the War Industries Institute in later years, decorated by Stalin with a high order, and latterly the head of the Western European Secret Service of the Kremlin, Krivitsky was in an exceptional position to know the facts and to tell them. What he did write in such voluminous detail, if it remained unchallenged by the Stalinists, would constitute a shattering indictment of Stalin, the G.P.U. and their international frame-ups.

The Stalinist answer, quoted above just as it was furnished the New Masses by the office of the G.P.U., does not challenge a single one of his accusations! It confines itself to hurling a loaded chamberpot into a wind blowing in its own direction.

Now, since the New Masses, or rather the gendarmes who supervise its columns, has shown itself so clever in the question of names, we will probably be permitted to put a few questions:

What is the name of the "adventurer" in the Kremlin who once picked "the infamous Yagoda" for "his anti-Soviet dirty work"?

You have triumphantly exposed Krivitsky's "real name" as Shmelka Ginsberg. We are glad to see the emphasis with which you point out to this imposter, posing as a 100% Russian, was only a dirty Jew after all, an Austrian Jew at that (not Galician, perhaps), and on top of everything, hailing from ridiculous Podvoletchiska. That alone is enough to destroy his credit and credibility forever. It should teach him to be born, next time, in Georgia, like Stalin, or Kansas, like Browder.

Will you please tell us, in your next issue, the real names (middle initials included) of some of the men listed as your editors? Who—really now!—is A. B. Magli? And Joseph North? And Theodore Draper? And Robert Forsythe (or shall we ask "Colliers")? And Joseph Freeman (also, why is his name to be removed soon from the list)? And Michael Gold and William Gropper?

A Bow to the Masses' Ascetics

Also, give us the low-down on the name of the Gentleman-from-Abroad who directs the policies of Browder; it would make Mr. Winchell turn really green with envy.

We don't know much about Krivitsky's writing style or who, if anyone, ghosted his articles. But since you're so keen on the subject, your readers might be interested in the name of the bright young former Baltimore pupil of V. F. Calverton who writes those stirring speeches and articles of Earl Browder? And by the way, who writes Stalin's speeches now that comrade Stetsky has been liquidated?

As for night clubs and long nights, here or in Paris, we don't make any claims to the special knowledge your editors seem to possess. But the reference you make to them is one point on which you really hit home against Krivitsky. It is barroom gossip that the upper New Masses circle retires to its solitary, straw-mattressed cots no later than 9:30 P.M., for there is nothing else young men can do of an evening when they do not smoke, drink nothing stouter than Fermillac, have an ascetic horror for fleshly delights and, in general, lead the stainless life of an Atlas Mountain monk.

Yet, unlike those others who also retire purposefully at an early hour, the young men of the New Masses perform their singular rites and services in broad daylight, as is evidenced by the current issue of their paper. Stern moralists would undoubtedly pronounce harsh judgment upon them. Ours is tempered by the reflection that in a healthier and saner social order, the political as well as the economic bases of their profession, despite the standing which ages have given it, will be eliminated.

But until that better day has dawned, we think it is not unfair to ask that their practices be confined to the dusky nooks to which conventionality has tacitly assigned them, instead of flaunting them in the columns of an allegedly revolutionary periodical and in the full sight of decent souls whose stomachs are not as strong as they might be.