

# REVOLT

Published by the Central Committee of the  
Revolutionary Workers League, U. S.  
P. O. Box 5463, Chicago, Ill.

3 cents a copy—50 cents a half year (13 issues)—\$1.00 a year (26 issues)

Vol. III. — No. 7 CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 4, 1940 Whole No. 38

# YOU HAVE ONE YEAR TO LIVE

## Stalin's Invasion of Finland In the Light of Hitler's Invasion of Norway

AS THIS is being written both sides are rushing reinforcements in the battle for Trondheim which will be decisive for the whole effort of the German army to take and hold Norway. Allied resistance has stiffened, but the overwhelming odds are with the Germans and it seems more than likely that they will realize their aim of driving the Allies out of Norway south of Narvik, which they have now practically lost unless the German army suddenly goes haywire or the Allies perform a miracle either of which is not likely.

While we wait the outcome of the battle we can usefully investigate what the invasion reveals about the Stalinist invasion in Finland since this is still a moot point in the labor and revolutionary movements. In the opinion of REVOLT two conclusions can now be drawn.

1—It is now an accepted fact that either the British and French governments were caught unawares by Hitler's sudden thrust northward; or knowing that it

the Finnish war, or were in no position to do so. Their "fighting" was limited to diplomatic pressure and to wordy and hypocritical denunciations of the use of force. The best they could hope for was that the Finns would inflict heavy punishment on Russia. That is, no doubt, the cynical calculation underlying their sympathy for the Finns.

As far as the Finnish side of the war was concerned it should be as clear as a pikestaff now that the imperialists were not waging or equipping or financing war against Russia.

2—Equally revealing about the Russian side of the war is Hitler's invasion of Norway. On August 22, 1939 the Hitler and Stalin governments signed their now famous pact. Ten days later Hitler marched into Poland. Fourteen days after that Stalin marched into Poland. Ironically members of the general staffs of both armies met at Brest-Litovsk to discuss details of the double occupation. Later the governments agreed on a new boundary line. Poland was no more.

Continued on Last Page

ARE YOU an unemployed worker?

Or, are you working?

It makes no difference.

You have one year to live.

Irrespective of which party wins the 1940 election, it is the view of American military experts that this country will enter the war within a year, says pro-New Deal newspaper columnist, Jay Franklin. The interventionist spirit... is just beginning to rise now as a result of reaction to Hitler's invasion of Norway and Denmark.

"We" must be prepared to meet force with force said Roosevelt on April 17 speaking to the governing board of the Pan-American union.

In a debate with Secretary of Interior Ickes, General Hugh Johnson stated that Roosevelt's foreign policy as now practiced will get the United States into the European war.

COLONEL HENRY Breckenridge wants the United States to declare war on Germany the instant a single Nazi soldier or sailor sets foot on Iceland or Greenland.

Army men, testifying before Congress, said that plans were complete to embark millions of men if necessary in New York harbor. The details were kept secret.

Rear Admiral Joseph K. Taussig, commandant of the 5th naval district, says that war with Japan is inevitable.

The army has been increased since last September by more than one hundred thousand men.

Congress is debating an increase in the navy of eleven per cent. Voices are raised demanding an increase of twenty five per cent. Others demand a navy capable of defending the entire western hemisphere from any possible attack by

any combination of existing powers.

A flood of pro-Allied and anti-Nazi and anti-Japanese propaganda is poured out daily in the press.

Foreign trade is skyrocketing. War materials are flowing out of the country in tremendous quantities.

THE AMERICAN ruling class is jacking up its profits out of the blood and lives of the workers of Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Norway, England, France and many other countries.

Spread of the war to other countries will boost profits still higher.

Capitalists pray to Mammon every night for a bigger and bloodier war.

In public they are against war and for peace.

The Roosevelt government is not neutral "in thought" to use the President's phrase. It is pro-Ally. It is doing everything it can to help the Allies. It is doing everything it can to make the Nazi war more difficult. And it is doing everything it can to help the capitalists make bigger and better profits out of the war.

Either this government or the government that comes in January after the November election will give the signal and it will be your turn to do your bit for the Allies, against the Germans, or possibly against the Japanese, or maybe the Russians.

You won't be asked but you will be told. You won't be asked but it will be for democracy. You will have the glorious opportunity to shed your blood or have an arm torn off, or lose a gut or a lung, or have half of your face shot off, or both legs crushed by a tank, to make the world safe for the Allies and for bigger and better profits for American capitalists.

THE CAPITALISTS are...

to get into the fight. But they won't do the fighting. They will be drafted to serve on government posts at ten thousand a year. They will show their patriotism by working for a dollar a year.

The experts say it will be a year.

You have a year to live. What are you going to do with that year?

Are you going to stand around and wait?

Or, are you going to organize to stop the capitalists and the government from sending you to death? Are you going to allow them to lead you like sheep to the slaughter?

Or, are you going to put up a fight to save your life and the lives of your fellow workers?

THERE'S ONLY one good way to help our fellow workers in France and England and Germany. Show them by what we do that there is a way to stop the war.

Show them that they don't have to take orders from capitalist governments; they don't have to die when military experts give the word and capitalists wave flags and shout hurrah. Show them that they can have peace IF THEY TAKE THE DECISION OF WAR AND PEACE OUT OF THE HANDS OF THE CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT INTO THEIR OWN HANDS.

We have a year, they say. We say: let us use the year to build a revolutionary party. Let us organize the passionate desire of the American workers for peace into a fighting party strong enough to enforce the veto of the American workers when the capitalists vote for war.

This is REVOLT'S MAY DAY MESSAGE TO ALL REVOLUTIONISTS AND TO ALL WORKERS.

## Relief!

HERE IS A picture of relief in the richest country in the world.

The dollars and cents figures are the relief each state hands out for a whole month for a family. Top figure for a family for a month is New York state with \$35.50. At the bottom is Oklahoma with \$3.50.

\$ 3.50	Oklahoma
3.96	Mississippi
4.81	Arkansas
5.02	Georgia
6.52	North Carolina
6.55	New Mexico
6.83	Florida
7.56	Texas
8.00	Tennessee
8.09	Virginia
8.70	West Virginia
8.92	South Carolina
9.81	Kentucky
9.85	Alabama
11.21	Nebraska
11.67	Missouri
12.60	Kansas
12.72	Louisiana
12.98	Colorado
13.04	Arizona
13.17	Idaho
13.39	Indiana
14.28	Montana
14.46	North Dakota
14.55	Washington
14.71	South Dakota
15.50	Oregon
15.67	Wyoming
16.65	Ohio
16.77	Iowa
20.34	Nevada
20.35	Maine
20.36	Delaware
21.52	Illinois
21.72	Michigan
21.89	Wisconsin
22.35	Maryland
22.69	Vermont
22.74	New Hampshire
24.52	Minnesota
25.20	Utah
25.66	Dist. of Columbia
26.35	Massachusetts
26.39	Connecticut

27.01	Pennsylvania
28.00	Rhode Island
29.00	California
32.00	New Jersey
35.30	New York

Five states do not give any "relief" at all. The average is \$21.03 per month per family, about \$5 per week. Millions of American workers and their women folks and kids are slowly starving to death IN THE RICHEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD.

HERE IS WHAT some individuals and institutions say about this state of affairs:

Thousands of Children are hungry... are living under conditions where there is never enough to eat, to wear, or to keep warm. The result is malnutrition, starvation and disease.—Chicago Committee on Adequate Relief.

I'm hungry all the time: typical statement of... single women on relief.—U. S. Women's Bureau.

It is strange that these unfortunates would receive a greater allowance from the State of Illinois if they were criminals committed to our penal institutions.—City Club of Chicago.

Five cents is the average cost of a meal for a person on relief. For a typical American, it is 11c; for a person in a \$2,000 a year income family, 14c.—Illinois Conf. on Soc. Legislation.

Low-income people are eating about half as much as they want.—Milo Perkins, President, Federal Surplus Commodities Corp.

Teachers see children fading away before their very eyes. Education is impossible under such circumstances.—John Fewkes, President, Chicago Teachers' Union.

What will be the end of it all? There is no record in human history of millions of men submitting quietly to slow death. The lesson of history is that starvation breeds revolution. The American workers will not long put up with seeing their children fading away before their eyes, and their women folks eating half of what they want.

## Goats

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 18

(A.P.)—A joint congressional committee approved plans today for testing a new liquid oxygen explosive on live goats. The explosive (was) developed by Lester B. Barlow, Baltimore inventor...

Barlow said 60 to 70 goats... would be used for each experiment...

"It isn't a case of being inhumane," he said. "Animals often have been used for military tests, and there is no other way of finding out what we want to know—how the explosive will affect live tissue."

First, the Army tests this explosive out on four-legged goats.

Then, it will use it on the "live tissue" of the two-legged goats in war—either in the class war on strikers in the U. S., or in imperialist war on our class brothers born in other countries.

If it's successful other governments will copy it and use it on strikers in their countries and on American workers when this government enters the war.

Fellow workers, we're the "live tissue" Barlow talks about. We're the real goat in the experiment. What are we going to do about it? Let Barlow and the U.S. Army blow us to hell?

Or are we going to fight now to stop these killers in their tracks, expose their war plans, their death sentences for us?

Are we men or are we goats? If we're goats we'll submit and do nothing—except get blown to bits when the government decides it is time.

But if we're workingmen and women who are true to the cause of freedom we'll build a revolutionary party to stop the murder plans of the government and put an end to imperialist war forever—by overthrowing the capitalist system of society.

## Trotskyists Split In Two Result = 0

NEW YORK, April 28.—Between five and six hundred workers came to Manhattan Lyceum on the east side of Manhattan last night to hear spokesmen of the newly formed Workers Party, explain the causes of their split with Trotsky in which they contend they are supported by half the membership. Curiosity was one reason which attracted some workers to the meeting. But, no doubt, there were others who, like this writer, were interested in finding out whether this group has a revolutionary program for the solution of the pressing problems before the American workers.

Those who came to hear at first hand what caused the split may or may not have been satisfied according to whether they agreed with the point of view put forward by the speakers. But those who came to learn whether this group offered any hope of solving the problem of building a revolutionary party in this country to stop the ruling class from plunging us into war, learned that this problem was apparently not even worthy of consideration by messers Burnham, Shachtman and Abern who harangued the audience for more than two hours.

The only problem which seems to occupy their thinking and their propaganda is that Trotsky's support of Stalin's invasion of Poland and Finland makes him and those who agreed with him a left wing of what they call the Berlin-Rome-Moscow camp in the present imperialist war. Granted—at least for the sake of argument—that this is so, it is an important fact. But just how this fact—assuming that it is a fact—is going to enable the workers of the United States to make a revolutionary fight against the war danger in

In conversations with their supporters following the meeting this writer put the following question: what is the connection of this issue with the class struggle in the United States? Among the replies which he got were: first we must work out our theoretical position; what has that got to do with it?

In other conversations in which he tried to probe this matter further this writer inquired whether the Workers Party had a program for fighting the war danger in this country which was different in any important principle from the program of the comrades from whom they have separated. The replies established the fact that the Workers Party comrades agree with the comrades from whom they have separated, the Socialist Workers Party, led by that veteran bureaucrat and opportunist, James P. Cannon, who is supported by Trotsky, that the creation of a reformist labor party would be in the interests of the American workers and that it is the duty of the revolutionists to build such a party.

They have the same trade union policy of supporting some agents of the class enemy in the trade unions, the class collaborationist labor leaders, against other class collaborationists when these foul birds, fall out, or for other reasons. As one loyal Workers Party member put it: "We don't want a different trade union policy from Cannon's. We think he has a good one." And much more of the same.

From the hundreds of thousands of words that have been published by both sides from the speeches made at this meeting and from conversations with members of both organizations this writer draws the following conclusions:

1—The issue which precipitated the break in the ranks of the American Trotskyists was the political support which Trotsky wanted to give to Stalin's invasions of Poland and Finland; the now Workers Party comrades opposed this policy; they were in favor of applying a policy of

## Chrysler Chisels On Contract Grievances Mount

The strike referred to in the following article was the 54-day strike which ended November 30, 1939. The contract was signed on November 29. "It is going to be more difficult for the Chrysler workers to live with this agreement than it was for them to live with the last one," said Auto Worker in REVOLT, December 9. Chrysler Unionist substantiates this estimate.

DETROIT, April 25.—Chrysler workers have another victory. The Corporation has agreed to live up to the contract with the union, well, part of it anyway. After four months of negotiations the Corporation has agreed to pay time and a half for overtime work on the Saturdays following Christmas and New Year's as provided in the contract. When International Board member Richard Frankenstein announced this to a steward meeting, along with a statement that otherwise no more such overtime would be paid, he was hooted out of the hall.

Immediately after the strike, the union started negotiations for a 40 hour-week in all departments as is also provided by the contract. While the union went through the "regular procedure" many departments worked 37½ hours; now they are down to 30 hours and more procedure is being followed to beg the Corporation to allow 32 hours—as provided by the contract.

22 other major grievances are pending.

The cause of all this fumbling is a clause in the contract providing that the union cannot strike until the "regular grievance procedure" has been followed through. This takes several months; that is most of the production season. This "regular procedure" applies to the union only, not to the Corporation.

THERE MAY be honor among thieves; only the innocent look for it in the Chrysler Corporation. The contract was written in a hurry between midnight and morning—after Philip Murray had disarmed the workers by calling off the pickets—and the Corporation officials put in a few words they didn't mean; so now they simply ignore them.

As long as the union officials feel bound to prove our "responsibility" we can't strike no matter what the provocation, and the Corporation officials laugh at us. The workers' best weapon is strike or the threat of it; with this taken away the Corporation can afford to laugh, for production goes on and nothing much else

matters to them.

While the strike was on, U A W negotiators elected from each plant, with a few from the International tried to come to terms with the Corporation. Most of these negotiators were honest and the rest were scared to come back with a bum contract so the Corporation couldn't make a deal. They stalled. They stalled until the great leader, Philip Murray, from the C I O came to town. Corporation officials welcomed him like a long lost stockholder.

Murray chased the U A W negotiators out like little boys and "sat down around the table." The next 24 hours are veiled in darkness. Workers pounded the picket line, hopefully, trustingly; then the great man spoke: "Leave the picket line," he said. "Everything is fixed." If you think it wasn't read the contract.

THE PICKETS went home and the negotiators worked out the details between midnight and morning while the radio blared: "Meet to ratify the contract tomorrow, go back to work next day," until most of the boys were uncertain which came first. Not that it made any difference. The contract specified: "Not to be released until 3 p. m." Union men couldn't get a copy to study, but the newspapers had it at noon. On the same page with the "proposed" contract was a ¾ page announcing the schedule for each plant to go back to work.

The workers took the contract like a kid takes castor oil, because they couldn't do anything else. Phil Murray said: "You can go back to work and start paying dues again."

Mark Hanna said: "The captains of industry could not control the workers without our Lieutenants of Labor."

Someday the workers will fix these great "leaders" who stand as buffers between them and the capitalists.

Meanwhile, the Chrysler workers have another victory.

Chrysler Unionist.

Chrysler Unionist is not a member of the League. But REVOLT is glad to publish his attacks on labor's enemies.

working for defeats on both sides of the war in order to promote revolutionary action; Trotsky argued that as long as the Soviet Union is a workers' state, no matter how corrupted by Stalinism, it is a crime to work for its defeat in the war; the opposition could not meet this argument because they do not agree among themselves whether the Soviet Union is a workers state; some say, yes, some say, no, and some say neither; they get around this difficulty by contending that the point is not involved since Russia is now "an integral part" of the Berlin-Rome-Moscow camp in the imperialist war and is assisting the German imperialists fight an imperialist war; the opposition contends that Trotsky is giving support to the imperialist war via support of Stalin's actions in it; Trotsky defines the issue as the character of the Russian state; the opposition defines the issues as the strategy of fighting imperialist war; there is no agreement on what the splitting issue is; but the fact remains that however they define the issue the heart of the controversy is their attitude toward Stalin's policy in the present war; other issues relating to this issue are involved, but this is the nub of the difference.

2—Both sides have the same program for the class struggle in the United States; it has been an opportunist program right along; the split offers no prospect of

either side working out a revolutionary program on which to make a revolutionary agitation in the United States against hunger and war and on which to build a powerful revolutionary party.

3—The implication of the foregoing is that the split is not final and conclusive POLITICALLY despite the present organizational rupture; the Workers Party comrades are aware of this in one way or another; some think that they are making a fight to correct Trotsky; others think that when the situation in this country gets hot they will have to reunite with Cannon because they have the same program for fighting the war danger in this country; although the Workers Party spokesmen attack Trotsky as the left wing of the Berlin-Rome-Moscow camp they do not pillory him as a social patriotic traitor which would be their simple duty if their accusation is correct; they declare themselves to be now the American section of his Fourth International, presenting the split in this connection as competition with the Cannon SWP for recognition as the official representative of the Fourth International which is dominated by the theoretician and leader of the left wing of the Berlin-Moscow camp; the French Trotskyist movement before the war witnessed many splits over various issues which were followed by reunifications and further splits.

4—The split is therefore negative and marks the fact that the Trotskyist movement as a whole in this country was shattered by its inability to meet, even theoretically, the new problems arising out of the war; the fact that this movement has split in half over Stalin's war policy when they are in agreement on their program for this country and when they are unable to show any connection between this issue and what they propose to do and say about hunger and war in this country demonstrates that for the Trotskyist movement as a whole, in which we must include the Workers Party, the real basis for building a movement is the Russian question, and more particularly, the question of attitude toward Stalinism; in other words Trotskyism is not an independent movement in the political sense but is dependent on Stalinism either as anti-Stalinism or as critical support of Stalinism, and very often these two things are one; this has been true ever since the Trotskyist movement was founded in this country in 1928; in the present split the two aspects of Trotskyism have, temporarily this writer believes, taken on the form of separate organizations; whether the members of both groups will later unite, or whether some will make this split the beginning of a decisive break with Trotskyism remains to be seen; in any case the split demonstrates the

## GM Election Shows Growth Of Unionism

DETROIT, April 24.—The recently concluded NLRB election in General Motors plants throughout the country, involving as it did nearly three times as many auto workers as voted in the Chrysler election, (which was the largest single election up to that time) resulted in an overwhelming victory for the CIO. The UAW-CIO beat out the UAW-AFL almost three and a half to one. Even in departmental craft situations, where skilled workers were involved, only five resulted in victories for AFL crafts.

Tho the class collaborationist leaderships in both set-ups could not help but retard the development of union consciousness, the outstandingly encouraging fact in the election was that out of 125,040 voting, less than 14,000 voted for neither union. This of course means that the auto workers generally have finally learned the ABC lesson of distinguishing between organization and organizational leadership: they have voted for unionism in spite of the misleadership in the unions.

NO DOUBT the vast majority of votes for the UAW-CIO as compared with those for the UAW-AFL is resultant from the fact, known to the auto workers, that only the industrial form of union organization can get to first base in this mass production industry. The AFL certainly has a flimsy, if not a hopeless case, with the auto workers in Michigan, due more than anything else to the fact that in all those decades when it was the dominant organization in the United States labor movement it never made a single impressive gesture toward the organization of this industry.

So in a very positive sense this election marks a turning point in the relationship of forces as between these two class-collaborationist set-ups in the automobile industry if not in the mass production industries generally. The possibility of it marking the beginning of a turn in their relationship in the whole United States labor movement should not be excluded.

OF COURSE General Motors workers having handed over to the UAW-CIO the authority to bargain for them, do so confident of achieving tangible results in the way of higher wages, better working conditions, more recognition—and, in this way, they are no doubt due for disillusionment. In bidding for GM workers' votes, the UAW-CIO bureaucrats held out the bait of a thirty-hour work week at the rate of a forty-hour pay, of an annual wage, and vacations with pay. They of course mentioned in a subordinate way an immediate program which was far more modest; but what the GM workers will get will be precisely what the CIO bureaucrats can argue the GM profit hogs out of without any threat of strike, let alone any call to struggle.

Tho it should not be excluded at the present time when government orders, due to the present war situation constitute a very important part of GM production, even the GM corporation will concede certain minor points to their wage slaves even thru class collaborationist misleaders. The GM workers will win nothing important without taking the bit into their own teeth — striking, demanding more than these minor concessions, reintroducing what Knudsen called the "Roman holiday" of 1937—and on a higher plane

THE POSITION of the Revolutionary Workers League on the whole situation is that the auto workers have gained a good deal of union consciousness. They have in action at least, correctly distinguished between the forms of union structure, choosing the industrial in preference to the craft separatist. They have now reached the stage of development where the door is wide open to them for further progress, in the way of securing gains for the membership of General Motors plants, in the way of solidarity within the organized plants, and in the way of laying the basis for the organization of the unorganized plants, especially the last of the big three—Ford's.

What is very important however, for the auto workers to learn is that no important gains can be made without struggle, both against their employers and their misleaders in the unions. They should put themselves into the negotiations and union discussions more positively than ever rather than leaving it to their local and international leaders.

Auto Worker

## Why I Joined The League

NOW, AS IMPERIALIST wars hasten the breakdown of the present types of economic control, as concentration camps arise in California only to spread to her sister states, and as cold and starvation continues more acutely among the working class—now—is the time to build a true Marxist Party.

This party must place the issues squarely and simply before the workers, it must show them the only path left, which is to overthrow the present system of private property and boss rule and erect a workers' state which will lead to an economy in which the human economic necessities will be almost as free and abundant as the air we breathe.

This cannot be done without a strong Marxist workers' party. The Revolutionary Workers League is striving to bring such a party into existence. It is the duty of all class-conscious workers to participate in this work. Therefore, I want to help.

H. P.

Detroit, April 7, 1940.

Continued on Last Page



# Unity Negotiations Strike Snags

**THE THIRD** session of the negotiations between the **Fighting Worker** group and the League for unity of the two groups was held on April 24. The first session was held on March 29, the second on April 7.

The three sessions have revealed that both groups approach the problem of revolutionary unity from widely different standpoints. In the opinion of the Central Committee of the League, as of this writing (April 28), the following facts have been pretty well established by the exchange of letters and statements preceding the opening of negotiations on March 29, and by the negotiations themselves:

**1**—The League has taken the stand that the outbreak of the second imperialist world war and the pending entry into this war of the United States creates a new situation; the revolutionary struggle against the war becomes the decisive issue before the workers of all lands and the revolutionists in all countries; the League's perspective is that revolutions will develop out of this war more rapidly than was the case in the first world war; the revolutionists have very little time in which to organize their forces and prepare to play that part in coming events which their program and purposes call for; the immediate task before revolutionists who see the problem in this general light is the creation of revolutionary parties capable of measuring up to their tasks and responsibilities; this is now no longer a matter of general propaganda but an immediate task which must be solved promptly; in view of the splintered and shattered condition of the revolutionary movement in this country a first step in the solution of the problem of building a revolutionary party is the unification of the revolutionists themselves; although they are now divided over many and important issues they are as one in their estimate of the war as an imperialist war in the need for combating it by a policy of revolutionary defeatism and independent working class action, and in the goal to which this struggle will lead, the establishment of a revolutionary workers government; those revolutionists who stand on the theoretical principles of Marxism and who are in agreement on the war question should not permit their differences on other questions to stand in the way of their uniting at once.

Whether the **Fighting Worker** group agrees or disagrees with the League that the war creates a new situation and thereby presents the revolutionary movement with the solution of immediate tasks the **Fighting Worker** group has not stated. But it has definitely rejected the political basis for unity advanced by the League as non-Marxian and opportunist. It has insisted that unity is possible only on the basis of what it calls a rounded Marxist program. In place of the basis for unity advanced by the League it demanded acceptance of the 14 points of the Provisional International Contact Commission for the New Communist (4th) International of which it is an affiliate, as a basis for negotiations. The League accepted the 14 points as a brief and abstract statement of the general theoretical principles of Marxism. Negotiations got under way.

**2**—In view of the fact that a basis for negotiations had been found and that both sides entered into them with the avowed purpose of seeking unity; after having split apart two years ago and after having conducted factional warfare against each other, the Central Committee felt it to be important for the success of the negotiations and future collaboration, should the negotiations be successful, that each side know exactly what is in the mind of the other. It therefore proposed that each side define its attitude toward the other, and it took the initiative in stating its attitude. It declared at opening of the first session that it recognized the **Fighting Worker** group as a political equal. And it asked the **Fighting Worker** group for a statement of its attitude.

At the conclusion of the third session the **Fighting Worker** group had not made a definite statement of its attitude toward the League; whether it had the same attitude it held before the League broached the question of unity and accepted the 14 points—that the League was a centrist group; or whether it had changed and was now something else; or whether it wanted to discuss one or more of the 14 points to see whether formal acceptance of them by the League was consistent or was vitiated by differences on various aspects of them, before it could say whether its attitude was the same as formerly or was changed by the acceptance of the 14 points.

As it stands now the Central Committee does not know whether the **Fighting Worker** group considers that it is negotiating with Marxists to collaborate in the construction of a united organization; or, whether it considers that it is negotiating with opportunists with the aim of assimilating them, or, failing that, to break them up; or, whether it considers that it must await the conclusion of the discussion until it can decide this point.

In a word, the Central Committee does not know just what is in the mind of the **Fighting Worker** group. There is an ambiguity in the negotiations. There is as yet no real meeting of minds even though a limited meeting, which is absolutely necessary for the success of any collaboration. The present vagueness in the political relationship of the two groups is an impediment to the success of the negotiations.

**3**—In the view of the Central Committee, since both groups accept the fundamental principles of Marxism in general and as summarized in the 14 points, the essential task of the negotiations is a collaboration to apply these principles and these points to the solution of the concrete political and organizational tasks of building a united organization in the writing of a program on which the united organization shall act in the present situation; in drafting a constitution which shall define the structure of the new organization and establish the rules which shall regulate the relationships of its members; in defining the qualifications for the selection of a politically competent leadership.

In the view of the Central Committee the only valid reason for not proceeding directly from acceptance of the 14 points to their application in the solution of the above tasks would be to provide either side with an opportunity to determine whether the formal acceptance of the principles of Marxism was or was not vitiated by existing theoretical differences.

The Central Committee did not ask for such an investigation with respect to the **Fighting Worker** group. It believes it unnecessary. The **Fighting Worker** group, thus far, has asserted only that the acceptance of the 14 points constitutes a basis for the discussion of differences, the aim of which is to determine whether these differences vitiate our acceptance of the 14 points.

If this were stated to be a necessary preliminary to enable the **Fighting Worker** group to establish whether it was negotiating with Marxists and go on from there to the solution of the so-called organizational tasks it would be understandable and the difference in approach would be slight. But in the absence of any statement bearing on this question the exact difference in attitude toward the problem of the negotiations is difficult to establish. Like the attitude of the **Fighting Worker** group toward the League it is ambiguous. And constitutes, thereby, another impediment to a successful outcome of the negotiations.

The Central Committee believes that the significance of the difference in approach to the problem of negotiations as revealed thus far is this: that its own approach is more conducive to the construction of an organization of revolutionary propagandists, agitators, organizers and fighters since it would constrain both groups, on recognizing each other as political equals, to collaborate in working out the concrete application of revolutionary principles to such problems as the struggle against hunger, the fight against imperialist war and the war danger in this country, the struggle against class collaboration and dictatorship in the trade unions, the struggle against oppression of the negroes, the struggle to unite the revolutionists, and other great problems.

**WITH THIS** approach existing differences would be handled as differences in the application of revolutionary principles on which there is agreement. In this way their true significance could more easily be appreciated. Secondary differences could less easily serve as platforms for sharp divisions and splits; while more important differences could be seen concretely as giving rise to different lines of action and tactics in the class struggle and to important differences in party structure and regime. This approach would yield a truer result either in unity, or in clarifying the basic reasons why it could not be achieved at this time.

The approach of the **Fighting Worker** group on the other hand, lays a greater stress on differences per se, affords greater latitude for exaggeration of secondary differences into splitting issues, implies no necessary practical purpose in the discussion, thus permitting greater play for tendencies toward excessive theoretical discussion unrelated to practical conclusions, and in all these ways is less conducive to a positive result.

During the effort to clarify these problems it became clear to the Central Committee that the **Fighting Worker** group was insisting categorically on the acceptance of its approach to the problem both by failing to make any definite statement of its attitude toward the League and by showing no indication of meeting the approach of the League in any particular. At the end of the second session the problem therefore stood as follows: if the Central Committee were to match the intransigence of the **Fighting Worker** group with an equal intransigence the negotiations would come to an immediate end. If they were to be kept going a means had to be found to overcome the impasse which the confrontation of these two approaches created.

During the exchange of statements preceding the opening of negotiations the Central Committee declared that it was ready to make all necessary concessions to bring about unity. It gave a proof of this at the second session when it yielded to the objections of the **Fighting Worker** group to its proposal to open the negotiations to members of both groups and conceded that they should be closed.

With the same aim it declared at the opening of the third session that it was instructing its representatives to continue with the discussion which had already begun on the Russian question on the following basis: to afford the **Fighting Worker** group every opportunity to decide by discussion whether there is agreement on the principles of Marxism in general and as summarized in the 14 points.

In this way it hoped to reassure the **Fighting Worker** group that it had not withdrawn its negotiation committee and was not attempting to junk the agenda, fears which the **Fighting Worker** group had expressed verbally and in its press and to avoid a head-on conflict over question of approach and attitude and keep the negotiations going in the course of which these problems may yet be clarified to the mutual satisfaction of both sides.

**4**—The third session witnessed a continuation of the discussion on the Russian question, begun at the second session when the **Fighting Worker** group submitted an eight-point statement of its position. The verbal discussion of this position has now advanced to the point at which the Central Committee is putting its stand on the points of difference in writing.

Thus far the discussion on this issue has revealed the following: The eight-point statement repeats in part a position the Central Committee has already accepted in accepting the 14 points; it therefore accepts this position again. Of this character is the idea, for example, that the basic property relations established by the October revolution of 1917 still exist in the Soviet Union. And others.

But there are ideas in the eight-point statement with which the Central Committee disagrees. We give two illustrations.

The 14 points assert categorically: "Marxists will support the Soviet Union no matter in what kind of a war the USSR is involved." In accepting the 14 points the Central Committee, (*REVOLT*, January 6) made the following observation on the above:

"We understand that the 14 points were drawn up before the present war broke out and before such developments as the Stalinist invasions of Poland and Finland were envisaged. The fifth point is probably intended to apply to wars in which imperialist powers attack the Soviet Union and in which the Soviet Union either stands alone or makes a military alliance with one or more capitalist countries. Nonetheless recent experience has shown that that formulation as it stands without modification, can lead to serious errors if applied to such events as the invasions of Poland and Finland by the Stalinist regime.

It is clear that the Central Committee agreed and still agrees with what it took to be an attempt to define a position toward the defense of the Russian revolution (not the Stalinist regime) against imperialist attack, but urged a reformulation of this position to avoid its being construed to mean defense of counter-revolutionary invasions of small nations like Poland and Finland which were not engaged in imperialist attacks on the Soviet Union.

The Central Committee is glad to note in the eight-point statement a modification of the original position to meet the new problems arising out of the present war situation and its possibilities. The eight-point statement states:

"A war in which the S. U. participates would be reactionary only if it were waged against another healthy worker's state, or for the suppression of the revolutionary struggles and organs of dual power of workers in another country."

The implication of this is plain enough: Marxists would not support such reactionary wars on the part of the Soviet Union but would fight against them.

The **Fighting Worker** group is of the opinion that this position is an elaboration and concretization of the position in the 14 points and flows from the general line of these points. The Central Committee does not agree with this estimate. But this difference of opinion need not become an issue since the Central C. that in the circumstances cited the Soviet Union would be fighting reactionary wars.

The point at issue is that to the circumstances cited in the eight-point statement the Central Committee would add a third: a war in which the Stalin government uses the superior might of the Soviet Union to crush the independence of small nations like Finland and Poland when they are not part of an imperialist assault on the Soviet Union.

The Central Committee recognizes this difference as an important one. But it believes that it is by no means a decisive one, not one which justifies a split. Whether the **Fighting Worker** group is of the same opinion remains to be seen.

A similar situation developed with respect to the problem of the right of small nations to determine their own existence. The 14 points refer to this problem from only one standpoint—as a part of the problem of revolutionary strategy on the part of the working class in seizing power. The eight-point statement restates the position as stated in the 14 points. And to this it adds a second discussion of the problem—the relation of this problem to the defence of the Soviet Union. This second standpoint is not contained in the 14 points and constitutes an addition to the position of the latter.

The nub of the difference on this issue is this: the **Fighting Worker** takes the stand that the defense of the right of self determination can not be placed above the principle of the defense of the Soviet Union. It thereby assumes that there either is or can be conflict between the defense of the right of self determination and the interests of the social revolution.

The Central Committee rejects the idea categorically. No such thing is possible. On the contrary the right of self determination can be successfully defended and realized only by proletarian revolution. That is the positive lesson of the Russian revolution of 1917. That is the negative lesson of the Versailles imperialist peace which made a ghastly mockery of this right.

**THIS DIFFERENCE** like the preceding one is important. But the only practical significance it has between us at this time is its application to the Stalinist invasion of Poland and Finland, now over. The position of both sides on these events has been discussed in their publications and need not be repeated here. In its statement giving its position on these issues which it will submit to the **Fighting Worker** group the Central Committee will discuss them in more detail. Its position will be published in whole or in part in *REVOLT*.

The Central Committee believes that this difference like the preceding one is not a splitting issue. Whether the **Fighting Worker** group will take a similar position remains to be seen.

In short, and in summary, the negotiations have struck a number of snags as was to have been expected. The Central Committee is seeking means to avoid shipwreck. If the **Fighting Worker** group exhibits a similar attitude it may be possible to go ahead toward a positive solution.

## LETTERS TO REVOLT

**CHICAGO, May 1.**—About two months ago I landed a job with a large transport outfit as a tractor driver, working nights. Some 375 men were hired all told.

Us new fellows were on the extra list and about half had to report every morning at seven o'clock for work—and many had to wait around for hours on their own time till they got called to drive.

One morning I drove into the garage after working all night. The usual gang was hanging around waiting to be called by the dispatcher. Up walks the garage superintendent into our midst and points out a dozen men at random.

All you fellows, turn in your badges, he said. We no longer need your services.

He was about to walk away when he noticed one driver without a necktie.

Hey you, he said. Where's your necktie? It's at home.

Well, go on home and keep your necktie company, said the super. You're fired.

Many's the time I've heard the saying that a man was fired because the boss didn't like the way he parted his hair, but this is the first time I ever saw it.

That outfit ought to be organized. S. G.

**DETROIT** — Members of the WPA-Welfare Dept. of the UAW-CIO were treated to a disgusting spectacle of misleadership and misinformation at a recent meeting of WPA workers, held at 51 Sproat St., April 11. Darrell T. Smith, Washington representative of Labor's Non-Partisan League, was the guest speaker of the evening, and it was his talk which so disgusted those present that many of them walked out until Smith had wound up his dissertation.

Years ago, it was necessary for the workers to indulge in social revolutions to get what they wanted, Smith told the workers, but now we have an easy way of getting what we want—through the power of the ballot.

After the better part of an hour, during which he gently reminded the meeting that it was by such narrow margins as from ten to twenty votes in Congress that certain liberal legislation was defeated. Smith finally stated that he had run out of ideas for the entertainment of all concerned and took a seat at the rear of the hall to observe the results of his little "talk."

**JUDGING** from the reports emanating from the national office of the WPA Dept., the results insofar as they were reflected in the words of the members were far from what was hoped for, for a constant stream of protests were phoned in to the office, or received in person from members who could not restrain from disgust and chagrin. During the meeting, such remarks as: **Did you ever hear such bunk in your life? and Where the hell did they get that guy?** were heard from members who had "taken a walk" in true Al Smith style.

The demand for tangible results is particularly apparent among the WPA and unemployed members, and the CIO is hard-pressed as to how they can compromise their class-collaborationist policies with the demands of the rank and file for more adequate unemployment relief, such as WPA, and the shop-member demands for shorter hours and more pay and jobs. The current "line" seems to be that the 30-hour week can best be accomplished through favorable legislation, but the lack of visible progress is creating great unrest among the membership and the day is soon coming when the "shots" must produce or get off the pot.

M. A. H.

## Shop Talk

**DETROIT.**—We ambled over where old man Kelly was eating his lunch. He had just buried his son a couple of days ago. We wanted to offer our sympathies.

We just come over to tell you we're sorry about your boy passing away, said Glen. Thanks boys, he replied.

We first heard about it when the clerk came around making a collection, offered Tony. It sort of got us down for a while.

Yeah, boys, it was pretty sad. The wife took it kind of hard, too. Eighteen is too young to die.

"I hope, interpolated Jack, that that monkey (the clerk) got a good flower for us.

It was a nice flower, boys, and the wife wants me to thank you for her too.—Bill had a good send-off alright.

I guess you can buy a good funeral pretty cheap, said Tony. I see an ad on the street car, saying funerals for a hundred dollars.

Well, Bill's cost me three hundred, replied the old man. That certainly wasn't any too cheap, said Jack.

No, answered Kelly, but you can't get anything decent below that.

It almost took all of his insurance to take care of it.

Oh, he was insured? asked Glen.

Yeah—he was. Paid twenty cents a week tribute to the financiers for it. Insurance is a racket, you know, but what can a man do? You can't let yourself go to potter's field! I guess you can't at that, said Glen.

It seems like a man can't be decent without being a sucker too, said the old man.

No, I guess you can't, I broke in. For instance, you got to work to keep from being a bum, and the wages we get, and the speed we're workin', somebody's committin' highway robbery.

Yeah, you're right, Mike, replied the old man. They got you comin' and goin' from the cradle to the grave. It's hell to be poor.

Well someday the worm'll turn, I said.

I hope so, kid. But there goes the five minute whistle. See you again boys.

Mike Bono.

**CHICAGO.**—We were sitting in front of the plant eating our lunch when the business agent of our local came up.

How are you boys? he asked.

Okay, we said going on with our lunch.

That's fine, he stated and continued, You know fellows there is a special assessment this month. \$2.50.

\$2.50!, we shouted almost dropping our sandwiches. What in the hell for?

Now, now boys don't get excited, he stated, We've got a special organizing campaign.

Paul bobbed up. Who in the devil do you think you're kidding? Why we've been paying dues for three months and we haven't even had a meeting.

The business agent cut him short. Listen here, men. Those are the orders from downtown. You'll either pay it or you don't work. Now it's up to you. What will it be?

**OUR JOBS** are our life. We all knew that. The rat gave us no choice.

Okay, we said, we'll pay.

I'm glad you're using your heads, men, the agent replied. Here, have a cigar, and I'll be around next week. He passed around cigars. We watched him turn the corner.

The lousy bastard, we muttered throwing the cigars to the ground. Robbing us blind.

.. We were silent for a minute, then Carl spoke. This can't go on forever. Lousy wages in the plant and then this rat robbing us.

We all looked at him and nodded approval. Then Jim broke in.

Unionism is a great thing, fellows. But it doesn't mean a goddam with that rat. It's our union and we've got to run it. We just have to get rid of him.

We all stood very still letting Jim's words sink into our minds, and then repeated. Yes, we just have to get rid of him.

H. M.

## IN THE RICHEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

**LOS ANGELES, CAL., April 28.**—(AP).—Officials of a Los Angeles insurance firm revealed today that they had handled a deal by which insurance of \$2,250,000 on the jewels of the Countess Haugwitz-Reventlow (the former Barbara Hutton, 5 and 10 cent store heiress) had been switched from Lloyds of London to domestic companies.

**CAMBRIDGE MASS., April 12.**—(AP).—More than 40 per cent of the people in the United States, Says Dr. Thomas Parran, surgeon-general of the United States Public Health Service, are suffering from a new kind of starvation—attributed to faulty nutrition.

"This 40 per cent is not getting a diet adequate to maintain good health and vigor," he said....

"The new kind of starvation may be even worse in its ultimate social effects than the ancient famines which periodically killed off a large part of the population...."

Dr. Parran said that the very foods which the nation had in surplus were "those in which the national dietary is deficient—milk and milk products, citrus, fruits, green vegetables and meats."

**NEW YORK, April 23.**—(AP).—A baby who will be born with a super-silver spoon in its mouth is expected in the household of James H. R. Cromwell and his wife, the former Doris Duke, whose eventual total inheritance will make her the richest woman in the world.

The child will have a 2,400 acre playground with huge trees, velvety lawns, and gleaming statuary in "Duke Farms," Mrs. Cromwell's estate at Somerville, N.J.

Its nursery prospects are virtually unlimited, including the Cromwells' Hawaiian seaside retreat, "Shangri-La"; their cottage at Antibes, their North Carolina place and villas in Palm Beach and Newport.

Mrs. Cromwell's cousin (is)... the former Barbara Hutton, another famous heiress....

Mrs. Cromwell... at 22 inherited... her first \$10,000,000. Another \$10,000,000 went to her at 25, and she will receive a third \$10,000,000 at 30.

**WASHINGTON, D. C., April 22.** — The house voted unanimously today to conduct a thoro investigation of one of the nation's great problems—the interstate migration each year of 2,000,000 homeless and hungry citizens who are victims of drouth, the depression, and mechanized farming.

The roadside population of the United States represents the movement of 350,000 homes.... Every year, 2,000,000 citizens cross state lines in search of employment. This mass movement does not include the thousands of professional hoboes and bindle stiffs who prefer a nomadic life.—Chicago Tribune.

Shopping notes:

Women at their wits' end over what to buy for their husbands might like to know that the current price of memberships in the Chicago Stock Exchange is \$1,500. That's what the last two have sold for.—Chicago Times, May 3.

Fired from his job, Joseph Binnotti, 50, 4619 Deming, couldn't see much that was pleasant ahead of him. So he waded into the river at Grand ave., today. He was dragged out.... —Chicago Times, April 16.

## Stalin - Hitler

Continued from Page One

There was unmistakably a political and military collaboration in the destruction of Poland.

It was unmistakable because it took place in full view of the whole world. Neither side made any effort to conceal it. In fact a considerable part of their success depended on the stupefying shock which the fact of their collaboration created all over the world and which made thought of effective opposition impossible.

**BEARING THESE** things in mind let us look at the invasion of Finland and Norway to see whether there is any similar relation between them. In inflicting a decisive blow on Finland's army, draining the country's resources and visiting the horror of war upon it, annexing its second largest city, and a considerable strip of its territory "leasing" important naval and military bases, and imposing the need of maintaining "friendly" relations with Russia, the Stalin government, whatever its motive or purpose, made sure that Finland would not be an active or important factor in ensuing developments in the Baltic and in Scandinavia.

And that fact was, obviously, one of the decisive facts in Hitler's invasion of Norway. Were Fin-

land what it was before Stalin's crushing blow, Hitler would have had to confront the possibility of facing a united Scandinavia in any attempt to conquer Norway. It was not the most likely event. But it was a possibility which, had it taken place, would have immeasurably increased the hazard of attempting an invasion of Norway and Hitler would have had to reckon with it. It is significant that Hitler assisted Stalin's conquest by threatening to intervene if Sweden and Norway permitted Allied troops in important quantities to cross their territory to aid the Finns; and that the invasion of Norway was not undertaken until Finland was reduced to impotence.

**WITH FINLAND** prostrate it became almost axiomatic that Sweden would stand aside while Hitler made his try. With Finland unable to play an important military role, Sweden's east flank is vulnerable to possible attack by Stalin. Whether Stalin would have any reason to enter Sweden is not important because, from the Swedish standpoint, he was in a position to do so should he make the decision, for whatever motive.

With Sweden's neutrality assured the hazard of taking Norway was greatly reduced. And Hitler

struck. If he wins he will not only secure enormous advantages for his war against the Allies. He will also secure Russia's north-western flank as long as the present German-Russian political relationship endures.

Whether Stalin and Hitler agreed in advance on the moves they would make in Finland and Norway is a matter about which we have no data. If they did they were probably embodied in secret treaties. If they exist the coming revolution in Germany and the uprising against Stalin in Russia may recover them.

**BUT WHETHER** they planned it that way or not, the fact remains that each one here acted in such a way as to assist the other in the realization of a brutal purpose. In view of these considerations it is difficult not to conclude that they are operating according to a grand strategic plan which they unfold a step at a time—each government in its own material interests which, thus far,

**FRANCES B.**

**DEAR COMRADE:** REVOLT is in receipt of your letter which it intends to publish. There are one or two points about the letter which are not clear and ought to be cleared up. Will you please get in touch with us? —Editor.

## Trotskyist Split

Continued from Page Two

bankruptcy of Trotskyism.

**5**—In all this there is a valuable lesson for those workers who are trying to build a revolutionary party: the political basis for building a revolutionary party to overthrow the American imperialist bourgeoisie has to be the

have found nourishment in the satisfaction of the other's needs, but which tomorrow may come into sharp conflict. Whether this is so coming events will show.

But it is already as clear as crystal to REVOLT that Stalin's invasion of Finland must be set down as a brutal grab for the advantage of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the German imperialist government; it had nothing whatever to do with the defense of the Russian revolution, except to strike it another deadly blow by drawing a line of blood between the Russian workers and the Finnish and all other workers.

All those who characterized the war on the Finnish side as being part of an imperialist attack on the Soviet Union were in error, as were those who saw in the war on the Russian side a defensive move in the interests of the Russian revolution.

**CONCRETE** application in policy and **ACTION** of the principles of revolutionary Marxism to the particular position of the United States in the world situation and to the situation in the United States. Differences on the application of these principles to other countries as in the case of the Russian question are important for revolutionary theory and propaganda; but such questions can become **DECISIVE** for revolutionary unity or division in the United States only when they affect directly the ability of the revolutionists in this country to make a revolutionary agitation among the American workers and to organize them for revolutionary action, as was the case positively in the split in the Socialist Party in 1919 when the Communist Party was founded; and as has been the case negatively since the rise of Stalinism and its corruption of the Communist Party.

If the Trotskyist split will assist workers to throw off the sectarian idea that a revolutionary movement can be built or split on issues which do not affect directly and vitally the struggle against the American capitalist class and state, it will not have been without positive result.

F.