

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. II, No. 6. Saturday, February 5, 1938. Published every week by the SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N. at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter September 1, 1937 at the post office at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

MAX SHACHTMAN Editor. HAROLD ROBERTS FRANK GRAVES Associate Editors. BOB BROWNE Business Manager.

"Fugitive From Justice"

Immediately upon the announcement that the Massachusetts authorities had arrested Fred Beal and held him for extradition to North Carolina where a 20-year prison sentence awaits him, the Daily Worker labelled Beal a "fugitive from justice."

Those three words reveal a depth of degradation that has rarely been reached by a paper claiming devotion to the cause of labor.

From what "justice" is Beal a fugitive?

Beal and six of his fellow unionists were framed-up and sentenced in September 1929 to long terms of imprisonment in a lynch court in North Carolina for the simple and sole reason that they had led the unspookably exploited textile slaves of Gastonia in one of the most magnificent and heroic strikes the Bourbon South has ever seen.

Upon the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, of which the defendants were members, they forfeited their bail and fled to the Soviet Union. After they had left, the Daily Worker of August 27, 1930, wrote:

"They are quite justified in escaping from the vicious sentence imposed upon them, by placing themselves beyond reach of the Southern capitalist class justice.... The working class as a whole should glory in the fact that they got away. The workers should support their escape despite the howls of the bourgeoisie.... Let the bosses take the bail; it is better that they have \$27,000 than the seven Gastonia fighters serve 117 years in their prison."

Why were none of the Gastonia defendants "fugitives from justice" in 1930? Why does the Daily Worker join in 1938 with the "howls of the bourgeoisie" in demanding that "Southern capitalist class justice" be given its victim, Fred Beal?

Because Beal has committed the greatest crime imaginable in the eyes of the Stalinists. His residence in the Soviet Union made him an opponent of the Soviet bureaucracy.

That is the only reason why the Communist Party in this country would like to see him pay the penalty of imprisonment for his devoted working class activity among the textile workers.

And in order to get their revenge, the Stalinists sink to the lowest level of the traitor: They blow the whistle to call the cops against a militant worker! Like stool-pigeons, these eminent defenders of the reactionary Southern courts put the finger on Beal as a fugitive from "justice."

Whoever does not feel a shudder of revulsion at this latest display of Stalinist ignominy, is lacking the elementary spirit of working-class solidarity. To those still imbued with that spirit, who still work in the great tradition of defending the victims of American class "justice" from the days of the Haymarket martyrs to the days of Sacco and Vanzetti and Mooney and Billings, we once again call for an iron ring of protection around the imperiled militant, Fred E. Beal. Let the united front of the Stalinists and the cops be broken by the united front of the entire working class.

Another Frame-Up

The International Furriers' Union is run by Mr. Ben Gold and the other Stalinist leaders just as Turkish Wallis managed a province under the bloody Sultan. They are now adding to their repertoire of domination the methods of the Moscow Frame-Ups.

The Stalinists in the furriers' union have been feeling the ground shift from under them. In New York, the biggest center, there is a rising movement of revolt by progressives, especially among the Greek workers. Gold and Co. have therefore proceeded with an attempt to frame-up the leader of this opposition on the charge of being a stool-pigeon and the like. Now they are trying a similar stunt in Toronto.

Max Federman, vice-president of the International and manager of the Toronto furriers' locals, is being framed by the New York union leaders on the charge of embezzling funds. At a joint meeting of the two Toronto locals at which the charges were heard, the membership voted overwhelmingly to acquit Federman. The Stalinist officials have nevertheless taken action against him.

Federman, who has in the past worked harmoniously with the Communist officials, is nevertheless a member of the Left Poale Zion in Canada, a radical Jewish workers' organization. His crime apparently consists in not being a 100 per cent Stalinist, ready to take orders and give them in accordance with the bureaucratic decisions of the Stalinist leaders. Too popular to be replaced, he must needs be framed-up and driven out of the labor movement.

How much longer will the workers tolerate this infamous crew of Stalinist character-assassins and the policy of totalitarian rule in the labor movement which they follow at the behest of the anti-Soviet bureaucracy of the Kremlin? The Federman case again shows the need of burning the Stalinist cancer out of the working class and its organizations.

The Ludlow Amendment

The Appeal has pointed out that regardless of the faultless intentions of the supporters of the Ludlow Amendment for a popular referendum on war, especially of the masses of the people who see in it a way of preventing the American warlords from hurling the workers and farmers into a new imperialist slaughter, we cannot become the advocates of the Bill. And that for the simple reason that we regard it as another of the many pacifist illusions by means of which the masses are distracted from the only means whereby imperialist war can be fought, namely, the continuous prosecution of the class struggle against the system which inevitably breeds war.

For those who consider the Ludlow Bill a guarantee against the United States government launching a war without sanction from the people, we recommend the following comment by one of the prominent advocates of the amendment, Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. Writing in the official organ of the United Automobile Workers (January 15, 1938), Whitney says:

"As I interpret this Amendment, our government would still be free to pursue a vigorous international peace policy. There is nothing in the Ludlow Amendment that would prevent our ships from turning their guns on attacking planes, just as was recently done in the Panay incident on the Yangtze River. There is nothing in the Ludlow Amendment that prevents the vigorous defense of the Monroe Doctrine. There is nothing in the Ludlow Amendment which would prevent Congress from spending 100 per cent of our national income for defense purposes. Under the Ludlow Amendment, Congress could even conscript American citizens in contemplation of a conflict. Our warships may continue to be manipulated in peace time just the same under the Ludlow Amendment as at present."

To imagine that after all such preparations have been made for a new war, the imperialist masters of the country would hold off final action because of a "scrap of paper," is simply to drug the masses into the paralysis of false security. That's the trouble with the Ludlow Bill.

People's Front Balance

The Promise: The People's Front Government in France will smash Fascism. The People's Front in France will guarantee democracy. Through democracy the masses will go forward to socialism.

The Reality: Four years ago the masses, by their own spontaneous action, had the tiny Fascist groups on the run.

Today, every one who knows anything about France admits that the Fascist movement is stronger, larger and more aggressive than ever. Early in 1936, the masses struck by the hundreds of thousands and by their own action and solidarity obtained considerable wage increases, the 40-hour week, and union recognition.

Today, the wage increases have been wiped out by the rise in the cost of living and the government is preparing to smash the 40-hour week in cahoots with the employers.

In 1936, the Unions grew to enormous proportions. Today, a Fascist trade union movement is gaining ground for the first time, based on the demoralization and disillusionment caused by the treacherous People's Front regimes.

The first People's Front government early in 1936 was overwhelmingly Socialist, with the capitalist Radical party playing a background role, and Blum as premier.

The second People's Front government marked a shift to the right, in favor of the capitalist parties in the cabinet, although Blum remained premier. The present, third People's Front government has shoved the Socialists out completely, made Chautemps, a capitalist politician, premier, and marked another sharp shift to the right.

That is how the People's Front in practice, in reality, "stops" Fascism and "leads to socialism."

The 'New International'

The February issue of the New International, which has just appeared, inaugurates a new and valuable feature, a Review of the Month by the Editors. The bulk of the Review this month is devoted to a survey of the record of the New Deal, Roosevelt's course during the "recession," and the administration's war preparations as revealed in the new defense appropriations. Especially impressive is the lengthy analysis of the Ludlow amendment and the debate which has raged around it.

Also pertinent to the present American scene is James Burnham's article on "Roosevelt Faces the Future," which casts a balance sheet of Roosevelt's class record and points out the trends toward political realignment and third-party formations in connection with the 1940 elections. The editors announce a series of articles by Burnham on American politics, the next to be concerned with the Labor Party movement. The timely article by James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, on the foundation of the new party, and George Novack's study of "Marx and Engels on the Civil War," round out the material relating to the national scene.

International events are covered by Alfred Rosner's comments on the impasse of the French Popular Front, and Felix Morrow's review of the current crop of books on the Spanish civil war. Much historical material, hitherto unavailable, is furnished by Trotsky's "Two Letters on the Question of the German October," which relate to the German events of 1923, and the extracts from John G. Wright's study of the controversial Kronstadt revolt.

The chief difficulty with the New International is a purely technical one: the limitation of space. Articles on many important subjects—the murder of Corcoran, the anniversary of Lenin and Luxemburg, the Brandler-Thalheimer position on the Soviet Union, the Mexican situation—were crowded out of the present issue, as were many important reviews. Support for the subscription drive and an increase in circulation will pave the way toward a larger and still more useful New International.

The Peace-Loving President



Browder Defends Imperialism

By James Burnham

When Marxists state that Stalinism now functions in the world labor movement as a counter-revolutionary force, as the chief obstacle in the struggle for workers' power and for socialism, there are still, of course, many who do not believe them. There are, for example, honest members and sympathizers of the Communist Party itself who think that this altogether sober and scientific analysis of the Marxists is "mild dogs." Such persons are compelled by their own conscience to think in this manner.

They differ in their whole moral makeup from the cynical, depraved and shameless bureaucrats who actually run the Communist Parties of the world. In their own hearts, they sincerely want socialism; and they believe that the only road toward socialism lies through support of the Communist Party, which they mistakenly look upon as the heir to—the October Revolution. If they understood the true role of Stalinism, they would abandon it overnight. That is why we must dissect every concrete manifestation of Stalinism, in order to remove the false outer skin and lay bare the internal decay.

WAR QUESTION IS DECISIVE

It will need no argument to prove that today the war question is the decisive question. Since it is the decisive question, the answers given to it provide the surest touchstone to the character of every political movement. To anyone who doubts what the Stalinist answer is and means, the New Republic of February 2 offers an easy and spectacular way of clearing up those doubts.

In this issue of the New Republic there is published a debate between Earl Browder and Charles A. Beard on the general subject of "Collective Security." I plan, on another occasion, to analyze Browder's arguments in this debate, as well as those of Dr. Beard, and in particular to discuss the whole conception of "collective security." I wish, in the present article, to consider merely the point of view from which Browder writes.

Naturally enough, Stalinists pretend to their own followers that they write from the point of view of the international proletariat. Even a brief survey of Browder's article in the New Republic can demonstrate beyond any doubt that he is reasoning and writing from the point of view of the defense of U. S. imperialism.

BROWDER SPEAKS FOR ROOSEVELT POLICY

In no line does Browder even suggest that his policy is a working class policy, or an independent policy of any kind. He himself speaks openly for Roosevelt's policy. The cover of the magazine correctly reads: "Earl Browder—for the President's Policy." "Clearly, then," Browder writes, "in our country the task is to or-

ganize effective support, behind the President's policy, of the 27,000,000 who voted for him in 1936." Replying to Bruce Bliven's objection that his policy is peculiarly "Russian," Browder says: "We will not quarrel with Mr. Bliven as to how the policy could be best framed in American terms; we are willing to leave that to the President...."

The President, according to Marxism, is the chief political executive of the ruling class, the bourgeoisie, in this country. Browder, by his own words, accepts the war policy of the chief executive of the bourgeoisie, accepts it one hundred per cent, and is willing to leave its fuller formulation altogether to that chief executive.

WOULD SUPPRESS LABOR'S STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITAL

In Browder's article, the class struggle—according to Marxism the motive force of history, from an understanding of which all Marxian analysis of all social and political problems proceeds—is mentioned only once. There is no word of the class struggle in the discussion either of the causes of, or the cure for, war. On the one occasion where the class struggle appears, it is cited as one of the major weaknesses of the United States as against Japan; and, it therefore follows, as a factor which must be overcome if an "effective peace policy" is to be achieved.

Browder's argument thus advocates the suppression of the class struggle, as a necessary part of the means for achieving what he calls an effective peace policy. This does not appear so odd when we understand that in reality Browder wants to achieve not peace but a war policy for the United States; suppression of the class struggle is, in fact, necessary for an effective war policy on the part of a capitalist nation. "But America, rich and full of potential booty, is still considered by the world to be in a pacifist funk. It is torn by a constitutional crisis and sharp class struggles, and contains powerful forces that would welcome Japanese aggression for their own fascist ends."

FILLED WITH FRANK JINGOISM

Browder's article is filled with the frank jingo appeals to the interests of U. S. imperialism. "A continuance of isolation policies by the United States will surely convince the arrogant militarists of Tokyo that now is the time for them to take over the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Alaska, as guarantees against the future, when the United States might dare. From that it would not be a large step to recall how much more successful are Japanese than Americans in cultivating the beautiful and rich lands of California." This is the crux of Browder's argument.

He continues it by stating that the United States is in more danger from Japan than is the Soviet Union. "A continuance of the same line (pursued up to now by Japan) leads her not to Vladivostok, Harbin and Chita, but rather to Manila, Honolulu and Nome." That is to say, Browder's central argument in favor of his own war position is that his policy alone can protect and defend—what? The working class? The struggle for socialism? Not in the least. His policy, he says in his own words, alone can defend the possessions of U. S. imperialism.

There is nothing more revealing in this article than Browder's use of "our" and "we." In every instance these words stand for the United States as a nation—that is, for the imperialist state. For Marx, the workers had no fatherland until they conquered one for themselves. Browder is less lonely. "Our country" appears twenty times. "If we continue to desert them to their fate, as Mr. Bliven advocates, we will have no one to blame but ourselves when we have to take up the full military burden under more unfavorable conditions." Browder speaks these days with the full rounded phrases of a statesman. But not, he is careful to make clear, of a statesman of the working class. "We," says Browder, we and the other representatives of the imperialist United States, will be ready to assume "the full military burden" even "under more unfavorable conditions."

ROOSEVELT WILL SAVE HUMANITY

The most startling and naked of all the sentences in this remarkable article is, however, the following: "Only the courageous implementing of the policy laid down by President Roosevelt in Chicago can save our country, and all the capitalist world, from unparalleled reaction and catastrophe." Criticism itself becomes tongue-tied when faced with such a remark.

Whom is the working class called upon by Browder to save? He answers: "Our country, and all the capitalist world." And what must this capitalist world be saved from? He answers: "From catastrophe." But what is catastrophe for the capitalist world? Catastrophe for the capitalist world is, and is only the socialist revolution. Browder's entire article is summed up in this clarion call: Join with me to save capitalism from the socialist revolution.

(This article is the first in a series of four on the New Republic debate between Earl Browder and Charles A. Beard. The remaining three will discuss the origin and meaning of "collective security"; Dr. Beard's "isolationist" reply to Browder's advocacy of collective security; and the Marxist answer to collective security.—ED.)

Party Resolutions

TRADE UNION MOVEMENT and the S. W. P.

(Continued from page 2)

unity, but rather favorable. In its systematic work of preparing the country for war and extending the militarization of all institutions, it understands that the trade unions can be more smoothly coordinated into a war machine if friction in their ranks is eliminated and if they are a single unit led and controlled by a single reactionary leadership.

In addition, a certain section of the employers is exerting pressure in the direction of unification because it finds the "raids" conducted by the C.I.O. on the A.F. of L., and vice-versa, with their consequent effects on industrial production, to be more unprofitable to the employers than dealing with a single, conservatively-led union would be. The financial drain upon both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. in the violent struggles against each other, are also a factor of some influence in bringing unity closer to realization.

Finally, the original point in dispute, namely, the question of organizing the mass-production industries on an industrial (vertical) basis, has already been settled by the realities of the auto, rubber, steel, electrical unions now in existence and functioning. Not even the most hardened Bourbon of craft unionism in the A.F. of L. leadership would seriously propose today to dissolve the United Automobile Workers, for example, into the 22 craft unions which existed under the Green dispensation prior to the C.I.O.'s advances.

Apart from face-saving considerations, the principle of industrial unionism, at least as applied to the mass-production industries, may be considered generally acknowledged throughout the organized labor movement, and reluctantly accepted even by the Green-Woll machine. What stands chiefly in the way of the successful conclusions of the unity negotiations now under way, is the struggle for power in the united organization between the old A.F. of L. and the new C.I.O. bureaucracies. The main point in dispute is not the right of industrial unionism, but such a form of re-unification as will give the one or the other bureaucratic machine the greatest number of supporters and the upper hand in the united organization.

Our party, together with every revolutionary and class-conscious worker, takes a clear-cut position in favor of the earliest and completest possible unification of the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O., and also the hitherto unaffiliated Railroad Brotherhoods. The only condition, practically speaking, under which such a unity would be a step backward would be one binding the former C.I.O. unions to abandon the industrial form of organization and to divide themselves into scores of impotent craft unions. Unification on such a basis is, however, scarcely conceivable.

Unity would be a tremendous step forward for a number of reasons. The united trade union membership in the United States today is the largest ever reached in all its history, far larger than at the post-war peak. Unity of all the unions into one, would mean a common, organized union front of approximately 8,000,000 workers, with a tremendous attractive power for the still unorganized, with almost inexhaustible forces capable of withstanding the offensive of the employers and of advancing aggressively the demands of the workers on all fronts. The unification would overcome the present, thoroughly reactionary division between the unskilled, proletarian elements in the unions, on the one side, and the skilled labor aristocracy on the other. Finally, a united union organization is, in general, a better field for the work of the revolutionary vanguard than a union movement divided against itself.

The reactionary role which the A. F. of L. leadership has played is clearly established in the minds of the class-conscious workers. From this it should not follow that the revolutionary vanguard makes a fetish of the C.I.O. and worship unquestioningly at its shrine. Prior to the establishment of the unity of the two organizations, which the revolutionists must advocate as their general line, they work in either organization, according to specific local circumstances.

Unity Must Be On Proper Basis

The revolutionist does not withdraw from a union just because it may be conservative in policy or leadership; on the contrary, such a condition is usually all the greater reason for revolutionary activity in the union, always provided, of course, that the union embraces the decisive sections of the workers (employed or unemployed, as the case may be) in its particular field. But even where concrete circumstances dictate working in an A.F. of L. or craft union, the revolutionary militant must always bear in mind the need of stressing the obsolescence and ineffectualness of the craft union form and the demonstrated superiority of the industrial form of organization, be it achieved by direct organizing of the unorganized, or by the amalgamation of craft unions already in existence in a given industry.

Although it is impossible for us at the present time to influence decisively the course of events, or to determine the pace and method of trade union unity, we are nevertheless bound to concentrate our propaganda and agitational activity among the workers in favor of the most desirable basis for unity, that is, democratic organization and a wide measure of autonomy for the affiliated unions, especially such a measure as would facilitate the organization of the basic industries into industrial unions and preserve the integrity of those already in existence. Every attempt to carve up the industrial unions into craft formations must be stubbornly resisted as thoroughly reactionary.

While the general line of all militants in the labor movement must be based upon the speediest consummation of unity, it does not follow that each and every single concrete question can be solved by the abstract consideration of unity at all costs. Prior to the complete unification of the two main bodies of labor, a number of cases have already appeared where the bald slogan of unity would actually set back the militant and progressive movement. While the tactical line in each particular case must be subordinated to the general line of complete unification of the trade union movement, it does not follow that the two coincide in every given instance or at every given moment.

MARXIST SCHOOL

Opens Week of February 14th

- 1. ELEMENTARY SOCIALISM—Hal Draper Monday, 7 - 8:30 P. M.
2. PROBLEMS OF YOUTH MOVEMENT—Jos. Carter — Monday, 8:45 - 10:15 P. M.
3. MARXIAN ECONOMICS—J. Wright Tuesday, 7 - 8:30 P. M.
4. PRINCIPLES OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM—M. Spector — Tuesday, 8:45 - 10:15 P. M.
5. PROBLEMS OF TRADE UNIONISM — B. J. Widick - E. R. McKinney — Wed. 7 - 8:30 P. M.
6. HISTORY OF THIRD INTERNATIONAL — Max Shachtman — Wednesday, 8:45 - 10:15 P.M.

All courses will have ten sessions each. Tuition fee is \$2.50 per course. Register now!

Marxist School, 116 University Place, New York. — Telephone, GRamercy 5-9142

Subscribe To The Socialist Appeal