

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. II—No. 35 Saturday, August 27, 1938

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

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$2.50 per year. Bundle order 3 cents per copy. Single copies 5 cents.

All checks and money orders should be made out to the Socialist Appeal.

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 **GEORGE CLARKE**
Associate Editors
S. STANLEY
Business Manager

Labor Will Clean It's Own House

(Continued from page 1)

In the struggle between the C.I.O. bureaucrats and the A. F. of L. bureaucrats the main strategy of the latter group is to smear the C.I.O. with a Communist color. For the moment the Dies Committee is perfectly willing to lend its services to the A. F. of L. leaders, but only for the purpose of destroying the C.I.O. To the reactionaries even the A. F. of L. is unacceptable, but they are willing to be friendly to Green and his lieutenants in order to weaken the Lewis organization. Their friendliness to the A. F. of L. will disappear suddenly under conditions where they can no longer use it against the C.I.O.

In their blindness the A. F. of L. leaders do not see that Dies and those behind him are out to destroy every form of unionism, no matter how conservative. In strengthening the hand of the reactionaries against the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. leaders are preparing their own destruction.

The Dies Committee is concealing its real motive of attacking every form of trade unionism (and incidentally the New Deal) by concentrating its attack on the Communists. It is using the time-honored method of smearing labor organizations with an unpopular color.

Militant and progressive workers will not be misled by the fact that the Dies Committee is attacking the Stalinists and in some cases actually showing the truth about their activities. The justifiable hatred which every sincere revolutionary worker has for the treacherous Stalinist leaders on account of their disruptive and demoralizing activities in the unions, their slanderous accusations against and their willingness even to murder their political opponents, should not lead any one into the incorrect position of openly or secretly supporting the Dies Committee.

No one is more anxious than we are to destroy the influence of the Communist Party in the labor movement. That influence is of the most reactionary character. One can truthfully say that the Dies Committee is not conducting a red-baiting campaign for the simple reason that the Stalinists are themselves the most vicious red-baiters. It is as if one section of red-baiters is persecuting another section of the same tribe.

Either because of stupidity or as a crafty maneuver, the reactionaries still consider the Stalinists as revolutionists. The attitude of hostility to the Communists among the most reactionary sections of the population will disappear only during a war when the Communist Party will be recognized by everyone as the most loyal supporter of the government conducting the war. At present the reactionaries find it convenient to attack the labor movement by picturing it as under the influence of the Communists.

Our appreciation of the Stalinists as a reactionary force cannot and does not minimize our hostility to the Dies Committee. We want the Stalinist influence destroyed by the workers themselves, and not by reactionaries of the stamp of Dies. We look to the development of the class-consciousness of the workers to uproot the influence of the Stalinists.

When the workers in the automobile workers' union mobilize against the Stalinists for their disruptive work, then we offer our support. But the hounding of the Stalinist hounders by reactionaries will be met by our opposition.

The aim of the Dies Committee is not to destroy the Stalinist influence in the labor movement but to destroy the labor movement itself. This fundamentally reactionary character of the Dies investigation determines our attitude of implacable hostility to the Committee. Every bit of influence we have in the labor movement will be mobilized against the Committee and its phoney investigation.

Lewis' Eloquent Silence

John L. Lewis is still silent on the works of the union-wreckers in the C.I.O. But his actions speak volumes.

While Lewis does not find it expedient to make any personal statement, his agents are loudly peddling a policy which undoubtedly has his approval. More likely, Lewis is the author of the policy.

John Brophy, Lewis' right-hand man, turns up at the California State Convention of the C.I.O., bestows his official blessings on Dictator

Bridges and denounces as "dangerous radicals" the majority of the industrial unionists who protested this fiasco as a culmination of the debilitating rule of the same Bridges.

Wyndham Mortimer, announced in the press to be Lewis' favorite in the auto union, declares at the Stalinist rump conference at Toledo that the expelled officers "have at all times consulted and been advised by the head of the C.I.O."

No official statement of support for the new administration of the National Maritime Union which ousted the Stalinist clique has been forthcoming from Lewis or his lieutenants. This silence, at best, indicates non-support.

On the West Coast, in the auto union and in the maritime organizations, progressive unionists are waging a bitter battle for the life of their unions. The issue that is being decided is whether the labor organizations shall be a weapon against capitalist oppression or whether they shall be subtle tools for Stalin's foreign policy. There can be no neutrality in this struggle. Where does Lewis stand?

Lewis favored the Stalinists and promoted them to key positions soon after the creation of the C.I.O. The Stalinists ferreted deeply into the organization, and, now after their long sapping work has been completed, the job of undermining the labor unions is under way in real earnest. Lewis is reaping the whirlwind. But it appears that he is so completely involved that he can no longer extricate himself. Thus in union after union, the wreckers count heavily on Lewis' support—and get it.

Lewis leans upon the Stalinists today as a counter-balance to those forces in the C.I.O. who fought against his prestige politics which, when joined with Bill Green's, threw a monkey wrench into the unity negotiations. Lewis can no longer trade on his great personal popularity. That was on the wane since the "little steel" strike was defeated and went down precipitously as the ensuing months went by, and the C.I.O. drive made no headway. A rupture with the Stalinists at the present time would place Lewis at a decided disadvantage in the C.I.O. and probably give Dubinsky and his allies the upper hand. The bureaucrat Lewis would sooner join with the Stalinists in wrecking the powerful C.I.O. unions, as he once wrecked the United Mine Workers, than see his influence clipped and himself demoted to a second-rate position. Lewis comes first—the labor movement second.

Lewis' failure to speak out in the present C.I.O. crisis has contained within it more than a tacit support of the Stalinists. In his own cunning way, he is allowing his agents to "stick their necks out" while he watches the reaction. If the kickback from the labor movement is too strong, it is not impossible that Lewis will drop the Stalinists like a hot potato. With this thought firmly in mind, let no one be surprised if one of these days he reads a flamboyant denunciation of "Communism" by Mr. Lewis.

But in any case, that will in no way mitigate Lewis' responsibility for the present wrecking activities of the Communist Party. It is within his province to deal them their heaviest blow right now. His failure to do so makes him guilty with them of the damage and destruction being wrought on the labor movement.

The alliance of Lewis with the Stalinists is not without principle—if anything these unscrupulous adventurers purvey can be called principle. They share a common stand for the Roosevelt war program. For different reasons, it is true, but nevertheless with similar actions. The labor movement is now warned in advance of the disastrous consequences of this "program."

The reports are daily coming through that the defeats suffered by the Stalinist union-busters are being turned into routs. Neither Lewis nor ten like him can stop this onslaught. And if he is foolhardy enough to get in the way, he will place himself directly under the double-barrelled fire of progressive unionism.

Sacco and Vanzetti

A Pittsburgh judge announces that he will publish a book proving the innocence of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, and promises to name the guilty persons. We hope the judge has written a book so revealing in its facts, so devastating in its exposures and so convincing in its logic that even Harvard's president-emeritus, A. Lawrence Lowell, will be forced to recant his academic sanction of the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti eleven years ago.

To millions of workers throughout the world, books proving the innocence of the two Italians are merely redundant. They know that when the executioner pulled the switch that sent the death-dealing current through the bodies of Sacco and Vanzetti, two innocent men were murdered—murdered as surely as if paid assassins shot them down from ambush.

And these millions of workers know where the real guilt rests, too. The seven years of legal trappings that preceded the death of Sacco and Vanzetti did not for a moment the identity of the cruel exploiters who hoped to deal all labor a blow by taking the lives of "the little fish peddler and the good shoemaker."

The sham justice of the Massachusetts courts that legalized the killing of these two men made clear to workers everywhere the whole sham of "democracy"—the democracy that answers a simple worker's plea for freedom and justice with death in the electric chair.

Today, eleven years after, workers throughout the world remember the tragic death of Sacco and Vanzetti. Nor will they soon forget.

Horse Trader's Alibi

"Explaining" the Republican ALP Coalition

By JAMES BURNHAM

In the history of the politics of the labor movement, there have been few more shameful and shameless deals than the coalitions recently entered into in New York City by the American Labor Party. With the workers genuinely striving to create a party of their own, the bureaucrats running the A.L.P. have treated them like a flock of cattle, and have handed them over to one of the old parties in every district where they were able to strike up some kind of contemptible bargain with the old party bosses.

The incipient mass protest from the ranks has finally stimulated an official statement from Alex Rose, Secretary of the A.L.P., published in full in the New Leader. This lick-spittle apology comes close to a new low.

Three Main Points

The statement makes three main points. To begin with, Rose explains that "only a few" Republicans and Democrats have been endorsed—so why should everyone be so excited? In other words, there have been only about 25 or 30 sell-outs, which is not bad for an imperfect world. He argues like the father of the Indian princess who was only "a wee bit pregnant."

Secondly, he claims that there is a chance—just a chance, mind you—that with the coalition policy the A.L.P. will hold the balance of power in the State Senate. Few points could be worth less. In the first place, he doesn't even pretend that the A.L.P. could al-

so possibly hold the balance in the State Assembly—and even if in general a position of holding the balance is worth anything, it obviously does not do the slightest good to hold it in one house and not in the other. But in the second place, even holding a balance of power in the Legislature as a whole, when that balance would be bought at such a price as the A.L.P. is now paying, would not be worth a "inker's damn" to the workers.

Rose himself ravenously proves this in his third point, which is surprisingly enough, that neither of the old parties is any good. "The A.L.P. rejects the illusion that either one of the major parties, as a political party, as against the other is more concerned with progressive legislation."

Argument Worthless
How this argument is in favor of the deal made with the regular Republican Party organization of New York County is beyond the powers of ordinary mortals to discover. The truth is that for labor to organize its own political strength on the basis of numbers of officials immediately elected is always wrong and self-defeating. This holds not merely for the long term, but for the short term as well. Clearly, the A.L.P. can bloc up with one or the other of the old parties at Albany only by accepting a policy acceptable to the given old party; that is, only by accepting a capitalist policy and by throwing over a working-class policy.

Far more substantial and concrete gains, even on the short

term, are made by the display of independent working-class strength: it is this which forces concessions much more thoroughly than drawing the teeth of working-class strength through coalitions. An A.L.P. candidate running a solid second or even third in Manhattan, but doing so on a clear-cut working-class program with firm working-class support will get a lot more attention in Albany, and everywhere else, than an A.L.P. candidate running with the support of Kenneth Simpson's Republican machine, and on a program acceptable to Kenneth Simpson.

Only G.O.P. Wins

But what caps the climax is that the Republicans have endorsed A.L.P. candidates only in districts which are virtually certain to go A.L.P. without outside help, or virtually certain to lose even with it; whereas the A.L.P. endorsements to Republicans are in each case absolutely essential to give the Republican nominee a chance to win. The sell-out was paid for by a rubber check.

Naturally, Bro. Rose does not see fit to explain why the whole deal was carried through in the dead of the night, with the membership of the A.L.P. given not one single chance to make its voice heard. Rose and his friends all express their eagerness to defend democracy on the battlefields which Roosevelt is preparing for them. But they are terrified even at the thought of a little democracy intruding into "their" party.

S.P. Spurns United Front for GPU Victims in Spain

On August 1st, the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party addressed a communication to the Socialist Party, the Independent Labor League (Lovestonites) and to the Anarchist group of Carlo Tresca requesting the establishment of joint action against the frame-up trial of loyal anti-fascists and political opponents of Stalinism being prepared by the Spanish office of the G.P.U. in Barcelona.

The letter pointed out that the planned trial was only a climax to a long series of persecution and repression by Spanish authorities against revolutionary workers and urged that action be taken to prevent a Moscow trial on Spanish soil. Five proposals for united front activity were suggested.

Five Proposals

1. Telegrams of protest to the Spanish government;
2. Setting up of a lawyers' committee to go to Spain as defense counsel;
3. That the trial be suspended until the accused had full opportunity for free choice of their own counsel;
4. Organization of an International Labor Commission to attend the trial;
5. Letters along these lines to well-known intellectuals and trade unionists.

Replies to this communication signifying their willingness to join in common action have been received from Carlo Tresca and the Lovestonites. The Socialist Party, however, rejected the proposal. Because of the urgency of action in behalf of the victims of the G.P.U. and because the issue in question reveals the sincerity of all organizations involved, we are reprinting below the text of the correspondence with the National Executive Committee of the S. P.:

S. P. Replies

Dear Comrade:
Your letter of August 1st was presented to the National Action Committee of the Socialist Party at their regular meeting last night.

They asked me to transmit to you their decision in the matter. It was the decision of the National Action Committee not to accept your proposition for united front action on the Spanish trials for the following reasons:

1. The Socialist Party has been engaged in a consistent campaign in the interest of the working class in Spain. By official protest and statement and by various means they have made known to the Spanish government the position and desire of the Socialist Party, and they expect to continue that independent activity with all the resources at their command.
2. We believe the political difference in our attitude toward the Spanish government is so basic that the difference could not be reconciled by any kind of united action.
3. We believe, because of these differences, that such united action would not be of specific aid to those we seek to help at the present moment.

Fraternally yours,
(Signed) Roy E. Burt,
Executive Secretary.
S.W.P. Writes Again
Attention: Roy E. Burt,

Dear Comrades,
Your rejection of our proposal to create a united front of all working class organizations interested in defeating the Spanish fascists and consequently in the liberation of all anti-fascists now in the jails of Barcelona was indeed a surprise to us, especially in view of your claim that you are actively interested in behalf of the anti-fascist prisoners.

We consider the matter of freeing them of such vital importance to the anti-fascist movement that we deem it necessary to comment on the reasons which you give in your letter for refusing our effort to create a united front.

Reason 1) You state that "The Socialist Party has been engaged in a constant campaign in the interest of the working class in Spain," and that you "expect to continue with independent activity."

It is exceedingly difficult to reconcile such a statement with your rejection of our offer. Does it not appear incongruous that because of your interest in the Spanish workers, you should refuse to act jointly with other organizations on behalf of these workers? It seems to us that because of that very interest, you should gladly accept our offer to build a united front on behalf of the Spanish political prisoners, for it is obvious that our joint efforts would be more fruitful than our separate activities.

Reason 2) You state that "We believe the political difference in our attitude toward the Spanish government is so basic that that difference could not be reconciled by any kind of united action."

Undeniably there are basic differences between us. You believe in supporting the Loyalist government politically, while it is our policy to reject support politically to the Loyalist government—a government which jails revolutionary anti-fascists—confining our efforts to material support. We beg to point out that our proposal for united action does not aim to reconcile any differences, but to help free the revolutionary anti-fascists. Why should basic differences prevent us from acting jointly? The very concept of a united front presupposes basic differences. In the particular instance of helping Spanish political prisoners, we can take these basic differences for granted. We can continue to discuss and debate them without in the least interfering with joint meetings, joint resolutions, and similar joint activities pertaining only to the question of liberating the Spanish political prisoners and thus help defeat fascism in Spain.

We are hopeful that you will consider a change in your attitude, and if you do, we shall be most glad to come to a most definite agreement as to the nature and scope of our joint activities.
Comradely yours,
Albert Goldman,
Acting National Secretary.

Nazi Chieftain



Fritz Kuhn

JAIL TWO IN ANTI-NAZI PROTEST

LOS ANGELES.—Two members of the Socialist Workers Party, John Murphy and John Morino, last week were found guilty by a jury of violating the Los Angeles handbill ordinance and sentenced to five days in the county jail by Judge Paonessa of the Los Angeles Municipal Court. Marshall Ross, attorney representing the two men, requested bail be fixed for purposes of appeal, and it was set at \$500 for each of the two defendants.

Murphy and Morino were arrested for posting leaflets announcing a recent demonstration and picket line before a German Bund Anti-Communist convention in Los Angeles on the 6th of August. The Los Angeles section of the S.W.P. and the Y.P.S.L. were the most active and militant supporters and participants in the demonstration attended by over 3,000 people.

The Communist Party members appeared only through the guise of the Anti-Nazi League and the United Anti-Nazi Conference, and were very militant and enthusiastic in singing the "Star-Spangled Banner," "My Country 'Tis of Thee," and shouting the slogan "Down with Fascism—Up with Democracy."

Sing Workers Songs
At one point in the meeting, the C. P. leadership was incapable of curbing the enthusiastic singing of the "International" by its working-class membership when the revolutionary song was begun by the S.W.P. contingent who injected the only union and working-class songs and slogans in the demonstration, while holding the front line position in the demonstration and receiving the brunt of all the jostling and shoving of the police.

At the very height of the demonstration the leadership of the Anti-Nazi groups gave orders to disperse and were booed and opposed by a large section of their own followers. When large sections of the crowd demanded to remain until the Nazis left their convention hall, the frantic leadership warned them against pro-

Pinning 'em Down

By JAMES CASEY

CAMPAIGN THUNDER

The election campaign is on and for the militant class-conscious worker this means redoubled political vigilance and action. Issues, large and small, are being distorted, ignored or their existence denied. Candidates and their helpers are rending the air with the latest demagogic whoppers. These professional fish-story tellers are all lovers of humanity—they say so themselves—and anyone critical of their fabric must be mankind's deadliest foe.

The militant worker will not be abashed either by the thunder raised by these soothsayers or the imposing strength of their army. He will recognize in their tales a confession of fear and inability to wrestle with the nation's political and economic problems and he will drive ahead with his program for a better world.

In recent years millions of voters have been won over to the proposition that only the Republicans would plunge the country into war and foist upon the American people a yoke of fascism; that the Democratic party would fight both these evils and lead the people out of the economic crisis to a new prosperity. From this sunny proposition was evolved a second one, which is now making the widest rounds, to wit: that only President Roosevelt could guide the government ship in these troubled times and any change in the White House would foredoom the nation to blackest disaster.

THE MESSIAH IS COME!

A dangerous Rooseveltian fiction has been fashioned out of a maze of paradoxisms and it is being endorsed as political truth by liberals, "progressives," Stalinists and other self-appointed spokesmen of the working class.

Until the time the Communist Party was ordered to change its line to conform to Moscow's imperialist alliances, Stalinist leaders (now the loudest exponents of the Rooseveltian myth) were among the most energetic and eloquent in their indictment of the President as an arch-enemy of the working class and the New Deal as a smoke-screen to save the profit system.

As for the liberals, who have ever scorned the necessity of acquiring a sound political philosophy, and whose only care is the maintenance of the status quo, the Rooseveltian Messiah myth is an expression of wish-fulfillment.

Millions of rank and filers, harassed by hunger, unemployment, low wages and impelled by the threats of war and fascism are almost helplessly falling in line behind their vacillating leaders. Rooseveltolatry is sweeping the city and countryside. And the President is not the least of those spreading the gospel of the new messiah.

In his first and second campaigns for the Presidency, Roosevelt talked a great deal about loyalty to the Democratic Party platform. Today he talks principally of loyalty to Franklin D. Roosevelt and is calling upon the electorate to confound and retire Senators and Representatives whom he has placed on the purge list.

PROGRAMS AND MEMORIES

To the average voter, this development suggests the existence of basic differences on major issues between the President and the group of pariahs. Such an impression is further being strengthened by a powerful daily press, by droves of "faithful" government officials, Federal job dispensers and political units in every corner of the land.

As a matter of fact, the blacklist has nothing to do with any fundamental disputes between the warring Democratic factions and all talk of one side being purely "left" and the other extremely to the "right" is plain, unadulterated poppycock.

In 1932 Roosevelt and his colleagues were catapulted into office because the American masses were sick of the capitalist crisis, of Hoover and Republican reaction. Again, in 1936, the administration was returned to office due to the still bitter memories of Hoover, coupled with Roosevelt's rosy promises and the steady drift of the voters to the left.

But, despite the leftward swing of the citizenry, the Democratic Party platform was and is a definitely anti-working class document saturated with demagogic phrases and dedicated to restoring and skyrocketing profits for the bosses. On all major issues, it is basically the same as the Republican platform—as like as two peas in a pod.

Roosevelt and his Democratic associates have all worked harmoniously in raising the dividends of Big Business and in shameless betrayal of the demagogic pledges embodied in the platform.

The few controversies that have arisen center merely around methods of how best to restore the normal heartbeats of the gasping capitalist monster.

In the formulation and execution of the methods, the record shows Roosevelt to be sometimes to the left of his party associates, at other times decidedly to the right. On the armament question, for example, the President has stood out for the largest army in the nation's peacetime history and for a navy second to none. On the issue of war preparations Roosevelt has been as reactionary, if not more so, as any member in either house of Congress, Democratic or Republican.

This all leads to the question as to what achievements the President can dangle before the people's eyes to warrant his presumptuous attitude—leaving aside entirely the fact that he was re-elected mainly because he was opposed to reaction, tyranny and war.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

When Roosevelt assumed the Presidency, the national debt totaled 23 billion dollars and there were in the country from twelve to fifteen million unemployed. Today, after six years in office, the Roosevelt administration has increased the debt to 33 billions and there are again from twelve to fifteen million workers looking for jobs. In addition, the standard of living has declined while prices and wages have been sadly out of proportion to huge profits amassed by the large corporations.

It is very true that the Roosevelt administration appropriated funds for WPA projects. It is likewise true that scores of companies have benefited by contracts to supply materials for the made-work. It is also a fact that the administration voted inadequate relief funds for hundreds of thousands facing starvation—but, then, would it not have been far worse for the "liberal" administration to allow the millions of jobless to be driven into a state of desperation?

As was inevitable from the start, Roosevelt has been unable to solve unemployment and the latest crisis is sapping further the vitality of the American masses. A continuance of the artificial pump-priming program—capitalist planning—will serve only to increase the national debt, within a year or two, to 45 or 50 billion dollars. Eventually, a drastic devaluation of the currency will be decided upon as imperative to save the financial structure and the workers, farmers and middle class will be the chief sufferers.

CONGRESS WITHOUT CONGRESSMEN

Roosevelt has made sufficiently plain that he wants a thoroughly servile Congress. He intends also to staff all the Federal departments with 100 per cent "yes men." From Senator Barkley, who nominated Roosevelt at the last two conventions, and Jim Farley come strong intimations that the President will seek a third term.

Should the President succeed in his present plans of centralizing power, it is not within the realms of impossibility that he might, if re-elected, tell his servile Congressmen to go back to their homes and stay there "as an emergency measure."

In the meantime it is clear that the liberals and "progressives" are helping Roosevelt to create the very situations—open capitalist dictatorship and war—which they are trying hard to avert. Their adherents and other rank and filers must be made aware of the dangers in following Democrats, "right" or "left," as well as their reactionary Republican brothers.

This is the job cut out for the militant class-conscious worker. In performing it, as part of the program of Socialism, he will be carrying forward the banner of the Socialist Workers Party.

vocateurs who would attempt to lead them into struggle with the fascists. The crowd became confused and finally dispersed, many characterizing their leadership as strikebreakers and flinks. It was apparent that the middle class organizations established by the C. P. would be impotent in any real conflict with fascism; that the only fighting force able to protect the working class would be the working-class organizations led by a militant revolutionary leadership discarded by the Third International in the struggle against fascism and for the working-class power.