

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. 11—No. 54 Saturday, December 16, 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

Make the List Grow

After years of nauseating chatter about the great mission of the "people" in the fight for "decency" and "liberty," events surrounding the persecution of Jews in Germany drive home the point that the working class is the only class in modern society capable of leading any progressive movement.

While frock-coated millionaires, big-shot rabbis and priests are making the welkin ring with cheap protest against Hitler and just as cheap sympathy for the Jews, the only real program of assistance for the refugees comes from the labor movement. The campaign for "opening the doors" of the U.S. to the victims of Nazi persecution has already been taken up by a considerable number of unions.

Local 544 of Minneapolis, the Harris County, Texas, C.I.O. Council, Local 10 I.L.G.W.U., Local 5 American Federation of Teachers, the Headquarters Branch of the M.F.O.W.&U. (Marine Firemen), a Federal Labor Union in Montana and an Office Workers Local in Boston have passed resolutions favoring the dropping of immigration restrictions to refugees.

While this list indicates the real sentiment of the American workers towards the refugees, it would be folly to say that it has more than skimmed the surface of the American labor movement.

Where are the names of the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. which have passed such defiant resolutions against Hitler—and whose leaders, Lewis and Green lose no occasion to make high-sounding speeches of "deep concern" for refugees?

Where is the name of the United Automobile Workers, which was in the forefront of the unions in the fight against war—and whose leader Homer Martin takes great pride in championing progressive causes?

Where is the name of the needle trades unions, whose leaders never fail to appear on public platforms to shed bitter tears about the misfortune of the Jews?

Where is the name of Local 22 of the I.L.G.W.U. or the Knitgoods workers local, both led by Lovestonites whose political organization has publicly declared for the opening of the doors to the U.S.?

Where are the Stalinist-led unions, the Furriers, the Foodworkers, the National Maritime Union, etc., whose leaders make a profession

by William Harvey, pseudonym of a well known doctor.

Albert Goldman discusses the views of the Menshevik leader Martov in reviewing the latter's brochure on the state and the socialist revolution. Dwight Macdonald again writes a column called "Reading from Left to Right." The "section of the Archives of the Revolution contains a contribution of Karl Marx, "A Worker's Inquiry." Book reviews and other important articles complete a highly valuable and outstanding issue of the magazine. Copies are still available at the price of 20c per copy. The subscription rate is \$2 per year. Address: The New International, 116 University Place, New York City.

A comprehensive analysis on the importance and meaning of Socialized Medicine is contributed

The December number of The New International is out and is featured by Leon Trotsky's article entitled "A Fresh Lesson." In this article Trotsky reviews the situation in Europe after Munich; the character of the coming world imperialist war; the position of the democracies and the dictatorships and the role played by the working class parties.

The "Editor's Comments" concern themselves particularly with the results of the recent elections in November.

The "Editor's Comments" concern themselves particularly with the results of the recent elections in November.

of violent anti-Hitlerite speeches—most of which is jingo pro-war agitation?

The workers in these and other unions should demand an accounting from their leaders. The labor movement least of all can tolerate the "sympathy" racket. It must act—and act at once—for admitting the refugees into the United States. United and concerted action of the labor movement can force Congress to "open the doors" at its coming sessions.

On the Make

Anthony Eden is no fair-haired boy. He's an ambitious politician on the make.

He has come to this country to build himself up as the potential British spokesman for an Anglo-American combination when war comes.

He's no Galahad of democracy, as the Daily Worker and a lot of other old ladies and liberals like to believe. He had his hand deep in the gore of the Non-Intervention committee and only those with short memories have forgotten his smelly role in the business of ending the sanctions against Italy over the Ethiopian affair.

Eden represents the safety valve of the opposition to Chamberlain's "appeasement" policy in Britain. When Chamberlain steps out he will step in—he hopes—and carry on, by gad, not for democracy but to preserve the waning glory of the Empire.

Refuge and Social Democracy

The powerful parties of the Second International in the Scandinavian countries play a leading role in the cabinets of all three countries. Premiers, ministers of state and foreign affairs, etc. etc.—these portfolios are held by the Social Democrats. We, of course, have no illusions about the real power: that remains in the hands of the capitalist class, in whose service the Social Democrats function as a liberal front. But the Social Democrats justify their role as one of actually securing, through their governmental functions, real gains for the working class.

Taking them at their word, then, why do they not open the doors of these countries to the refugees from the Hitler terror? Why do they not, at the least, try to do this? Their refusal to do so brands them as not even honest democrats, let alone Socialists.

Equally contemptible is the studied silence of their blood-brothers in this country, whether of the stripe of the Social Democratic Federation or the "Socialist Party" of Norman Thomas. These gentlemen wax indignant at the Stalinist regime for not opening the doors of the Soviet Union. But on the equally swinish conduct of the Scandinavian Social Democrats—on this they are silent.

The Socialist Call, Norman Thomas' organ, in its December 10 issue prints a denunciation of Stalin's failure to act on behalf of the refugees—reprinted from the Swedish Social-Demokraten! But why don't Norman Thomas' comrades in Sweden, Norway, Denmark open their doors to the refugees—on this not a word.

And these people set themselves up as critics of Bolshevik morality!

Outlines Available

Five educational outlines on current issues, put out by the New York party, are available for sale at the special price of ten cents for all five. Only a limited number are available.

The outlines deal with: "The Right of Asylum," an historical sketch; "Open the Doors," on the Hitler pogrom and the reactions of the various governments, including the Soviet Union; summary of the speech in New York by C. L. R. James on "The Twilight of the British Empire"; and two bulletins on the French general strike and the situation in France.

Order through the National Educational Department of the S.W.P., 116 University Place, New York City.

Collective Security- for the Capitalists



Carlo

REMEMBER THESE FACTS!

- Who put the strike-breaking Daladier government into power? The Socialist and Communist parties, by unanimous vote in the French Chamber of Deputies on April 10, 1938!
Who voted last summer to grant the strike-breaking Daladier government "extraordinary financial powers," i.e. the power to rule by decree without parliament? The Socialist and Communist parties, by unanimous vote in the French Chamber of Deputies on April 13, 1938!
Who called upon the French working class to support the "People's Front" government of Daladier on the grounds that it would save democracy? The Socialist and Communist parties!
Who voted the money for the military budget of the Daladier government, for the army whose "People's Front" rifles were used to crush the general strike? The Socialist and Communist parties!
Facts speak louder than promises. Remember these facts!

U.S. Establishes Control Over Chile After Long Battle With Great Britain

By DONALD BERGNER United States financial and commercial interests have finally emerged victorious from the long, drawn-out struggle for the control of Chile, the world's chief source of that prime necessity of war, nitrates. German traders and British capitalists have been waging a strong fight for control of the Chilean markets.

Prior to the World War British commercial interests predominated, but in 1914 Germany got out in front and stayed there until the beginning of this year. U. S. share of Chilean foreign trade was only one-half that of Great Britain in 1913. The U. S. forged ahead of her during the War, but then the struggle for second place shifted back and forth until last year. Last year the U. S. passed Britain with a cloud of dust and in February of this year managed to pass Germany as well. The comparative figures for sales to Chile for that month: U.S. \$4,400,000 and Germany, \$4,250,000.

U. S. Investments Dominant In the investment field, that is in the basic control of Chilean banking and industry, Germany

has never even had a chance. Britain had almost complete control prior to the War. In 1912, for example, the U. S. had only \$12,000,000 invested in Chile. In 1931 Britain had a half billion dollars while Wall Street's boys had reached 714,000,000 dollars worth, of which almost a half billion were invested in industrial interests.

What is so valuable in Chile? Besides the war necessity, nitrates—owned by a partnership of the Chilean government and the American Guggenheim interests—Chile is the world's second largest producer of copper. The copper industry is also largely under the control of U. S. interests as is the production of electric power.

Seven Cents a Day The aristocratic land-owners, allying themselves with whichever imperialist power happens to be dominant at the moment, have continued serenely along their money-grabbing path of feudal oppression of the Chilean peasantry. Four-fifths of all the arable land of Chile is owned by only 3,000 people. The millions of rotos, condemned to an average wage of about seven cents a day plus a little bread and beans, live under a system of veritable medieval serfdom.

It is these big land-owners who have formed the native backbone of every reactionary move in Chilean politics. They backed the Alessandri government during the middle 1920's after Alessandri had dropped his earlier liberalism. Then they supported the bloody anti-labor dictatorship of Ibanez from 1927 to 1931 although Ibanez, the agent of Yankee imperialism, liquidated many British interests and some over-ardent supporters of Britain. They backed the new Alessandri government that took over following the short period of "chaos" after Ibanez was forced to flee.

Strikes Overthrow Dictator This second Alessandri government put an end to a short period of comparative freedom brought on by strikes, revolts and threats of more throughout the country. Students and workers came out into the streets against Ibanez, as they did two years later against Alessandri when the sailors led the revolt. In the latter revolts, a semi-socialist government led by Carlos Davila and the popular labor leader and Socialist Martindique Grove held power for a short time. But it didn't last long. Soon Alessandri and his British and land-owning friends were back in the saddle, to sit tightly on it until this year's elec-

tions put in Pedro Aguirre Corda, friend of Washington and Wall Street.

In the hotly-contested election this October, the charge was made by many, especially the Communists, that Aguirre's opponent, Senor Gustavo Ross Santa Maria was—because of his opposition to the "people's front" and to U. S. control of Chile—an agent of the Fascist powers. Nothing could be further from the truth. At that time it was stated in the Socialist Appeal that Ross is the agent of "democratic" Britain. This becomes clear when one notices that the "radio program" featured on the front page of Ross' paper, El Diario Ilustrado, is limited to one station: the British Broadcasting Corporation.

Wall Street Man "People's front" Aguirre made it publicly clear immediately after his election that he was no poor second even to Ross in authoritarian ideas. "Left wing governments," says this millionaire landowner-capitalist, "need two assets: discretion on the part of the rulers and discipline on the part of the masses." He also made it quite clear that he was pro-U.S. No "Mexicanization"—expropriation of Wall Street interests—for this country.

The charge has been made by everyone but the Stalinists that Aguirre was supported by a strange "Front," one so "popular" that it included the Fascists. The original Stalinist answer to this was that this support was given by individual Nazis who broke with their leadership.

The Chilean press carried the following interesting item on October 18: "Aguirre Visits Ibanez (the jailed ex-dictator and co-leader of the Nazis.—D. B.). Thanks him for the withdrawal of his candidacy and the support he offers. . . ."

The Stalinist Brass Check The Stalinists however said that it was only Ibanez and not Gonzalez von Marees, the other Nazi co-leader, who supported Aguirre. But the fact that the half-German Gonzalez also supported Aguirre is further proved by the violent attacks on Gonzalez appearing very prominently on the pages of El Diario Ilustrado. The Stalinists offer one final attempt at a squirm-out.

Their leading Latin-American pen-prostitute, Mr. Ricardo Martindique Grove held power for a short time. But it didn't last long. Soon Alessandri and his British and land-owning friends were back in the saddle, to sit tightly on it until this year's elec-

'Communists' Become Open Backers of Arms Program

Coming out brazenly for Roosevelt's Big-Navy-Army building program in preparation for imperialist war, Earl Browder, Fuehrer of the Communist Party, last week established a new landmark in Stalinist degeneration. It is important to recognize the exact nature of the "advance" the Stalinists have now made over their previous subordination to the war-makers.

The latest Stalinist line was issued in the form of a "report" by Browder to a "plenary session" of the National Committee which, needless to say, adopted it unanimously. In the days when the Communist Party enjoyed internal democracy, the policy of the party was fixed, after a report and discussion, by resolutions, the majority resolution becoming the program of the party. Now, of course, there are never any minority resolutions, and the program appears in the form of a pronouncement by the Fuehrer, the endorsing resolution of the National Committee merely consisting of helling the pronouncement.

Repeats France Masked and shamefaced jingoism, half-explicit avowals of loyalty to the capitalist state, indirect support of militarism, are now being replaced by open jingoism, unequivocal devotion to the capitalist state, and direct support of armaments.

What is now unfolding in the Stalinist camp and its sphere of influence is a repetition, word for word and step by step, of the fatal course down which the Stalinists and the Social Democrats dragged the French workers. Browder is merely repeating Thorez, his French counterpart. He merely changes the name of Daladier to Roosevelt and Jouhaux to Lewis. Stalinist votes for the French military budget and military loans to semi-fascist Poland, are to be aped by Stalinist votes for Roosevelt's military budget and military loans to semi-fascist Brazil, etc. No one can accuse Fuehrer Browder of originality!

Sacrificing Workers' Needs As Thorez openly subordinated all considerations of social gains for the French working class to the sole real interest of the Stalinists, the military alliance of the French bourgeoisie with Stalin, so Browder asks but one boon of American imperialism: military alliance with Stalin. Browder is, if anything, more crude than Thorez was. He says:

"Today, as never before, the fate of the world depends upon the role that will be played by these two greatest powers in the world (America and Soviet Russia) . . ."

"It is necessary to find a program of collaboration which can effectively unite these two greatest world powers. . . ."

"The issue of a positive peace policy for America more and more becomes dominant and all alignments upon domestic is-

suces readjust themselves to the larger line-up." (Daily Worker, December 10, 1938.)

In plain English: "Rulers of America, find a place in your imperialist plans for a line-up involving Stalin, and in return we shall do our best to subordinate every need of the workers to your military needs."

Browder Joins General Staff The new line drops all pretense of not supporting the Army and Navy general staff armament proposals. Actually, the Stalinists were for the Big Navy Bill, when it was introduced at the last session of Congress; the Stalinist lobbyists were extremely active in pushing the bill; but publicly the Stalinists "merely" attacked the opponents of the bill as isolationists. This was typical of the previous technique. Now there is no longer any masking of the full line. Browder says: "Prior to the Munich pact, we declared that a correct peace policy . . . could quickly halt and remove the menace of fascist aggression without the necessity of a big armaments program for our country. . . ."

"This argument on armament that was valid before Munich loses its force afterward . . . only American arms can preserve the Americas from conquest by the Rome-Berlin-Tokio alliance." (D. W., Dec. 7.)

A Mess of Pottage In return for Stalinist support for armaments, Browder wants a military alliance for Stalin. He says:

"The question is not are we for armaments, yes or no; it is the more complicated question, 'Armaments, for what?' If it is for the defense of the liberty and independence of our own and other peoples, yes, emphatically yes! But the people must learn to make its 'Yes' a power for securing guarantees that the armaments will be for that purpose and for no other." (D. W., Dec. 7.)

Promise and Reality In other words, Browder proposes an exact repetition of the Franco-Soviet pact and Daladier's promises, the Stalinists not only voted military budgets but broke up and terrorized workers' meetings called to opposed military expansion. After the Stalinists had served their purpose, they were thrust aside, the Franco-Soviet pact was thrown on the scrap heap and Daladier's troops, heavily armed with the new weapons provided by Stalinist votes, broke the strikes of the workers. If he deems it necessary, Roosevelt will use the Stalinists in this country in the same way and for the same purpose.

This, then, is the significance of the latest Stalinist line. All the circumlocutions and masked formulations are dropped. Henceforth Browder openly wears Uncle Sam's uniform—not a private's, but the chevrons, boots and Sam Browne belt of a recruiting officer.

QUESTION BOX

(Conducted by the National Educational Department)

Question: How can the United States afford to "open the doors" to the thousands of German Jewish refugees, when there are already millions of unemployed workers in this country?—B. G., New York.

Answer: This is the argument that Hitler uses: "There is no room for the Jews in Germany!" Similarly, this objection says: "There is no room for the Jews in the United States!" Hitler says the Jews are taking away the jobs of good German workers; the "democratic" capitalists here say that the refugees will take away the jobs of good American workers.

Moreover, if the Jews have to be sent to Madagascar or Guiana because unemployment leaves no room for them elsewhere, is it not logical for the "democratic" statesmen to propose that the home unemployment problem be solved likewise? After all, it would be better than to let them starve!

In the earlier days of this country, the right of asylum for refugees was recognized in practice. Then the U. S. was comparatively poor. Today, when it is the wealthiest nation in the world, it cannot "afford" to admit the Jews? Why is it that the wealthier a capitalist country becomes, the less it can afford to admit persecuted people?

The answer to Roosevelt and Chamberlain is the same as the answer to Hitler. In Germany, it is not the Jews who have taken away the workers' jobs—it is German capitalism, it is Hitler himself. The same thing is true here: it is the bosses who take away the jobs from the workers!

In this country there is work and wealth enough not only for the millions of unemployed but also for the comparatively small number of refugees who would be admitted. The Socialist Workers Party has the program which will aid both the victims of the Nazi terror and the victims of unemployment. We demand a 10 billion dollar federal public works program; a 5 billion dollar federal housing program; a wage scale which rises with the cost of living; reduction of working hours at the same weekly wage rate to give the right to a job to every worker; open the idle factories and let the workers operate them at union wages, under workers' control; make the rich pay for the ravages of their crisis!

To oppose opening the doors to the refugees is to endorse the policy of Hitler!

Front when even their Trotskyite colleagues did the same? The only trouble with this is one minor detail: the analogy doesn't work. This is fabricated out of the whole cloth—and Martinez knows it. The Chilean Trotskyites, the Revolutionary Workers Party, did not support Aguirre—

and all independent Socialist candidates as a protest against capitalist politics and those labor leaders who were playing them. (This is third of a series of articles on the situation in Latin-America. Next week there will be an analysis of Argentina, leading opponent of the U. S. delegation at the Pan-American Conference.)

Read Socialist Appeal

Stalinists Try To 'Smear' Grynszpan

The case of Herschel Grynszpan has aroused the deepest sentiments of sympathy and solidarity among the widest variety of people. Even representatives and spokesmen of the conservative wing of capitalist democracy came forward spontaneously in behalf of the young Jewish emigre who sought in feverish desperation to protest dramatically before the bar of world opinion against the savage torments to which Hitlerism subjected his family and his people. Public figures so far to the right, politically, as Dorothy Thompson, have expressed themselves categorically against the Nazis' demand that Grynszpan be guillotined for shooting Vom Rath.

We are revolutionary Marxists, and by virtue of our whole tradition, our doctrine, our daily behavior, we have nothing in common with the theory and practice of any kind of individual action, much less individual terrorism. At bottom, however justified it may be "morally," it has always been either a substitute for or a brake upon the action of the masses which, properly organized, is the ONLY effective method of struggle against reaction. Yet, although our movement has always persistently and patiently combated individual terrorism, it is proud of the fact that at all times and in all lands it has never hesitated, when confronted with a choice between the misguided foe of tyranny and the despot who fell before his bullet or bomb, to take the side of the former.

We cherish the memory of William Tell and not of Gessler the tyrant. Not a shadow of infamy is attached in our minds to the epic traditions of the Russian terrorists who gave their lives in the struggle against the bloody Czars and Grand Dukes and their murderous police prefects. One would have to be devoid of the last iota of hatred for oppression and despotism, to think or write otherwise.

That is why it is so utterly revolting to see how the Stalinists in France have conducted themselves with reference to the Grynszpan case. At a time when even conservative writers put all emphasis on pointing out that the Hitlerites were only reaping the fruit of their vicious anti-Semitic campaign, and that the real responsibility for the crime rested on the shoulders of the Fascist bureaucracy, the Stalinist press leaped in to throw the mud of suspicion on the young Jewish martyr. On November 9, 1938, the Paris Stalinist daily, l'Humanite, wrote as follows:

"The police know as surely as we do that young Grynszpan was in constant relation with the Trotskyist circles, which swarm with agents of the Gestapo. Is it so improbable that one or more of these wretches said: 'Your family is being persecuted; its possessions are being stolen. That can't be tolerated. Avenge yourself, avenge yourself!' We firmly believe that there lies the truth."

The next day, l'Humanite continued the comments dictated by its pathological hatred for the "Trotskyists," referring to ". . . what shady role might have been played by an agent of the Gestapo introduced into the Trotskyist circles of Paris which Grynszpan frequented."

It goes without saying that the "police know" NOTHING about Grynszpan's "constant relation" with "Trotskyist circles"; that the Stalinists know NOTHING about such relations, for the good and simple and sufficient reason that Herschel Grynszpan never had any relations with our movement—in France or elsewhere, no more than Trotsky ever had relations with the Gestapo. The whole story is simply a lie woven out of cloth bearing the familiar trade mark of the G.P.U. The only thing that "the police know as surely as we do" is that the Stalinists are loathsome liars, whose desperate fear and hatred of our movement drive them to a cynical game of ducks and drakes with the freedom and even the life of a young lad whose despairing act elicited the spontaneous sympathy of virtually the entire civilized world.

The labor movement has never been a paradise. To one extent or another it has always been compelled to suffer in its ranks the presence of abominable elements and their abominations, both alien to its principles and its ideals. Hence everything sober and clean in the labor movement has never neglected the ever-necessary task of weeding out of its garden all poisonous and deformed growths. But it is hard to recall, in the long and colorful history of this movement, anything at once so base, so unscrupulous, so vile, so offensive to every feeling of simple decency and sanitation, as that inexhaustible source of rotteness we know as Stalinism.

Its reaction to the case of Herschel Grynszpan is but one of countless instances.