

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

Vol. II—No. 56 Saturday, December 31, 1938

Published every week by the  
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: National Office: ALgonquin 4-8477

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

**A Healthy Young Baby**

When the bells ring in the New Year, the Socialist Workers Party will be one year old. New Year's Day 1938 saw the launching of the revolutionary party of the American working class. New Year's Day 1939 records a year of slow but solid achievement and the beginning of a campaign to put the party on the map of labor history, present and future.

The new year confronts the party with far more grandiose tasks—no less than directing the working class on the first steps of the high road of the American Revolution. A huge task indeed but our party faces it with confidence, full of hope, of youth and of enthusiasm.

A twice-a-week *Appeal*—a long step on the road to the daily—will begin the campaign. And after that—watch our smoke!

**More Pious Tears**

The U.S. delegation went to Lima just about the time President Roosevelt was sounding off with his piteous wails about the plight of the victims of Fascism in Europe. At Lima delegates of all the American nations—capable of absorbing all the refugees—succeeded, under the careful piloting of Cordell Hull in avoiding the whole issue.

A resolution introduced by the Cuban delegation merely "deploring" the persecution of racial and religious minorities in Europe had a hard time getting out onto the floor of the Pan-American conference. It was finally adopted grudgingly and the matter rested there. No action. No offer of asylum. Not a single offer of concrete help of any kind. Just some more pious tears. Just some more Rooseveltian hypocrisy.

This won't help the victims of Fascism escape their persecutors. It will only leave them to rot and to suffer under the clubs and whips of the Fascist beasts.

We repeat: Open the doors to the victims of Fascism! We'll make it possible for them to live here in the same way we must make it possible for our 15,000,000 jobless to live—by turning all war funds over to the unemployed, inaugurating a \$20,000,000,000 public works program, fighting for and winning the 30-hour week with no reduction in pay, establishing a \$30 minimum weekly wage, and by opening the factories and running them under workers' control.

Open the doors to the refugees and open the doors to a fighting program to win life and livelihood for our own great oppressed the minority, the submerged "third-of-a-nation"—the 15,000,000 jobless and their dependents who must struggle or else starve.

**Why We Need an Army**

... with the cooperation of the Public Relations Officers of the War Department' *Life* magazine for Dec. 19 publishes a very elaborate pictorial display of the equipment and lack of equipment of the United States Army. Extensive research, they claim, reveals that the "U. S. is Weak in Arms and Industry Unprepared. *Life* is pulling for the vast rearmament program soon to go before congress and attempting to make America "war-minded" enough to accept it as a matter of course.

But why do we need an army? This is the question that sorely tries the jingo editors of *Life*. And in their usual fashion, they answer it quite candidly:

"The Army does not talk about it, but it ponders steadily a 'White Paper' containing detailed plans for suppression of 'civil disorder' (i.e. revolution) within the U.S."

"... national defense does not mean lying supinely in wait for an enemy to visit devastation upon us, picking his own place to attack; THE BEST DEFENSE IS AN ATTACK." (*Life's* emphasis) If devastation is to be kept from our land, when an enemy moves against us we must be ready to meet him, to fight if possible on his own ground."

*Life* speaks for the War Department and the War Department speaks for Wall Street. Why do they need an army?

To protect the ill-gotten wealth of the 60 ruling families (whose names are variations on the theme of Musica-Coster) stolen from the toiling millions of this country.

And to steal some more from the downtrodden peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. That's why they need an army!

**W.A. Company Union**

David Lasser, President of the Workers Alliance, is "concerned because we see a tendency on the part of some congressional leaders to pose funds for rearmament as against funds for work and social security. We firmly believe that both are necessary."

The head of a company union, slightly on the outs with his boss, would probably have said on the demand for a wage-cut: "There is a tendency on the part of some employers to pose big profits as against high wages. I firmly believe that both are necessary."

Any worker could tell the fink leader that you can't keep high dividends and big profits and not take a wage cut. The W.P.A. worker fired off his job might tell the snivelling fink who runs the Worker's Alliance that you can't run a battleship-armament program and keep the workers in jobs and relief.

The Worker's Alliance is a company union. Faced with the dire straits of the hundreds of thousands fired off W.P.A.—their only means of subsistence—in order to provide funds for the huge army-navy program, what does this organization do?

A few weasel protests, like its mouth was full of hot water, no real action—and a big boost for the rearmament program.

Workers who have learned what to do with company unions will know how to act towards the Workers Alliance. Then they will go out and build the real alliance of employed and unemployed, tied to the unions with the motto of action and life:

**BREAD AND HOMES! NOT BATTLESHIPS AND MACHINE GUNS!**

**Counsel of Treachery**

Some wisacre once said: we learn from history that we don't learn from history. John L. Lewis' recent pronouncement in the name of Labor's Non-partisan League proves again there was more sense than humor in that ancient epigram.

Labor's Non-partisan League was created in 1936 to harness the labor vote for the Democratic Party. But despite the intentions of its creators, it was a reflection of the stirring for independent political action on the part of the millions of new recruits in the C.I.O.

Lewis kept the lid tightly clamped on this sentiment and it stirred vainly in the rotten barrel of the Democratic Party, brightly polished on the outside by a New Deal shine. This company union policy in politics brought the results company unionism has always brought: defeat and disaster.

Democratic Governor Davey of Ohio, elected by labor's votes, smashed C.I.O.'s strike in Little Steel.

Democratic Governor Kraschel, elected by Labor's votes, called out the National Guard and broke C.I.O.'s strike in Newton, Iowa.

Democratic Mayor Wilson of Philadelphia, supported by L.N.P.L. had his cops swinging their clubs over the heads of the garbage collectors in their recent strike.

And that's only the beginning of the record.

By the time the 1938 elections rolled around, it was clear as a pikestaff that the New Deal was no solution to the breakdown of American capitalism. Millions continued unemployed and on the brink of starvation despite an industrial upturn; the middle class and the farmers went down to ruin and bankruptcy in increasing numbers. The future uncertain and unpromising, the masses were groping for a new way out. Labor could have given them new hope and courage by independence in political action and program. But Lewis kept labor strapped to the Democratic party and its faltering New Deal.

Result: practically every candidate supported by Labor's Non-partisan League, all of them Democrats including the Farmer-Laborites who supported the New Deal nationally, went down to miserable defeat. The only "victory" was in New York where Banker Lehman just managed to nose through, while nearly every American Labor Party candidate was beaten.

That election was the warning signal. The middle classes switched from the New Deal to the Republican Party. Only the workers held on because there was no other alternative given them.

Now with the New Deal a squeezed-out lemon—bankrupt in everybody's eyes but Lewis', and discarded even by its once-proud father Roosevelt—it is more than time to break clean from it and the Democratic Party. The New Deal is now the open enemy of the masses. It throws tens of thousands of workers off the WPA rolls and proceeds with unashamed arrogance to build more warships and armaments than any administration since Wilson. Anybody who supports Roosevelt and his New Deal, how must answer for his program which is borrowed from Herr Goering: battleships! Not bread! Anybody who supports the New Deal today and fails to take the road fighting independent labor politics is helping the drift to reaction and fascism on the part of increasing numbers of the middle class. Any labor leader who keeps the workers tied to the capitalist parties is a traitor to his class.

And that is precisely what Lewis is doing. His statement that L.N.P.L. will "continue to work within the framework of the Democratic Party" is a counsel of treachery. It proves not that Lewis, does not learn from history, but that he does not want to learn from history!

**Politics and the Unions**  
Concerning the Sailors Union of the Pacific

One of the surest marks of the reactionary nature of the labor school taught by the late Samuel Gompers was its slogan of "No politics in the unions!" The history of the American trade union movement, down to the present day, has shown that the slogan was deceitful as well as reactionary. In reality, it always meant: No working class politics in the unions, no independent political action by the workers. It always meant: capitalist politics played by the conservative leaders in the name of the unions but without the control of the members.

To this day, even William Green and the A. F. of L. leadership are up to their chins in politics—capitalist politics—which takes the form of lobbying in Congress and the State capitols and of "rewarding friends and punishing enemies." As a result of the course followed under this slogan, American labor has functioned with one of its arms paralyzed.

**The S.U.P. Amendment**

These thoughts come to mind as we learn of the constitutional amendment which has just been voted on by members of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, one of the most militant and class-conscious labor organizations in the country. The amendment deals with the question of politics in the Union. Every sentence in it is a first-class mistake and if the S.U.P. were to follow it out in practice, it would rapidly render itself as sterile as the I.W.W. which is attacking it now with such bitter viciousness and whose spirit the amendment breathes from stem to stern.

Let us quote the last three sentences which give the key to the amendment:

"Whereas: The workers have been betrayed in countries all over the world by political opportunists who are only trying to further their own ends, and

"Whereas: Labor cannot afford to owe allegiance to two organizations without weakening its own strength in the economic field, therefore be it

"Resolved: That any member who insists on bringing politics in the union be brought up on charges as a detriment to the union."

Three sentences, and all wrong! Where the Issue Lies

1. For every political faker who has betrayed labor, there has never failed to be a "pure and simple" trade union faker who beat him to the punch. For every Earl Browder, there are a dozen Greens, Lewises and Hutchesons. For every Thorez and Blum

(Communist and Socialist Party leaders in France), there is a Jouhaux (the French Bill Green). As for the "anti-political" anarcho-syndicalists in Spain, if they played a more revolutionary role than their fellow-People's Front cabinet ministers of the C. P. and S. P., it was not discernible to the naked eye. What is wrong with all these gentlemen? The fact that some engage in political action while others say they don't? They all engage in political action. Their betrayal lies in the fact that they practice capitalist and not independent working class politics.

2. If the amendment means you cannot "owe allegiance to two organizations" in the same field, it is correct. In that case, the I.W.W.—inspired author of the resolution—would have to call for eliminating from the S.U.P. those I.W.W. members who are "two-card men." But the author means something else, and he is doubly wrong. Can a man owe allegiance both to his union and a labor cooperative? A union and a workers' fraternal order? A union and labor sports association? Of course he can, because there is no conflict there.

On the same grounds, there is no conflict between owing allegiance both to his union and to a working class political party. A man can "owe allegiance" both to his left arm and his right arm, and if he uses the one he is not "weakening the strength" of the other. The amendment's author simply aims to send labor into battle against the employers and their government with one arm tied behind it.

**Political Rights**

3. As for the last sentence, it is not only bureaucratic and highly injurious to the union's interests, but it is also so much nonsense. Not only has any union member—be he Republican or Democrat, Socialist or Single-Taxer, Stalinist or Revolutionist (Trotskyist)—the right to present his political views and proposals before his own union (naturally, at the proper time and in a proper way, which the membership as a whole provides for), but the fact is that the S.U.P. has been up to its elbows in political action, and rightly so, without in the slightest degree impairing its effectiveness or "strength in the economic field."

We understand the sound instinctive reaction of the militant maritime workers against "political action" as taught by the social democrats, to whom the beginning and end of politics is

dropping a ballot in a box once a year.

We understand their reaction against "politics" as practiced by the Stalinists, to whom the term simply means any and every foul trick, cheap maneuver, piece of chicanery and bluff that will enable them to install bureaucratic control over all labor organizations.

But "politics in the unions" should mean to the militant, class-conscious worker in particular nothing more or less than independent working class political action which is organized, practiced and controlled by the workers themselves.

When the S.U.P. or its members properly participate in a demonstration demanding of the government of California that Tom Mooney be released—that is political action, and whoever proposed such a demonstration at an S.U.P. meeting would be "bringing politics in the union!"

When the S.U.P. properly sends its representatives to Washington to oppose anti-labor legislation at Congressional hearings—that is political action.

When the S.U.P. properly calls upon the people of California and Oregon to defeat the anti-picketing ordinance—that is political action.

When the S.U.P. properly tries to organize a fight against the government's fink halls—that is political action.

Where It Would Lead

A dozen similar examples could be cited. Is that the kind of politics that the recent amendment seeks to prohibit in the S.U.P.?

The S.U.P. has been on the right track, which is the reason why it has forged to the forefront of the American labor movement. The kind of nonsense embodied in the amendment, assuming it is enforced, can only lead to one of two things: the reduction of the S.U.P. from a flourishing and representative union to the level of a fruitless I.W.W. set of flea-bitten anarcho-syndicalists; or the transformation of the S.U.P. into one of those "respectable," "non-political" and bureaucratized unions which the A. F. of L. hierarchy find so ideal.

The unblemished record of fierce adherence to proletarian democracy and aggressive class struggle which the members of the S.U.P. have behind them, gives one the right to expect that both these dangers will be averted—by retiring the "amendment" to its proper place: the museum of the S.U.P.

**Democracy a Myth In the Argentine**

By DONALD BERGNER

Buenos Aires is England's financial Gibraltar in Latin America. The Argentine capital, at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, is the gateway to British influence in the Latin States. It is also the seat of one of the "typical American democracies" with all the trimmings. The Presidents make speeches to convince the folks that they're not dictators, and their soldiers' guns make lead speeches to the unconvinced.

The present holder of the presidential chair is Senator Roberto M. Ortiz, one of the country's richest landowners and feudal lords, to the tune of over four million dollars. Senator Ortiz is also the attorney for the tremendous British railroad interests, and the apt disciple and stooge of his predecessor in office, the big-brother dictator Agustin P. Justo.

**Peace on a Bomber**

The Ortiz inauguration on Feb. 2 of this year was "honored" by the attendance of six U.S. army "flying fortress" bombers. The bombers, besides bearing a "gentle hint" that the U.S. is not so far away, also carried a letter from F.D.R. about how "... our two republics nurtured by similar ideals, have lived peacefully for over a century."

Ortiz was elected the preceding September, as so often happens in these "American democracies," by a sizeable minority. His opponent, Marcelo T. de Alvear, received a clear majority of the popular vote, but by a combination of fraud and manipulation of the electoral college Senator Ortiz transformed his own minority into the majority.

Not that Dr. Alvear was so

very different from Ortiz. Oh, no! Alvear is also flesh of the flesh and blood of the Argentine ruling class. He is one of her leading "gilded playboys of yesteryear," a boulevardier, social lion and tourist de luxe, a former president, and Cabinet Minister under President Irigoyen. Together with Irigoyen he won a certain amount of fame as an "anti-imperialist" for their attempt to strengthen native capitalism at the expense of the foreign interests. The Argentine capitalists, themselves tied very closely to London City, did not object at all, as long as the Irigoyen "Radicals" confined themselves to attacking U.S. interests, especially in oil lands. But when Irigoyen stepped on the toes of the British there was an immediate reaction and he was tossed out by the ruling class and a new dictator named Uriburu took over.

**Suppresses Strikes**

Alvear's "Radicalism" was even less firm than that of Irigoyen. He deserted his chief and made peace with the pro-British forces. But it would be unfair to assume that Dr. Alvear was a temporizer. Not at all. He showed his mettle very courageously at the one really crucial moment in Irigoyen's career. Following the post-war depression a great series of strikes broke out. One of these, led by the Buenos Aires stevedores, spread right out to Patagonia and assumed tremendous proportions. The government of these "friends of labor" took immediate action. They called out the troops and slaughtered the strikers by the hundreds.

But the British imperialists didn't quite trust him. Mainly be-

cause they felt that the Justo-Ortiz government clique was doing a pretty good job and there was no need to change horses. Then too there were rumors that Alvear, no longer the maker of violent anti-yankee speeches, was more friendly to Wall Street than he should be. But Alvear was ambitious to get back into the Presidential chair. He gathered around him the Union Civica Radical, which had organized the fascist "Klan Radical" during the strike period, the Communist Party, and a Stalinist stooge organization known as the P.S.O. (Workers Socialist Party) made up of ex-left-wingers from the moribund old Socialist Party. And there we have the "Argentine People's Front." A pretty mess! But not very successful.

With no reason to support either of these "democrats," the Marxist vanguard of the Argentine workers, organized in the Bolshevik-Leninist League, denounced both of them as agents of imperialism and called for the formation of a strong revolutionary workers party as the only way to struggle against British and Yankee imperialism and their native agents. The B.-L. L. is now the Argentine section of the Fourth International and can count upon the warm support of the British and U.S. sections in its fight to break the stranglehold of imperialism on Argentine economic and political life.

**Britain Dominant**

Imperialist interests, especially those of Great Britain, dominate all the main industries of Argentina. Over two billion dollars of British capital invested in the country form the lever by which London controls the railroads,

**QUESTION BOX**

(Conducted by the National Educational Department)

**QUESTION:** Why do you attack the pacifists, who, like yourselves are in favor of fighting against imperialist war?—C. H. J. Newark.

**Answer:** It is not a question of sincere intentions "in favor" of fighting war; it is a question of knowing how to fight war effectively. In our opinion, at the best, pacifism is completely ineffectual in fighting war; it merely sidetracks the anti-war energy of the masses into futile channels, and thereby leaves them unprepared and unarmed before the jingo drive and hysteria of a war crisis.

This applies not only to the absolute pacifists, who are on principle opposed to all resort to forceful means. This policy has been an abject failure in Gandhi's "struggle" against British imperialism, where it has meant complete capitulation. When Franco revolted in Spain, the fascist arms could not have been fought by "folded arms." Even in the day-to-day class struggle, small-scale resort to force is not excluded by militant unionists; much less in the more intense class struggle of a war crisis, when the boss class itself is ready to meet every movement of the workers with violence.

Pacifism in general regards the fight against war as being in a water-tight compartment by itself, without relation to the class struggle of workers against the bosses going on in society, and without realization of the basic roots of war. We know, however, that imperialist war is an inevitable continuation of the politics of a capitalist government which seeks to prop up its decaying system by exploitation of other countries, where it dumps up against rival capitalist governments seeking to do the same. The fight against war, therefore, must be a fight against capitalism itself, and for a new and warless society, Socialism.

War is a symptom of the contradictions of the capitalist system, just as fever is a symptom of malaria. One would not think of treating malarial fever by putting the patient in an ice-box; the only effective treatment is to strike the roots of the disease itself. Similarly with the fight against war.

Marxists decide their attitude toward a given war on the basis of the politics which give rise to that war. We are against the war which Roosevelt is preparing to enter because we know it will be fought for the interests of American imperialism. We are for colonial and national wars, by China against imperialist Japan for example, because China's cause is that of national independence from an imperialist yoke; it is not itself an imperialist nation. We are for revolutionary civil wars, because we are in favor of the politics behind such struggles. That is why we are not pacifists.

All experience shows that an effective struggle against war can be led only by the revolutionary movement. In 1917 the widespread and numerically powerful pacifist movement in America collapsed at the first note of the war-drums. It had no ideological basis for resisting the war hysteria and war slogans, nor any organizational basis for resisting the war drive. At the same time it was movements like Lenin's in Russia and Liebknecht's in Germany who maintained their struggle and organized resistance to the war to the last.

This is why we attack and criticize those who sow pacifist illusions about war in the minds of the masses. But at the same time, wherever pacifists are willing to engage in a concrete action against the war preparations of the American government, on a specific issue such as the war budget, we will certainly join with them in a united front of action on this concrete measure. The best cure for pacifism is real involvement in the class struggle.

(Readers of the *Socialist Appeal* are urged to submit their questions to this department.)

**Lima Parley Is Cold Comfort to U.S. Diplomats**

(Continued from Page 1)

as against the original Hull proposal. At the time the Argentine proposal was first advanced the U.S. delegates and the American press attacked it as being virtually meaningless and lacking any concrete plan for the defense of what the boys are pleased to call "the American democracies."

**Dressing It Up**

Today, faced with the necessity of showing the American public and the world in general that they "brought home the bacon," the document suddenly becomes "a momentous declaration on continental solidarity for defense" (Associated Press dispatch, Dec. 27). This although the U.S. was unsuccessful in its attempts to organize an American League of Nations, Court of Justice, or—most important—a military alliance.

Senator Borah, more frank than

most American politicians, is forced to admit that "we" did not get as much as had been expected. The *Baltimore News-Post* in its first reaction to the compromise declaration, on Dec. 21, calls it a victory for Argentina. But now the press boys are all working hard to make a victory for the U.S. out of it.

**Priest Spills the Beans**

One of the U.S. delegates who is evidently unused to some of the diplomatic subtleties is the Reverend Father O'Hara. In his first public appearance in Lima, delivering a sermon on the feast day of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Reverend let loose. Not, to be sure, against the "war-makers" or "aggressors." No; the holy disciple of the Prince of Peace chose as his targets pacifism and "subversive doctrines, be they light pink or dark red."

Father O'Hara (and how many of the rest of the delegation?) thus reveals that he agrees with the War Department, which places first on its list of wars to be prepared for, not wars abroad against fascist powers, but a civil war at home against mass uprisings.

most of the oil fields and banks, the quebracho forests (source of tannic acid), and the tremendous capitalistic farms. The latter are often over a million acres large and supply great quantities of wheat, linseed, corn and cattle, mostly for export.

The United States has \$808,000,000 invested, compared with only forty million in 1913, when Britain had a billion and a half. The Wall Street money is mainly concentrated in the packing industry—Swift, Armour and Cudahy—and to a certain extent in banking and the state debt. At one time the U.S. tried to capture control of the oil fields but the "radical" Irigoyen, put a stop to that.

**Argentine Imperialism**

The tremendous amount of capital invested in Argentina, plus her advantageous climate, resources and advanced industry, have resulted in the development of what is sometimes called "Argentine imperialism." Argentine capital has for many years been reinvested in neighboring countries. For example the Argentine firm of Carlos Casada has over two million dollars invested in Paraguay, controlling approximately ten million acres of farmland—one ninth of the total land of Paraguay—and 200 kilometers of railroad. Argentina also played a very

active role in the Chaco War, egg-ing on both Paraguay and Bolivia in the hope of weakening Bolivia sufficiently to be able to get economically while U.S. finance, weakened by the depression was in no mood for expansion. After the war Argentine capital was able to get a 99 year lease of the entire Southeast region of Bolivia. Of course this so-called "imperialism" is more of a "sub-imperialism" that was and still is British in reality.

And it is Britain that stands behind the big-armaments policy, the policy at Pan-American Conferences, and the internal policy, of the Argentine government. It stood behind the open dictatorship of Uriburu, of Justo, and behind the false "democracy" of Ortiz. This is the "democracy" that was hailed by Roosevelt and Hull this February, that suppresses the independent liberal paper *La Critica* every time it gets too critical, that arrested 29 leaders of the C.P. in Buenos Aires on April 17.

On May 11, President Ortiz reiterated his "faith in democracy" ... and told Congress to get to work passing his bills instead of wasting time debating "politics." As the famous Argentine patriot Sarmiento said in 1852, "Argentine politics is run by cows."

**Celebrate New Year at Pioneer Party-Irving Plaza**