

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

VOL. IV, NO. 7 SATURDAY, FEB. 17, 1940  
Published Weekly by the  
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

- FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:**
1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
  2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
  3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
  4. Thirty-thirty—\$50-weekly minimum wage—\$0-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
  5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
  6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
  7. All war funds to the unemployed.
  8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
  9. No secret diplomacy.
  10. An Independent Labor Party.
  11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.
  12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

**Leon Sedoff**

Tomorrow will be the second anniversary of the death of Leon Sedoff. To this day the circumstances of his death remain a mystery. He had gone to the hospital for a comparatively minor operation. Then he was dead, under extremely suspicious circumstances. All efforts to find out what had happened ran up against the resistance of the "democratic" French government; it was then still in the hey-day of the Franco-Soviet pact.

As Ignace Reiss, before being murdered by the Stalinist GPU in Switzerland, had revealed, the GPU was out to murder Sedoff. They succeeded, we believe, and succeeded, thanks to their relations with the French government, in blocking any investigation of their crime.

Our youth movement remembers Sedoff particularly as their first great contribution to the adult movement. He was, indeed, still a young man—33 at death. His father, Leon Trotsky, has commemorated him in an unforgettable pamphlet. But Sedoff, with his own brain and heart, built the monument by which he will be best remembered: the *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*. He edited it and wrote for it and saw to it that it hit its mark, reaching not only Russian-speaking revolutionists throughout the world but penetrating also past the GPU into Stalin's domain. Leon Sedoff fought Stalin and paid for it with his life; but his work will put an end to Stalin and the darkness which Stalin spread over the land of the October Revolution.

**The Irish Martyrs**

The hanging of Peter Barnes and James Richards, soldiers for Irish freedom, has been followed by a new heightening of the struggle against the British overlords in Ireland, and that is as it should be. The best way to honor these Irish martyrs, and the long line of those who died as they did at the hands of British imperialist murderers, is to free Ireland.

The British imperialists are trying to smear the movement for Irish freedom as instigated by Hitler. The great Irish revolutionary socialist, Jim Connolly, answered the same kind of slander during the last war, with an immortal slogan: "Neither King Nor Kaiser," and hung it across the Transport Workers Hall in Dublin. We can not think of an equally perfect slogan; but the thought, "Neither Chamberlain nor Hitler," is clearly a part of the real revolutionary movement in Ireland today.

**Still Going Down**

To pick up from where we left off, last week, in our comments on the development of the new "recession":  
The New York Times business index showed last week an acceleration of the decline of production, dropping from 103.1 to 101.5.  
The index of Time magazine, which attempts to estimate long-range factors rather than the week's production, was down below the figure for the same time last year!

Steel operations for the week were scheduled at 68.8 per cent of capacity, the fifth consecutive decline of the year, a drop of 200 per cent of capacity during the five-week period.  
We're headed for a deepening of the economic crisis. These jobs in private industry that Roosevelt promised on January 5, when he brought in the budget with WPA slashes and PWA wiped out, haven't come into existence. Instead, more men are being fired each week.  
And the same Democratic and Republican congressmen who are bent on passing Roosevelt's starvation budget, have the gall to appropriate money for "poor little Finland!"

**Fascist Cops**

After Mayor La Guardia had indignantly denied a number of times during the past year the persistent report that a large number of New York policemen were members of Coughlin's fascist Christian Front, pressure finally made it necessary to investigate. Police Commissioner Valentine ordered each policeman to fill out a questionnaire. New York papers carried on Tuesday "unofficial and incomplete returns": at least 1,000 of the 19,000 men in the Police Department were self-admitted members of the Christian Front. And for every one that admitted it, how many were members but didn't admit it? And for every member, how many were sympathizers of the fascist storm troops?

Yet, we are told, in the struggle between fascism and the labor movement, we should look for protection to . . . these policemen!  
The labor movement will build its own Workers Defense Guards and smash the fascist gangs wherever they raise their heads—or it will go down under the boots of the storm troopers.

**The Anti-Lynch Bill**

**(Statement of the National Committee, Socialist Workers Party)**  
Once more the question of a federal anti-lynching law is before the Senate. The House of Representatives has already passed the bill and now the Senators from the South are prepared to filibuster it to death.  
It is not because the bill in and of itself is so dangerous to the rule of the white aristocracy in the South that the southern Senators are determined to kill it. Its provisions are not so serious, even if enforced, to strike terror into the hearts of the lynchers and prevent all lynchings.

But the representatives of the southern ruling class, anxious to keep the Negroes under complete subjection, refuse to give up one particle of their "rights" to do everything and anything to the Negro masses. They are determined to retain those "rights" at all costs, including that of lynching the Negroes whenever they see fit.

An anti-lynching bill might constitute the first opening in the wall which the Southern ruling class has erected against any tampering with their right to exploit the Negro masses. Should this bill pass, Negroes might be encouraged to demand that they actually be given the right to vote, and that the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act be applied in the South as well as in the North. They might also demand the abolition of child labor in the South and the right to receive an elementary education. The southern ruling class fears anything that might improve the condition of the Negroes and consequently opposes any bill which may have that effect.

The Republicans and Democrats of the North have come out in favor of the anti-lynching bill. Every Negro and every white worker should understand that these Republicans and Democrats vote in favor of the bill only to use the Negroes as a political football and not actually to protect the Negro against the rule of the southern whites. If the northern Democrats and Republicans were really anxious to give the Negro his rights, they could find enough to do in the North.

The Socialist Workers Party is in favor of the enactment of the anti-lynching bill and calls upon all the workers, especially the white workers, to rally behind the movement in its favor. Workers should not depend upon the politicians; they should organize meetings, adopt resolutions in the unions, and flood every Senator with letters and telegrams, urging passage of the bill.

The Socialist Workers Party declares, however, that the problem of the Negro in the South will not be solved by the enactment of an anti-lynching law. There are no lynchings of Negroes in the North and yet the Negro continues to live under the most miserable conditions. The problems of the Negro workers, as well as of the white workers, will be solved only when they join in a common struggle against the white capitalist rulers of this country and when they succeed in taking over governmental power and establishing a socialist society which will guarantee equality and plenty for all, regardless of race or creed.

Until such a socialist society is established, the Negro and white workers should join in a struggle for every immediate gain. The anti-lynching bill represents a step forward. Organize to demand its passage!

**In the World of Labor**

By Paul G. Stevens

**Purge in the Mexican Communist Party**

The Mexican Communist Party is to hold an "extraordinary" convention next month. This convention is being called for the purpose of under-taking a thorough-going purge of the present leadership of the organization.  
In the "theses" for the convention, entitled "The National and International Situation and the Tasks of the Party," we begin to get an inkling as to the why and wherefore of the purge. While the situation has been extremely favorable for growth, the "theses" say, it has not been taken advantage of "because of the sectarian-opportunist (sic) line of the leadership of the party which did not have sufficient vision to grasp the development of the revolutionary movement in our country and the possibilities of forming a mass party of the proletariat."  
What is involved, obviously, is the sacrificing of a number of scapegoats in the leadership for carrying out the pro-"democratic" line which the Kremlin has now thrown overboard. From an earlier paragraph in the document we are given the impression that this number is going to be quite large:

"Right now . . . there is proceeding a cleansing, from the top to the bottom, of our own ranks, eliminating from its midst all (underlined in the original) the wavering and alien elements from the party, who because of the false political line and the lack of revolutionary vigilance have infiltrated its ranks."

Among the leaders to be purged, we are informed, are Vicente Guerra, Arturo Ramirez and Manuel Lobato, all members of the Central Committee. Guerra was a member of the all-powerful secretariat and Lobato an alternate to it. Ramirez is the leader of the Mexico City district organization which forms the core of the party. They are charged with any number of crimes in the usual Stalinist fashion—from "facilitating and protecting the work of Trotskyist spies" inside the organization to making pacts with the Right Wing presidential candidate General Almazan. Even a group of free masons was allegedly under their wing. But their gravest crime, it seems, is an opportunist capitulation to President Cardenas.

Of all the charges made, the last one mentioned seems to be most significant. The contradictory character of the charges is quite in line with Stalinist practices and it is always necessary to wade through all the verbiage of these allegations and to sift them carefully for an indication of the real purpose. In this case it is quite apparent that all else outside of "capitulation to Cardenas" is just the usual dressing. In a pending break with Cardenas lies the essence of the purge.

Apparently, a large number of functionaries of the Mexican C.P. has been resisting the change of line in consideration of the rather comfortable positions that the backing of Cardenas and his pro-democratic orientation has afforded them. So that in reality, the convention will be a sort of a showdown between the pro-Cardenas and the pro-Moscow functionaries.

It is not excluded, however, that in the rank and file of the party a movement to break with Stalinism in a revolutionary direction may develop as a result of this situation.

**Fruits of the "People's Front" in France**

Among the lesser crimes of the "People's Front" in France was the Stalinist rehabilitation

of Leon Jouhaux, social patriotic leader of the General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.) in the last war. Jouhaux was not only dressed up as a militant fighter but feasted as a staunch friend of Soviet Russia, in Moscow no less than in Paris.  
But there is no gratitude in Jouhaux' heart at all. No sooner had the war broken out than he took up his old post as French imperialism's chief war-booster in the ranks of labor. Of course his C.G.T. denounced Soviet Russia and supports Daladier's campaign against it. That in itself is what was to be expected from the first. But the U.P.—and all other press agencies as well—is able to announce now that "the French General Confederation of Labor which for years has had a pronounced left wing tendency bitterly denounced Russia as well as Germany today."  
The "pronounced left wing tendency"—that is the gliding of Jouhaux by Stalin's popular front policy. His denunciation of the Soviet Union is only the fruit of that policy.

**German "Socialists" in the Service of Imperial France**

We have become quite used to the abominable patriotic antics of the social democratic politicians of England, France, etc. They act no differently than they did in the last war. Only the German social democracy does not repeat its performance of 1914. But that is not through any change of heart on its part. Hitler has simply refused to give it a chance to do its part.  
Somewhat ludicrously, the German social democrats do manage, nevertheless, to be true to color. They have remained social patriots—but are now on the side of the Erbsfeld, the "hereditary foe" they helped fight in the last war. From France issues their miserable propaganda for a "socialism" that is to be introduced into Germany on the bayonets of French imperialism. In turn, they print at the masthead of their official organ, the "Neue Vorwaerts," an inscription in large type: *Journal Anti-Hitlerien*. Daladier's anti-Hitlerism, it appears, is just as acceptable to them as their "socialism" is to Daladier. They have become, to use the phrase of one of our German comrades, "social patriots in reverse."

But they are not alone in the ranks of "social patriots in reverse." Among them are to be found also the heroes of the centrist S.A.P. (German Labor Party), the erstwhile pride of the so-called "London Bureau" and—Willie Munzenberg, for a long time a pillar of German Stalinism and its foremost Trotsky-baiter.  
Until long after the Moscow trials, Willie continued to condone every atrocity committed by the Kremlin butchers. It was only after Moscow cut off financial support and invited him for one of those visits which cost scores of other German Stalinists their lives, that Munzenberg became a violent anti-Stalinist. But Willie apparently knows how to make anti-Stalinism pay just as well as he knew in the old days how to work the Moscow racket. Now he publishes a paper in Paris called "Die Zukunft" (*The Future*), as the "organ of the Franco-German Union." It goes without saying that the paper's line is such as to gain only plaudits from the French general staff. Collaborators on it include half a dozen other German ex-Stalinists, old wheelhorses in the Munzenberg publishing schemes.  
Business as usual, seems to be his slogan.

**SPARKS IN THE NEWS**

by Dwight Macdonald

**Magistrates and Labor Laws**

Among the states, New York is especially noted for its progressive labor legislation. In 1886 the first law regulating hours of work of New York women employees was passed. In the fifty-three years since then, largely because of the pressure of the workers themselves, a structure of labor laws has been slowly built up—laws limiting the hours of work of women and minors, laws providing for sanitary inspections of factories, laws providing for medical care and insurance benefits, at the boss's expense, in case of industrial disease and accidents.

The laws are fine—as far as they go, at least. But it appears that in New York City they are simply not enforced. The Consumers League of New York has issued a report entitled, *The City Magistrates and the Labor Laws*, which every trade union and labor organization should study. This covers all labor cases heard in the city's Magistrates' Courts over a period of three and a half years (January, 1934 through June, 1937).

Two out of every three of the employers who were brought into court charged with violation of the labor laws got off without any punishment whatsoever. The fines imposed on the remaining third averaged \$18. "In economic terms," the report notes, "this means that the profits accruing to violating employers were left virtually intact."

Why did two-thirds of the employers get off without even a fine? Was it because they were found not guilty by the magistrate? No, most of them were found guilty as charged. But they

paid no fine because they were let off with suspended sentences. One magistrate found guilty 46 employers in one session. He fined one of these \$20, two \$10, three \$5, and he let the remaining 40 off scot free with suspended sentences.  
These are the same magistrates whose high salaries and political corruption have been a scandal for years, the same dispensers of "justice" who daily hand out heavy fines and jail sentences to strikers, pickets and left-wing demonstrators. It is time the unions did something about the perversion of justice in the city's Magistrates' Courts.

**The First Step**

As this is written, the War Deal's campaign to lend Federal funds to "poor little Finland" (what about "poor little WPA", now suffering aggression without any Mannerheim Line to fall back on?) seems to be on the verge of success in Congress. The liberal-isolationist bloc is meeting this first real test by—joining the enemy and whooping it up for war loans to Finland.

What is behind Roosevelt's Poor-Little-Finland line is bluntly expressed in the Kiplinger Washington News Letter for January 27: "Pressure for credits to Allies is increasing. Congress is sour on such credits now, but many sophisticated Congressmen privately admit that the move to expand Export-Import Bank and lend to Finland is a step towards some sort of financial aid to the Allies at some later period."  
Poor Little Finland today means Poor Little British Empire tomorrow.

**Their Government**  
FDR Is Thinking  
Of Next November

It is a key principle of realistic political analysis that the foreign and domestic policies of governments are inseparably linked, that they are, in fact, for the most part simply two phases of the same policy. It could hardly be otherwise. The basic problem for each government is to run the state institutions, which it administers, in the interests of the ruling class of the given nation; to uphold against all enemies the social structure upon which the power of the ruling class rests. This problem confronts the government equally on the domestic and the international arena. Foreign policy (including war) is the attempt to solve this problem as it is posed externally, just as domestic policy is the attempt to solve the same problem internally.

Most liberals and reformists try to obscure the link between foreign and domestic policy. Up until recently some of them used to tell us that they "approved Roosevelt's New Deal" (his domestic policy) but disagreed with his "aggressive" foreign policy. Now many of them are reversing. They say that they object to his internal measures (cutting down of relief, drive against civil rights, prosecution of labor unions . . .) but are in accord with his "peace" and "neutrality" program in external affairs.  
Social-patriotic support of wars is often founded upon a pretended separation between foreign and domestic policy. During peace, the social-patriot criticizes the government, even calls for ousting it and putting a labor government in its place. Internally, they admit, the government (Daladier's, for example!) run by bourgeois parties acts for the bankers and the industrialists, and against the masses of the people. But beyond the borders the government changes its spots: there it acts as the representative of "the entire nation." Consequently (as in France and England today) the social-patriotic parties vote unthinkingly for the government when it comes to prosecuting a war.

**New Deal and War Deal**

The general rule that foreign and domestic policies are linked applies, of course, to the Roosevelt government. Roosevelt was not a Dr. Jekyll when proposing New Deal laws to Congress and a Mr. Hyde when sending a note to Japan or intervening in Mexico. In both types of action, he proceeded from the same premise in the effort to solve the same problem.

The transition from New Deal to War Deal, which began in October, 1937, swung into high gear, and will be completed with the entry of the country directly into the war, can be understood as a shift in emphasis. During the New Deal the emphasis, the weighting, was on internal measures as the primary mechanism for solving the problems of American capitalism; the War Deal means the realization that the internal measures have failed, and the consequent shifting of relative emphasis to external measures.  
The shift is symbolized by the difference in the way that Roosevelt is looked upon by most people. Until a year ago he appeared primarily as a national reformer on the home front. More and more he now figures as the bearer of the country's destiny on the international scene.

However, the linkage between domestic and foreign affairs does not stop merely because of the shift of emphasis. Major stress on external measures came about as a result of the breakdown of preceding internal measures; similarly the current external measures react upon the internal situation.

This is true for American society as a whole, and in relation to the government's basic problem of upholding capitalist rule. It is true also for Roosevelt's narrower problem as head of the governmental bureaucracy, as party politician and as an individual.

The enormous, swollen bureaucracy (Federal, State and local), the Democratic party and Roosevelt as a person have very important special interests of their own, in addition to and sometimes in conflict with the interests of the ruling class which they serve. Roosevelt knows that, just as formerly these special interests depended chiefly on the showing made internally, so now they depend first of all on the showing made externally. Roosevelt knows that his own political fate, and the fate of his wing of the Democratic party, and the jobs in the bureaucratic apparatus, are being decided by "foreign affairs."

I believe that this background must be kept in mind if we are to evaluate correctly many of the recent moves which Roosevelt has been making in foreign affairs—including his flirtations with the Vatican, the particular manner in which he has been handling the Soviet-Finnish war, and the junket of Sumner Welles.

If the war had not started, Roosevelt would, I think, have been washed up by now. He took an almost unalloyed beating from the regular Congress last year, and from the opposition wing of his own party. But the war put him back on his feet. His rating in the Gallup Poll made an unprecedented jump in September and October.

At first his advisers apparently thought that the United States would declare war within six or eight months, and that he and his followers would ride back into office as the only adequate war leaders. With the war developing as no one expected, they have become puzzled. Will they campaign, in the party convention and the election, on a "he kept us out of war" platform or with a "unite to win the war" slogan? They can keep both roads open provided (1) the war increases in seriousness and extent and (2) Roosevelt is made to seem the only man who can handle the war crisis, whether or not this country is formally a belligerent.

The first condition will take care of itself, without any pushing from Roosevelt. The fulfillment of the second is a congenial task for so accomplished a demagogue as Roosevelt. He and his publicity staff constantly reinforce the impression that he is indispensable; his war moves and his "peace moves" are alike presented with that twist.

Some of these moves, like the armament appropriations, the pressure on Japan, the drive in Latin America, the munitions sales to France and Britain, are altogether serious parts of the general war preparations and would be undertaken by any administration, Democratic or Republican. In the case of others (the overtures to the Vatican, the trip of Welles, and even the policy on Finland), we observe a great gap between the grandiose words and the insignificant actions. (With all the talk, Finland has got next to nothing that it needs from this country, and probably is never going to get much.) It is reasonable to suppose that in these latter moves, at least one of Roosevelt's eyes and maybe half of the other is on next summer's Chicago convention and November's election day to follow.

**ANTI-WAR MEETING**  
**How Close Are We to War?**  
Speakers:  
**JAMES P. CANNON and SARAH RICE**  
*Nat'l Secretary, Socialist Workers Party* *Former Yorkville C.P. leader*  
**Friday Eve., February 16, 1940**  
AT 8 O'CLOCK  
**YORKVILLE CASINO**  
210 EAST 86th STREET, N. Y. C.  
Admission: TWENTY-FIVE CENTS      Auspices: Local New York, S.W.P.