

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. IV, No. 27 Saturday, July 6, 1940

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

Editorial Board:
FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN

General Manager:
GEORGE CLARKE

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

"Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879."

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—\$30 WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE—30-HOUR WEEKLY MAXIMUM FOR ALL WORKERS ON ALL JOBS.
5. \$30 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.

Patriotism at a Price

The final argument which induced the French cabinet to capitulate to Hitler was that unless they surrendered the country to Hitler there would be a proletarian revolution in France!

We have this on the authority of Elie J. Bois, former editor of the *Petit Parisien*, who tells the story in a June 30 dispatch from London to the *New York Times*. It was General Maxime Weygand himself who led the capitulators. Weygand first described the military difficulties of the French armies. Then, Bois tells:

"Then, referring to the Russian debacle of 1917 and the Soviet menace, he said, 'We must not let it come to that.'

"This gave the defeatists in the Cabinet their chance to come forward, since the Commander-in-Chief not only justified but actually covered them. Didn't he tell them that, according to an Admiralty report, there were riots in Paris and that Maurice Thorez, Communist leader, had occupied the Elysee Palace?"

Bois tells this story indignantly—indignant because it turned out, he says, that there was no revolutionary danger in Paris. He is not a bit indignant at the fundamental attitude taken by the cabinet that surrender to Hitler was preferable to a proletarian revolution.

This revelation of how the French cabinet preferred a foreign invader as against the victory of the French working class serves to underline one of the central thoughts expressed in the Fourth International's Manifesto on the war, which we published last week. We quote from it:

"The bourgeoisie never defends the fatherland for the sake of the fatherland. They defend private property, privileges, profits. Whenever these sacred values are threatened, the bourgeoisie immediately takes to the road of defeatism. That was the way of the Russian bourgeoisie, whose sons after the October revolution fought and are once again ready to fight in every army in the world against their own former fatherland. In order to save their capital, the Spanish bourgeoisie turned to Mussolini and Hitler for military aid against their own people. The Norwegian bourgeoisie aided Hitler's invasion of Norway. Thus it always was and always will be.

"Official patriotism is a mask for the exploiting interests. Class-conscious workers throw this mask contemptuously aside. They do not defend the bourgeois fatherland, but the interests of the toilers and the oppressed of their own country and of the entire world. The theses of the Fourth International state: 'Against the reactionary slogan of national defense it is necessary to advance the slogan of the revolutionary destruction of the national state. To the madhouse of capitalist Europe it is necessary to counterpose the program of the Socialist United States of Europe as a stage on the road to the Socialist United States of the World.'"

Lewis and Wheeler

Two weeks ago John L. Lewis was defending Herbert Hoover and was opening the way to collaboration with the Republican party. This week he is saying (at the Townsendite convention, Tuesday) that the Republican party "failed to accept its opportunity to become a party of the people" and that the only Democrat who can defeat Willkie is Senator Wheeler. And if Wheeler is not nominated by the Democratic convention, why then, says Lewis, like a really dynamic leader firmly and unflinchingly pointing the concrete way which *must* be, which is the only road, why then, "then it will be time for organizations of labor, organizations of labor, organizations like the Townsend clubs and others to consider what to do."

That's his bold leadership for you! Periods of war pitilessly bare all the realities of the society we live in. The relationship between the capitalist class and the labor bureaucracy, ordinarily concealed by numberless devices, has to be uncovered as these labor lieutenants of capitalism spring to obey the orders of the ruling class to prepare for war. The AFL and CIO bureaucrats automatically, unquestioningly, endorse the war program and especially its immediate aspects, the gigantic armament program. And Lewis, as the most "left" of the labor bureaucrats, can permit himself no greater liberties than to flirt with the Republicans, to "demand" the acceptance of the candidacy of a cheap capitalist demagogue like Senator Wheeler, and then to mumble something about "considering what to do" if he doesn't get Wheeler.

And if he permits himself no greater liberties than this now, when the country is still at peace, we can imagine how cravenly Lewis will come to heel when the capitalist masters actually embark on war.

To trust Lewis, to lean on Lewis, to expect anything from Lewis, in the coming period of war and social convulsion, would be to deliver the American workers into the hands of their enemies. These are strong words. But unless they become part of the understanding of the American workers, they will run the mortal danger of frittering away the great opportunities which lie ahead, still concealed in the smoke of the battlefields, but there, ahead of us, soon capable of realization.

The Voorhis Bill

The Smith bill, which became law when Roosevelt signed it on Saturday, sought to outlaw the publishing and other activities of all labor organizations which advocate the overthrow of the government by force or violence, "or by any other means." Now the government is backing a bill, which was adopted without debate Monday by the House, which strikes heavy blows against every labor organization with international affiliations, whether it advocates changes in the government or not.

This new bill, introduced by Congressman Voorhis of California, Roosevelt's spokesman on the Dies Committee, (Dies himself is backing the bill), would make it obligatory for a labor organization to file the names of all officers, the address of all meeting places of branches, the time of meetings and the name and address of any member or contributor to the organization, if the policies of the organization "are determined by or at the suggestion of, or in collaboration with . . . an international political organization."

Ostensibly aimed at the Bund and the Stalinists, these provisions also apply to the Social Democrats, the Socialist party, the CIO (through its participation in the congresses of the Latin-American Federation of Labor), the AFL (as an affiliate of the International Federation of Trade Unions) and, of course, to ourselves as the American section of the Fourth International.

The bill now goes to the Senate. Every labor organization which doesn't want to have its membership lists in the hands of the capitalist class must fight it tooth and nail.

Reads a Richman Brothers clothing ad: "No longer does even a workman need sweater in summer! See our new summer-weight suits—at prices even workers can afford to pay." How wonderful is the capitalist system—it can provide—sometimes—even the producers some of the product they made!

STATE OF THE NATION

San Jose, Calif., State college co-eds have organized an "Archshoot club" to deal with any stray parachute troops. They will use bows and arrows. Some of them explained: "When they come we'll puncture the parachutes, then watch them fall and break their necks."

PATRIOTISM

E. D. McMahon, San Antonio oil man, says: "One of the greatest immediate dangers is a bottleneck in the defense industries, due to labor laws. Any labor leader who opposed amending our labor laws . . . comes close to being a traitor. And any senator or representative who panders to these labor leaders who would sacrifice the defense of the United States in order to build up their personal power, union dues, etc., is betraying his country."

AFTER HITLER'S CONQUEST OF FRANCE--WHAT NEXT?

By L. LUND
(This article was written immediately after France had capitulated. Objective conditions have prevented earlier publication.)

In the wake of a number of other and smaller European states, France is being transformed into an oppressed nation. German imperialism has risen to unprecedented military heights, with all the ensuing opportunities for world plunder. What then follows?

From the side of all sorts of semi-internationalists one may expect approximately the following line of argumentation: Successful uprisings in conquered countries, under the Nazi heel, are impossible, because every revolutionary movement will be immediately drowned in blood by the conquerors. There is even less reason to expect a successful uprising in the camp of the totalitarian victors. Favorable conditions for revolution could be created only by the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini. Therefore, nothing remains except to aid England and the United States. Should the Soviet Union join us it would be possible not only to halt Germany's military successes but to deal her heavy military and economic defeats. The further development of the revolution is possible only on this road. And so forth and so on.

Nothing New In This Argument

This argumentation which appears on the surface to be inspired by the new map of Europe is in reality only an adaptation to the new map of Europe of the old arguments of social patriotism, i.e., class betrayal. Hitler's victory over France has revealed completely the corruption of imperialist democracy, even in the sphere of its own tasks. It cannot be "saved" from fascism. It can only be replaced by proletarian democracy. Should the working class tie up its fate in the present war with the fate of imperialist democracy, it would only assure itself a new series of defeats.

"For victory's sake" England has already found herself obliged to introduce the methods of dictatorship, the primary pre-requisite for which was the renunciation by the Labour Party of any political independence whatsoever. If the international proletariat, in the form of all its organizations and tendencies, were to take to the same road, then this would only facilitate and hasten the victory of the totalitarian regime on a world scale. Under the conditions of the world proletariat renouncing independent politics, an alliance between the USSR and the imperialist democracies would signify the growth of the omnipotence of the Moscow bureaucracy, its further transformation into an agency of imperialism, and its inevitably making concessions to imperialism in the economic sphere. In all likelihood the military position of the various imperialist countries on the world arena would be greatly changed thereby; but the position of the world proletariat, from the standpoint of the tasks of the socialist revolution, would be changed very little.

Revolution Must Be Prepared For!

In order to create a revolutionary situation, say the sophists of social patriotism, it is necessary to deal Hitler a blow. To gain a victory over Hitler, it is necessary to support the imperialist democracies. But if for the sake of saving the "democracies" the proletariat renounces independent revolutionary politics, just who would utilize a revolutionary situation arising from Hitler's defeat? There has been no lack of revolutionary situations in the last quarter of a century. But there has been lacking a revolutionary party capable of utilizing a revolutionary situation. To renounce the training of a revolutionary party for the sake of provoking a "revolutionary situation" is to lead the workers blindfolded to a massacre.

From the standpoint of a revolution in one's own country the defeat of one's own imperialist government is undoubtedly a "lesser evil." Pseudo-internationalists, however, refuse to apply this principle in relation to the defeated democratic countries. In return, they interpret Hitler's victory not as a relative but as an absolute obstacle in the way of a revolution in Germany. They lie in both instances.

What the Nazis Now Face

In the defeated countries the position of the masses will immediately become worsened in the extreme. Added to social oppression is national oppression, the main burden of which is likewise borne by the workers. Of all the forms of dictatorship, the totalitarian dictatorship of a foreign conqueror is the most intolerable. At the same

time, to the extent that the Nazis will try to utilize the natural resources and the industrial machinery of the nations defeated by them, the Nazis will themselves become inevitably dependent upon the native peasants and workers. Only after the victory, do economic difficulties always begin. It is impossible to attach a soldier with a rifle to each Polish, Norwegian, Danish, Dutch, Belgian, French worker and peasant. National-socialism is without any prescription for transforming defeated peoples from foes into friends. The experience of the Germans in the Ukraine in 1918 has demonstrated how difficult it is to utilize through military methods the natural wealth and labor power of a defeated people; and how swiftly an army of occupation is demoralized in an atmosphere of universal hostility. These very same processes will develop on a far vaster scale in the European continent under Nazi occupation. One can expect with assurance the rapid transformation of all the conquered countries into powder magazines. The danger is rather this, that the explosions may occur too soon without sufficient preparation and lead to isolated defeats. It is in general impossible, however, to speak of the European and the world revolution without taking into account partial defeats.

Hitler, the conqueror, has naturally day-dreams of becoming the chief executioner of the proletarian revolution in any part of Europe. But this does not at all mean that Hitler will be strong enough to deal with the proletarian revolution as he has been able to deal with imperialist democracy. It would be a fatal blunder, unworthy of a revolutionary party, to turn Hitler into a fetish, to exaggerate his power, to overlook the objective limits of his successes and conquests. True enough, Hitler boastfully promises to establish the domination of the German people, at the expense of all Europe and even of the whole world, "for one thousand years." But in all likelihood, this splendor will not endure even for ten years.

We must learn from the lessons of the recent past. Twenty-two years ago not only the defeated countries but also the victors emerged, from the war with their economic life disrupted and were able to realize very slowly, to the extent that they realized at all, the economic advantages accruing from victory. Therefore the revolutionary movement assumed very great proportions in the countries of the victorious Entente as well. The only thing lacking was a revolutionary party capable of heading the movement.

Crisis In Germany Too!

The total, i.e., all-embracing character of the present war excludes the possibility of direct "enrichment" at the expense of the defeated countries. Even in the event of a complete victory over England, Germany in order to maintain her conquests would be compelled in the next few years to assume such economic sacrifices as would far outweigh those advantages which it might draw directly from her victories. The living conditions of the German masses must in any case worsen considerably in the next period. Million upon million of victorious soldiers will find on returning to their homeland an even more poverty-stricken home than the one from which they had been torn away by the war. A victory that lowers the living standard of the people does not strengthen a regime but weakens it. The self-confidence of the demobilized soldiers who had scored the greatest victories will have been raised in the extreme. Their betrayed hopes will turn into sharp dissatisfaction and embitterment. On the other hand, the Brown-Shirted caste will rise even higher above the people; its arbitrary rule and profligacy will provoke ever greater hostility. If in the last decade the political pendulum in Germany has, as a result of the impotence of belated democracy and the betrayal of labor parties, swung sharply to the right then, as a result of disillusion in the consequences of the war and of the Nazi regime, the pendulum will now swing even more sharply and decisively to the left. Dissatisfaction, alarm, protests, strikes, armed clashes will again be on the order of the day for Germany. Hitler will have too many worries in Berlin to be able successfully to fulfill the role of executioner in Paris, Brussels or London.

Consequently the task of the revolutionary proletariat does not consist of helping the imperialist armies create a "revolutionary situation" but of preparing, fusing and tempering its international ranks for revolutionary situations of which there will be no lack.

The new war map of Europe does not invalidate the principles of revolutionary class struggle. The Fourth International does not change its course.

'Nation' Backs GPU

(Most of the American "liberal" organs which burned their fingers by defending the Stalinist version of the Moscow trials were careful enough not to repeat their performance when the news broke of the attempted assassination of Leon Trotsky. But the weekly "Nation" did repeat its performance, publishing in its June 8 issue an article, "Mexico's Phantom Conspiracy," from its regular Mexican correspondent, Mr. Harry Block. Block said the attack "had all the earmarks of a put-up job" and was at particular pains to absolve the Stalinists.)

By LEON TROTSKY

I see that the "Nation," which bismirched itself through its attitude in regard to the Moscow judicial frame-ups, has hurried again this time to support the fantastic and stupid versions of the GPU in connection with the attack of May 24. Everyone it seems is guilty, General Almazan,

the "reaction," possibly Trotsky himself—but by no means Stalin. Meanwhile the Mexican police have uncovered the assassins. They are—by accident—agents of Stalin. . . .

What an infamous reptile breed these radicals of the "Nation"! But they will not escape their punishment: we shall teach the American workers to appreciate them as they deserve—to despise them. Coyoacan, D.F.

By JOSEPH HANSEN

Who is the author of the "Nation's" article on the attack upon Leon Trotsky? Harry Block is a citizen of the United States. His wife is Malu Cabrera, daughter of the Licenciado Luis Cabrera, a very rich and very reactionary lawyer retained by the oil companies and landlords of Yucatan. At the same time, Harry Block is a close collaborator of Lombardo Toledano, the notorious political agent of the GPU in Mexico. Harry Block is the managing editor of "Futuro," the foul, slan-

derous monthly of Lombardo Toledano. He is also the head of the publishing department of the Stalinist Universidad Obrera. Under orders of the CTM he publishes a special weekly bulletin, "Mexican Labor News," distributed free in the United States.

In the inner staff of Lombardo Toledano the "authority" of Harry Block is based upon the fact that he is considered the agent of the Soviet Embassy in Washington in relations with the CTM. The head of the Soviet agency in Washington is Oumansky, who made his diplomatic career as an agent of the GPU. Consequently Harry Block is the confidential go-between for two agents of the GPU, Oumansky and Lombardo Toledano. No wonder that Harry Block defended the dirty theory of "self-assault" in the pages of such a prostituted magazine as the "Nation."

Meantime the majority of the assailants have been apprehended. All are members of the Communist Party and agents of the GPU. They are the colleagues of Oumansky, Lombardo Toledano, and Harry Block. It will be interesting to learn the reaction of the "Nation's" editorial board now.

June 18, 1940

Rumania Move May Herald Stalin's Policy Switch

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

Taking advantage of Hitler and Mussolini's pre-occupation with their task of dealing a knockout blow to the British Empire, Stalin demanded and obtained the return of Bessarabia, the province which Rumania had seized from the Soviet Union in 1918. The fact that together with Bessarabia Stalin obtained the northern part of Bukovina is almost conclusive evidence that his demands were motivated by a desire to prepare defensive positions against the attack which everyone expects Hitler to launch against the Soviet Union as soon as he is through with or as soon as he makes peace with England.

If it is true that Stalin is also demanding control of the mouth of the Danube it would only strengthen the theory that he is trying to seize as many defensive positions as he possibly can while the seizing is good. To gain control of the Danubian estuary would be bearing Hitler in his den.

Did Hitler know of and acquiesce in Stalin's actions? Speculation is rife as to whether there was an agreement between the two permitting Stalin to take Bessarabia and Bukovina, or whether the latter took what he wanted without asking his "friend" Hitler.

The statement issued by the German Legation in Bucharest to the effect that the occupation of Bessarabia was instigated by Cripps, the British ambassador to Moscow, and was nothing but a British trick to involve the Balkans in the war, conflicts with the attitude of the Berlin officials, which is, that the whole matter is one entirely between the Soviet Union and Rumania. The inference of this difference between Bucharest and Berlin is that Stalin acted without as much as notifying Hitler. This inference is strengthened by the haste with which the Germans in the occupied territories made their exit.

But the answer to the question as to what extent the move into Rumania was made by Stalin with the knowledge and consent of Hitler does not affect its defensive character, that is, that primarily it constitutes a further preparation of Stalin to defend himself against Hitler. The sudden despatch of tens of thousands of troops into Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia a few weeks ago was clear evidence that Hitler's phenomenal success has Stalin considerably worried.

It is the defensive aspect of the move by Stalin, as against Hitler, that will keep the petty-bourgeois democrats of all varieties from going into hysterics and demanding either that the "democracies" take strong action against the Soviet Union or else that the Bessarabian workers take up arms against the Red Army.

When Stalin sent the Red Army into Finland it constituted an invasion of a "small democratic nation" and the petty-bourgeois democrats reacted so violently that they were willing to take up arms to help defeat the Red Army. Some also claimed an intention to use their arms against the Finnish army, but all were for the defeat of the Red Army.

But the petty-bourgeois democrats cannot get all heated up about Rumania as they did about Finland. Although a small country it can hardly be classed as a democracy. We can therefore expect that the "democracies" of all types, while ceremoniously referring to their theory of Stalinist imperialism and of the partnership between Hitler and Stalin to divide the British Empire if not the whole world will, however not raise much of a howl—all of which indicates the democratic roots of their opposition to the Soviet Union.

As for us we shall continue to state that a workers' state has a right and a duty to take advantage of the conflicts and difficulties of the imperialist world in order to extend its base and strengthen its defensive positions. And we shall continue to attack the bureaucratic methods of the bureaucracy of the degenerated workers' state when these methods alienate the sympathies of the working masses and thus nullify the gains made by virtue of the acquisition of territory and defensive outposts. To the Bessarabian workers and peasants we say: Join your brothers in the Soviet Union in the struggle against imperialism and against the Stalinist bureaucracy.

And it becomes clearer with the passing of every day that all of the defensive positions acquired by Stalin cannot possibly compensate for his crime in entering into the pact with Hitler. He thereby not only lost the support of millions of workers who considered the Soviet Union as the champion of the struggle against fascism but he also enabled Hitler to gain complete control over Europe, making certain of an attack by him on the Soviet Union without the slightest fear of any interference by France.

The factor of contending imperialist states on the European scene, a factor of tremendous importance to the safety of the Soviet Union, has been wiped out by the pact and by the consequent victory of Hitler.

That Stalin realizes the danger of his situation is evidenced not only by his movement of troops but by a more or less clearly-indicated change of line on the part of the Stalinist parties, a change of line that has a meaning only if Stalin is cautiously preparing a shift towards the "democracies." For the past two months or so the Stalinists have been attacking German imperialism as well as Allied imperialism and now they have launched a campaign against the Munich men in the English cabinet and for a people's government to continue the struggle against Hitler.

It may not be long before the Stalinists will discover that there has been such a change in the constitution of the English government that to support the "democracies" against Hitler will become the sacred duty of the working masses.

NOT SAID NOW

"War brings many collateral disasters. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, suffer. We think we shall be wiser and cooler the next time, if there is one; and we shan't."—Editorial, *New York Times*, August 9, 1929.

Says Raymond Clapper: "We are in a most serious crisis. We do not know at what moment Japan will strike at the Netherlands East Indies, and menace our supply of rubber and tin. If that action comes, we shall have to decide at once, within a few hours, whether to fight or to accept a Munich in the Far East." Step right up, boys, who'll be the first damfool to risk his skin for some rubber and tin?