

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. IV, No. 30 Saturday, July 27, 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—\$80-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.

That 'Anti-War' Plank

Promises in the platforms of the Republican or Democratic Parties are not made to be observed. They are inserted for the purpose of capturing votes before elections and are ignored or entirely forgotten after elections. It is, therefore, the rule that no exceedingly great care is taken in the formulation of those promises.

Roosevelt and his coterie of New Dealers, however, tend to follow the rule that it is best to be careful in the wording of their promises. A promise not to involve the United States in war is absolutely essential in order to get the support of large numbers of workers who are definitely opposed to the participation of this country in the European war. Their opposition is not necessarily based on a thorough understanding of the nature of the war now raging in Europe, or of the role that the United States would play in such a war. It is based on hatred and fear of suffering and death, perfectly legitimate feelings in the masses who are compelled to die for a cause that they feel is not their's.

It is interesting to observe how careful Roosevelt and his supporters have been to formulate their policy with reference to a possible entry of the United States into the war, or to a possible shipment of American troops to participate in the fighting across the Atlantic.

Last week we commented on the carefully phrased sentence by which Roosevelt wanted to impress everybody with the belief that he would under no circumstances send an army to Europe. His promise was contained in the following sentence: "We will not send men to take part in European War." As we showed in our editorial last week, this sentence, does not at all constitute a promise not to send armed forces to Europe.

Evidently the ambiguity of the sentence struck many people besides ourselves. Suspicion was aroused at the phrase and "isolationist" demagogues of Senator Wheeler's type took advantage of the ambiguity of the phraseology to demand that a more specific promise be inserted in the platform of the Democratic Party. In view of the attempt of the Republican Party to characterize the Democratic Party as a war party the politicians of the Democratic Party saw a chance to turn the tables on the Republicans. They would insert a statement in their platform which would not only satisfy the "isolationists" but confound the Republicans.

Thereupon the Democrats inserted the following in their platform: "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our army, navy or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of an attack."

That sounds explicit enough, does it not? But please note the phrase "except in case of attack."

Now all good people know that the American capitalists have never attacked anybody and never intend to attack anybody. All good people know that the American capitalists and other capitalists never wage an offensive war, only a defensive war. No capitalists ever do any attacking. In view of that we can rest assured that whenever Roosevelt or his successor will deem it advisable to send armed forces to Europe it will be done because Germany attacked the United States, not because American capitalism has decided to attempt to destroy its imperialist rival before it got too powerful. That will be the story as the American capitalists will tell it.

Conclusive evidence that our interpretation of the foreign policy section of the Democratic plat-

form is correct can be found in the fact that Henry L. Hopkins, personal representative of the president to the Democratic convention was able to make the following comment on that section of the platform: "There is nothing in the foreign policy plank which changes by one jot or tittle the foreign policy of the president and the secretary of state. I refer not only to the present policy but future policy."

In addition, the president himself found it necessary to state in his acceptance speech that he intends to follow the same policy that he followed before the convention.

That Senator Wheeler and his "isolationist" brethren were satisfied with the plank in the platform does not mean therefore, that the plank contains any important change from the previous policy. It simply means that the "isolationists" and pacifists are ready to support the war machine of Roosevelt on condition only that he accept their phrasing. The class conscious American worker will take it for granted that American capitalism either under Roosevelt or under Willkie is preparing for war against Hitler's Germany if the British Empire should succumb to Hitler's attack. They take it for granted that war is inevitable unless the American workers can stop it by their own action.

Profitable Patriotism

An editorial entitled "The Chance of a Lifetime", in the July 6 *Business Week*, takes this month's prize for plain, unadulterated, fancy and all other kinds of sheer gall. It demands nothing less than that all corporations working on "national defense" orders for the government shall, for their patriotic services, in addition to payments for their orders, be paid TWICE the amount of capital these patriots have put up.

The government is already making arrangements to pay back to the corporations the full amount of the capital they invest. This is being done by allowing the corporations, in making annual tax returns, to charge off as a special depreciation allowance TWENTY PER CENT of the capital cost of all plant expansion. In other words, in five years, the corporations will have received in tax exemptions the full amount of the capital they have invested. They'll have the plants at the end of that time for nothing, paid for by the government.

But that's being paid only once for their patriotism. That's not enough, says *Business Week*. "By itself, a special depreciation tax allowance is insufficient reason for going ahead with construction of a plant to make munitions." (Incidentally, notice that cold-blooded tone; we always thought they wanted to make munitions because they were patriots.) *Business Week* therefore demands—not as a substitute for special depreciation tax allowances but in addition to those allowances—a system of "charging this rapid depreciation or obsolescence into the cost of the goods they produce for the government. Here again," *Business Week* continues, "the President can work wonders for new investment in plant and equipment by making it possible for the Army and Navy to include in the price they pay for their needs a prorated share of the cost of new construction."

That system would certainly work wonders. Put up a million dollars for a plant. Get "normal" profits on government orders. In addition charge off the cost of the entire plant from your tax returns in five years. In addition add to the regular profits on your bill to the government the cost of the entire plant once again. "It's the chance of a lifetime for a President", concludes *Business Week*. It certainly is!

Third Term Tripe

The Republicans were singularly unfortunate in the way their "anti-third term revolt" got under way. The lame duck Senator from Nebraska, Burke, with whose name is associated the peace-time compulsory conscription bill now before Congress, with whose name is associated the most reactionary attacks in the Senate against the labor movement, and who will never live down his warm praise of Hitler upon returning from Germany in 1938—that was scarcely the right man to make the first bolt from the Democratic party on the ground that the third term leads to dictatorship.

The third term issue is tripe. A third term for the president of the United States is no more heinous than a third term for the president of the U.S. Steel. No sensible worker, for example, ever votes against a candidate for president of his union because the man has already served two terms. If his union leaders are carrying out a progressive program he will continue them in leadership as long as they will serve.

The case against Roosevelt is his reactionary program. Those who are opposing him on the third term issue can scarcely claim to represent a less reactionary program. It is the story of Tweedle-dum and Tweedledee.

Precisely because there are no basic differences between the contending Democratic and Republican programs, they must fight each other for control of the pork barrel on such cooked-up issues as the third term. Roosevelt's "answer" to the third term issue, that he personally is indispensable, is just as fraudulent as the issue he opposes.

Had the trade union leaders of the CIO and AFL done their elementary duty and launched a Labor Party against both capitalist parties, that party would not have needed to spend a moment on the third term issue. There would have been a clear issue: capitalist parties versus a party of the workers' organizations.

Stand On War and USSR
Taken By Chinese Section

Resolution Blasts Those Who Will Not Defend the USSR

Regarding the question of the war and the USSR which has been discussed in our International and particularly in the American section, the Communist League of China, following its own discussion and a careful study of the controversial documents received from other sections, places on record the following position and opinions:

1. THE QUESTION OF THE WAR: We consider that the thesis "War and the Fourth International" adopted by the International Secretariat in 1934 remains correct in principle. The actual development of the present war confirms, in its fundamental course, the analyses and predictions made in that document. Certain events, such as the actual grouping of the warring camps (e. g. Stalin's alliance with the German imperialists) were not predicted, but this does not in any way invalidate the principled position put forward in the thesis.

The character of the second world war, as correctly defined by our thesis and other important documents during the past ten years, is a war of rival imperialist powers, that is, a war for the redivision of the world in accordance with the new correlation of forces among the imperialists. But here it is essential to keep in mind the point that the USSR, occupying one-sixth of the earth's surface, is among the objects to be divided. It is one of the main objects.

The antagonism between the USSR and the imperialist powers, which in the class and sociological sense is the most fundamental in the contemporary world, has been modified to some extent by the degeneration of the USSR under the Stalin regime, and at the present time is overshadowed by the mighty conflict between the imperialists themselves. But it would be a criminal mistake to conclude from this that imperialist military intervention against the USSR has been removed from the order of the day. In our opinion the inter-relationship between the imperialist war and the coming anti-Soviet war, as formulated in Section 2 of the thesis ("USSR and the Imperialist War"), continues to correspond with reality. A statement by the Minority section of the American party, attributing to Comrade Trotsky the assertion that "the present war is an anti-Soviet war", is a gross untruth. Nowhere can we find any such statement in the recent writings of Comrade Trotsky.

For Defense of the USSR

2. THE QUESTION OF THE USSR: It is true that the war requires us to pay the closest attention to every change occurring within the USSR, so that we may check our policy from time to time. But up to now, in the opinion of the Chinese Section, no change has taken place of such significance as to warrant a modification of our policy of unconditional defense of the USSR. In support of this contention, we advance the following reasons:

(a) There is no fundamental difference between the Stalin-Hitler, alliance of today and the Stalin-Laval pact of yesterday. Stalin's invasion of small states on the western border of the USSR is motivated by the same consideration which yesterday impelled him to relinquish old territories in the Far East (Chinese Eastern Railway, Amur River Islands)—namely to avoid a major war.

(b) From the sudden adoption by Stalin of the methods of military aggression, the Minority of the American section concludes that Soviet external policy is now one of "bureaucratic expansionism" or imperialism and that Soviet economy has fallen into a dilemma which poses the alternative: "Expand or Die!" For this reason, the Minority has abandoned the policy of unconditional defense of the USSR. In our opinion their observations are utterly erroneous and superficial. The mere fact that Stalin has leapt from his formula, "We don't want an inch of others' territory," to a policy of military seizures, does not warrant a change in our attitude toward the USSR. As formerly we refused to see in Stalin's policy of conservative preservation of the status quo the triumph of socialism in a single country, so now we refuse to regard Soviet military seizures as evidence of a new policy of "bureaucratic expansionism." Both purely defensive wars and "wars of aggression" are juridical and moral categories of the bourgeoisie. They cannot replace the sociological and political definitions of the Soviet state.

The mere fact of "aggression" does not suffice to prove that the USSR has an economic need for expansion. Would it be correct to say that the Soviet attacks on Poland and Georgia in 1920, the inclusion of Outer Mongolia in the sphere of influence of the USSR in 1923, and the decision to hold the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1924 were expressions of an economic necessity to "expand or die?" Or on the contrary: Can we say that Stalin's policy coincided with the principles of "socialism in one country" when he sold the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1933 and abandoned the Amur River islands to Japan some time later?

Changes in form, when they surpass a certain degree, mean also a change in content. Quantity passes into quality. But the latest changes in the form of Kremlin policy—from one of concessions to one of aggressions—have not changed the character of the Soviet State. Nationalized property still remains. Although terribly exploited and distorted by the bureaucracy, this great gain of the October Revolution can be regenerated and become a mighty fortress of world socialism. Revolutionary militants of the IV International are therefore still bound to give unconditional defense to the USSR.

Cite Chinese Experience

3. THE SOVIET-FINNISH WAR: For the reasons given above we took the position of defense of the USSR in the Soviet-Finnish war.

Just as we are uncompromising opponents of Stalin's entire reactionary policy, so we did not support the invasion of Finland, which was part and parcel of that policy. But we are active revolutionists and it was therefore not sufficient to condemn the invasion of Finland. When the Red Army, dominated by Stalin's reactionary policy, becomes involved in a war with a bourgeois state, we can no longer confine ourselves to criticism and condemnation. We then have to weigh the question which is the most favorable outcome for the workers' state and the whole revolutionary movement: Defeat or victory for the Red Army? There is but one answer for a revolutionist. We must become real defenders of the USSR and place ourselves in the same camp with the Red Army.

It is necessary in many cases to distinguish between political confidence and support and military action. In China we fight side by side with the armies of Chiang Kai-shek and the Stalinists against the Japanese imperialists, but we have never extended an ounce of support to the Kuomintang or the Chinese Communist Party, whose policies we have never ceased criticizing. The mistake of the American Minority, it seems to us, lies in their refusal to distinguish between political confidence and military support.

Question of Progressive Wars

4. ECONOMIC SYSTEMS AND THE NATURE OF WARS: The nature of a war between two states is mainly determined by the economic and social systems which prevail in the belligerent countries. This does not mean that one should unite all historical-economic systems in a single schema, and then establish which are progressive and which reactionary according to their place in the historical sequence. In the present epoch there are only two antagonistic economic systems: dying capitalism and the embryo of socialism (USSR). So far as there are backward economic systems found in certain countries, none of them play any independent role. If a country with such a backward system conducts a war, the nature of the war must be determined by the object it fights against. If the war is directed against an imperialist power, then it is progressive (e. g., China against Japan, Abyssinia against Italy, India against Britain), for it will, if successful, clear the road for development of the productive forces in the backward country itself, and will, whether successful or not, weaken imperialism. On the contrary, a war by a backward country against a land which has abolished private property is wholly reactionary (e. g., China's war against the USSR in 1929), for the backward country acts as a tool of imperialism. On this whole question the Minority have gone wrong because of their schematism and mechanical thinking.

Anti-Soviet Minority Aids Imperialists

5. ON THE QUESTION OF THE THIRD CAMP: We are advocates of the building of the "Third Camp" only in this sense: that we take a defeatist position with regard to both the "democratic" and fascist imperialist camps in the present war. But we will never consider ourselves in a third camp with regard to the antagonism and coming war between the USSR and the imperialists. The conception of the "Third Camp" advanced by the Minority in America identifies the USSR with the Stalinist bureaucracy and Nazi imperialism with the Soviet regime. This shameful confusion of things that should not be confused can only render service to the war camp of the "democratic" imperialists.

The Fourth Internationalists cannot take a defeatist position with regard to the USSR today, when Hitler is in alliance with Stalin, nor tomorrow when Stalin may ally himself with the British and French imperialists to fight Hitler. The Minority position, carried to its logical conclusion, means that no defense of the USSR is possible unless and until the USSR is completely isolated, without any imperialist allies, and falls victim to aggression. No more ridiculous position could be imagined for one calling himself a Marxist revolutionist.

6. ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL: Having read all the documents of both factions of the SWP and having heard a verbal report by Comrade S (a visiting member of the Minority), the Communist League of China has concluded that the discussion which preceded the SWP convention, and the discussion in the convention itself, were conducted in full keeping with the principles of party democracy. Complaints of "bureaucratic methods" advanced by the Minority seem to us quite insufficient to justify the action of the Minority in splitting the party.

In view of the extraordinary circumstances brought about by the war and the split, we endorse the proposal of the American, Canadian, and Mexican sections for the convocation of a Pan-American Conference, with representation from other sections if possible, in order to elect a new executive body for the Fourth International. With the hope that the loyal elements of the Minority may be won back, we also propose that the Minority be invited to send delegates to the conference.

COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF CHINA
(Section of the IV International)

By (signed) S. S. P.

Shanghai, June 10, 1940.

Yes, the French
Popular Front
Was Responsible

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

In attempting to explain the miserable debacle of the French army the reactionary press in America points to the Peoples Front regime under Blum as the factor mainly responsible. Over and over again the editorials of that press attempt to show that the decrease of production during the period of the Blum regime placed France at a tremendous disadvantage in comparison with Germany as far as the production of armaments is concerned.

The increase in wages and the reduction in the number of hours of work under the Peoples Front, are, according to the capitalist press, the main factors that led to the defeat of the French army.

Naturally the capitalists and their apologists have a definite purpose in mind in their insistence that responsibility for the defeat of France be placed at the door of the Peoples Front regime. If the social gains acquired by the French workers during that regime are responsible for the defeat, then it follows that the American workers should be willing in this moment of danger to American capitalism to surrender whatever social gains they have made recently.

The Wagner Act, the Wages and Hours Law, the Walsh-Healy act must be wiped off the statute books or at least modified to an extent that they will not interfere with national defense. Higher wages and shorter hours will lead the working class right into the clutches of Hitler. So runs the refrain of those who begrudge the slightest gain made by the working class.

Quite in keeping with the patriotism of the employing class there has, as yet, not appeared any demand for capital to sacrifice or even to limit its profits. On the contrary the writing, into one of the acts of Congress, of a provision for the limitation of profits to a bare eight percent was the signal for strenuous objections on the ground that such a limitation would injure the cause of national defense. How? Because it would take away the incentive for the owners of industry to produce the maximum possible.

But why should a reduction in wages not take away the incentive of the workers to produce? That's different. The workers' incentive must be patriotism and if that is not sufficient, hunger is also an incentive and a little (or a lot) of force can be exerted as an additional incentive. One standard for the capitalists and another for the working class is perfectly logical for a government representing the interests of the capitalist class.

The Real Crime of The Peoples Front

It is quite true that the Popular Front of the Socialists, Communists and Radical Socialists (just plain liberals, representing the big capitalists) is responsible for the plight of the French workers at the present moment. Not because it made concessions to the workers by raising wages and shortening hours; but because it acted as a brake upon the movement of the masses towards taking over complete power in France.

When in 1936 the French workers seized the factories it was as clear as daylight that the social revolution was on the order of the day. The workers were ready, willing and anxious to go ahead and complete the job of doing away with the rule of the 200 families. With any kind of leadership an almost bloodless revolution could have been consummated.

This was not to be however. The Socialist party tied as it was to the capitalist order, was unwilling and unable to lead. The Communist party tied to the foreign policy of Stalin (who at that time looked to the democratic imperialists for salvation against Hitler), could not possibly furnish the necessary leadership. And both of these parties were united with the Radical Socialists openly devoted to the interests of the capitalist class. That party was led by Daladier who later took the initiative in smashing the Communist party.

The capitalists at that time were more than willing to sign the Matignon agreement granting the 40 hour week and a raise in wages. They were more than willing to lose a little in order to consolidate their forces for the inevitable counter attack.

Knaves and fools pointed to the "victory" of the workers as evidence that the Popular Front could stop fascism.

But the counter attack was not long in coming. Under the leadership of Daladier, the darling of the Popular Frontists, the gains were all taken away. The reactionary forces became bolder and ever bolder. The war and the defeat enabled them to take complete control.

What a different story we would have if the French workers had not followed the leadership of the Popular Front. A workers' revolution in France would have meant a workers' revolution in Spain followed inevitably by a revolutionary movement of the German workers. The policies of the Popular Front enabled France to gain power in Spain and enabled Hitler to conquer France.

Both from the point of view of the capitalists and of the working class the Popular Front bears the main responsibility for the victory of Hitler. From the point of view of the capitalists it meant the necessity of operating under the disadvantage of a 40 hour week as compared with the sixty hour week of the German workers. Production undoubtedly was interfered with from the capitalist point of view.

The American capitalists are heeding that lesson. They want to fight Hitler with his methods.

The American workers must also learn the lesson of France. For us the Popular Front is to blame not because it gained concessions but because it used those concessions as a means to stop the further advance of the workers. The Popular Front was the first step in saving capitalism and the victory of fascism was the second step.

The lesson for the American workers is clear: Get all the concessions you can but do not stop there. Go on to complete victory by organizing a workers' government.