

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV, No. 32 Saturday, August 10, 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, 1917.

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.

Who Is Responsible?

The United Auto Workers Union convention adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution condemning "the brutal dictatorships of Germany, Italy, Russia and Japan." For the inclusion of Russia in this list the real responsibility rests upon the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union.

It is the Kremlin dictator and his fellow bureaucrats both within and without the Soviet Union who have created a situation where the average worker not trained in Marxist thinking can see no difference between Hitler Germany and the Soviet Union.

Naturally we do not in the least forget the abominable role played by the leaders of the Convention, who together with other "democrats" are quite willing to play around with the Stalinists so long as the "democratic" capitalists are on friendly terms with Stalin, but turn against the Soviet Union when Stalin stops playing ball with the "democracies". We can rest assured that these trade union leaders will always be in the camp of the ruling clique of "democratic" capitalism.

We heard no squawk coming from these leaders when Stalin was murdering all the old revolutionists. At that particular time Stalin was still in the good graces of the ruling cliques in the democratic imperialist countries.

Nevertheless, it must be recognized that to the average rank and file delegate it appears that the Soviet Union and Germany and Italy are all in the same class. The propaganda of the Stalinists can hardly fool them into believing that there is democracy in the Soviet Union. All the lies emanating from Stalinist sources cannot conceal the fact that there is not the slightest democracy in the Soviets, in the trade unions or in the ruling "party" in the Soviet Union.

The trade union leader who wants the support of the Stalinists can conveniently forget the existence of huge concentration camps where tens of thousands of the most militant workers in the Soviet Union are tortured by Stalin's GPU, but he can bring that to the attention of the rank and file whenever he thinks it will serve his purposes.

Can the Stalinist leaders with all their fantastic lying conceal from the workers the fact that there is now a close tie-up between Stalin and Hitler? Can they conceal from the workers the despicable role Stalin has played in permitting the most vicious enemy of the working masses to gain control of all of Europe?

It would indeed be a miracle if the average worker would fall for the Stalinist propaganda under such circumstances, where every worker can see that Stalin has been of the greatest help to Hitler.

Only the most advanced workers trained in Marxist thinking can see that the Soviet Union is something different from the Stalinist regime, just as a trade union is something different from its corrupt and bureaucratic leadership. It is not easy for the advanced worker to convince the average worker that there is a difference between the political apparatus of the Soviet Union, which is identical with the political system of Hitler, and the economic base which consists of nationalized economy gained by the victorious October Revolution.

Stalin's despotism makes it difficult for us to distinguish the Soviet Union from the fascist capitalist countries but the fundamental distinction does exist and we shall do our utmost to educate the workers so that they can see that distinction.

How often have we proclaimed that the greatest enemy of the Soviet Union is the Stalinist bureaucracy, which by its acts destroys the confidence of the workers in the Soviet Union as a workers' state. When a powerful and progressive union like the United Automobile Workers can

place the Soviet Union in the same category as Germany and Italy and Japan it should be clear to everybody that the greatest enemy of the Soviet Union is the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The lesson is the same that we have been teaching for years. To defend the Soviet Union it is necessary to destroy the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Poor Aren't Paytriot

There are 72 million poor people in this country, but it's un-American to be poor. Most of these people have been on relief at one time or another during these last eleven years of economic crisis, and if they also happened to be non-citizens, the fact that they have been on relief bars them from citizenship. This is the opinion of Supreme Court Justice Nathan O. Lapham of New York State who, on July 22 at Rochester, denied citizenship to six applicants who were on relief. That, said the judge, showed they were not "attached to the principles of the Constitution." This is only the latest of an increasing number of such incidents.

We think the judges who came to the conclusion that poverty-stricken people don't make good patriots are quite right in their own way. Those who have no stake in this vile economic system may very likely turn against it. Those who have only their chains to lose may soon seek to win a new world of socialism.

But the judges, if they want to complete their job, cannot stop with preventing aliens from becoming citizens. They must go on to disfranchise all naturalized and native citizens on relief. But that's only the beginning. The sharecroppers and agricultural workers of the South and California, for instance, have less to live on than many relief clients in some of the Northern cities. Off with their citizenship! And of course WPA workers (who must now be citizens) live on about the same scale as many workers in private industry. Some point therefore should be fixed—say, \$15 a week—and anyone earning below that should be stripped of his citizenship. Moreover, a man earning \$20 a week who has a wife and two children dependent on him is obviously worse off than a single man earning \$14 a week; so some table should be worked out whereby a man earning a certain amount should be dropped from the citizenship rolls if he has more than a certain number of dependents.

Of course, to be really logical, the judges would have to turn into non-citizens about 72 million poor people. That would have its dangers. It would make so plain the distinction between masters and slaves!

On second thought, therefore, we think the judges will reconsider and let those aliens on relief become citizens. What does it matter, after all, if they are allowed to vote once in four years for a president of the United States? If it makes them feel they really decide who is president, it's very useful to the capitalists to let the masses vote.

GPU-Made News

El Popular, the Mexico City daily which the Stalinists control through Lombardo Toledano (so much so that he was compelled to delete from its masthead the statement it formerly carried that it was the organ of the Mexican Confederation of Labor), prints in its July 27 issue an article entitled: "Rapprochement Between the United States and the USSR."

This is big news, indeed. Under a Washington date-line it reports: "It is considered that the American government is disposed to get together with the USSR, for various reasons; for counter-acting the Japanese policy in the Orient, for the decisive influence that the USSR could have in the European war, and for the commercial needs of the United States, now that European markets are closed to it."

There is, of course, no sign of such a trend in Washington. Is this story another Stalin "feeler" toward the United States? Mexico is being used for a number of such moves. After joining the Stalinists last August in the hasty switch from "collective security" to pro-Hitler "neutrality", Toledano has recently been permitted to make a pro-Ally speech, without one word of criticism from his Stalinist allies. Is the stage being set for a new Stalin turn?

That turn is not here by a long way; Molotov's speech showed that, with its fawning toward Hitler. In his statement on Molotov's speech which we print in this issue, Trotsky suggests another function of these "feelers" toward the democracies: to soothe the Stalinist agents in the democracies who got along so well with the capitalists in the "Peoples Front" period and who are now smarting under the blows they are receiving as allies of Hitler. By these "feelers" hope is held out to them that they will shortly be able to live in peace again with their "own" capitalists.

This function of the Stalinist "feelers" does not, of course, rule out the likelihood, indeed a certainty, that Stalin will be desperately seeking rapprochement with the United States when Hitler settles with Britain and turns eastward again. None of Stalin's recent gains solve his problem. For he is the problem, he and his bureaucracy; they have so weakened the Soviet Union that the possibility of any attack hangs like a nightmare over the Kremlin. Externally, the chief defense of the Soviet Union, the support of the world working class, has been shattered by Stalin's crimes; internally, the initiative of the Soviet peoples has been destroyed by the totalitarian regime.

Trotsky Nails Talk Of Almazan "Plot"

Editor, Herald Tribune
New York City, N. Y.
Sir:

In the July 25 issue of the Herald Tribune an article was published, telephoned from Mexico City by Mr. Jack O'Brine, quoting declarations made by a certain Cesar Ortiz, "Foreign editor of Mexico's leading labor newspaper, 'Popular,'" to sixty American educators visiting Mexico, of a "conspiracy" between me and General Juan Andreu Almazan to establish a "fascist regime south of the Rio Grande" and later in the United States in the event that I were admitted to that country. Mr. Cesar Ortiz, according to the report in the Herald Tribune, added that the Mexican authorities are investigating this "conspiracy" allegedly organized with the financial help of Hitler and Mussolini; that is, the German and Italian allies of Stalin.

Your readers no doubt are intelligent enough to discern the source of this dirty, arrogant, and stupid falsification. The source is specified by three letters: GPU.

As for Mr. Cesar Ortiz, I do not know anything about him. But I can admit that he really exists and directs what is called the "foreign" policy of "El Popular". On July 2, before the Mexican courts, I reaffirmed that this paper is a semi-official organ of the GPU; that in all questions of interest to Stalin it supports the politics of the GPU; that it invariably defends the crimes of the GPU and propagates all the falsifications and slanders which the GPU spreads against the enemies of Stalin; that if—after a long period of defending Hitler—"El Popular" today defends "democracy" it does so under direct orders from the GPU and in the interest of some temporary need of Stalin.

In view of the fact that the perpetrators of the assault against me, and particularly the murderers of Robert Sheldon Harte, (Trotsky's secretary) are agents of the GPU and members of the Comintern; that the editors of "El Popular" were moral accomplices in the preparation of the May 24 assault and in the attempts to cover up the crime; that these facts are being placed before the court by me with all the necessary exactitude; and in view of the fact that the friends of the GPU and the inspirers of "El Popular" happen to be deeply compromised, the secret police of Stalin, its agents and friends including evidently Cesar Ortiz whom I do not know, are making desperate attempts to block the judicial investigation and to terrorize me in order to prevent further revelations concerning the criminal activity of the GPU on the American continent. All these attempts are in vain, I will carry my work through to the end.

In order to give my denial of the assertions reported in the Herald Tribune all the necessary completeness I add:

(a) I have never had either direct or indirect connections with the internal politics of Mexico, in particular the recent election campaign.

(b) I do not have the honor of knowing General Juan Andreu Almazan. I have never had either direct or indirect relations with him in particular nor with any of the outstanding figures in general in any of the political camps of Mexico.

(c) I do not have and could not have any motive to create any difficulties for the government of the only country which granted me its hospitality.

(d) The assertions reported by your correspondent represent not an isolated fact but part of a campaign which has been uninterruptedly and systematically conducted against me under the direction and with the financial assistance of the GPU.

(e) I reserve the right to sue Mr. Cesar Ortiz for the malicious slanders he has made against me in the interests of the GPU.

LEON TROTSKY

July 27, 1940
Coyoacan, D. F.

ORTIZ RETREATS; DENIES HE WAS QUOTED CORRECTLY

MEXICO CITY, July 29—Today's "El Popular", Stalinist-controlled organ, publishes a letter by Cesar Ortiz in which he denies responsibility for the remarks attributed to him by the New York Herald Tribune, accusing Trotsky of plotting with Almazan. Trotsky having confronted Ortiz with the Herald Tribune article here, where Ortiz' charge could not stand for a moment, Ortiz had to retreat.

It is his "opinion," says Ortiz, that "the members of the Fourth International in Mexico are linked to the Almazanist and reactionary elements, and are conducting a work of disruption and confusion among the workers and peasants of the country. In the talk that I gave before the group, 'Seminary in Mexico,' I limited myself to giving this interpretation and to indicating the provocative character—for the revolutionary regime of President Cardenas—that the Trotsky 'case' has had.

"I am not responsible for the sensationalist forms which the Herald Tribune may have wished to give this simple and known reference."

HAVANA PARLEY FAILED TO MEET HEMISPHERE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

By SAM MARCY

Now that the Havana Conference is over, all sections of the American bourgeoisie are busily engaged in drawing a balance sheet of its results and accomplishments.

All sections of the bourgeoisie are in accord that the menace of Nazi economic penetration, real as well as feigned, must be vigorously combated by force if necessary.

All are agreed that henceforth the Caribbean sea must become a strictly American lake, that the long string of islands stretching from the Bahamas off the coast of Florida, to Trinidad off Venezuela, must pass into the hands of Yankee imperialism, by payment if needs must—in the form of a mark-off for French and British defaulted war debts!

And if there is still any room for further exploitation of Latin American markets, the United States should extend its beneficent hand—with money in the form of loans, supported by good and sufficient collateral security!

And if Latin America can absorb American manufactured products, shut out from the European markets by the Imperialist War, then by all means, the Roosevelt government should help create the facilities necessary for the marketing of these finished products. And above all, the solid "democratic" bonds, which are common to all Americans such as Batista, Vargas, Senator Reynolds and Martin Dies, must be strengthened.

THEY RUN UP AGAINST SOME HARD FACTS

Upon all of these things, all sections of the American bourgeoisie are in perfect accord. But all of this unanimity cannot hide the most burning contradictions within world imperialist economy, cannot hide the fact that Latin America is primarily an agrarian and raw material "supplement" to industrial Europe and partially to the United States, that Europe and Latin America are component elements of a blind anarchical system of economy each of which produces at its own risk the products needed by the other, but never being in a position to adapt itself to the demands of the other.

The fact that both Latin America and the United States both suffer from the same capitalist disease of overproduction, in the sphere of cotton, wheat, corn, cereals, oil and others, while Europe

is on the verge of starvation for lack of these products, illustrates once again the law of the growing disproportion between the main branches of capitalist economy, between industry and agriculture.

Latin America must be in a position to export its agricultural products to countries which need them (Europe). The United States can only absorb them to a very small extent, and what is more, it is afflicted with the same malady as is Latin America: it has huge surpluses of agricultural products, which it can only dispose of in Europe or Asia.

WHY THE FARMERS AREN'T PLEASED

Agricultural capitalists in the United States, or to be more specific, the Middle Western agrarian interests, are in sharp competition with Latin America in the sale of the same products.

What then, is this talk by Roosevelt of empowering the United States Import and Export Bank to loan Latin America \$500,000,000 to help them sell their agricultural products? Isn't it enough, cry the Western farmers, that we have to meet such sharp competition from Latin America without Washington helping them to undersell us, with a subsidy paid by American taxpayers?

But it is not in answer to your interests, that I make this proposal, Roosevelt would answer if he were truthful. It is in the interest of powerful industrialists and financiers who have invested billions of dollars in Latin American railroads, telephone companies, public utilities, oil refineries and merchant vessels, that Roosevelt makes this proposal.

These billions of dollars will bring no premiums to the coupon clippers in Wall Street, unless Latin America can export its products. Thus if Brazil does not export its cotton, it does not use the American-owned railroads in Brazil, uses less electric power, less telephones, less merchant vessels. As a matter of fact, and not merely as an illustration, American investments in Latin American industry have brought constantly diminishing returns, as a result of the catastrophic drop in Latin America's export trade.

Thus the Roosevelt government prefers to help the finance capitalists who have investments in Latin America rather than the agrarian interests of the Middle-

STRUGGLE BETWEEN FARMERS AND FINANCE PICTURED

The struggle between the finance capitalists and the agrarian interests of the middle West was graphically and dramatically illustrated in the Senate Banking Committee during the consideration of the Wagner Bill providing for an increase in lending powers of another \$500,000,000 in order to cover loans to Latin America.

Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones, representing the finance capitalists, was explaining the purposes of the bill and came to the part wherein he stated that the United States would help Latin America export more wool and hides, even into the United States. He was immediately cut short by Senator Fraizer, of North Dakota, who said, "We produce wool and hides here—we could produce all we need."

Senator Clark, from Idaho, immediately joined, since Idaho is also an agricultural state. So did other Senators from the middle Western states join in the protest, but of no avail, since it is the bankers and industrialists who run the country and not the middle-Western farmers.

Perhaps it might not be far afield to point out here that the sharp curtailment of the home market for agrarian products, and the ever-growing dependency of the American agricultural states upon exports to Europe and Asia, has reflected itself politically in demands for "isolation" as America's foreign policy—meaning by that term non-involvement in war, since war curtails export markets—and for the development of peaceful trade policies with all countries and against high tariffs. That explains the strong, "isolationist" tendencies in the middle West, and the use it is put to by such demagogues as Senator Wheeler and others.

Latin America and the Middle West can only be liberated when the proletariat of the Western Hemisphere takes the means of production into its hands, ousts the capitalists and establishes a socialist system of production, based on use and not profit. That is the only way to solve the imperialist contradictions which are torturing all of toiling humanity.

AGAINST CAPITALIST MILITARY TRAINING CONSCRIPTION BILLS

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

Are we for or against the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill? One thousand percent against it.

Not because of any particular clauses contained in it; not because it is a measure introduced in time of peace and thus violates American tradition. But because it is a measure introduced by a capitalist government for the purpose of defending the imperialist interests of American capitalism.

If our party had a representative in Congress he would vote against any conscription bill introduced by any representative of the capitalist class because it could have as its purpose only the defense of the interests of the capitalist class.

We are bitterly opposed to the capitalist class and to its government and we are opposed to any measure introduced for the defense of that class and that government.

But we are for military training. We want workers to be trained in the use of arms. We have nothing in common with the pacifists. Our opposition to conscription is not based on the fantastic idea that somehow or other military training is bad for the character of an individual and bad for some kind of an abstract democracy.

We want to see every worker skilled in the use of weapons so that he can help defend the interests of his class.

If any pacifist speaks before a gathering of workers and tries to convince them that they should oppose military training, the revolutionary worker should ask him: "What do you want us to do? Do you want us to be drafted during a war (as we shall inevitably be regardless of your pacifist mouthings) and be sent into the trenches without military training? Do you want us to stand up against the trained thugs of the capitalist class not knowing how to use modern weapons?"

Anyone with half an eye can see that we are now living in a period of war and militarism and the intelligent worker realizes that the working class can meet its enemies only if it is prepared in a military sense.

And it is because we understand the enormous necessity of military training for the workers that we stress that point.

Determined to make every worker see the necessity of military training our emphasis will be on that aspect of the question. Every worker should know that our opposition to the conscription bill is not motivated by pacifist considerations. Every worker should know that we want the workers to be trained in military technique.

We Were Wrong On R. O. T. C.

In my opinion we made a serious mistake in the past on the question of our opposition to the Reserve Officers Training Corps at the colleges. The student youth who then were the majority of the youth in our party had all the pacifist characteristics connected with the left wing of the social-democrats. Our agitation against the R.O.T.C. was largely pacifist in character.

This section of the student youth did not see then, as they do not see even now, the necessity of emphasizing the need for military training for every worker and every student who wants to participate in the revolutionary movement.

But then the question arises as to how to get military training for the workers? As a revolutionary party opposed to military conscription by the capitalist state, but at the same time in favor of military training for the workers, we are obliged to propose a measure which would place the training of the workers under their own control.

Trade Unions Must Take Charge

What better means than to have organized labor take charge of training the workers in military science? It would be an easy matter for the trade unions to organize camps of their own where the workers would be trained under officers over whom they had complete control.

And so long as there is a capitalist state able to draft workers for war, why should not that state furnish the funds to defray the expenses of workers' training camps?

Will the capitalist government grant such a demand? That is immaterial and it depends upon how strong a movement is created around such a demand.

Will the workers rally around such a demand? We do not know definitely until we try. Certainly such a demand will appear reasonable and necessary to every advanced worker. And above all it is bound to instill into the minds of many workers the necessity of military training for themselves and their class.

If Conscription is Adopted

Assuming that Congress passes some kind of a conscription bill, should advanced workers refuse to be conscripted?

Absolutely not. They should take their place amongst those conscripted just as they take their place among the workers who are exploited in the factories.

To be a conscientious objector is to read oneself out of the revolutionary movement. There is no place in that movement for people who cannot see the necessity of living with the masses whether in the factory or in the barracks.

No revolutionary worker should try to avoid conscription on the theory that he does not want to serve in a capitalist army.

And after having been drafted into the army the revolutionary worker is under an obligation to act in such a way as to gain the confidence of his fellow soldiers. It would be contrary to the interests of the revolutionary movement if he were to be marked and constantly punished for individual insubordination.

We are not in the army to show off our independent spirit. We are there because unfortunately the masses have not yet been won over to our ideas and while we are there we must try our best to make them believe in our ideas.

To be a skillful soldier and to fight for the interests of his fellow soldiers is the best method to achieve the position of leadership which every revolutionary worker should have in order best to serve the interests of the working classes.