

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

VOL. IV—No. 33 Saturday, August 17, 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:  
**RUTH JEFFREY**

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.  
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle  
orders: 5 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,  
1935, 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.

**Somebody's Lying**

On August 9 the New York Times reported the following:

"Of the money made available by Congress on July 1 to pay for the projected air armada of the army and navy, 45 percent of the army's share has been contracted for and 75 percent of the navy's has been committed in contracts formally awarded, William S. Knudsen (head of the National Defense Advisory Commission) said in a radio program tonight (August 8)."

Next day, August 9, Col. Henry L. Stimson, the Secretary of War, appeared at a Congressional tax hearing and made, according to the Associated Press, the following statement:

"Congress made available to the army during the month of June approximately \$400,000,000 for airplanes, engines and accessories. Yet, today, almost seven weeks later, we have been able to sign contracts for the construction of but 33 planes of the 4,000 and more for which these appropriations were made."

On August 10 President Roosevelt came away from taking a look at the Boston and Portsmouth Navy Yards and the Army Arsenal at Watertown, Mass., and in a statement headlined by the Times, declared: "Defense Program Hitting Its Stride, President Asserts".

"Things are going along awfully well. I'm very well pleased with all I saw today and it shows we are really getting into our stride."

Compare Stimson's with the other two statements. Somebody's lying!

Who is doing the lying? And why are they lying?

The answer is that all these gentlemen are sitting on the proverbial sharp horns of a dilemma and have to tell us two violently contradictory things at the same time.

They've got to say that everything is going along swimmingly in order to avoid pointing the finger right at the cause of the breakdown in the arms drive—the unyielding demand of the big capitalists for virtually unrestricted profits.

At the same time they have to put the fear of the lord into the Congressional committees now being asked to take the lid off all profit restrictions.

But above all they have got to cover up the fact that the big bosses of the country, the steel magnates and shipbuilders and plane manufacturers, are holding a gun at the country's head—"Injure us our profits or to hell with your defenses."

Appearing before the same committee as Stimson a day after his radio appearance, William Knudsen complained that he "had been unable to give contractors assurance their expansion costs could be amortized (i.e. written off out of earnings in computing tax returns)." Stimson, after making his startling revelation about planes, did not go on to denounce the actual saboteurs of the arms program but pleaded that the risk (!!) these manufacturers have to undertake "is one that is entitled to special consideration."

And while these hands are reaching into the public pocket, Roosevelt takes a squirt at a few government arms shops—government, not private shops—and says that "things" are going fine. Everything is hitting its stride. Roosevelt steers cautiously clear of saying how things are going in the private plants which have to produce the great bulk of the planes, ships, and guns for which these billions of public money have been taken. Roosevelt knows when to keep his mouth shut.

Because when the bosses come to Washington and demand bigger and bigger slices of the rich booty now being handed out, they are speaking for the real rulers of the country whose overwhelming interest is not that of the people but is only the interest in their own profits.

Out of this foul mess the lesson emerges with ever-increasing clarity: the American people will be able to organize their defense in a world torn by imperialist war only if they first wrest power from the hands of the capitalists who now wield it. This job can be done only by the workers who turn all the wheels, handle all the tools and will handle all the guns.

The old rotten system does not work anymore. It could not work in peace because out of its own womb it produced war and mass privation. And now we see that its guiding profit motive stymies even its own plans for participation in the war.

**The Army's Politics**

The kind of government for the United States which is desired by the U. S. Army's officers may be surmised from an article in the July 20 Army and Navy Journal on "Why France Collapsed", by Col. T. Bentley Mott.

With the usual professional solidarity, he has nothing but praise for the French Army's officer-staff. He blames it all on French democracy; his diatribe, indeed, reads like a Nazi indictment of democracy: "For ten years politicians eager for power and foreign agitators paid to disrupt the country preached war between the classes. . . None was more influential than M. Blum. . . French boys in public schools were being poisoned with pacifist doctrines and class hatred by teachers, in great part communists, organized into unions affiliated with subversive groups. . . During all this time of internal strife and external vacillation the army escaped contamination. . ."

He grows eloquent in praise of the new fascist government. Petain and Weygand took power because everybody "knew that the only hope of salvation lay in public servants such as these—men who had spent 50 years of sober living under modest circumstances, in silence, thinking only of serving France." Had France been under this Petain regime when the war began, "the result would have been different."

Nor does Col. Mott spare the obvious conclusion: "Foreign affairs in time of crisis cannot be conducted by newspapers and their readers. They have to be directed by a man."

The man on horseback—that's the kind of government that Col. Mott wants, and it is plain enough from the publication of his article in such an authoritative military officers' journal, that he speaks for the dominant section of the officer corps.

The first chance they get during the coming war, they will try to foist that kind of government on us.

Capitalist democracy is finished, repudiated by its own officer corps.

Either the revolutionary victory of the proletariat and the establishment of a Workers' Government, or a fascist regime—those are the only real alternatives of the coming period of militarism and war.

**Lundeen's Party**

Senator Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota last week issued a statement to the press declaring that "both" parties adhere to an interventionist policy and that, therefore, "a new national party" is necessary. The new party shall be organized by "Labor, the farmer, those who believe in cooperatives, those who believe in neutrality and placing our national interests before the interests of any other country." And "all good Americans who believe in absolute neutrality and America first" should rally in convention at Chicago sometime before September 1, "in order that red-blooded Americans who are not under European influence" shall make their influence felt in the elections.

A party that would include those who "place our national interests before the interests of any other country", "America first" advocates, etc., doesn't have to be formed; there are two such parties already, the Democratic and Republican. Lundeen's isolationist clap-trap, which would make the two parties out to be mere puppets of Britain, only serves to hide the fundamental truth that interventionism is being pursued precisely because of "our"—the capitalist class—national interests.

It is safe to predict that Lundeen won't get anywhere with his demagogic proposition. The times are hostile to backwoods bunk. Lundeen's own party, the Farmer-Labor Association of Minnesota, is falling apart, the remnants of it are seeking fusion with the Minnesota Democrats. It has been just such a party as Lundeen now proposes nationally—calling on Labor and the farmers for its main support but with no thought of a class program for the workers and the poor farmers.

If there was one place where such a loose-joined party might conceivably have been successful, it was in the predominantly agricultural state of Minnesota. But it didn't work. Because it was neither controlled by the trade unions nor did it fight on behalf of the trade unions, the workers in the cities did not look upon it as their party; the same thing happened with the farmers. It was neither flesh, fish nor fowl. Apparently Lundeen has learned nothing from the Minnesota experience.

The only kind of party that can arise, in this period of sharp conflict of class interests, to challenge the two capitalist parties, is a Labor Party, constituted by and controlled by the trade unions. No sensible worker will lift a finger to help Lundeen's venture. But many millions will be inspired to begin a new life when the trade unions call upon them to form a party of the masses. Lundeen sniffs the coming tidal wave and wants to ride it. But in a party directly controlled by the organizations of the workers the Lundeens should have no place.

**GPU'S OWN AGENTS WILL "CONFESS" LINK WITH TROTSKY, HE PREDICTS**

MEXICO CITY, August 7.—Leon Trotsky warned yesterday, when he received representatives of the Mexican and international press, that the Stalinist leaders identified and arrested by the Mexican police as participants in the attempt to kill Leon Trotsky on May 24, will shortly "confess" that they were agents of Trotsky all the time.

Having failed to cover up the role of the GPU by any other method, Stalin's secret police must now resort to the desperate course of having their own principal agents label themselves "Trotskyists", it was predicted by Trotsky.

**Serrano's Role**

He emphasized particularly the role of David Serrano, member of the Political Bureau of the Mexican Communist Party, who was arrested by the police shortly after the attempted assassination and is still held. Another Stalinist under arrest, Mateos Martinez, named Serrano as the man who ordered him to arrange for some police uniforms (the assassins wore them in the attack). Serrano's former wife, Julia, is also held, having admitted that she had been employed as a spy on the Trotsky household, with the special task of becoming intimate with the police guard stationed outside.

"Serrano", Trotsky said, "spent six years in Moscow, from where he was sent to Spain (during the civil war) and nobody goes out of Russia without the authorization of the GPU. Serrano functioned in Spain as a GPU agent and then came to Mexico as an important functionary of that body, which is the reason why he soon entered the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party."

**GPU Has Siqueiros**

David Alfaro Siqueiros, sought by the police as the director of the actual assault, is hidden—in the hands of the GPU, Trotsky

believes. Luis Arenal, named by the police as the man who shot Robert Sheldon Harte, Trotsky's secretary, is somewhere in the United States now, having been seen there two weeks after the attempted assassination. "Will not the GPU demand that Siqueiros—under threat of death—declare tomorrow that he has secretly been a 'Trotskyist'?" Will he not declare that it happened to kill Bob Harte in the course

of a fake assault? Will not David Serrano confess that he has been simply an agent of the Dies Committee for the organization of political assassinations? Isn't 'El Popular' (Toledano's paper) now preparing an article on this theme? We know in advance its style of patriotic indignation!" The Stalinists have officially disowned Siqueiros now, but not Serrano. If Trotsky's prediction is correct, that comes next!

By Leon Trotsky

**After Burnham--Macdonald**

The following is from a letter to a friend by Leon Trotsky.

I don't know whether you have seen Dwight Macdonald's article in the August issue of his PARTISAN REVIEW.

This man was a disciple of Burnham, the intellectual snob. After Burnham deserted, Dwight Macdonald was left in Shahtman's party as the lone representative of "Science."

On the question of fascism, Macdonald serves up a poor compilation of plagiarism from our arsenal which he represents as his own discoveries and to which he opposes some banalities that he characterizes as our ideas. The whole—without perspective, without proportion and without elementary intellectual honesty.

However, this is not the worst. Burnham's orphan proclaims: "We must examine again with a cold and sceptical eye, the most basic premises of Marxism" (Page 266). And what must the poor "Workers Party" do during this period of "examination"? What must the proletariat do? They should wait, of course, for the result of Dwight Macdonald's study. This result will probably be Macdonald's desertion himself into

the camp of Burnham.

The last four lines of the article can be nothing but preparation for personal desertion. "Only if we meet the stormy and terrible years ahead with both scepticism and devotion—scepticism towards all theories, governments and social systems; devotion to the revolutionary fight of the masses—only then can we justify ourselves as intellectuals."

Revolutionary activity based upon theoretical scepticism is the most awkward of inner contradictions. "Devotion to the revolutionary fight of the masses" is impossible without theoretical understanding of the laws of this revolutionary fight. Revolutionary devotion is possible only if one gains the assurance that his devotion is reasonable, adequate; that it corresponds to its aim. Such assurance can be created only by theoretical insight into the class struggle. "Scepticism towards all theories" is nothing but preparation for personal desertion.

Shahtman remains silent; as "General Secretary" he is too busy to defend the "most basic premises of Marxism" from petty-bourgeois philistines and snobs. . .

**What Will Happen to the Union Drive in Steel?**

By FARRELL DOBBS

The CIO has launched a campaign in the ten mills and shipyards of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. The plan of action was laid down at a conference of the CIO lodges involved, which was held in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania on August 11. The Steel Workers Organizing Committee and the Industrial Union of Marine and Ship Building Workers of America, both CIO affiliates, will participate jointly in the drive.

The Bethlehem mills are operating at top capacity with 200 million dollars in government contracts already received. This corporation is one of those which consistently violate the Wagner Labor Act and the Walsh-Healey Act. It refuses to pay the \$5.00 a day minimum on work on government contracts.

CIO Vice-President Phillip Murray announced before the conference that it would "lay the ground work to carry the fight to Washington." The conference itself announced, however, that failure by the company to bargain collectively will "compel the workers to enforce their rights by economic action."

This campaign, long overdue, can serve as the opening gun in a fight to correct conditions in the entire steel industry. The urgent necessity for the union to rise vigorously to the defense of its membership can no longer be denied.

**SWOC UNDER FIRE OF BOSSES AND GOVT**

The SWOC is under heavy attack from both the steel bosses and the government. The corporations are creating widespread unemployment and forcing down the earnings of the employed steel workers through technological change. They are violating the union contracts, stalling on the settlement of grievances, and practicing general discrimination against the SWOC membership. The bosses are undermining the union in every way possible.

The government, on its part, is fronting for the steel corporations "in the interests of national defense." Agents of the FBI are sent into the plants in an effort to intimidate the workers and try to put down any militancy among them. An undercover drive is being conducted against the alien workers. The finger of suspicion is pointed at militant workers who raise their voice in protest against the policy of the corporations.

The efforts of the AFL to organize the steel workers in opposition to the SWOC are more of an annoyance than a threat

to the CIO union. AFL propaganda is in large part based on the claim that it is "more patriotic" than the CIO. The AFL has nothing real to offer the steel workers. Its actions only serve to further disorient them.

**SWOC LEADERS DON'T FIGHT BACK**

The national leadership of the SWOC meantime shows an increasing tendency to subordinate the interests of the steel workers to the "interests of the national defense." Van A. Bittner, SWOC director, Western Region, has been appointed by Hillman to serve in one of the "national defense committees." The top officials are very jittery about the danger of being called "unpatriotic." They have gone so far as to warn the field organizers that if they are accused of "un-American activities" they cannot expect the SWOC to defend them, "even though they may be wrongly accused."

Grievances arising from contract violation and general discrimination against the union membership on the job are permitted to pile up. The complaints are tardily placed before arbitration committees or the NLRB and generally are not militantly pressed, even through these channels. There are very few sallies directly against the bosses. These occur only where pressure from the workers is most heavy.

Some cases of strike action by the steel workers are promptly labelled "outrage" and a settlement is forced at the first opportunity. The national leadership sometimes follows up the settlement with an attack on the local lodge officials. The usual reason given is per capita tax delinquencies, a violation of the union laws, or some similar charge. Militant lodge leaders are being forced into the background. The most conservative, least class conscious elements are coming forward.

**WORKERS WANT A FIGHTING LEADERSHIP**

Although the fight for a six hour day at eight hour's pay was sidestepped at the Chicago convention, some sections of the officialdom are now using this slogan. They are motivated largely by the need for some means to halt the decline in dues payment which is becoming a serious problem. There is little indication that they mean business.

The steel workers have a much different attitude. They accept the fact that they are being pushed into the war but they are not enthusiastic about the idea. There is general indifference among

them towards the boss-made, artificial war hysteria. They do not as yet understand the real significance of the war preparations and consequently have not gone over to active opposition to the program of the government. The "Fifth Column" agitation is not taken seriously but it harasses and disturbs them to a certain extent. The steel workers are most concerned about the vital question of jobs and wages. Many thousands of them are already unemployed. Those who have jobs face the threat of reduced earnings and wonder who will be thrown out into the streets next.

They want to fight but the defeat in Little Steel and the timidity of their top leaders since then has undermined their confidence in themselves and their union. The rank and file is anxious to overcome the present apathy and inertia. They need and want a fighting leadership.

**UNION'S SALVATION DEMANDS STRUGGLE**

Every factor in the situation demands that the SWOC leaders abandon their attitude of subservience to the "interests of the national defense" and that they fight for the interests of the steel workers instead. The battle must be carried direct to the steel bosses through militant trade union action. A vigorous organization drive must be launched, on a program of action:

All union officials off the "National Defense Committees."

Enforce the union contracts. Settle the workers' grievances.

Fight for the 6 hour day at 8 hour's pay.

Join us in a  
**GAY BEACH PARTY!**  
SUNDAY  
AUGUST 18th  
ORCHARD BEACH, No. 10  
Swimming,  
Boating, Fishing!  
Meet at Pelham Bay  
Station, IRT, 10:30 A.M.  
**Local N. Y., SWP**

**Answering A Query On Our Draft Stand**

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

A sympathizer of our party, in a letter which he sent me very recently, takes us to task for our position on conscription. He believes that we should not have raised, at this time, the question of military training under trade-union control and should have confined our agitation purely to a struggle against conscription.

"Most of the young workers", he writes, "are opposed to conscription and it is only introducing confusion when you talk to them about the necessity of military training under trade-union control. Leave that until after the conscription bill is passed. It may be right then but for the present stick to an anti-conscription issue."

By inference our sympathizer indicates that every other group opposing conscription will have nothing to do after the conscription bill is passed. They must fold up and shut up. At best they will be limited to a futile movement to repeal the conscription measure.

Our agitation for military training under trade-union control, however, will continue. For that slogan is independent of the struggle against a particular capitalist conscription bill. As a matter of fact the thesis of the Fourth International on the Death Agony of Capitalism contains the following demands (among others):

Military training and arming of workers and farmers under direct control of workers' and farmers' committees.

Creation of military schools for the training of commanders among the toilers, chosen by workers' organizations.

... Before the Burke-Wadsworth bill was thought of, during the debate, before its enactment, and after its enactment, our basic demand was, and will be: military training for workers under control of workers' organizations.

Because that training is absolutely essential in the present period of war and militarism. Into the consciousness of every advanced worker must penetrate that primary and fundamental idea: military training for the working masses for the defense of their class interests.

It may be true that most of the young workers are opposed to conscription. I seriously doubt that proposition but I shall grant its correctness for the sake of argument.

That would not in the least modify our attitude. For we are not interested in concealing such a fundamental truth from any worker as the necessity for military training. We are interested in impressing every worker with the idea that a negative attitude to any fundamental question is not sufficient.

The capitalist class wants to take every worker into its military clutches for its purposes—our reply is NO! But every worker must have military training and we must demand that his own workers' organization furnish him with that training.

**We Stand Alone On This Question**

And right now is the time to raise the question. We would be committing the greatest error if we failed to raise it at this very moment when every worker is thinking about and discussing the problem of conscription and military training.

Every demagogue (in which category I include, of course, the Stalinists), every muddle-headed liberal, every well-meaning and not-so-well-meaning pacifist, is shouting against conscription, is trying to catch the support of those workers who are more or less naturally opposed to the idea of giving up their jobs and being drafted into the army.

Our party alone distinguishes itself from all of these shouting against conscription by saying clearly and definitely: Yes, oppose conscription by the capitalist government but fight for military training for the workers under their own control.

In the last analysis the difference between our attitude on conscription and the attitude of every other group is the difference between people who are simply dissatisfied with the existing order and we who see the problem of our epoch clearly and are determined to solve that problem in the only way possible.

It is the same difference that exists between those democrats who raise pitiful cries about the advance of fascism and offer nothing better to fight that advance than mere opposition to the undemocratic methods of the capitalist class and the revolutionary Marxists who see the necessity for the workers to organize and take over power in order to wage a victorious struggle against fascism at home and abroad.

**We Do Not Stop Half-Way**

Our party opposes every step taken by the capitalists and their government to limit the democratic rights of the workers in any way. Our party urges the workers to struggle for every immediate demand.

But our party teaches the workers that it is not sufficient to wage a defensive struggle against the capitalists or to try to gain a few advantages here and there. Fascism cannot be destroyed in that way. It can be destroyed only if the workers, in addition to fighting for their immediate demands, take power into their own hands.

Our attitude on conscription and military training reflects that positive and militant attitude which every advanced worker must be taught to accept.

It is the same attitude which Lenin took to the question of disarmament. Instead of giving in to the sentiments of some left-wing workers who favored disarmament, he fiercely attacked that attitude as incompatible with revolutionary Marxism. Instead of disarmament, demand, advised Lenin, the right of the "inhabitants of the country to form voluntary associations for the learning of the military arts, the free selection of instructors, their payment out of government funds, etc."

Instead of joining the pacifists of every type and description to fight conscription in general, our party says to the workers: fight against capitalist conscription; demand the right to bear arms and to have military training under your own control; demand funds from the government for such military training.

Our party will never regret the position that it is now taking on military training.