

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. III, No. 21 April 4, 1938

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

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle orders: 2 cents per copy in United States; 3 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents. Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for six months; \$3.00 for one year. Reentered as second class matter February 16, 1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN

Associate Editors: HAROLD ROBERTS FELIX MORROW

Staff Members: EMANUEL GARRETT JOSEPH HANSEN

Business Manager: S. STANLEY

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

- 1. A job and a decent wage 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. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension. 6. Expropriate the Sixty Families. 7. All war funds to the unemployed. 8. A people's referendum on any and all wars. 9. No secret diplomacy. 10. An independent Labor party. 11. Workers Defense Guards against Vigilante and Fascist attacks.

We Are Not Pacifists

The pacifist usually shares the outlook of the American capitalist: he does not oppose the profit system, he is against the working class taking matters into its own hands, etc. His pacifism consists of believing that the present world order should be maintained without the use of force. He is blind and indifferent to the day by day coercion of the dollar and the cop, of the school, press and radio, over the minds and bodies of the workers.

And when war does come, and it becomes plain that the war is part and parcel of the profit system to which the pacifist is not opposed, then the pacifist usually ends up by finding "idealistic" reasons for supporting the war.

We are not pacifists. The revolutionist is as far from the pacifist as he is from the war-monger. We are the most consistent, most determined, opponents of the capitalist war-makers. But there are...

Wars We Are For

There are wars in which we have willingly fought, and in which we will willingly fight again.

The war of the workers and peasants of Spain against Franco and his Italo-German backers was our war. Not only our Spanish comrades, but comrades from all over the world gave their lives in the fight against fascism.

The war of the Chinese masses against the Japanese warlords is our war. Our Chinese comrades support it wholeheartedly, as do we and Fourth Internationalists the world over.

The coming war of the peoples of India against British imperialism is our war, likewise the struggle of Irish Republican Brotherhood, the Jamaican and other West Indian Negroes, the native Africans, the Arabian people, against the British Empire.

The coming war of Syria and North Africa and Indo-China against the French Empire is also our war. We are in complete solidarity with the Nicaraguans and Haitians suppressed by United States marines, and with the entire Latin-American world now writhing under the boot of Yankee imperialism.

We are for the war of the German people against Hitler, and the armed struggle of the Italian people against Mussolini.

In short, we are for wars of liberation. At this stage of world history this means: wars of colonial peoples against their imperialist oppressors, and civil wars of the working class and poor farmers against their "own" capitalist class.

To liberate the peoples of the earth is the one thing worth fighting for. And in that fight, it would be senseless to abstain from using the weapons which, in any event, the oppressors everywhere already use against the oppressed: the weapons of modern warfare.

To depend on these weapons alone for victory, however, means sure defeat. That we have just learned anew from...

The Lesson of Spain

Pravda, Stalin's personal organ, explains the Spanish debacle as resulting from "a foul stab in the back," dealt by the British and French diplomats.

Pravda's use of metaphor is extremely revealing. Who stabs in the back? Not a known enemy, for he is never permitted to get behind us if we can help it. We fight him face to face. But the Stalinist apparatus dinned into our ears day and night throughout the period up to Munich—that is, up to nearly the end of the Spanish civil war—that the only salvation of Spain lay in securing the support of the British and French democracies. Stalin's flunkies ordered us to believe that the Chamberlains and Daladiers were possible friends—Daladier they pictured to us throughout as already a friend. Stalin, it was, who was stabbed in the back by those he chose as friends!

But the Spanish workers were stabbed in the back, not by France and England, but by those who insisted—by propaganda and the bribery of Russian arms first, by rope and faggot later—that the Spanish workers and peasants must stake everything on secur-

It took place at home, in Spain itself. The hand that wielded the dagger was that of the Spanish Stalinist, social democrat and anarchist leaders. They, trusted by the masses, looked to for leadership, drove the dagger home.

Had these leaders been revolutionists, they would have taught the Spanish masses this fundamental thought, now almost forgotten by the labor movement, but once clearly grasped, in the days of the Russian Revolution and the ensuing heroic years of revolutionary struggle in Europe.

In any civil war or war for liberation, the side of reaction usually commands material instruments of warfare far superior to those available to the progressive side. To leave the issue of victory solely to the purely military struggle means, therefore, certain victory for reaction. Consequently, the progressive side can win only if, to its military resistance, it adds a political offensive.

The Russian Red Army was victorious against the interventionist armies of the whole world, not because it had superior military equipment—it did not have and could not have had that—but because of its superior political resources. The Soviets demoralized enemy armies by revolutionary propaganda, created insurrections behind the interventionist armies, inspired guerilla warfare, roused workers throughout the world to stop intervention. And the Soviets could do this only because, prior to that, they had made a proletarian revolution, had given the workers the factories, the peasants the land, and the whole world a new hope for the future.

This is the lesson that now applies directly to...

The Struggle in China

China is engaged in a titanic struggle against enslavement by the Japanese imperialists. Every blow struck at the imperialists in China is a blow against world capitalism, a blow that materially aids the cause of working class emancipation everywhere. That is why we support with all our strength the heroic struggle of the Chinese masses and make the cause of Chinese national liberation our own.

For more than a century that great nation of 400,000,000 people has been the target of the imperialist pirates of the West, of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States. Japan's robber war in China during the last seven years has been fought to bring the material and human resources of the country under the monopolistic control of the Japanese industrialists and financiers.

When the British, French, and American governments prepare to challenge this Japanese drive, it is not because they are interested in the cause of Chinese liberation but because they want to enslave the Chinese people themselves.

That is why it is the grossest and most dangerous treachery to place the fate of the Chinese people in the hands of these gangsters, to depend on the British and American fleets to defeat the Japanese, to tell the Chinese masses that in Washington and London they have firm and friendly allies.

The Chinese capitalists and landowners have always made common cause with the foreign capitalists against their own workers and peasants—who are among the most exploited in the world. They are fighting the Japanese now only because the Japanese capitalists are too hard-pressed to be able to share the loot with them. They tried for five years to compromise, surrendered vast territories without a struggle and only when pushed to the final extremity did they offer battle—a battle which has been ill-organized and sabotaged by corruption, treachery, and misleadership. The real job of carrying the fight through to its victorious conclusion will rest with the Chinese masses—not with the Chinese exploiters.

Twelve years ago these same leaders, Chiang Kai-Shek & Co., sold out to the imperialists and they will do so again at the first favorable opportunity. That is why the independent organization of the workers and peasants of China under a banner and with a revolutionary program of their own, is the firmest guarantee that the war will be fought through to the end and won. The victory of the Chinese workers and peasants will give an enormous impulse to...

The Fight for World Emancipation

Today, when we seem closer than ever before to the brink of a world catastrophe, the struggle to free the world from this horror becomes one of frightful urgency.

Because capitalism can't work, can't keep the wheels going, can't keep millions in sufficient food, it turns to bloody wars, wars for markets, raw materials, colonies, profits.

The bosses have no other way out if they are going to keep themselves in control of the gigantic machinery of production which capitalism brought into being. The machinery has become too big for them so they try to cut it down, they depress the living standards.

When pressed by recurring crises, the biggest bosses bring the workers under the heel of Fascism in order to destroy the meager "rights" permitted them under the more elastic form of "democracy." But this does not solve the crisis and pushes them relentlessly into wars from which they hope to emerge with enough loot to keep them going.

This is not our way out, workers! We can take over this mighty machine of production! We can make it work! We can make it satisfy the needs of all the people in the world! We can make it grow to heights now undreamed of! We can end wars forever, end human suffering, end the degradation that makes us grub like animals in the dirt, unable ever to raise our eyes to the skies and to begin living like thinking creative men and women!

All this we can do by crushing the parasites who live off our labor, by destroying the profit system that breeds only starvation amid plenty, war and death and suffering amid limitless opportunities for human happiness.

This is the goal of the Fourth International—the mighty goal of world emancipation—and to our banner of struggle against war, against Fascism, for the right to live freely, we summon all the workers and exploited of the world!



All over the world there are still maimed victims like these of the last world slaughter. Young men broken in body and spirit to feed the Moloch of capitalist war. Behind them come the new generation of youngsters, who are being trained in advance to wear gas masks, to grow accustomed to horrors, to death, and the constant presence of bloody conflict, so that they too will be ready to become cannon fodder on the battlefields of the new war. This is what capitalism offers succeeding generations of youth!

By Eugene V. Debs

In What War Shall I Take Up Arms and Fight?

Since my characterization of the soldier in the Jingo edition (as "the hired assassin of his capitalist master"—Ed.) I have been asked if I was opposed to all war and if I would refuse to be a soldier and to fight under any circumstances, and to make my answer through the Appeal to Reason. No, I am not opposed to all war, nor am I opposed to all under all circumstances, and any declaration to the contrary would disqualify me as a revolutionist. When I say I am opposed to war I mean ruling class war, for the ruling class is the only class that makes war. It matters not to me whether this war be offensive or defensive, or what other lying excuse may be invented for it, I am opposed to it, and I would be shot for treason before I would enter such a war.



as to my position. I have no country to fight for; my country is the earth; and I am a citizen of the world. I would not violate my principles for God, much less for a crazy Kaiser, a savage czar, a degenerate king, or a band of pot-

belled parasites. But while I have not a drop of blood to shed for the oppressors of the working class and the robbers of the poor, the thieves and looters, the brigands and murderers, whose debauched misrule is the crime of the ages, I have a heart-full to shed for their victims when it shall be needed in the war for their liberation. I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of the plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight from the ruling class, but I will not wait to be commanded to fight for the working class. I am opposed to every war but one: I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world-wide war of the social revolution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ruling class may make it necessary, even to the barricades. There is where I stand and where I believe the Socialist Party stands, or ought to stand, on the question of war. —From the Appeal to Reason, September 11, 1915.

Trotsky's Stand On War Issue

(Continued from page 3) lie prostrate will coincide precisely with the time of Franco's domination.

The Menace of Japan

You ask how serious a menace Japan is to the U.S.S.R., England and the United States. Japan is not capable of a war on a great scale, partly for economic reasons, but above all for social reasons. Not having emancipated itself up to now from the heritage of feudalism, Japan represents the reservoir of a gigantic revolutionary explosion. In many respects it calls to mind the Tsarist empire on the eve of 1905. Japan's leading circles attempt to escape from the internal contradictions by the seizure and pillage of China. But the internal contradictions make external success on a great scale unfeasible.

To seize strategical positions in China is one thing; to subdue China is another. Japan would never dare to challenge the Soviet Union, if there were not a glaring antagonism, evident to everyone, between the leading clique of the Kremlin and the Soviet people. The regime of Stalin, which is weakening the U.S.S.R., can make a Soviet-Japanese war possible. What would be the results of this war? I cannot believe for a single instant in the victory of Japan. I think that the most indubitable results of the war would be the collapse of the medieval regime of the Mikado and of the Bonapartist regime of Stalin. My Work in Mexico On my life in Mexico I can communicate very little. On the part of the authorities I have met

with nothing but kindness. I am absolutely apart from Mexican political life, but I follow the efforts of the Mexican people to conquer a complete and true independence with ardent sympathy. I am finishing a book on Stalin, which will appear this year in the United States, England and other countries. The book is a political biography of Stalin and has as its objective an explanation of how a second or third rank revolutionary can appear at the head of the country when the Thermidorian reaction begins. The book will show, in particular, how and why the former Bolshevik, Stalin, is now completely ripe for an alliance with Hitler. LEON TROTSKY Coyocacan, D. F. March 18, 1939

IN THIS CORNER By Max Shachtman

At bottom, the dispute between the so-called "isolationists" and the advocates of "collective security" is either meaningless, unimportant, or entirely beside the point with which workers are really concerned, namely, stopping or fighting war.

Where it is not a patent absurdity, isolationism in the modern world is a patent fraud. In so far as the negative criticism of that position goes, it is easily accomplished. The idea that the United States, with its tremendously powerful position in world economic and political life, can, or does, or will remain isolated from any important conflict is preposterous. The Seminoles of Florida's Everglades or the Plutes of Utah may have been able to pursue an isolationist life a hundred or more years ago. Modern American imperialism, regardless of the statesmen at its helm, simply cannot, does not, will not.

Nobody Likes War

The "collective security" advocates are simply the traditional defenders of imperialist booty, in new guise and with strange recent recruits. No more or less sane person, however reactionary—and this goes also for Fascists—is in favor of war for its own sake. Even the Fascists, we repeat, because however mad they may seem to be, they are not unaware of the fact that a large-scale modern war is a risky and expensive affair. That is why, in their own way, the Fascists too are for "collective security." Thus, Mussolini and Hitler are for "collectively securing" the Blackshirt conquest of Ethiopia. They are for "collectively securing" the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia. They would not object for a moment to having England and France and all the other "Democracies" join them in the "collectivity."

The "democratic" advocates of the policy merely want to secure "collectively" not their conquests of 1938-1939, but the booty they acquired in 1918-1919 and in the preceding decades. There, fundamentally, is the difference between them and the Fascists on this point.

Why the working class should fight to "secure" England's rule over, let us say, South Africa, or Belgium's over the Congo, any more than the German workers should fight to secure Hitler's rule over the Czechs, is not intelligently demonstrable.

The "isolationists" differ from the "collective security" advocates—as the last war showed—in that they refuse to assist either one of the two sets of their imperialist rivals: the Anglo-French or the Germano-Italian. "Let them fight it out to the point of exhaustion, so that if we intervene later on it will be as indisputable masters of them both. Why should we now tie ourselves down to helping one of our competitors against another one?"

To take either of the two positions is, therefore, to take a stand for imperialism and, consequently, for war.

Democratic Rights Do Matter

Is there, then, no way in which to stop Fascism, to stop Hitler's advances, to stop the war which we all realize is so imminent? Can we, then, take the position that it doesn't matter a particle whether we live, so to say, under Hitlerism or Rooseveltism, Fascism or capitalist democracy?

There is a way to smash Fascism and war! There is a difference, an important one, between Fascism and bourgeois democracy. Those who attribute to the revolutionary Marxists the view that it doesn't matter to the workers which political regime they live under, is deliberately distorting our position.

The democratic rights which the workers enjoy, in part only, to be sure, but nevertheless in part, under capitalist democracy—they are deprived of altogether by Fascism. But the whole point is that these rights not only cannot be extended and made more genuine, but they cannot even be preserved in their present vitiated form, if the workers continue to support in the slightest degree the power, the rule, the state of the bourgeois democrats.

Wherever we look today, we see that these gentlemen are interested first and foremost in the preservation of capitalist private ownership. Roosevelt, for example, reiterates his allegiance to capitalism on all occasions. "Democracy" interests them only in the second, tenth or fiftieth place. And when and where such democratic rights as the right to free speech, assembly, press, the right to organize, strike and picket, conflict with the interests of capitalist property and cynically—suppressed for the sake of the latter.

This elementary and ever so important truth, the professional democrats in the labor movement systematically conceal from the masses.

But War Ends These Rights

Take the democrat Dalsider. He is against the German dictators. Good. To "fight" them, to preserve French imperialist interests, he asks for the powers of... a dictator! In his war for democracy, he starts out by refusing to guarantee in any way the democratic rights of free speech, free press and assembly. And under modern capitalism, this is absolutely in the order of things. Tomorrow, it will be Roosevelt's turn to do the same. The bourgeois democrats thus pave the road for Fascism! Fascism can be stopped only by fighting these spurious "democrats"—and this is precisely why the workers need an independent class movement, an independent class struggle.

What holds for the struggle against Fascism is doubly true for the struggle against war. If Daladier—the bourgeois democratic type—tramples so rudely upon democratic rights even before war breaks out, how many of these rights will he allow to be exercised after war breaks out? We have seen and we know enough to say with complete sureness that the political regime of the "democracies" during the war and that of the Fascist states, will be as different as two eggs.

BOOK ON THE LAST WAR

- Beard, Charles—The Devil Theory of War... 1.50
Fay, Sidney B.—Origins of the World War... 4.00
Grattan, C. H.—Why We Fought... .98
Hart, Liddell—The War in Outline... .75
Europe Under Arms... .75
Kantor, Emanuel—The Evolution of War... 1.00
Loria, Achille—The Economic Causes of War... 1.00
Monat, R. B.—Diplomacy and Peace... 2.50
Lenin—Imperialism and the Imperialist War... 2.00
Wintringham, T. H.—The Coming World War... 1.00
PAMPHLETS
Lenin—War and the Second International... 25c
Liebknecht, Karl—Military... 25c
War and the Fourth International... 25c
War and the Workers—John West... 10c
Pro-War Communism—Veritas... 15c
Zetkin, Clara—The Tollers Against War... 20c
On Sale at LABOR BOOKSHOP 28 East 12th Street New York City