

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

Vol. III, No. 29 May 2, 1939

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

**Not Fit to Print**

When Hoover's ex-Secretary of State lets out a yawp for war, or Wilson's chairman of the War Industries Board moves to get the same job again under Roosevelt, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sets the stage properly and the newspapers blare the stuff out in headlines and reams of newsprint.

But when the Railway Labor Executives Association, constituted by the 21 principal railroad labor unions and representing over one million workers, sends J. G. Luhrs, executive secretary-treasurer of the association, to inform the Foreign Relations Committee that these unions stand firm for a popular referendum whereby the people shall have the right to vote before the United States can take part in a war—that's not news. The senatorial committee does NOT set the stage for the unions' statement, and the newspapers practically ignore it.

All the news that's fit to print—with the bosses and their political agents deciding what's fit.

A Berlin I.N.S. news item states that if war does not come this month, it may be delayed until June, since Hitler considers May his unlucky month. Lots of persons poo poo the idea of the science of astrology yet firmly believe that only the bourgeoisie know how to govern the world. This is in the face of the fact that the bourgeoisie can't govern without making life a hell for the majority of us.

**Dictatorship in Bolivia**

Bolivia is one of the "democratic" South American "republics" that Roosevelt wants to bring into a union of great American "democracies" in order to ward off the oncoming attack of the fascist countries. We should rather say that Bolivia was one of those chosen countries.

For now Bolivia has gone back on our President. She refused to continue pretending that she is a "democracy" and Colonel German Busch has openly declared a totalitarian regime. The Bolivian Legation in Washington, fearful of the adverse effect the proclamation of a dictatorship would have upon American public opinion, hastened to deny that the word "totalitarian" is applicable to the new Bolivian regime.

But what is a regime which openly prohibits opposition political parties, forbids trade unions to exist and destroys all forms of civil liberties? Call it by any name you please and it still remains a vicious fascist dictatorship.

What will our crusading democratic President do? Will he call upon the remaining "democracies" of the Western Hemisphere to ostracize Bolivia? Will he threaten Bolivia with sanctions unless the democratic regime is reinstated? We are certain that he will do nothing of the kind. For the simple reason that regardless of the nature of its regime, Bolivia remains a place where American capitalists can sell their products and invest their capital. The President will shut his eyes a little tighter and continue to prate about the American "democracies."

The rulers of Bolivia, not being competitors of United States capitalists are permitted to do anything they please to the Bolivian workers and peasants. Roosevelt or Ickes will make no squawk about Colonel Busch and his array of gangsters now crushing the life out of the Bolivian people.

Let those who believe that Roosevelt is sin-

cerely interested in protecting democracy in the Western Hemisphere rise to explain. What happened in Bolivia and President Roosevelt's silence furnishes more evidence that we are absolutely right in insisting that this business of defending democracy in the Western Hemisphere is nothing but a fraud. It means only defending the right of the capitalists of this country to exploit the Latin American peoples.

When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt showed some women friends through the White House, she pointed to the absence of all small decorations. "We put away all the small things," the First Lady explained, because "we discovered visitors—sometimes even high-ranking diplomats, are not above pocketing a Ming vase as a souvenir." Well, these diplomats didn't get where they are by picking on such small stuff as Ming vases. They lift those to keep in practice.

**Roosevelt Provides**

If a pious speech could be served on a platter and eaten like a roast pig with an apple in its mouth, the children of the United States could expect to become rosy-cheeked and robust by just feasting on the speech that was served up by President Roosevelt last Wednesday.

For if ever there was a speech that dripped with pious gravy, it was the one Roosevelt read at the opening session of the fourth White House Conference on Children in a Democracy.

Unfortunately not even the discovery of vitamins or the Fireside Chat has made a speech edible, and if any of the children of the United States were hungry before Roosevelt started reading into the microphone, they were just as hungry when he finished and can be sure that they will remain just as hungry until they die, if Roosevelt determines their future.

Democracy is dependent upon children and they are dependent upon democracy, Roosevelt said; therefore it is necessary that children safeguard the democracy and the democracy safeguard the children. But, and this is a BUT as large as Roosevelt's war machine—in many parts of the United States, according to the President's own admission, children are "not provided enough to meet the minimum needs for food, shelter, and clothing, and the Federal government's contribution toward their care is less generous than its contribution to the care of the aged."

Since Roosevelt's government allows the aged to die like stray dogs without even the doubtful benefit of "mercy killing," what this government does for the children, by its own admission, is so small that not even Roosevelt can find anything good to say about it.

He pointed out that in the United States, children are starved, denied an education, denied clothing, denied warmth, denied homes, denied every minimum necessity of childhood, denied even jobs and the opportunity to marry when they grow up.

The President said that he was very much concerned about this, and concerned too about the lack of religious training given children. If what he says is true, that a democracy cannot survive without providing for the children born under its flag, then democracy in the United States is indeed doomed—it has not provided for even the most elementary needs of its children.

What does President Roosevelt intend to do about this condition which he deprecates with such beautiful words? Wait a whole year, he says, for "recommendations" from the small audience of rich people who assembled at the White House to applaud his pious speech—and then see. "Godspeed in your high endeavor," were the words Roosevelt used to end his speech.

Roosevelt of course is not so stupid as not to have some kind of solution to this problem, although he mentioned it only casually in his speech—that a democracy cannot measure its success even by its armaments unless it provides for its children. Roosevelt's solution is connected precisely with the armaments he is heaping up with the billions of dollars he has snatched from the unemployed and the children of the United States.

Every child in the country, when he gets big enough to shoulder arms, will be provided with a bright shiny rifle and shipped overseas to mow down the children of other countries and be mowed down himself by the bright shiny rifles with which the capitalists of other lands have provided their working class and farmer children.

This is what Roosevelt means when he explains that a capitalist democracy in order to endure must provide for its children.

Senator William E. Borah denounces the European democracies as treaty spoliators and advises youth that any war emanating from the current crisis would be "sordid and imperialistic," and would not involve the question of democracy or totalitarianism. "These European powers, whatever may be their idea or ideology or political views, pursue one and the same course when they come to deal with international affairs. They alike violate treaties, disregard the most fundamental principles of right, pursue methods which inevitably lead to war, and then call upon the United States, Canada, and other nations to save them from their own intolerable and vicious methods." They call upon the United States on the same theory as one calls upon a pupil who has outdone the teacher.

**In Its Conquest of a World Empire  
We See French Democracy at Work**

While Playing Second-Fiddle in Total World Possessions To Britain, France Has Aped Its Cross the Channel Ally In Brutal Methods of Colonial Terror and Exploitation

By SHERMAN STANLEY  
The French "Popular Front" government stabbed Spain's fighting Loyalists in the back by keeping an iron wall between them and war materials.

The "Popular Front" premier, Leon Blum, organized the Non-Intervention Committee which served as a double-barrelled lock between the Loyalists and the munitions they needed.

When the Catalan Loyalists and their women and children fled into France they were hurried into concentration camps, surrounded by electrified barbed wire.

Double-dealing, cynical, suave, ruthless, scheming, the French imperialists have developed these traits to a fine degree, in the process of carving an empire out of the world.

**WORLD-WIDE EXTENT OF FRENCH EMPIRE**

- The French Empire is divided as follows:
- (1) The American and Australasian colonies: territory of 129,978 square miles—population of 1,112,000.
  - (2) African and Syrian colonies: territory of 9,910,710 square miles—population of 36,890,000.
  - (3) Asiatic colonies: territory of 900,842 square miles—population of 21,640,000.
- This total world area of 11,000,000 square miles (excluding France) spreads over the entire globe and makes of France a world Empire, all of whose imperial possessions are

at stake in the present conflict.

It includes the Canadian coast islands, West Indies islands, French Guiana, East Indian Islands, Tahiti, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Jibuti, Madagascar, Indo-China, Somaliland, Equatorial Africa, Togoland, Dahomey, Ivory Coast, Niger, Camerouns and Syria. In addition, there are a host of small island groups dotting the Pacific, Indian Ocean, etc. which—as with the British—serve as naval bases, refueling stations, military centers, etc.

**COLORS CANNON-FODDER FOR THE SLAUGHTER**

The colonies supply an enormous manpower for the French imperialist army. Figures for 1935 show that (1) In the French Foreign Legion there were 16,500 colonials; (2) The African army had 103,500 soldiers and (3) The Colonial army had 87,500. There were 230,000 soldiers overseas in 1935 and the number has probably doubled by now. Forced enlistments and recruitment drives have been going on for over a year.

French imperialism has had a history as long and bloody as that of the British.

As early as 1830 they held possession of Algiers, the most valuable of their possessions. For over 100 years they have drained this Mohammedan country. It is the India of the French Empire. Next came Tunis, an area likewise of great value.

In the 1860's, the French took time off from their act of carving up China to take possession of the five provinces of Indo-China (Laos, Cambodia, Annam, Cochinchina, Tongking). All of them were subdued and occupied by a large military force. The English, incidentally, were the leading spirit in the London-Paris axis

that existed at that time. They grabbed up the Malay peninsula while the French took over Indo-China. London and Paris were the forerunners of Berlin and Rome in imperialist teamwork.

A sharp struggle took place over Morocco which France needed to protect its Algerian colony. It was finally given to France in 1911 after the Agadir crisis led Europe to the brink of war.

After the World War, France and England wrote their Versailles Treaty. In addition to exerting a commanding influence over the "Little Entente" countries of Central and Balkan Europe, the French divided Germany's African colonies with the British and also got a mandate for Syria.

**COLONIAL REVOLTS PUT DOWN**

The French have faced two major revolts on the part of the Arabian nationalist movement for freedom. In 1912 they put down a general Moroccan rising and in 1920 they put down the Rifis who were led by the famous nationalist leader, Abd-el Krim. French imperialism aped its English brothers in ferocity and cruelty.

In 1925 they subdued a nationalist insurrection in Syria. Their administration of this "protectorate" was so vicious that even their own creation—the League of Nations—was obliged to formally condemn French mal-administration.

The French Empire has consistently followed the British imperialist tactics of plunder and loot, military and dictatorial rule, suppression of all nationalist and democratic movements. The rulers of France—like their fellow imperialists across the Channel—can only have their tongues in their cheeks when they talk of fighting for "democracy" and "civilization."

**C. P. Paint Brush Will Not Hide  
The Truth On Spain's Betrayal**

By FELIX MORROW

Heralded in announcements on preceding days as "the inside story on Spain's betrayal", the Daily Worker published on April 21 a "manifesto of the central committee of the Communist Party of Spain."

The document reveals very little about the "inside story". The "manifesto" is, rather, an attempt to still misgivings.

Why did the Spanish Communist party remain silent during the crucial days when the Negrin government cleared out and the Miaja-Casado Popular Front Junta took over and surrendered to Franco?

The actual facts are damningly clear. On March 5 the Junta took power. The next day the Negrin cabinet, including the Communist ministers, Uribe and Hernandez, evacuated the country, and in the same planes or others also went La Pasionaria, Lister, Modesto, Hidalgo de Cisneros, Carlos Nunez Mazas, Antonio Cordon, etc.—in a word, the entire leadership of the Communist Party (the general secretary, Jose Diaz, was already out of the country).

We pointed out at the time the impelling motive which made it impossible for the Stalinists to resist the Popular Front Junta. The Stalinists dared not admit to the world that the Popular Front had ousted the Stalinists. Still less could the Stalinists in turn oust the Popular Front, and take over the helm. Stalin himself had already abandoned Spain—as Krivitsky has since told in detail—and so the Stalinist leadership simply cleared out with Negrin.

**FAKING DATES TO FAKE AN EXPLANATION**

But how explain all this away? The "manifesto" which attempts to do so is dated March 18. This date, the most plausible which the Stalinists could attempt, is undoubtedly a fake. The central committee was not in Spain but in France, since March 6, and had they written the document on that date, it would have been published long ago, and not on April 21. The date line in the Daily Worker, "Paris, April 3 (by mail)" is pure fakery, for the huge Stalinist apparatus cables immediately here tenth-rate documents, let alone one of such significance, and why would the Spanish leadership hold the document in Paris from March 18 to April 3? Actually the document must have been written well after the

events. The "manifesto" is so written as to give the impression that it appeared in the midst of the events surrounding the establishment of the Miaja-Casado Junta. But the Junta took power on March 5, put down the protesting troops in the succeeding week, and on March 18 had radioed an appeal for peace to Franco and had ceased all pretense of resistance to the fascists! The Daily Worker's introduction to the "manifesto", as one which "warns the Spanish people that the Casado 'Junta' could only bring about the enslavement of the Spanish people", and the present-tense references in the "manifesto" to activities of the Junta, are pure fakery.

**"MANIFESTO" DODGES THE KEY QUESTION**

Why does not the "manifesto" denounce the death sentences against Barcelo and other Communist troop leaders? Why does it not accept responsibility for the revolt? On the contrary, it says that those "who speak about a 'Communist uprising' know very well, that if we had wanted to rise up in arms against the Government we could have done it, because we had the forces to do it and to win." Then why didn't the Communist Party overthrow the treacherous Junta and organize resistance to Franco? This key question is the one which above all is asked by those—International Brigades, Communist party workers in the various pro-Spain organizations, etc.—who sacrificed for Spain and want to know why their sacrifice was in vain. But the "manifesto" is designed, not to answer, but to avoid answering this fundamental question.

In order not to answer, the usual paint brush is employed. The "manifesto" is entitled the "Casado - Trotskyite treachery", and is bestrewn with references to "Trotskyites". The fact that our whole movement, in Spain and internationally, was the only one in the whole workers' movement which irreconcilably denounced the Miaja-Casado Junta and that we characterized its counter-revolutionary character while the Stalinist press remained silent—this established fact does not trouble the Stalinist fabricators. At all costs they must confuse the issue by the usual mountain of slander against the Fourth International.

They dare to link us with Casado—they whose party leader, General Miaja, presided over the Casado Junta, and who, as the "manifesto" admits, tried to make peace with the Junta!

Negrin went because the rest of the Popular Front, in seeking to save their own hides, needed a scapegoat to offer Franco, and the Stalinists, who controlled Negrin, were the obvious scapegoats. But Negrin's whole policy differed not a whit from his successors: both sought conciliation with Franco.

The Stalinists have sought to conceal this. In line with their preposterous picture of Negrin as a bitter-ender, the "manifesto" pictures the result had he remained at the helm: "... today we would have peace, independence and liberty without reprisals. And we even say that it could have been possible to save some of the social gains made by the Republic for the benefit of the workers and peasants. Today, the peasantry would not have the prospect of seeing the landowners come back as the victors nor the workers the prospect of a slavery regime."

ed over the Casado Junta, and who, as the "manifesto" admits, tried to make peace with the Junta!

Negrin went because the rest of the Popular Front, in seeking to save their own hides, needed a scapegoat to offer Franco, and the Stalinists, who controlled Negrin, were the obvious scapegoats. But Negrin's whole policy differed not a whit from his successors: both sought conciliation with Franco.

The Stalinists have sought to conceal this. In line with their preposterous picture of Negrin as a bitter-ender, the "manifesto" pictures the result had he remained at the helm: "... today we would have peace, independence and liberty without reprisals. And we even say that it could have been possible to save some of the social gains made by the Republic for the benefit of the workers and peasants. Today, the peasantry would not have the prospect of seeing the landowners come back as the victors nor the workers the prospect of a slavery regime."

Unfortunately for the Stalinists, however, even their own collaborators have divulged part of the truth. For example, Negrin's foreign minister, Alvarez del Vayo, wrote in the British weekly, the New Statesman, (reprinted in Left, April, 1939):

"Of the three conditions for making peace which Dr. Negrin had stipulated in that last meeting of the Cortes at Figueras on February 1—the independence of Spain, freedom for the Spanish people to determine its destiny, and the assurance that there would be no reprisals—we knew perfectly well that the only one still possessing practical meaning, the only one we must strive for, was the third. . . . It was a question of making possible the departure from Spain of some twenty thousand marked men and women. . . . It was for this that the Negrin government was still disposed to resist—and for nothing else."

**IN THIS  
CORNER**

By Max Shachtman

The conscription law proposed to the House of Commons by the Chamberlain crew is extremely enlightening, from at least two angles.

The first is the obvious contradiction between a law to conscript the young men of the nation into the army, and the loudly disseminated myth that the war which this army is to fight is overwhelmingly popular among the people. Anxious to maintain its carefully-acquired reputation for lying, the capitalist press, both here and in England, prominently displays reports that the youth of Britain is voluntarily flocking into the army. But if this is really the case, why is it necessary to resort to conscription? If there are so many volunteers, why must force be invoked to make them join the army?

**The Labour Party's Opposition**

But as said, this aspect of the Chamberlain proposal is all too obvious. Less so is the alleged opposition to the conscription act on the part of the Labour Party spokesmen. Alleged—because it is not real, not consistent, not durable.

How easy it is for the Chamberlain group to dispose of such opposition by a contemptuous gesture or a cynical remark. In effect, this is all that the supporters of the Prime Minister have to, and do, say to their Labour Party critics:

"The Honorable Gentlemen of His Majesty's Ever So Loyal Opposition seem to us to be lacking in patriotism, love for democracy, or even respect for their own avowed position. In fact, objectively, they are aiding and abetting that very policy of appeasement to which, not so long ago, they took such vehement objection."

"When the Prime Minister, in his ardent attempts to preserve the peace, returned from Munich, he was assailed for not taking a firm stand against the German Chancellor and the totalitarian powers. The Honorable Gentlemen refused to take into consideration the fact that the Empire was not then in a position to implement by means of warfare the firmer stand which it might have been necessary to take at Munich. They showed their inconsistency then by insisting that a position should have been taken last September which could not but have meant war, and at the same time they recognized England's disadvantageous situation in the criticisms they made at the same time of our lack of military and aerial preparations. We were then the ones who best defended the interests of the British Empire and, consequently, of world democracy."

"Now, however, when the situation is ripe for a really firm stand by England, a stand which we must be ready to back up by armed strength, we again confront the inconsistency of the Opposition. Do they perhaps intend to fight Hitler's army with printed copies of their eloquent speeches? Or are they really so innocent as to imagine that we can wait until the Royal Army is built up to war strength by volunteers who are, alas, not forthcoming in sufficient numbers?"

"It was the Opposition that insisted upon an aggressive policy towards the totalitarian regimes. Now that such a policy is being practiced, the Opposition refuse to make possible its implementation. We are prepared to challenge them to bring the issue to a head, for we are certain that they will not pick up the gage of electoral battle."

**Whoever Says A, Must Say B**

In their own way, the Tories would be entirely correct. The Labour Party patriots have a position which makes it impossible to oppose such measures as conscription. Whoever says A, according to the German proverb, must say B. Whoever demands so violently, as the Labour Party leaders have demanded for months past, that the country take steps in the conflict with Hitler which inevitably bring the war closer, cannot, at the last minute, pretend to balk at what, in the light of all that has happened, is a comparatively minor step in preparing for that war.

After all, the Labour Party politicians are just engaged in a game of pretense and petty factional warfare. A number of them have written in the quite recent past in favor of reconsidering the traditional English hostility towards conscription. The present official "opposition" to the law has nothing whatever in common with a principled stand. It is opportunistic from beginning to end. Tomorrow will prove to the hilt, when the Labour Party leaders come out openly, as they did in the last world war, as the most zealous and effective recruiting agents for the government.

But before they take on that role, they want a little more recognition than the Chamberlain government has condescended so far to give them. Not that Messrs. Atlee and Co. are ambitious or overbearing in their demands. Far from it. They would, in all likelihood, be satisfied with even less than Lloyd George gave them in his cabinet during the last world war. In other words, they would probably go along without so much as a murmur if the Chamberlain cabinet were reorganized to include a couple of such stainless democrats as Winston Churchill, notorious friend of the Soviets, and Anthony Eden, notorious enemy of the Tories—and possibly to exclude Chamberlain himself.

Naturally, if a "genuine" National Government were established, one that would include in the cabinet a few regular Labour party wheelhorses, that would be so much the better. In that case, they would make the Chamberlain-Cliveden gang look like so many chicken-hearted pacifists by comparison with their own unrestrained military ardor.

If the whole record of the Labour Party leadership is anything to go by, it is a safe prediction that as the weeks go by their opposition to Chamberlain's present conscription law will not only be abandoned but that they will be in the forefront of the House of Commons mob howling for conscription for all able-bodied cannon-fodder up to the age of 35, with exceptions made only for those sterling patriots, the shilling-a-year men who must perform stay behind the lines in order to keep industry going at top speed and war profit rolling in accordingly.

And it is just as safe to add the prediction that the American equivalent of the Labour party leadership—the bureaucracy of the trade unions in this country—will, at the right moment, give its English brothers cards and spades and still beat them at the game.