

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. III, No. 39 June 6, 1939

Published twice a week by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALexandria 4-8347

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Single copies: 2 cents per copy in the 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, 1933, 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, EMANUEL GARRETT, JOSEPH HANSEN
Staff Members: S. STANLEY
Business Manager: S. STANLEY

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. 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.

Stop Reaction's March

The Pennsylvania legislature has just passed a bill outlawing sit-down strikes, abolishing the check-off of union dues, and granting the employer the unwarranted privilege to interfere with workers' rights by calling for a union election whenever he wishes.

This bill is part of the nation-wide offensive of Big Business and the War Deal against labor and belongs to the same category of legislative and judicial attacks as the vicious anti-labor bills passed in Oregon and Washington, the sit-down prosecutions in Los Angeles, the decision of the Supreme Court in the Fansteel case, and the \$7,500,000 damage suit of Republic Steel against the workers it shot down.

With the development of the sit-down strike and the great wave of union organization that created the C.I.O. and built up the membership of the A.F. of L. to new heights, the American worker demonstrated that he had unlimited power to bring the employers to heel and put a stop to bosses' acts of intimidation, violence, spying, shootings in the back, low wages, long hours, and colossal profits for the stockholders.

But the employers own, control, and manage the government and the courts. As soon as the militancy of the workers seemed to die down, the employers launched a counter-campaign, utilizing their government as the instrument of attack.

Through their government, they are attempting to do away with the sit-down strike which won gains for labor so effectively. Through their government they are attempting to impoverish the union treasury by abolishing the check-off. Through their government they are attempting to put a complete halt to union organization by permitting the employer to call an election whenever he is sure that the union for one reason or another does not have a majority in the plant.

The first step in calling a halt to this offensive of Big Business is clear recognition that these anti-labor laws should be regarded by militant labor with the same degree of contempt with which Big Business had them enacted.

To the law of the employers: PROFITS FIRST, the workers must reply: THE RIGHT TO LIVE FIRST.

There is no deception, no violence, no frame-up, no bloody or despicable deed which Big Business will not commit in its counter-campaign against labor. We must organize Workers Defense Guards immediately in every union local in order to meet a new wave of machine-gun terror from the bosses.

And we must organize to put into power our own government, a WORKERS' GOVERNMENT that will act to protect and increase the rights of the great majority of working men instead of the small handful of stockholders whose vaults are bursting with ill-gotten profits.

The "Front" Collapses

By a decisive majority, the Congress of the French Socialist Party voted to put an end to collaboration with the Stalinist party.

The decision marks only the formal burial of the Popular Front which has been dead on its feet these many months in France. The so-

called "Radicals" led by Daladier, had abandoned it some time ago.

A more inglorious end to a movement for which such fabulous promises were made, is hard to imagine.

The Popular Front was going to unite the workers into a solid bloc and win to its banner the "progressive capitalists." It succeeded only in yoking the workers to the chariot of the ruling class.

It was going to consolidate and extend the gains won by the workers by their own militant class action, especially during the powerful sit-down strike movement of June 1936. First under Blum and then under Daladier, every one of these gains was taken away from the workers, who were cajoled, browbeaten and forced into abandoning them under the plea that it was in the interest of the Popular Front.

It was going to bar the road to the advance of the fascists in France, to the rise of totalitarianism. The fascist gains are stronger and more impudent in France today than they were three-four years ago. The advance of totalitarianism, of dictatorial rule, of government by decree has been swifter and more stunning during the period of the Popular Front government, especially Daladier's, than ever before in France.

It was going to "secure peace," to stave off war, to "halt Hitler." It did none of these. Not only is war more imminent, but the masses are more disoriented and demoralized in face of that mortal threat to their lives and liberties. Still more: both the Socialist and Communist Parties ended their Popular Front collaboration by becoming the most zealous patriots, the most furious shouters for a "preventive" war against Hitler and Co.

It was going to lead to a "united party" of the working class. It did not; it could not. The gulf between the social democrats and the Stalinists is wider today than at the beginning of the Popular Front. The social democrats have become more rabid national French patriots. The Stalinists have become more openly nationalist Russian patriots. The one is no more honorable than the other.

As the "Iron Front"—class collaboration in Germany opened the road to Hitler. As the "People's Front"—class collaboration in Spain facilitated the triumph of Franco. In France, the collapse of People's Front collaboration with capitalism makes it possible for the workers and peasants of that country to reorganize their ranks, to turn the helm in the right direction, and with their invincible united strength, crush the war-mongers and capitalist exploiters. There is yet time for this.

And let us learn the clearly-indicated lessons from Europe. The Popular Front—that means the subjection of labor to capital; that means ignominious defeat.

Progress, victory—these are possible only by means of the United Workers Front, of Class against Class.

And How!

"I-Hate-War" Roosevelt continues to hate war in his own inimitable fashion.

Having turned over to the war machine the funds belonging to the unemployed and spent more money for warplanes, battleships, bombs, rifles, torpedoes, bayonets, and submarines than any other peace-time president in the history of the United States, he has now launched a recruiting campaign without parallel to expand his army.

Huge recruiting stations on wheels are to be opened, new slogans are to be invented, and posters, motion pictures, and the radio are to be marshalled for use. Major Harold N. Gilbert, recruiting officer-in-charge said that even some "high pressure salesmanship" might be used.

They'll need plenty of high pressure salesmanship. For, as the recent Gallup polls have shown, not all Roosevelt's charm has sold the American workers and farmers on the idea of going to war.

Stalin Aids China

A dispatch from Hong Kong reports that materials are coming from Russia to the aid of China on a greatly reduced scale. Not only have shipments been cut down, but the experts who have been acting as a staff of advisors to Chiang Kai-shek have been withdrawn almost entirely.

Observers report that no new agreement has been reached for further aid from Russia and that Stalin's policy of helping China has about run its course.

What is the trouble? Has Stalin succeeded in draining away China's gold supply the way he did Loyalist Spain's? Or is he finding that his G.P.U. apparatus cannot learn the Chinese language as easily as it learned Spanish? Or did his fishing agreement with Japan extend to the borders of Tibet?

Visits Palestine, Finds Communist Party Pursuing Anti-Jewish Line

How Melach Epstein, Former "Freiheit" Editor, Saw the Full Viciousness of the Stalinist Line and Was Driven Into Exile for Telling His Objections to the Bureaucracy

How Melach Epstein, editor of the Communist Party's Yiddish daily, the Freiheit, went to Palestine and was horrified to discover the Palestinian Communist Party conducting an anti-Jewish policy; how he returned to seek the intervention of the Central Committee of the American party; and how, as a consequence of raising the question he was driven from his editorial post, has now been told by Sh. Weber, who from 1932 to 1937 was a colleague of Epstein and co-city editor of the Freiheit. Details of this story appear in an article by Weber in the Jewish Daily Forward, May 27.

When Epstein arrived in Palestine in the Spring of 1936, a prominent figure in the Communist movement, he found himself greeted with open hostility by the Arab secretary of the Palestinian party. "Who sent for you, who needs your advice?" this man said to Epstein. "We get our advice from Moscow, and you stop interfering."

C.P.P. Anti-Jewish As a result of his encounters with this man and his investigations of the actual conduct of the Stalinists in Palestine, Epstein was driven to the conclusion that "the general secretary of the Communist Party of Palestine is a bitter enemy of the Jews."

Moscow's appointee as chief-tain of the Palestinian Stalinists worked on the basis of the outlook, which he expressed to Epstein, that all Jewish Communists were actually secret sympathizers with the Zionist movement. As a consequence, he took measures to drive most of the Jewish Communists out of the organization.

In accordance with Moscow's line of refusing to distinguish between the genuine aspira-

tions of the Arab masses and the corrupt and unprincipled game played by the Mufti and his terrorists, the Palestinian Stalinist organization not only defended the bombings and assassinations carried on by the Mufti's gangsters, but actually itself engaged in such bombings, Epstein discovered. Jewish Communists were singled out for the horrible task of throwing these bombs. In cases where Arabs were assigned, the Jews were required to manufacture the bombs.

Meets Oppositionists Epstein had a meeting with a group of Jewish Communists who had been driven out of the organization, and learned further corroborating details along the same line. Since then, these dissidents have organized around the paper published in both Arabic and Hebrew, Haor-El Nour, on a program of Arab-Jewish workers' and peasants' unity.

Epstein learned of the assignment of two young Jewish Communists to throw a bomb at a Jewish meeting in Tel-Aviv. He sought out those assigned, and prevailed upon them to abandon the project.

Horrified by what he had seen in Palestine, Epstein went to Spain and there saw the chieftain of the colonial department of the Communist International. The latter, when appealed to by Epstein, told him that his only recourse was to secure the aid of the Central Committee of the American party.

Epstein Tells His Story The foregoing facts were reported by Epstein to a select meeting of members of the Jewish Bureau of the C.P. and editorial associates on the Freiheit. Weber was at this meeting, and the terrible facts reported by Epstein and the failure of the Stalinist leadership

to do anything about them led him finally to break with Stalinism.

Epstein never succeeded in bringing the matter to the point of discussion in the Central Committee. He was merely called before a sub-committee and confronted with a ready-made resolution supporting the policy of the Comintern in Palestine. A bureaucrat without much courage, Epstein soon enough capitulated. His sole act of resistance was to refuse to write an article at the time defending the line of the Central Committee's resolution.

The Jackals around him took advantage of the weakening of Epstein's position as the result of his raising the Palestine question, and after a period of defending himself, Epstein was finally forced to resign his post as editor, and go into exile for two years at the other end of the country.

The Basic Line Weber's story provides a minor link in the broader story which requires no revelations at all, but is known to the Jewish workers and Arab workers and peasants of Palestine. The Stalinists have sought to win the good will of the Arab landowners and bourgeoisie in preference to that of the Palestinian masses. Having no faith in the colonial revolution which is indicated for the Near East, the Stalinists prefer to link themselves with the Arab exploiters and to use them as a form of pressure upon Britain on behalf of Stalin's diplomatic moves. The Stalinists never criticize the Arab exploiters, and have discouraged all moves to organize the Arab workers as an independent force. This is the basic policy lying behind the anti-Jewish orientation of the Palestinian Stalinist organization.

Manifesto Issued by League for Cultural Freedom and Socialism

(Continued from Page 1)

mum is put upon the conventional and the academic. The social sciences are witnessing the revival of various forms of obscurantism, the rise of an intolerant orthodoxy. Educators are being intimidated through loyalty oaths. Government censorship cripples W.P.A. theatre, art, and literary projects. Terrorism is exercised by the Catholic church over such cultural enterprises as the movies. Covert sabotage hinders the publication of work by independent and revolutionary writers. And in heresy hunting bodies like the Dies Committee, many of these tendencies find official and concentrated expression.

Such conditions are a challenge to independent intellectuals. Yet no existing cultural organization is ready fully to meet the challenge. If in the totalitarian states intellectual life is an affair for the police, in America it is preparing, under pressure of anti-fascist hysteria, for voluntary abdication. Cultural circles, formerly progressive, are now capitulating to the spirit of fascism while ostensibly combatting its letter. They fight one falsehood with another. To the defecation of Hitler and Mussolini they counterpose the defecation of Stalin, the unqualified support of Roosevelt. The mysticism of "Aryan" supremacy they match with a national-democratic myth conjured out of America's historic infancy. To the war drive of the fascist powers they reply with a war drive of their own.

In consequence the intellectual gains of recent decades are being rapidly wiped out. The last war set moving in this country a profound current of scepticism in respect to bourgeois values in art and life. Responsible for the finest cultural achievements of the post-war period, this tendency culminated after 1929 in the radicalization of a significant part of the intelligentsia. But now, in the name of a spurious "anti-fascist" unity, numerous intellectuals are deserting their hard-won critical independence. They are giving up their opposition to capitalist exploitation and oppression, to imperialist domination of colonial lands. They no longer protest repression and frame-up in this country, in the Soviet Union, and in other "democracies." They have forsaken the struggle for the right of asylum. In

the name of a "democratic front" against tyranny abroad they put up with increasing tyranny at home. In short, they have surrendered the right—and duty—to protest all injustice, to investigate all formulae, to challenge all dogmas, to think through all problems. And inspired by Stalinist and social-reformist propaganda they advocate a new war for "democracy." Yet this war must give birth to military dictatorship and to forms of intellectual repression far more violent than those evoked by the last war.

Among advanced intellectual circles in the United States the most active forces of reaction today are the so-called cultural organizations under control of the Communist party. Pretending to represent progressive opinion, these bodies are in effect but apologists for the Kremlin dictatorship. They outlaw all dissenting opinion from the Left. They poison the intellectual atmosphere with slander. And they have succeeded in imposing their views and methods on groups formerly independent of the Communist Party.

Against these forces we, the undersigned, believe that artists and writers must unite to defend their independence as craftsmen, indeed, their very right to work. It goes without saying that we do not subscribe to that currently fashionable catch-word: "Neither communism nor fascism." On the contrary, we recognize that the liberation of culture is inseparable from the liberation of the working classes and of all humanity. Shall we abandon the ideals of revolutionary socialism because one political group, while clinging to its name, has so miserably betrayed its principles? Shall we revert to a program of middle-class democracy because the Kremlin government, in obedience to its own interests—which are no longer the interests of the masses anywhere—directs us to do so? On the contrary, we reject all such commands. Democracy under industrial-capitalism can offer no permanent haven to the intellectual worker and artist. In its instability, it becomes the breeding ground of dictatorship, and such few liberties as it grants us today, it will violently revoke tomorrow. The idea of democracy must come to flow-

er in a socialist democracy. In the revolutionary reconstruction of society lies the hope of the world, the promise of a free humanity, a new art, an unrestricted science.

The defense of intellectual freedom requires, moreover, that we reject all theories and practices which tend to make culture the creature of politics, even revolutionary politics. We demand COMPLETE FREEDOM FOR ART AND SCIENCE. NO DICTATION BY PARTY OR GOVERNMENT. Culture not only does not seek orders but by its very nature cannot tolerate them. Truly intellectual creation is incompatible with the spirit of conformity; and if art and science are to be true to the revolution, they must first be true to themselves.

We are not alone in these convictions. Our principles are in general agreement with those contained in a recent manifesto of Andre Breton, the French poet, and Diego Rivera, the Mexican painter. Movements inspired by their manifesto have already appeared in France, England and elsewhere.

We appeal, therefore, to all writers and artists in the United States who are in substantial accord with our views to unite with us in forming a revolutionary league of writers and artists. The function of this organization will be to give publicity to our aims, to provide a forum for cultural discussion, and to campaign against all reactionary tendencies in intellectual life wherever they arise.

THE LEAGUE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM AND SOCIALISM: James Burnham, V. F. Calverton, Eleanor Clark, David C. DeJong, F. W. Dupee, James T. Farrell, Clement Greenberg, William Gruen, Melvin J. Lasky, James Laughlin IV, Dwight Macdonald, Charles Malamuth, Sherry Mangan, Clark Mills, George L. K. Morris, George Novack, Lyman Paine, Kenneth Patchen, William Phillips, Fairfield Porter, Philip Rahv, James Rorty, Harold Rosenberg, Paul Rosenfeld, Meyer Schapiro, Delmore Schwartz, Winfield T. Scott, John Wheelwright, and Bertram D. Wolfe.

(Please address all communications to: Dwight Macdonald, Acting Secretary, 539 East 88th St., New York City.)

IN THIS CORNER
By Max Shachtman

Some of our readers may be aware that the Lovestonites are carrying on a shamed campaign for union into one organization of themselves, the Socialist Party and the Socialist Workers Party. Shamefaced, because the I.L.L.A. and the editors of the Workers Age do not take a position on the question yet—that's their idea of giving leadership—but, with mock humility, they print inspired "letters from the rank and file" in which the standpoint in favor of union is given the better play.

On another occasion, our own opinion on the question will be put forward at greater length. Suffice it for today to print a communication which shows the lengths to which Lovestone is going in his anxiety to unite with the "Trotskyists"—a letter just received from an old friend in Paris, under date of May 21. It reads in part:

"I come to a less pleasant subject, Lovestone and his lecture. It was reserved for a half hundred members of the P.S.O.P., plus several invited guests, I among them. You can well imagine that under the circumstances Lovestone had nothing of the 'innocent abroad' about him. The aim he assigned himself, on the basis of an exposition of the American trade union situation, was visible from the beginning to the end of his lecture but only if one were a little familiar with this situation and with things in America in general. It was a bit long and tiresome because Lovestone does not speak French and his translator wanted to translate bit by bit and himself spoke very slowly, sometimes haltingly. But he was a true colleague, who did his all to accentuate, by his tone, the points that L. smothered over, here and there, and you know our proverb that 'c'est le ton qui fait la chanson' (It's the tone that makes the song).

Such "Honest" People!

"On every point he was obviously tendentious. Even when he pointed out, at the outset, that there were now two trade union movements in the United States, he insisted on the fact that they were two genuine movements, nothing like what the Comintern had tried to do formerly when it sought everywhere to split the existing trade unions. Similarly with respect to the trade union work of the members of the Lovestone group. Ninety percent of them are unionists—the other ten percent being ineligible—and eighty percent hold trade union positions, often modest ones but permitting them to carry on a good work of education, he said. They are model unionists, disciplined and respectful of the rules and regulations. To be sure, they defend their points of view and try to have them prevail, but if they are in the minority, they submit and apply the decisions adopted. They never maneuver to impose their proposals 'from above' as was the case with the wicked Bolsheviks. They are true democrats. However, that holds true only of strictly union questions. When it is a matter of political questions—for example, the struggle against the war—they intend to preserve a complete freedom of action, even though the majority decides against them. However, they form fractions inside of all organizations.

"As for the two trade union organizations, the older, the A.F.L., is well known for its conservative tendency. Yet, it is a democratic organization, each affiliated union maintaining the right to act as it pleases. Whereas in the C.I.O. there is no democracy whatsoever. What's more, when the re-constitution of unity was possible, because the A.F.L. accepted the new principle of organization on an industrial basis, it was Lewis who pulled out, showing thereby that he wanted above all to keep his center, of which he was the all-powerful master. That is why the Lovestone group, after having worked with the C.I.O. and having rejoiced over its creation, moved away from it. Lovestone said nothing, of course, of his activity and of his personal interventions, of his collaboration with Homer Martin, etc.

"That's about all there was in the general exposition. It was already pretty tendentious and the picture of the A.F.L. was rather flattering, just as the picture of the Comintern of the good period was calumnious. But in the question period, when Lovestone alone had the floor and always the last word, his fire was directed against the American 'Trotskyists.' They are only a political sect. Little influence in the trade unions. Only 400-500 members (the Lovestone group has 2,000, he said). The Trotskyists are Stalinists upside-down. Their turns are as abrupt as those of the Stalinists and, if they criticize Stalinism, they get their slogans from the Pope of Coyoacan. For example, after having entered the Socialist party, they abruptly left it, after having caused a good deal of trouble and having weakened it (this said for the benefit of the leaders of the P.S.O.P. who welcomed the French Trotskyists). Similarly in the trade union movement where they at first defended Homer Martin, then attacked him without anyone knowing why. Finally, in this case, a not very flattering portrait but one which will certainly not surprise you. He said not a word, naturally, either of the Twice-Weekly Appeal or of the New International.

An Embarrassing Question

"Yet one question embarrassed him: Is it true that the Lovestone group approved the first Moscow trials and changed its attitude only with the third trial, when Rykov and Bukharin were involved? There is no connection, said Lovestone, between this question and the subject of my lecture. But I do not want to evade it. It is true that we were mistaken at first about the Moscow trials. But the I.L.L.A. does not pretend to have reached perfection as yet. It can make mistakes. If it were already perfect, we would no longer have anything to do!"

"Pretty ridiculous, isn't it? But what could he say?"

"Even though the I.L.L.A. was still far from perfection and Lovestone was subject to error, the aim he set himself was certainly no less affected by it: it was to discredit the American Trotskyists and, by that, to reinforce, in the struggles developing at present inside the ranks of the P.S.O.P., the anti-Trotskyist elements, Freemasons and others who find Trotskyism rather annoying. For me, being only an invited guest, not a member of the P.S.O.P., and respectful of the rules of well-known old French politeness, I limited myself to listening and to recording the fact that I had lost a good evening."