

SOCIALIST APPEAL
 Vol. III, No. 41 June 13, 1939

Published twice a week by the
 SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.
 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. 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, 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
 EMANUEL GARRETT JOSEPH HANSEN

Staff Members:
 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.

Two Items

WASHINGTON — Here are the White House menus for luncheon and the state dinner honoring King George and Queen Elizabeth today:

- LUNCHEON**
- Minted Melon Balls
 - Green Turtle Soup
 - Broiled Sweetbreads, Mushrooms
 - Asparagus Saratoga Chips
 - Hearts of Lettuce, Roquefort Dressing
 - Pineapple Sponge Shortcake
- DINNER**
- Clam Cocktail
 - Calf's Head Soup
 - Terrapin, Corn Sticks
 - Boned Capon, Cranberry Sauce
 - Peas Butter Beets
 - Sweet Potato Cones
 - Frozen Cheese and Cress Salad
 - Maple and Almond Ice Cream
 - White Pound Cake Coffee

KEARNY, N. J.—While his wife was at the town hall here today seeking relief, James Gilmore, unemployed and ill for three years hanged himself in a clothes closet in his home at 143 Brighton Avenue, according to the police. His wife found him hanging when she returned home, and notified the police. Gilmore, who was 59 years of age, was the father of five children.

If he was hungry, why didn't he get himself invited to the luncheon and dinner to the King? Isn't this a democracy?

Say Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen: "Just how close the president and his lieutenants believe Europe is to war is illustrated by the following: The Justice Department is secretly collaborating with the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board and the S.E.C. in preparing a set of economic and financial bills for submission to Congress immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities. The bills are designed to protect banks and stock exchanges from demoralizing echoes of a European conflict and are based on the lessons learned from world war experience." Naturally, there are no bills to be presented in Congress designed to protect the workers and their organizations, but the Socialist Workers Party is now, as always, working on its own methods of protecting the workers.

A Democratic Pope

When the new pope was elected by the cardinals at Rome the excitement and joy of the Daily Worker knew no bounds. The election was a victory for "democracy" and a blow to fascism. Pius would show the war-mongers where to get off at.

Now the press brings the report that "the pope is considerably perturbed by the planned alliance of Britain, France and Russia because of fears that the Soviet will be allowed to play an important part in European diplomacy. The church is an irreconcilable enemy of Bolshevism, so there is little doubt that the pope will do everything in his power to prevent the conclusion of this alliance or to minimize its effect if the negotiations now in progress are successful."

Pius is actively at work trying to establish the notorious Four Power Pact—England, Germany, France and Italy—which would of course be directed towards isolating and eventually crushing the Soviet Union.

His policy, or, more accurately, the policy of

the Catholic Church, should occasion no surprise. The institution of organized Catholicism, as of every church, is wedded to the preservation of private property. When it can best be maintained by "democracy" the churches, as in the United States today, are generally speaking for democratic capitalism. When it cannot be maintained save by fascism, as in Germany, Portugal, Spain and Italy, the churches are generally speaking for fascist capitalism. Whatever the political regime, it is capitalism they serve as spiritual shield.

The pope, like his predecessors in office, is only running true to form.

First Lady

One jeweled phrase was omitted in the Daily Worker's account of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech to the "Right to Work" congress of the Workers Alliance:

"It doesn't always mean having more money to live better. It is a matter of more education."

The First Lady of the Land has something there, especially for the unemployed whom she was addressing. Let us give a few examples:

If you are sweating in an airless dump and can't pay rent for a decent place to live in—don't think of more money. You don't have to. Just enroll in a night school or go to college.

If you are on the near-starvation diet of the relief authorities, and you wouldn't fight hard against being served steak—just to break the monotony, you know—there is no need to think of money. Just take yourself a six-year post-graduate course in astrophysics at the local University. At the end, you will surely not worry about food at all.

And if you're a doctor or teacher on the rocks, just remember, it isn't money you need. It's more education. Go back to school. Try it all over again. There must have been something in your freshman year that you failed to pick up.

The First Lady in Eighteenth Century France, a chippie named Marie Antoinette, told the hungry people of Paris to eat cake if they couldn't get bread.

Our First Lady is more modern and dignified. She tells the hungry masses: Go to college.

Though Liechtenstein is small, it is peculiarly important in the picture of world finance and international capitalism. The little country is, in effect, a safety deposit box for corporations that deal in international trade. Among other mammoth organizations, the Standard Oil Company has magnificent offices in the city hall, and a short distance away are the offices of the Royal Dutch Shell Company. Cheek by jowl are the offices of Krupp, the German munitions firm and Schneider, the French munitions firm. The income tax levied on corporations is 0.75 per thousand and the personal income tax is 1 per cent, but neither tax can be greater than 500 Swiss francs a year, or \$115. These are the companies which at home are strong proponents of "broadening the base" of taxation.

Soviets and Democracy

Testifying before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Ludlow amendment providing for a popular referendum on war, Major General John F. O'Ryan, retired, opposed the amendment because it would substitute the "Soviet idea for the American concept of representative government."

Now it seems to us that the General's remarks are not without point.

The "American concept of representative government," little children are taught in school, is the acme of democracy—the rule of the people. Fascism, on the other hand, is abominable because the people do not rule. The various Führers rule, they decide everything themselves without even making a pretense of consulting the ruled. They operate on the principle that "we know what's good for you."

Now everyone knows that the decisive majority of the American people is for a national popular referendum on war. In taking this position, the people are saying, and justifiably, that they do not trust the President and Congress. They want to decide on war themselves. They want to exercise the democratic prerogatives they were taught in school. Especially when their very lives are involved.

No, say O'Ryan and his fellow-American democrats. That's not the kind of democracy we have here. WE'LL decide FOR you. A referendum, he says, would base grave questions on the "emotional reactions of the electorate of the country."

The war-mongering rulers of the land would not be "emotional" at all. They would decide to plunge the masses into the slaughterhouse without a nerve quivering or a hair turning. And their kind of democracy doesn't provide for the people intervening in any way on the matter.

That, you see, would be Sovietism.

At bottom, O'Ryan is right! Capitalist democracy is a fraud. Only a Soviet democracy, a workers' democracy means true democracy for the masses, the real rule of the people.

Araquistain's Story of How Stalin Brought Spain's Treasure to Russia

Confirming Krivitsky's Testimony, Araquistain's Disclosures Expose the Great Stalinist "Sacrifices" for Loyalist Cause — Spain's Gold Tied Negrin to Stalin

Luis Araquistain's revelations on what Stalin's agents did behind the scenes of the civil war in Spain, a story suppressed for some unavowed reason by the New York Times (see story on page 1), was nevertheless published elsewhere in the United States, among others by the *Scranton (Pa.) Times* on May 25, 1939 — the story of how more than half a billion dollars in Spanish gold disappeared from the Loyalist treasury and turned up in Russia.

Stalin saved Loyalist Spain! Stalin's arms and munitions and airplanes stopped Franco in his tracks! Stalin sacrificed his all, staked his all, for Democracy in Spain! Praise be to the Great Stalin and blessed be His name!

One of the first "men in the know" to inject the rude disharmony of truth into this hymn of adoration was Walter Krivitsky, head of the Soviet Military Intelligence in Western Europe during the first part of the Spanish Civil War. He told a good part of the real story of Stalin's reactionary intervention in Spain; of the reign of terror instituted by the G.P.U. against the militants and revolutionists in the Spanish working class; of the obsolete military equipment sent from Russia and paid for in cold cash; and of the rifling of the Spanish treasury. Good, cold-blooded business—that's what it was for Stalin, among other things, when he secretly obtained millions of grams of gold from Spain.

Araquistain, another "man in the know," now confirms Krivitsky's account of the hi-jacking operation. He even furnishes additional and conclusive evidence. In the article printed by the *Scranton Times* he writes: **HOW STALIN GOT THE SPANISH GOLD**

"Negrin ordered, as minister of the treasury, that the gold of Spain, transferred first from Madrid to Cartagena, be sent later to Russia. I am not telling thereby any secret, even though, were it a secret, there would not be any reason now to keep it. The shipment of the Spanish gold to the Soviet Union was known by many Spaniards. The Russian general, Krivitsky, publicizes that fact. What Krivitsky does not know is the exact amount and

the way in which the deposit was made. I shall complete those details.

"The gold of Spain was the chain that tied Negrin indissolubly to Stalin, and what tied Stalin to Negrin. But it was Negrin himself who forged the links of the chain. By doing it he could continue in power in the republic and could continue as a phantom government after the defeat.

"The Spanish treasury was in danger at Cartagena. The enemy knew surely of the transfer and it is probable they prepared an assault against that hiding place of republican reserves. I myself advised Negrin to take it out of Cartagena. I asked him to come to Paris after having obtained, at his own request, permission from Largo Caballero for the trip. When I expressed my fears to him and suggested the convenience of placing the treasure in a safe place, he told me, smiling, that at that very moment the gold was on its way to Odessa.

"He explained how the deposit was made. It had been made in the name of Largo Caballero, of Indalecio Prieto and of Negrin himself. If some day one of the three was not available, or all of them, four men would replace them—three ambassadors (I was one of them) and a minister plenipotentiary. I am satisfied Largo Caballero never intervened with his signature in the operations concerning the gold deposited in Russia. I suppose that Prieto did not, either.

STALIN-NEGRIN RULED IN NAME OF GOLD

"In October, 1938, when President Azana thought of changing his policy, and consequently his cabinet, Negrin told him brutally that he was irreplaceable and that if Azana wanted to throw him out, he, Negrin, would place himself at the head of the army and the masses and resist him. Azana tolerated this flareup, which was really a coup d'etat, instead of ordering immediately the arrest of his insolent prime minister, or himself resigning at that very moment, which was the right one and not belatedly, as he did in France. Negrin, as exclusive treasurer of the republic, made himself unremovable dictator.

"At the end of the war, the

republic, people and army, tired of keeping up a war that had been virtually lost long before, and the continuation of which benefitted only Russia, arose against Negrin and compelled him to flee by air to France. But what about the treasure? It is not for nothing that the communists, which is to say Moscow, declared the Madrid Junta to be rebellious. It was necessary to defend the remnants of Spain's treasury.

"According to a communication dated February 10, 1937, from the Spanish republic's ambassador in Moscow, Marcelino Pascua, the amount deposited in Russia was 510,079,529 grams of gold (approximately \$573,989,115 at \$35 per ounce for gold).

"How much of it remains? Mystery. About this gold, Stalin knows a lot more than we, the Spaniards, do."

STALIN THE CRIMINAL AND HIS ACCOMPLICES

Leaving aside for the moment Araquistain's tender regard for Azana and the Madrid Junta—gate-opener for Franco—the facts he presents are highly revealing. They will not be successfully challenged by anyone, of that one may be certain.

It is interesting, in passing, to note that Araquistain himself, self-styled "left" socialist, is from every political point of view, nothing less than an accomplice to the Stalinist crimes. For many crucial months, he knew about the sordid game that Negrin and the Stalinists were playing. Despite his attempts to absolve Caballero, there cannot possibly be any doubt that the latter also knew. Yes, in the name of God knows what, Araquistain was as silent as a man with a mouthful of water. By his own admission, he kept the "secret."

But the guilt of an accomplice does not clear the name of the principal criminal. And his name is Stalin.

What will the Stalinists say in reply to Araquistain's story? What did the New Masses say? Will it answer Araquistain as it did Krivitsky? Will it perhaps say that, in the first place, there is no such person as Araquistain and, in the second place, his name is Schmelka Aronberg?

With Italy as His Model, Coughlin Agitates for a Totalitarian State

By GRACE SAUNDERS

Father Coughlin seeks to install in the United States an out-and-out fascist dictatorship. He uses the term "corporative state" instead of fascism, because fascism is too malodorous. But his model is the brutal, repressive, anti-labor government of Mussolini's Italy.

Coughlin tries to destroy confidence in democratic capitalism while spreading the illusion that fascism opens the road to a full life. He refers hypocritically to the evils that do exist under democracy, and hopes the dissatisfied workers, influenced by his fake sympathy, will leap into the arms of the fascist butchers. He wants Americans to jump out of the frying pan of decaying democratic capitalism into the fire of decadent fascist capitalism. He conceals the extent to which the ordeal of the fascist fire will sear and maim the bodies and minds of the workers.

Like all demagogues, Coughlin resorts to misrepresentation. The choice before the American people, he says, is one between the chaos of unemployment and misery amidst plenty under the New Deal (or the Old Deal)—and fascism. (Roosevelt is backed by those "who oppose fascism even though they must support chaos." — *Social Justice*, May 22.)

Coughlin fails to mention the third choice—the road to socialism.

Coughlin hammers away steadily at the props that support the American government. He denounces Roosevelt. But he also hits out at the Republicans. "It is well for the Republicans to know now that the American people," says Coughlin, "will not take a step back towards Hooverism. . . The Republicans (in Michigan) have discredited themselves to such an extent that the majority of persons in the Wolverine State now recognize that a mis-

take was made" (in electing a Republican governor).

HIS "CONSTITUTIONAL" CASE FOR FASCISM

So long as we have the party system of government, Coughlin goes on, we are doomed. "Partysim," he states, was not provided for in the Constitution. When it suits him, Coughlin pretends he is a firm upholder of the Constitution. He says: "Partysim, like many other abuses, was introduced into our national lives many years after the Constitution was established." The right to vote as one sees fit, Coughlin terms an "abuse." Under fascism, one does not vote as one sees fit.

To replace "partysim," Coughlin plugs for the "corporative state." He says: "A corporative system in nowise destroys representative government: it perfects it"—a patent lie. In passing it should be noted that Coughlin's concern for "representative government" is so fitful that he fails even to mention it in his "Sixteen Principles."

Says Coughlin again: "A corporative system will abolish many of the sins and shortcomings of our present brand of political partysim." Coughlin, of course, doesn't speak of the sins and shortcomings—to put it mildly—of the fascist dictatorship.

Coughlin leaves no doubt that he looks to fascist Italy as his model. "Mussolini," he tells us, "is no longer an arbitrary ruler. Italy has taken her place with a Christian Social order."

What is this "corporative state" under which Coughlin would chain and gag American workers?

Coughlin's "corporative state" means government by corporation heads, who, in turn, are ruled over by a dictator. The corporation heads would form a "corporative council," such as exists in Italy, and would be composed of men like

Tom Girdler (representing steel); the DuPonts (munitions); Morgan and Rockefeller (banking interests); Ford (automobiles); and others of America's sixty ruling families.

It is these people who would control the destinies of American workers. They would decide how many hours the worker would toil per day; where he would receive; what salary he would eat, wear, say, and think; how much he would pay in taxes; how much "free labor service" he would perform. These are the people who would determine the prices of farm products; clamp down an iron censorship over the press, the radio, the theater, the movies, and the school. They would have complete power to force the country into war.

As in Italy, trade unions would be destroyed, workers' organizations ruthlessly smashed. Any who protested the arbitrary and discriminatory acts of the corporation heads would be summarily tried by court martial, if they weren't simply sent to concentration camps or shot without the formality of a trial.

This, in outline, is what Coughlin and America's ruling families are urging upon the workers. It is not a pretty picture. It is therefore no accident that Coughlin always avoids stating what will really happen if the workers follow him into the fascist abyss.

The radio priest does all in his power to blur the real issue that faces American workers and anti-fascists, which is not, as he would have us believe, the fight between decaying democratic capitalism and fascism.

The fight against both the rottenness of present day society and the fascist blight is the fight for socialism. The issue is clearly fascism or socialism, fascist chains or a full and expanding life, slavery or liberation.

IN THIS CORNER

By Max Shachtman

An indignant but anonymous reader takes us to task for our not overly enthusiastic comment on the pathetic campaign which the paper of the Lovestonites is making for uniting into a single organization the Socialist Workers Party, the Socialist Party and the Independent Labor League of America (the Lovestonites).

We do not know how many workers have been taken in by this patently fraudulent campaign, but since, as Lester F. Ward used to say, nothing is too absurd to be believed, we will assume that there are a few who find that the proposal is not without attraction.

As far as the Trotskyist movement in this country is concerned, it has no need to apologize for its record on the question of unity. While it never blubbered sentimentally over the phrase or waved it as a catch-penny slogan, for the more than ten years of its existence it has stood for genuine unification on the solid foundation of principle.

Our Record on Unity

Despite the brutal blows, the calumny and provocation of the Stalinist machine, directed first by Lovestone and then by Foster-Browder, we offered, on the day after our expulsion from the Communist party for "Trotskyism," to give up our separate existence, our own organization, and return to the ranks of the C.P. as simple members, enjoying nothing more than the rights of any other member. We carefully refrained from forming a new or rival party, believing as we did that it was still possible to straighten the helm in the C.P., to set its course towards international socialism, to free it of the bureaucratic ballast that threatened to sink it and finally did.

After we had broken irrevocably with the Communist International in 1933, we continued to work for the union of all revolutionary forces on a principled basis. The then Communist League of America gave up its separate organization in 1934 and merged into the new Workers Party together with the young American Workers Party (Muste group).

As sections of the Socialist party moved to the left and sought a clear-cut Marxist position, we did not content ourselves with calling upon them to leave their party and join ours. Without abandoning a single principle of our program, we dissolved the Workers Party and entered the Socialist Party to work, side by side with the old S.P. left wing, towards a common revolutionary program and a common revolutionary party. If that aim was not accomplished under the name of the S.P.—it was realized under the banner of the new Socialist Workers Party instead—it was only because the vote-catchers for LaGuardia and the toolies of the needle-trades unions' bureaucracy could not tolerate revolutionists in their ranks and proceeded autocratically to expel us en masse.

There, briefly, is our record, in action, on the question of unity.

Lovestone: Trickster

Now Lovestone knows that there is as much chance of the three organizations he names fusing into one as there is of the proverbial camel passing through the eye of a needle. Lovestone knows perfectly well, that an instructive experiment was just concluded in the unity field between the Thomasites and the Trotskyists, the former of whom brutally expelled the latter. He knows this so well, that he finds in the call for unity a most inexpensive device for acquiring popularity at the expense—he calculates—of both Thomas and the Trotskyists, whom he will singly and jointly blame for the failure to adopt his proposal. But like all cheap gadgets, this device is too poorly constructed to work.

It is not necessary to dwell here on all the basic political questions which divide us from the Lovestonites, questions which their leaders apparently consider organizational trifles: the Popular Front, support of bourgeois candidates in the elections, war, trade union policy, the International, etc. These have been dealt with more than once in our columns.

But it is interesting to point out that save for the purely hypocritical advocacy of "unity," Lovestone hasn't changed his attitude towards the Trotskyists by one iota. It was he and his clique who expelled us from the Communist Party which he then led—expelled us merely because we had the audacity to ask for a discussion, on the eve of a party convention, of the problems raised by the Russian Left Opposition. Before that, he helped to organize the international machine of Stalin-Bukharin for expelling the Trotskyists everywhere else in the Communist International.

He is still dedicated to that aim in life! As shown by the Paris letter we printed last week, his main concern, during his visit in France to the P.S.O.P., was to help the right wing and centrists—the Freemasons, pacifists and all other varieties of middleheads—to expel the Trotskyists from that organization. He loudly proclaims his solidarity with the right-wing leadership of the P.O.U.M. which, although itself expelled from the Comintern years ago for "Trotskyism," is now engaged in expelling its revolutionary critics on the same grounds.

At the same time this trickster has the effrontery to instigate and encourage in his paper a campaign for "unity" with the S.W.P. in this country!

Engels on Unity

"We must not let ourselves be misled by the clamor for 'unity,'" wrote Friedrich Engels to August Bebel on June 20, 1873. "Those who have this word most often on their tongue are the great instigators of discord, like the Swiss Jurassien Bakuninists at this very moment, the instigators of all the splits, who clamor for nothing more than for unity. These unity-fanciers are either feeble-minded people who want to mix everything into a shapeless mush which needs only to settle in order to bring back all the differences in much sharper conflict, because they are then all together in one pot (you have a fine example in Germany in the people who preach the reconciliation of the workers and the petty bourgeois), or else they seek to falsify deliberately. That is why the greatest sectarians and the greatest squabblers and scoundrels are at certain moments the loudest unity-shouters. In all our life we have never had more trouble and spite than from the unity-blowers."

Sound words then; sound words now.