

**SOCIALIST APPEAL**

Vol. III, No. 57 August 8, 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. Single copies: 2 cents per copy in the United States; 3 cents per copy in 44 foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.

Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for six months; \$2.00 for one year.

Reentered as second class matter February 16, 1938, at the post office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN  
Associate Editor: EMANUEL GARRETT  
General Manager: MARTIN ABERN  
Assistant Manager: SHERMAN 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.

**No Secret Diplomacy**

On July 24 the State Department issued the following order:  
"In view of the contemporary international situation it will not be possible to make the confidential or unpublished files and records of the department, of a date later than December 31, 1918, available to persons who are not officials of the United States Government."

Hitherto access to the files has been exceedingly restricted. Only a limited number of persons such as professors, students and international lawyers were permitted to use them under various limitations. But now all state papers for a period of twenty years become a closed book to everybody outside the government.

And even for records prior to 1918, permission is limited to persons like lawyers, publicists, historians, instructors and professors in accredited colleges and universities who have an "important and definite use for the information desired." Since the State Department is the judge of what is "important," under these regulations no radical could consult original sources in writing a history of the United States!

Most significant in the State Department order is the period for which complete secrecy is decreed: the last twenty years. Why should Roosevelt and Hull trouble to cover up the acts of Wilson's last years, or the Republican administrations of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover? Why should the New Deal seek to shroud these Old Dealers?

Because New Deal or Old Deal, Republican or Democrat, whatever the label, the foreign policy of the American government has run in one direction: to safeguard and extend the foreign interests of America's Sixty Families. Harding the Republican took up where the "New Freedom" of Wilson left off, and "New Deal" Roosevelt took up where Old Deal Hoover left off. And now, as the war draws near, Roosevelt covers up his predecessors and himself.

The State Department does little more than formalize the already-existing situation in which the American people are kept in virtual ignorance of the government's diplomatic moves. We are thus kept in ignorance in order to blind us to the speedy approach of war.

Every workers' and farmers' organization should demand, in the interests of its members' lives:

No secret diplomacy! All treaties and agreements shall be open to the inspection of the people! Let the people decide! Let the people vote on war!

**"Trotskyite Drive"**

We've seen the Stalinists do lots of absurd and ridiculous things in their time, along with the innumerable vicious things they do, but Clarence Hathaway has just given us the best belly laugh we've had since the time Ike Amter swallowed his false teeth.

Hathaway is editor of the Daily Worker. The other day he declared himself a class-war prisoner, issued from jail an appeal to "the public" for a bail fund, and heroically "prepared to remain in prison knowing full well that labor and its supporters will not permit our common enemies to injure the Daily Worker or the Communist Party." We were just rushing out of the office to get poor Clarence out of the can when the Daily Worker arrived and the headline knocked us over: "Hathaway Calls Jailing Part of Trotskyite Drive."

pretty high up in Trotskyite circles and we don't like anything done without our knowing about it. But after we cooled off, we found that we didn't put him there and he wasn't a victim of the class war. In fact, we got to wondering why Hathaway didn't have the good sense to keep his mouth shut until Browder got him out. For the true story is not so nice for Hathaway, Browder and the board of directors of the Communist Party:

The Daily Worker, as libelous a yellow rag as ever was seen in this country of yellow journalism, was finally nailed recently by one of its victims. Walter Liggett was murdered in Minnesota in December, 1935; the killer was never apprehended. Liggett had been editing an "anti-vice paper" and had no connections with the labor movement. Local reactionaries sought to utilize his murder in their campaign against the Farmer-Labor movement, but got nowhere. But the Stalinist machine, having up to the day before, in its "third period," poured its filthy slanders on the Farmer-Labor movement, turned around and poured its slanders on Liggett, in its belated attempt to curry favor with the Farmer-Laborites. Mrs. Liggett sued to defend her husband's name, and got a judgment for libel against the Daily Worker and its editor.

The other day Mrs. Liggett had Hathaway jailed, in an attempt to collect his share of the judgment. Mr. Hathaway, under examination, stated that he earned \$100 per week as editor (sounds like a lot for an editor of a "workers' paper," but then think what a dirty job it is) but that after paying out lots of alimony, he can't pay his share of the judgment. At this point Hathaway let out the bray about a "Trotskyite drive." Neither he nor the Daily Worker told the story about the Liggett case in any detail; they were too refined for that. But they linked it with three "Trotskyite" suits for libel and then let out a yell about a "Trotskyite drive." They didn't give any details, either, about these three suits. One is by Max Eastman, no Trotskyite thank you, another by one Charles White, whom we don't even know. But the third we don't mind in the least having pinned on us, for then we can tell the story which Hathaway didn't tell:

In November, 1937, some enemy of the trade union movement murdered Pat Corcoran, president of the Minneapolis Teamsters Joint Council. Pat had won the undying enmity of the bosses when he took a leading part in re-unifying the teamsters' movement after the General Drivers Union of the city had been expelled earlier by the International; in the unified movement Pat worked closely with the so-called "Trotskyite" leaders of the General Drivers Union in bringing about 100% unionization of the teaming crafts, making Minneapolis the best-unionized city in the country, and in building the North Central Drivers Council out of which came the magnificent 11-state uniform contract for over-road drivers. Not only the enmity of the bosses; Pat had also incurred the enmity of the Stalinists for his "crime" of collaborating with the "Trotskyites." So when he was killed, the Stalinists proceeded to smear him and his colleagues as "labor racketeers" and to call for a "Dewey investigation of the Minneapolis labor movement to clear out the labor racketeers." (That was when Dewey was a hero of the Stalinists.)

The class-conscious trade unionists wanted no Dewey poking into the unions. And they knew Pat and his co-workers. The local Stalinists dared not utter their slanders in the trade unions. Hailed before the coroner's jury, not one Stalinist had the courage to say on his own behalf what the Daily Worker had said. The Stalinist frameup scheme collapsed. Then the drivers union leaders, seven of them, filed a libel suit against the Daily Worker; the suit is still pending.

A horrid thought has just struck us. Can it be that Browder didn't want to bail out Hathaway? What other explanation could there be for Hathaway—elbowing the lid off this smelly brew? Anyway we've enjoyed the farce of Hathaway playing class-war prisoner—and the opportunity to remind the advanced workers once again of how the Stalinists tried to destroy the progressive labor movement of Minneapolis.

**Labor Looks Through The Press**

By Arthur Hopkins

Joe Alex Morris of the United Press cites the danger of war in Europe should a "bluff be called, or a mistake made in high places." What a hell of a game that is—they make a mistake, and we pay the penalty!

Peoria, Ill. police arrested a man on protest from his neighbors that he was driving a car. They found him on a little used road, travelling at a moderate rate of speed. He had been warned previously not to operate a bicycle. Cause of all the neighbors' alarm is the fact that the driver was blind. But we let the bosses drive our economic machine!

David Griffin, 28, of Minneapolis, is soon to take a two year tour into Africa and Asia. Griffin has been carrying on missionary work in addition to his job as salesman for a mail order house, and uses his business, he says, merely as a front for missionary efforts.

**Pros and Cons Not Far Apart in Congress Neutrality Act Dispute**

The Much-Touted Conflict over the Neutrality Act Is in The Last Analysis a Disagreement over the Most Effective Means of Dragging the People of the Country into War

By JAMES BURNHAM

In almost all of the conflicts between Roosevelt and the anti-Roosevelt opposition in Congress, conflicts which during the present session of Congress have generally led to Roosevelt's defeat, the bulk of the boss press has to one or another degree supported the opposition. To this general rule there is one outstanding exception: namely, the conflicts over foreign policy. Wherever Roosevelt and some section of Congress have differed on foreign policy, the boss press has overwhelmingly declared for Roosevelt.

The sharp struggle over the Neutrality Act has been a notorious example.

**PRO AND CON CLOSE TOGETHER**

The issue here, when all the smoke is cleared away, boiled down to very small potatoes. Roosevelt wanted the power to declare, by executive decree, unilateral embargoes on war munitions; that is, to embargo the shipment of war munitions from this country to another country which Roosevelt would declare was "at war" and was an "aggressor" in the war.

A large bloc in Congress did not want to grant this power to the President. It wished to retain a section of the old Neutrality Act which provides for an embargo on the shipment of munitions to either side, when a "state of war" is defined to exist by the President.

This Congressional bloc, for the time being, came out on top, and the President was forced to withdraw his demand. The boss press, led by the New York Times, condemned the Congressional bloc for sabotage of the national interests of the United States.

In this whole fight, there was a large element of contemptible farce. So far as the question of war or peace goes, the outcome doesn't make a great deal of difference. Whichever law is on the books, the Sixty Families can still swing their power and resources in the direction where it suits them best—in the direction, that is, where the biggest profits lie. Nowadays "war munitions" are only a tiny part of what goes into a war: coal and petroleum and copper and cotton and rubber and food and iron are in the end more important than guns and military air-

craft, both for the warring nation and for the economy of the exporting nation.

Consequently, whether an embargo on war munitions alone applies to one side or to both sides or to neither (as in the compromise "cash and carry" plan which is favored by a number of Congressmen) is not going to decide either who wins the war or how it entangles the United States. Moreover, the government and the bosses can always get around any embargo statutes, if they really wish to, by credit devices, transshipments, etc.

**GANGED UP ON WAR REFERENDUM**

It is furthermore interesting to note that in the heat generated by Roosevelt, Hull and the members of Congress over the Neutrality Act, all parties to the dispute managed to forget about the proposal for a war referendum, embodied in several bills submitted to Congress, and favored by the huge majority of the people. Can it be that part of the reason for the big argument over Neutrality was precisely to turn public attention away from the war referendum?

Nevertheless, making the proper discounts, a genuine difference between the two sides remains.

Roosevelt's entire domestic program and policy have collapsed in an utter and complete breakdown. All that he can salvage from the dismal wreck of his once shining armor is his foreign policy. He knows clearly that his foreign policy has the fundamental perspective of a war of imperialist aggression, in which United States capitalism, mortally sick at home, would try to save itself by acquiring unchallenged dominance for exploitation of vast areas in Latin America, the Far East and even Europe.

From this premise comes the Lima Conference, the parade of Latin American dictators to Washington, the notes to Japan, the intervention in Europe, the huge armament increases.

But to carry out his perspective, Roosevelt wants and needs an absolutely free hand. He wants and takes a free hand in spending the armament billions; he closes the State Department files; he negotiates secretly. He does not want any "interference" from Congress;

there are always a few Congressmen who are apt to ask embarrassing questions, who like to "investigate," who might argue when the time for action comes. For these reasons, Roosevelt wants a Neutrality Act which leaves everything up to himself.

Big business has exactly the same fundamental perspective in foreign policy as has Roosevelt. And consequently, big business supports Roosevelt in foreign policy, whether it is a question of armaments or secret diplomacy or discretionary embargoes.

It should not be imagined that Congressmen are any less "patriotic" than the President, or that they will have any difficulty supporting the war when the day arrives. Indeed, many who were against Roosevelt in the Neutrality conflict explained that they took their position only because they didn't think war was near: in other words, if they thought the crisis serious enough they would change at once.

**CONGRESSMEN MUST FACE CONSTITUENCIES**

But two special factors operate on many of the Congressmen. The Republicans use the dispute here, as on other points, for factional advantage—to bring about another defeat in Roosevelt's growing list, and to get an "anti-war" issue for next year's campaign. And all Congressmen have got to go home and face their constituents at closer hand than the President. (The legislature is, in general, more subject to popular pressure than the executive.) Now the constituents are, of course, opposed to war; and many of them, especially in the Middle West, have a pretty good idea of the direction in which Roosevelt's foreign policy is leading. Under such circumstances, a vote against the unilateral, discretionary embargo is highly desirable if the Congressmen want to see a friendly crowd when they get to the home-town station after their strenuous seven months of serving their country.

The conflict over the Neutrality Act, like other similar disputes in all imperialist governments, is in the last analysis a disagreement over the most effective means of dragging the country into war.

**Stockyards May Be Setting for Next National Strike Struggle**

(Continued from Page 1)

attended the packing house workers' convention. Some of them were regularly elected, many of them were merely appointed as so often is the case of unions in their formative stage. Reports made at the convention claimed that on a nation-wide scale a total of 78,000 workers have been enrolled under the banner of the Packing House Workers Organization Committee, out of the approximately 129,000 employed in the industry. Out of the 29 Armour plants in various parts of the country the PWOC claims a majority support in seventeen.

It must be remembered, however, that insofar as both enrolling and support are concerned this is still to be regarded as a rather loose thing; but there can be no doubt as to the desire of the workers to restore unionism and union conditions in the industry. Thus, for example, at a Labor Board election held in the Chicago Armour plants last October, on a "Yes" and "No" vote for collective bargaining agency, the CIO came out ahead with a wide margin.

**CIO DEMANDS NATIONAL CONTRACT**

Now the CIO demands an exclusive national wage contract. This the packers has contemptuously refused. Officials of Armour and Co. accepted an invitation to confer with the City Council labor committee the other day, only to reiterate their flat refusal even to meet with the union.

On this same occasion officials of the AFL Butcher Workmen Union put in their appearance with claims to be considered in negotiations. And, although it was the treacherous conduct of officials of this union which was responsible for the disastrous collapse of the packing house workers' last general strike in January 1922, and despite the fact that this union is still a stockholder in Armour

and Co., it has made some headway of late in organization in stockyards in Chicago and elsewhere.

This particular fact, when viewed in the light of the often acrimonious struggle between the AFL and the CIO, is one of the elements of serious weakness in the present situation. Perhaps it furnishes also one of the reasons for the contempt and haughtiness shown by the meat packers.

**BUT CIO IS IN STRONG POSITION**

Yet the CIO union is in a strong position, almost a commanding position. John L. Lewis made that a proud boast when he hurled his challenge at the Chicago Coliseum meeting:

"Well what have we here?" he said. "The meat packers. They may think they're pretty big. Well, they're no bigger than United States Steel, General Motors and the coal industry. These big industries changed their minds about wage contracts, and we helped them. Now we're going to give the same help to the meat packers." Incidentally, while several of the CIO union leaders (Stalinists or their stooges) at the meeting carried banner streamers, "For Roosevelt in 1940," and while other speak-

ers proclaimed that same choice, Lewis remained silent on this point. Moreover, he made caustic criticism, saying that: "The WPA bill recently passed by Congress is a direct repudiation of the pledges made by the Democratic party in its 1936 platform." He added that the "majority party must share responsibility with the Tory Republicans for a measure which will deprive a million unemployed of WPA jobs."

**WEAKNESS IN STRIKE PLANS**

But to return to the question, will there be a packing house workers strike? Preparations are being intensified on all fronts. That much is certain. The meat packers have shown their attitude clearly and precisely. Much confidence could have been instilled in the minds of the workers, and their ranks could have been enormously solidified, if officials of the PWOC had been at least as clear and precise. It is difficult to regard a leadership as genuinely serious that fails, in anticipation of a major struggle, to propose at least the elementary basis, or the rudimentary forms, for a national union that may begin to give the body both actual flesh and blood. This was not done at the recent convention, which left the packing house organization still in committee form.

It should be necessary, moreover, to formulate at least a simple set of clear and precise demands and not, as is now the case, to reduce everything to the altogether too innocuous formula—that the packers meet with the union. Regardless of whether or not the packers will at this stage listen to the demands, the workers must know for what they may be called upon to strike. They must know a good time in advance. They must be given a solid point around which to rally for the supreme effort.

**IN THIS CORNER**

By Max Shachtman

It has taken the Stalinists three whole months to get the necessary instructions on how to deal with the problem of the Ukraine as raised so boldly, honestly and simply by Leon Trotsky in his article printed in the Appeal of May 9, 1939.

Analyzing the position of the Soviet Ukraine under the yoke of the Kremlin autocracy, and the position of those millions of Ukrainian workers and peasants suffering as national minorities under Polish, Rumanian and Hungarian domination, Trotsky raised the slogan of "A united, free and independent workers' and peasants' Soviet Ukraine"—free and independent not only of the German, Polish, Hungarian and Rumanian imperialists but also of the oppressive Stalinist clique.

**Trotsky Anticipated Arguments**

In his article, submitted for discussion of the revolutionary movement, Trotsky anticipated the objections of the Moscow apologists to so thorough an extent that the reply they have finally made in the New Masses of August 8, over the signature of the not unknown hack A. B. Magil, may be thoroughly disposed of merely by re-reading what Trotsky wrote.

Magil is one of a numerous tribe trained up at the breast of the Stalinist treasury. When the archives of the old regime were seized and made public by the Bolsheviks in 1917, they disclosed what had long been suspected. The Czarist regime bought up journalists and whole editorial staffs all over the world, whose job it was to defend and justify, with the only type of argument at their disposal, every misdeed and crime committed under Nicholas the Bloody. Some of these literary lackeys were paid exceedingly well; none of them went hungry. The Czar didn't do so well by his own people, but he was not stingy when it came to retaining journalistic advocates abroad. Stalin follows the same practice with the boys on his foreign payroll, and from the services they render and the arguments they use, he gets at least as much out of his investment as did the Czar.

Let us pass over the tiresome calumnies repeated by Magil (they all boil down to the charge that Trotsky is Hitler's ally) and comment only on one point he makes. Declaring that the right of nations freely to secede must not, as Lenin said in 1917 and many other occasions, "be confused with the question of whether it would be expedient for any given nation to secede at any given moment (but) must be settled by the party of the proletariat in each particular case independently, from the point of view of the interests of social development as a whole and the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism"—Magil concludes that "when Trotsky, therefore, calls for separation of the Ukraine, what he is advocating is the subjection of the Ukraine to imperialist bondage and national oppression."

**Denies RIGHT of Separation**

Magil is simply making mendacious use of a quotation from Lenin. While Lenin emphasized the need of considering the expediency of advocating separation of one nation or people from another, he never denied the right of separation. That is precisely what Magil denies to the Soviet Ukraine. And not only to it, but also to the Ukrainian minorities in Poland, Rumania and Hungary. Lenin used to point out that the right of divorce does not necessarily mean that at every single moment you advocate a divorce between a given couple. Magil is not only outraged (Outraged? Not in reality; he is merely putting on an act) at the idea of the Soviet Ukraine separating from the Soviet Union, but he is no less indignant at the thought of the Ukrainian minorities in adjacent countries breaking from their oppressors and joining with their co-nationals in a powerful, united Soviet Ukraine.

Such a united country, he says, "formed with the blessing of Hitler and as a result of the dismemberment not only of the U.S.S.R. but of Poland, Rumania and Hungary as well, would deal a death blow to the independence of those three countries. His (Trotsky's) program is, therefore, in contradiction with their national interests."

In other words, the Polish landowners, the Rumanian Boyars and the Hungarian feudal lords who rule over millions of Ukrainian peasants and workers, have found in Magil a stout warrior protecting their "national interests." In other words, furthermore, it would be a "death blow to the independence" of Hungary if the peasants of the Carpatho-Ukraine, whose territory was given to Hungary after Munich "with the blessing of Hitler" (as Magil might say, and this time correctly), were to fight for freedom from Hungarian rule and for incorporation into a more powerful, united Soviet Ukraine.

Present-day Soviet Ukraine must not, cannot separate from Moscow, cries Magil. Why not? Does not the "most democratic Constitution in the world" provide, in Article 17, that "Each Union Republic reserves the right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R."? It does; only the "right" is a horrible joke. Anyone who tries to exercise that right is immediately labelled a fascist spy and executed on the spot—unless he is driven to suicide before then, as has been the case of more than one Ukrainian Communist. What value has a right which MAY NOT BE EXERCISED? The same value as all the other "rights" the Father of the Peoples grants his subjects.

The Stalinist policy towards the Ukrainian question plays right into the hands of reactionary nationalists and of Hitler. The truly imperialistic refusal of Stalin and his Magils to acknowledge and fight for the right of self-determination of peoples, nations and national minorities, has left this field free for reactionary and demagogic exploitation by Hitler. That explains in large part why Hitler was able to win the Sudeten Germans so easily to his standard. Stalin's policy towards the Ukrainian millions is facilitating a similar fate for them.

Their rain dance brought to a close, members of the Zuni Indian tribe of New Mexico awoke the next day to a cloudless sky that augured no let-up in the worst drought they could remember. Wise old headmen opined that the return of the blazing sun indicated the failure of the gods could mean but one thing—for some reason of which they were not aware their ancestors were visiting vengeance upon them. (INS dispatch). All Christians, Mohammedans, Buddhists, etc., will laugh heartily at the naivete of the poor backward Indian.

Dr. Benes, exiled president of Czecho-Slovakia, who helped draft the Versailles treaty 20 years ago, admits that "the Versailles treaty was not perfect." We all know what an imperfect egg is.

**INFORMAL HOUSE**  
Box 245 Kerhonkson, N. Y.  
(Near Ellenville)  
120 acres of greenland in the Catskills, 40 acres of pine for sunbathing; handball, ping pong, archery; swimming and horse-back riding nearby; dancing.  
UNUSUALLY LOW RATES  
\$18 Weekly \$6 Weekend  
Busses met at station  
Tel. Kerhonkson 118 R

Subscribe to The New Internationalist