

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. III, No. 79 Tuesday, October 17, 1939

Published Twice-Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-3547

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. For
sign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle orders
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.
Entered as second class matter September 29, 1939, 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.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

A Matter of Taste

"The war of the Soviet Union against fascism will be the most just and most legitimate of all wars that humanity has known. It will be a war for the liberation of the oppressed nations reduced to slavery. It will be for the defense of the international proletariat and the culture of the whole of progressive humanity against fascist barbarism."

In these resounding words did *Pravda*, Stalin's organ, express itself a few weeks ago, August 14, 1939.

By October 9, however, *Izvestia*, the Stalin government organ, could declare:

"One may respect or hate Hitlerism, just as any other system of political views. This is a matter of taste. But to undertake war for 'annihilation of Hitlerism' means to commit criminal folly in politics."

What is Stalin's taste in this matter? Not to make war on Hitlerism, that is clear enough. But to make war on behalf of Hitlerism? If we are to believe the plain meaning of words, Stalin is prepared now, not merely to solidarize himself with Hitler on "peace terms", as he did in the *Izvestia* editorial quoted above, but to back Hitler in the prosecution of the war.

So we are informed, if we understand English, by Mr. Harry Gannes, foreign editor of Stalin's American organ, the *Daily Worker*. In the October 10 issue, Mr. Gannes says: "If London and Paris are counting on their blockade and talk of raw material shortage in Germany as a means of continuing the imperialist war, the Soviet Union will soon remedy that."

And, along the same line, the Stalinists have dropped all references to both imperialist camps being "equally guilty." This radical formulation (used for but a few weeks) is now dropped; in its place one finds only the Anglo-French camp described as "war-mongers."

This new line—more exactly, this latest unfolding of the pro-Hitler line, was ushered in by the *Daily Worker* with a tremendous front-page editorial on October 10. That Hitler has war aims is not even implied. Indeed, the only reference to Hitler is this sentence: "German imperialism, with Hitler at its head, has been forced to propose peace." Peace? Forced? By whom? Why? These key questions are not answered by Gannes or by Stalin, for the good and sufficient reason that they are conniving with Hitler in his war demagoguery.

If the Stalinists are silent about Hitler's war aims, they are eloquent on the subject of his opponents' war aims, which are the *only* war aims they mention. Here is the characterisation of the war in that big *Daily Worker* editorial:

"And 'Whose war is it?' as Earl Browder asks. It is an imperialist war, a slaughter for conquest and domination of the world, in which the Anglo-French imperialists propose to kill off millions of people to achieve the aims of Chamberlain, Churchill, Daladier and Bonnet."

Hitler's name used to be the only one mentioned. Then it led all the rest. Then it was mentioned equally with Chamberlain et al. Now it disappears from the list. The Stalinists have completed the transition from the camp of Anglo-French imperialism to the camp of Hitler. Just a matter of taste, you see.

Poor Little Finland

The patriots do not miss a single trick in their campaign to whip up the war fever among the masses. One day it is poor little Poland whose independence and democratic regime ought to be saved by a world war. Another day it is poor little Latvia or Lithuania, with their no less notoriously democratic regimes that ought to be rescued by imperialism. This week it is poor (but honest) little Finland over which the patriotic scribblers are spilling their ink.

Our views on Stalin's course in the World War have been stated often in these columns. It is reactionary through and through. The pretexts for the subjugation of Finland are just as foul and fraudulent and hypocritical as they were in the case of Poland.

But no less foul, fraudulent and hypocritical are the tears and lamentations of the patriots. To hear and read them, you would think that Finland is just a quiet little mouse that wants nothing better than to live and let live. That the people of the country enjoy as close to a paradise as sinful humanity can ever hope to attain. That the government is composed of such nice people, as democratic as the dickens, and very meticulous about paying their debts.

Therefore, long live Finland's brave little army, and its heroic Field Marshal, Baron Karl Gustav Emil Mannerheim!

But Finland, after having been granted its independence from Russia by a quick stroke of Lenin's pen, has been a hearth of reaction for years. How can any informed person forget the unspeakable Mannerheim, Finland's master today—or at least its master tomorrow? Of all the butchers of the post-war White Terror against the working class of Europe, Mannerheim was perhaps the most infamous. After the Russian revolution, the Finnish workers and peasants tried to take power in Finland. They had to pay for this crime with the lives of their best sons. The Marshal of the White Terror was the same Mannerheim who today heads Finland's army. In a country of little more than 3,000,000 people, he slaughtered 30,000 workers—about one out of every hundred in the population—slaughtered them like cattle in a packing house.

Who financed the Finnish counter-revolution, who helped to consolidate it? The German Kaiser, the Anglo-French imperialists, and the *United States!* The debt which Finland's ruling class has been paying back to the United States with such singular regularity, is dyed with the blood of the country's martyred thousands.

So again, long live General Baron Karl Mannerheim and poor little Finland! Long live the sacred, progressive, democratic war to save and protect Roosevelt's pal—the Finnish butcher!

Nazi on Voroshilov

The *Deutsche Zeitung von Mexico*, a Nazi organ directed and financed by Goebbels, published a long article of admiration for "Marshal Voroshilov" on Sept. 30, 1939. The author of the article is a Nazi diplomat, who has also worked in the Soviet Union. He says: "I myself met Voroshilov only a few times at official receptions in the years of my activity in the Soviet Union; but I know many of his friends including those who were in constant political and military contact with him."

The Nazi diplomat narrates in his article some heroic anecdotes about Voroshilov, and then reports about the rise of the present Marshal after the Russian civil war:

"As early as 1924, he was summoned by Stalin to Moscow as the commander of the Moscow Military District. Lenin had died meanwhile and Stalin became his successor. One of his first measures was to overturn Trotsky as War Commissar; and now it was necessary for Stalin to create a firm and reliable prop against Trotsky's supporters in the Moscow garrison, and Voroshilov was the indicated man. Only a few months later . . . in 1925, Voroshilov became Soviet Russian Minister of War and Supreme Commander of the Red Army, a post which he has occupied uninterruptedly until today, and during this period he proved to be a sincere friend of Stalin and a splendid organizer of the Soviet Russian army."

But more interesting and important is what the Nazis think today about this sincere friend of Stalin:

"The path that Voroshilov has trod, from shepherd boy to first Marshal of the Soviet Russian army is undoubtedly a most exceptional one, even for Russian conditions. It is a course achieved only by those geniuses who are born only once a century. But perhaps the military career of Klim Voroshilov is not the most important one of his life. Much more extraordinary is really the ideological reversal he went through. The little mechanic of Lugansk, one of the oldest Bolsheviks . . . who was an outspoken opponent of all state stunts, is now one of the first statesmen of the Soviet Union, the supreme commander of the army which has the task not only of defending the Soviet Russian frontiers but also takes care of maintaining order at home. Its needle-tempered sword strikes every one who dares to undermine the state order, destroys every one who still dares today to propagate revolutionary ideas of class struggle, of fraternity of the peoples and of world revolution. And in this sense, the life of Klim Voroshilov is at the same time a mirror of the history of the evolution of the Bolshevik party of Russia which, under the leadership of Stalin, developed from a Bolshevik party with world revolutionary aims into a national-Russian party."

Every Worker Opposed to the War
Must Take a Position Against Both
War-Mongering Camps in the ALP

(Continued from Page 1)
from either camp must be carefully analysed to squeeze from it its real meaning.

LOVESTONITES COME TO
DEFENSE OF RESOLUTION

We now have before us the latest "left wing" attempt to confuse the issue: the Lovestone ("Independent Labor League") explanation of why its members voted for the pro-Ally resolution. Let us analyse the explanation, because it is a particularly "clever" defense of the ALP resolution. In analysing it, we will be enabled all the better to see the full implications of the ALP resolution.

The heading of the Lovestone explanation ("Workers Age", October 14) is: "ALP brands Stalinists as enemies of labor—denounces CP for backing Hitler pact." Neither in the head nor anywhere in the story is there a single hint that the ALP resolution declares for the Anglo-French camp! There is not a single quotation from the resolution!

On the resolution, all that the Lovestone story gives is this very brief (and untrue) description:

"This resolution was an illogical combination of two unrelated matters—an endorsement of the Administration policy of repeal of the arms embargo, the strongly stressing the necessity of keeping America out of war; and a condemnation of the Russo-German pact and Stalinism in America. The discussion was largely centered around the latter point, which was obviously uppermost in the hearts and minds of the assembled delegates. . . . The viewpoint on the embargo was defended by Julius Hochman, general manager of the Dressmakers Joint-Board, Alex Rose, state secretary of the ALP and other, who, however, stressed that with them too, keeping America out of war was uppermost in their minds."

THE RESOLUTION SPEAKS
OUT CLEARLY FOR ALLIES

Now let us compare this description of the resolution with what the resolution really says:

1. The fundamental motivation of the resolution is given in these paragraphs:

" . . . we herewith give expression to our views on the present conflict abroad. . . . The great majority of the American people have looked forward to the day when the remaining democracies on the European continent would find the strength to resist the brazen aggression of Hitlerism. The present war in Europe—the direct result of the Nazi invasion of Poland—has finally brought to a decisive struggle the conflict between the European democracies and the Hitler regime. In this struggle the fate of Europe hangs in the balance. A victory for Hitlerism will inevitably mean further territorial aggression, the spread of intolerance, the ruthless suppression of civil liberties and personal freedom and perhaps the final destruction of civilized life—as we know it—on the European continent."

"The American Labor party has consistently and emphatically opposed dictatorship everywhere, in any form—both from the right and the left. . . ."

In another paragraph the resolution says:

"The great majority of the American people have watched the developments of the last few weeks in Europe with deep sympathy for the cause of the Western democracies that are fighting for the preservation of those democratic values and liberties which we in this country treasure so dearly."

Such is the political position on the war laid down in the ALP resolution of October 4: unequivocal alignment on the side of the Anglo-French imperialists.

2. It is from this pro-Ally standpoint that the resolution condemns the Stalinists and the Stalin alliance with Hitler. It says:

"They (the Stalinists) know that the democratic institutions in all the democracies of Europe, as well as the fate of millions of workers are at stake. Their callous disregard of this fact stamps them as anti-democratic, anti-humanitarian, anti-labor, and the blind servants of Russian in-

ternational policy."

It is, therefore, as democratic-imperialist patriots, and not as working class internationalists, that the ALP leaders attack the Stalin alliance.

3. The same patriotic standpoint is the motivation for the resolution's support of Roosevelt's proposal to lift the embargo in order to aid Anglo-French imperialism. This is the real and logical motivation for lifting the embargo. In order, however, not to embarrass Roosevelt, the ALP resolution supports the Roosevelt proposals in Roosevelt's hypocritical terms, as a "neutrality" measure, although its assertion of "neutrality" at that point is in flagrant contradiction to its lengthy declaration in favor of the Allies.

COVERING UP THE
ALP POSITION

We are now in a position to contrast the actual content of the ALP resolution with the Lovestone description of it. The Lovestone description conceals the pro-Ally motivation of the document. The Lovestone description conceals the fact that the resolution's attack on Stalin flows solely from this democratic-imperialist standpoint. The Lovestone description repeats at face value the hypocritical alibi of the ALP bureaucrats that, though supporting the lifting of the embargo, they "stressed that with them too, keeping America out of war was uppermost in their minds." In all these ways the Lovestone description is a deliberate falsification, designed to cover up the war-mongering ALP bureaucrats.

The Lovestoneites voted for that war-mongering resolution. The only explanation they offer for their vote is this sentence: "Since it proved impossible to divide the resolution, it was voted on as a whole and carried 605 to 94, the latter figure indicating the strength mustered by the Stalinists and their sympathizers."

That explanation is as spurious as the Lovestone description of the resolution.

At the October 4 city conference of the ALP, to which the sentence refers, NOBODY demanded a vote to divide the resolution. Neither the Lovestoneites nor the Norman Thomas Socialists attempted to employ the many parliamentary methods available—division of the resolution, separation of the questions, amendment, substitute motion, etc. etc.—to separate the pro-Ally and pro-Roosevelt sections from that dealing with the Hitler-Stalin pact. So much for the question of fact.

Far more important, however, is the question whether "to divide the resolution" would have made any difference. If it could have been divided, the Lovestoneites are saying, then a proletarian internationalist would have been flawlessly correct in voting for the sections dealing with the Hitler-Stalin pact.

Absolutely false! The proletarian internationalist criticism of the Stalin regime has nothing whatsoever in common with the anti-Stalin attacks of imper-

ialist patriots. Isn't it obvious? Coughlin attacks the Stalinists, but we don't vote for his attacks. The Pope denounces the Stalinists, but no Marxist can associate himself with those denunciations, nor with those of Hearst. Neither can a Marxist associate himself with the attacks on the Pact of any agent of imperialism, even if that imperialist agent is an ALP bureaucrat.

FAR FROM BEING A
MARXIST CRITICISM

How, we ask, can anyone who calls himself a Marxist, internationalist, revolutionist, vote for the democratic-imperialist denunciation of Stalinism contained in the ALP resolution? What is the crime of Stalin and the Communist parties, according to those sections of the resolution (we have already quoted the relevant parts above)? The crime adduced is that the Stalinists have a "callous disregard" for the fate of the Anglo-French camp. To vote for these sections of the resolution could only mean, logically, the opposite of the Stalinist "callous disregard"—namely, to express a warm regard for the fate of the Anglo-French camp. It means to be a partisan of the Anglo-French camp. That's what the writers of the resolution meant it to be! No Marxist could vote for that. But the Lovestoneites did. And the Thomasites did.

The condemnation of the Pact for which a Marxist would vote would be one which no Antonini, Rose, Hochman, or other ALP bureaucrat could vote for. For that criticism would stigmatize as the root cause of all the other crimes of Stalinism the Stalinist abandonment of international revolution—and the ALP bureaucrats stand with Stalin on this basic question. As for the crimes which flowed from Stalin's anti-revolutionary policy and the consequent conversion of the Communist parties into agents of his reactionary foreign policy, so many of these crimes were heartily approved by these ALP bureaucrats! The Franco-Soviet pact and the consequent subordination of the French working class to their bosses via the Popular Front, in the midst of the revolutionary strikes of June, 1936; the Stalinist-Socialist votes for the French military budgets and the military loan to Poland; the crushing of the Spanish revolution in favor of the bourgeois democracy (which meant in reality in favor of Franco); the subordination of the American trade unions to Roosevelt—none of this could be left out in characterizing Stalinism, and none of this could the ALP bureaucrats vote for, since they and their European brothers were with Stalin in all these crimes.

Under no circumstances, we conclude, could internationalists and democratic-imperialists vote for a common denunciation of the war position of Stalinism. In that very phrase, "to divide the resolution," the Lovestoneites reveal their complete inability (or unwillingness) to understand the difference between proletarian and bourgeois criticism of Stalin.

IN THIS
CORNER

By Max Shachtman

The Lovestoneites and Thomasites, who so painstakingly restrained their opposition to war when Alex Rose and Luigi Antonini, with their support, rammed the pro-war resolution down the throat of the ALP, are bravely giving their opposition free play in a concerted attack upon us.

They, you see, really oppose the entry of the United States into the war and they believe that their objective can be accomplished if they can find enough men and women of good will to associate with them. On the other hand, we, benighted Trotskyists, are paralyzing the struggle against war because we say that American participation in the World War is inevitable.

"Leon Trotsky's hate of Stalin rather than any logic makes him insist that the United States must get into this war. Inevitability is born of his personal desire. That kind of 'inevitability' is paralyzing, to any social determination of destiny." Thus Norman Thomas in the Call (formerly the Socialist Call).

In his column in the Lovestoneite Workers Age, Bertram D. Wolfe takes up the cry against us. He reproaches "the Trotskyites for the pseudo-Marxist theory of 'inevitability' and fatalism. We assumed we were dealing with sincere opponents of our entrance into war and we limited ourselves to warning that the doctrine of 'inevitable involvement' was theoretically false, refuted by history; that involvement or non-involvement would depend upon a living struggle which would be paralyzed by the wide acceptance of the fatalistic doctrine of inevitability."

Exposing a Fraud

Although things look pretty black for us, we shall nevertheless try to explain our position on the question—our real position, of course. It will then be easy to understand what a deliberate fraud is being practised by Messrs. Thomas and Wolfe.

Let us consider Thomas and his S.P. first. He doesn't believe America is bound to enter the war; it is not inevitable; it must be stopped; it can be stopped. Good. But if that is the case, why does Travers Clement, National Secretary of Thomas' Socialist Party, send out a National Office Bulletin over his signature, dated October 1, 1939, and addressed "To All State, Local and Branch Secretaries" which contains the following "paralyzing" and "pessimistic" paragraph:

"In a few months, despite our efforts and those of all anti-war forces, we must realize that the United States may be plunged into this war. If that day comes, we shall be hounded as never before in our history."

When Norman Thomas doesn't let his right hand know what his left hand is doing, isn't that just a little bit of duplicity?

The case of Wolfe is even more deplorable, if only because he knows better than Thomas. He never believed it, in his old Stalinist days, when he bracketed Trotsky with the bourgeoisie and the counter-revolution. He doesn't believe it now, when he brackets us in his column with Roosevelt and Browder.

Wolfe knows perfectly well—he taught it long enough—that so long as capitalist imperialism lives, war is just as inevitable as crises and other manifestations of the inherent contradictions of modern class society. He knows also that in the present World War, the inevitability of involvement applies to a far greater number of countries than were affected in the last war. (A glance at the newspaper accounts of developments in the Scandinavian countries and Finland will help illustrate this point.)

Does this mean that the United States is bound to enter this war and enter it now? The question is concrete and specific and Wolfe knows the answer to it as well as we do. And he knows also that when a Marxist declares that America's entry into the Second World War is inevitable, he means:

So long as the Roosevelt pro-war regime, authentic representative of American imperialism and its interests, is in power in the country, participation in the war is inevitable. In point of fact, the United States already has at least one leg in the war. What else does Roosevelt's declaration on the defense of Canada mean? What else is the meaning of the Panama Declaration brought home by Sumner Welles?

Truth Must Be Known

Do pessimistic conclusions follow from this? Does this mean paralyzing the struggle against war? Not at all. In general, the workers cannot carry on any effective struggle without knowing the truth. At bottom, Thomas and Wolfe are really saying that the workers will oppose war more strongly if they are kidded about the realities of the situation. The truth, the realities, are that under a capitalist government in this country, the entrance of the United States into the war is dead certain. Conclusion? Drive the present government out of power and put in its place a genuine government of peace. And that can only mean a workers' government. Whoever tells the workers less than this is at best a miserable pacifist phrasemonger who is doing his own bit towards dragging the workers into war by distracting them with utopias and drugging them with illusions. Whoever tells them less than this is falling to lay the basis today for the only serious struggle that can be conducted against the war after it has broken out.

A Correction

Our attention has been called to the need of correcting a wrong impression created in last week's issue. We did not mean to imply that all the signers of the "open letter" to the League of American Writers were members of the League for Cultural Freedom. Some of them, like James T. Farrell, Philip Rahv, William Phillips and a few others, are not. Nor did we mean to imply, as some readers seem to have concluded, that we were ignorant of the position on the war question taken by this or that individual. We were and are interested in the position on the war question of the League for Cultural Freedom as an organization, for the signatories to the open letter include all the recognized spokesmen of the League. They demand a formal statement from the League of American Writers. And we demanded the same kind of statement from the Hook Committee. Thus far, of course, with no results but the continued silence of the past.

CIO Convention Yields to
Pressure of War Dealers

The United States Department of Labor headed by Madame Perkins also came in for its share of criticism because of its attitude towards the labor movement.

Considerable significance can also be attached to the fact that Harry Bridges, Stalinist director of the West Coast CIO, was chosen by the CIO executive board to act as chairman and introduce Lewis when he made his main report to the convention. It was a symbol of the continued alliance between the Lewis bureaucracy and the Stalinists.

Thus far Lewis has been successful in patching up the differences within the CIO and putting up a solid front for the entire industrial union movement.

But this one fact stands out, Lewis has already capitulated before the pressure of the Roosevelt administration and is going to support America in an imperialist war. In this he joins the AFL bureaucracy.

Contradiction
There can be no question that the majority of the delegates at the CIO convention—as well

as at the AFL convention—were opposed to war. They thought they were voting for resolutions which would help keep American workers from being dragged into war. The blunt truth is that the Roosevelt policies which the conventions endorsed mean an acceleration of the drive towards war, as the *Socialist Appeal* has often explained.

In the bitter speeches against the various Roosevelt government agencies, the CIO leaders have proved that the New Deal has been turned into the War Deal, and labor is getting the short end of the deal. This is the meaning of the attacks on the NLRB, the labor department and the administration of the wages and hour law.

The vacillation of the CIO leaders on a program for the convention is explained by this contradiction. However, in the final analysis, the bureaucrats chose the road of capitulation instead of struggle against the Roosevelt anti-labor drive.

Let the People
Vote on War!

Read The
New International