

A New Anti-War Pamphlet

Labor and the Second World War

By J. R. Johnson

III

Franklin Roosevelt, War-Monger

On April 14, addressing the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union in New York, Franklin Roosevelt, war-monger, warned all foreign powers to keep their hands off "continental America." In other words, Latin America was the exclusive property of American imperialism.

On April 16, Franklin Roosevelt, war-monger, asked Congress for \$200,000,000 to widen the Panama Canal for war. On July 2, the National Guard staged a big war demonstration in Chicago, with tramping men, bombing planes flying, martial music playing.

On August 18, Queen's University, at Kingston, Ontario, conferred an honorary degree on the President. In his speech of acceptance, Franklin Roosevelt, war-monger, pledged the armed forces of the Americas for the defense of Canada.

On September 25, when the German-Czechoslovakian crisis became acute, Franklin Roosevelt, never missing a chance, addressed appeals for peace to Hitler and Benes. In reality those letters were addressed to the American people, preparing them for war. What else did Roosevelt mean by this: "The supreme desire of the American people is to live in peace. But in the event of a general war they face the fact that no nation can escape the consequences of such a world catastrophe." Day by day he drummed war into the ears and dangled it before the eyes of the American people.

War requires national unity. On October 15, Roosevelt issued an appeal to business to cooperate with the government. Above all, war requires a docile labor movement, and one of the war-monger's main preoccupations is to get the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. united so that he can "discipline" them. To the A.F. of L. convention, in the fall, he wrote a letter asking for a settlement of their quarrel with the C.I.O.

The Lima Swindle

On October 14, the War Office announced that it had completed a survey of ten thousand factories for the purpose of working out a skeleton organization to coordinate production in war. From the factory owners, said the War Office, it had met with a spirit of complete cooperation. No doubt. The war is for their benefit. These gentlemen do not go to war themselves, and they pile up enormous profits.

On October 26, Franklin Roosevelt, war-monger, said in a radio speech that the war plans must be completely overhauled and accelerated. On November 15, he raised a new slogan, "continental defense." The land, sea, and air forces would be brought to the level needed for action anywhere from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn. He would hang his war-helmet on any peg, the higher the better. Near the end of the year he announced his delegation to the Lima conference.

This Lima conference was the most potent of all the threadbare swindles Roosevelt has been perpetrating on the people. The largest of the Latin American countries, Brazil, is a fascist state. So is Bolivia. So is Paraguay. In fact, there are not more than half a dozen "democracies" in all Latin America. But with the coming war in mind, Cordell Hull, under Roosevelt's orders, spent weeks intriguing for a declaration of solidarity in the name of American "democracies." The end of 1938 saw Hull bringing back to his master the lying Declaration of Lima. Hull did not state that his hardest job at the Conference had been to stifle a resolution by the Latin American countries against, not Hitler and Mussolini, but against American intervention in Latin America on behalf of American investors. The best that Hull could do was postpone it for five years.

Roosevelt celebrated the end of the year by announcing on December 28 that he would build ten thousand war planes. Thus ends a short summary of Roosevelt's work for "democracy" and "peace" in 1938.

Look at the Record

Naturally 1939 saw him step up the furious pace of 1938. We can only point to the highlights. A war budget of \$1,319,558,000. On January 31, he said that America's frontier was "in France." He attacked his old enemy, the Ludlow referendum. Let the people vote on war? No, said Roosevelt. Eleanor Roosevelt wrote a special article in *Liberty* denouncing the bill.

He fought to remove the embargo on the sale of arms. Today he mouths phrases about neutrality. But months before the war had begun in Europe, he announced that America would go in. Speaking at Warm Springs in Georgia in the spring of 1939, he said he would go back in the fall "if we don't have a war." The *Washington Post* interpreted this to mean that a new war was rapidly approaching and that it was hopeless to believe that America could keep out. In one of his press conferences, Roosevelt warmly approved this editorial.

Think back for a moment, workers and farmers, and see the pit that American imperialism has been digging for you through its agent and grave-digger, Franklin Roosevelt. This incomparable liar, while carrying on sham battles with the monied interests, has in reality been doing their job better than they could do it themselves, for he still has a little popularity with the masses. Only space prevents us from amplifying this terrible catalogue, but we have said enough to show that he is the most dangerous demagogue who ever sat in the White House and the greatest living menace to the peace and security of the American people.

The Attack on the Workers

Your imperialist has to prepare his armaments and whip up people. But whether he is fascist or "democratic," he has

also to "discipline" the working class movement in order to carry on his war.

In November of 1938 the W.P.A. stood at an all-time high. Why? Through Roosevelt's concern for workers in the cold days of winter? Nonsense. Election Day is the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November and Roosevelt wanted the workers' votes. As soon as the elections were over, Roosevelt began a nationwide assault on labor, attacking the democratic rights of the workers, and striking at W.P.A. and relief.

Roosevelt's Supreme Court, by its decision in the Fansteel case, outlawed the sit-down strike. A Philadelphia court gave the Apex Hosiery Company damages of nearly three-quarters of a million dollars against the Hosiery Workers Union. Girdler's Republic Steel followed this pointer by suing the C.I.O. for seven and a half million dollars of damages during the 1937 strike, including loss of trade. No more deadly weapon was ever discovered by a capitalist government than this decision to penalize striking workers for capitalist loss of trade. In effect it bars all strikes. In Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Oregon the legislatures passed laws forbidding mass picketing.

Congress cut the wages of building workers on the W.P.A., and Roosevelt came out with the declaration, "You can't strike against the government." At the same time he sought to break the spirit of the workers by slash after slash at the W.P.A. Roosevelt proposed an appropriation of \$875,000,000, and Congress, in opposition proposed one of \$725,000,000. There was a great battle, Roosevelt supposedly for the workers and Congress against them. But few workers (except those who received their pink slips) noticed that Roosevelt's own figure meant driving thousands of workers into starvation. Later even these sham fights were abandoned. Roosevelt's proposed appropriation for the W.P.A. in his April 27 budget message was so low that no one in Congress, neither Republican nor "Tory" Democrat, found it too high. The F.B.I. and the Federal court seized the opportunity of the Minneapolis W.P.A. strike to launch a bitter attack at the workers of that militant town.

With the beginning of the war in Europe, Roosevelt strained like a hound on the leash. Before two weeks of war he declared a state of "partial national emergency." He appointed special members of the F.B.I. to investigate "subversive activities," i.e., all those who mean resolutely to oppose the war. Attorney-General Murphy made a tour of the whole country looking for spies. It is the same old trick. All who expose the war-mongers and their plans will be called "spies" and German agents, and the unthinking among the masses of the people will be incited against those who try to warn them.

(Continued in Next Issue)

TROTSKY TELLS BRITISH PAPER HE WILL NOT WRITE FOR IT IN SHARPLY WORDED STATEMENT

MEXICO CITY, Oct. 23—Leon Trotsky today rejected a request from the London Daily Herald, widely circulated official organ of the British Labor Party, for an article which, in effect, would have meant to steric the British war aims in conformity with the policy of the Daily Herald.

The exchange of cables between the editor of the Daily Herald and Leon Trotsky was as follows:

"Cable Prepaid
"Leon Trotsky
"Mexico

"Six hundred word article by return cable giving your reasons for opposing negotiations allies with Russia STOP Bernard Shaw article supporting Stalin will appear same page STOP Prepared order fifteen pounds if published.

"Editor, Daily Herald
"London, Oct. 20."

"Cable Prepaid
"Leon Trotsky
"Mexico

"Would welcome immediate reply if prepared cable article requested last Friday or not STOP If agreeable please cable article today at latest.

"Editor, Daily Herald
"London, Oct. 23."

"Cable Collect
"Editor, Daily Herald
"London

"You did not publish my letter protesting imperialist London policy against Mexico STOP You did not publish my statement on coming war granted to your own correspondent Vincent STOP Now you want to adapt me to your anti-socialist policy STOP That will not succeed.

"Leon Trotsky
"Coyoacan, Oct. 23."

In the Labor Unions

By B. J. WIDICK

In a brief trip through the middle-west touching two industrial centers we were able to get first hand reactions to the effect of the new line of the Stalinists in the labor movement.

In those localities where the Stalinists have been confronted by progressive opposition, they are having a very embarrassing time trying to shift to the new line of "Keep America Out of Imperialist War."

This is true despite the overwhelming sentiment of the workers against participation in war. For the workers just don't trust the Stalinists like they used to. For example, in one key CIO industrial union council, the Stalinists introduced a mild "keep America from being dragged into war" resolution.

Only a few weeks previously they had denounced a more clear-cut resolution against imperialist war as "Trotskyite-fascist." And had succeeded in getting the resolution tabled.

You can imagine how the progressives and every other delegate to the council felt when the Stalinist spokesman read their resolution with the new line.

Jeers, razzing and a demand for an explanation of the new line came fast. Silence was the only answer. So a motion to table the Stalinist resolution was passed.

Nobody Taken In

Efforts to obtain an explanation from Stalinist delegates after the session were equally fruitless. Only embarrassed silence and a desire to be left alone!

The rule or ruin policy of the Stalinists has left too many deep scars for the advanced workers to forget and be taken in by the pseudo-"left" line.

And after denouncing us because we said that the Bolshevik party and the trade unions no longer existed, and for saying that the Russian state is proletarian only in its property relations; and after getting particularly incensed because we said that the bureaucracy "was an instrument of counter-revolutionary forces," the Lovestoneites concluded:

"Error has its logic as well as truth. One wrong step leads to another, so that today the Trotskyites are proposing to imperil the unity of the Russian proletarian rule by trying to form a rival, and of course, conspirative, party in the Soviet Union. . . ." ("What Is the Communist Opposition," by Bertram D. Wolfe).

Clay in the Hands of the Potters

When they called us anti-soviet and today when they are anti-soviet, the Thomas-Lovestone groups were motivated by the same considerations: they always take the easiest road. When the entire capitalist world was at the bottom of the trough of the economic crisis (1934) and during the honeymoon of Stalin with the democracies (1935-1937), it was easy to be pro-soviet—more exactly, pro-Stalin. During those momentous years, nothing could blast the Lovestoneites loose from their pro-Stalinist position. They even dared to defend the infamous Moscow trials against Zinoviev-Kamenev and Radek-Pyatakof! Only after the execution of the Red Generals (June, 1937) did they, in the dark, without any explanation, abandon their apologies for the Moscow trials. But today, when the Soviet Union is allied to the enemy of the friends of American imperialism, the Thomas-Lovestone groups repudiate not merely Stalin, but the Soviet Union. As they yielded previously to the pressure of the Stalinist regime and its democratic allies, now they yield to the pressure of the democratic imperialists. Can one imagine, for a moment, that these people will stand up under the pressure of the war-mongers when the war comes here?

Thomas-Lovestone Groups Yield to the Pressure of "Democratic" Imperialists

By FELIX MORROW

Having adopted the Roosevelt war program at their respective conventions, the CIO and AFL bureaucracies proceeded to carry out along with its other aspects, the anti-Soviet orientation of that war program. The AFL convention adopted a resolution for a boycott against all Soviet goods. The needle trades bureaucrats, heading the American Labor Party, in their pro-Anglo-French resolution of Oct. 4, made clear their support of a war against the Soviet Union. That would be a holy war, according to the brazenly war-mongering New Leader, organ of the Social-Democratic Federation.

No revolutionist can support either the Anglo-French-American camp or the Hitler-Stalin camp in the American labor movement. The task of the revolutionist is to build and recruit into the third camp: the camp of revolutionary struggle against war.

On all questions connected with the war, the third camp stands on a different program than that of the two war-camps. This is equally true of our attitude to the Soviet Union. We neither join the democratic war-mongers in their war against the Soviet Union, nor do we join the Hitler-Stalin camp in their justification of Hitler and Stalin.

Trying to Straddle Unbridgeable Gaps

But, beside unequivocal spokesmen for the three camps, there are also those in the labor movement who are trying to straddle between two camps and who, to justify this impossible acrobatic stunt, deliberately blur and confuse the issues. Up to the Stalin-Hitler pact, the Stalinists used to have many allies who performed this task of confusion; but these are falling away beneath the blows of the democratic war-mongers. But there are other purveyors of confusion, who are useful to the democratic war-mongers. We refer to the Socialist party of Norman Thomas and the Lovestoneites (Independent Labor League).

Let us no longer receive crumbs from the tables of the CIO and AFL bureaucracies, the Thomas-Lovestone groups try to keep one foot in the camp of the democratic war-mongers. We have written several articles describing this gymnastic feat, particularly on the Thomas-Lovestone support of the American Labor Party's pro war resolution of Oct. 4, and their servile whitewash of the CIO-AFL declarations for Roosevelt's war program.

On the question of the Soviet Union, as on all others connected with the war, the Thomas-Lovestone groups adapt themselves to, cater to the prejudices of the camp of democratic war-mongers.

Until the signing of the Hitler-Stalin pact, the Thomas-Lovestone groups recognized that the Soviet Union still retains the economic conquests of the October Revolution—nationalized property; the Lovestoneites still stood for the defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism, and the Socialist party stood for something like that (it is hard often to find out what the S.P. stands for programmatically); the Thomas-Lovestone groups also recognized that there was a conflict between the Stalinist bureaucracy and the interests of the Soviet Union.

All this the Thomas-Lovestone groups appear to have dropped overboard without notice after the Hitler-Stalin pact. Why? They give no explanation. But they now write of the Soviet Union in terms which they never employed before.

Lovestoneites Silent on Defense of the U.S.S.R.

The Lovestoneites, in their convention resolution on the war, evade the question whether the Russian workers should defend the Soviet Union against the capitalist world. All they say is:

"Tomorrow, if Stalin succeeds in driving his own people

into war on the side of either imperialist block (already he is aiding Germany), we must give solidarity and support to the Russian people against their own war-makers also." (Workers Age, Sept. 16)

But if Stalin remains in power, shall the Russian workers defend the Soviet Union? The Lovestoneites do not say. And not to say, means no defense.

The Thomasites call upon Roosevelt to apply the embargo on arms against the Soviet Union; and when we sharply call Thomas to account for this anti-Soviet act, the Lovestoneites rush to Thomas' defense, with the broad implication that the Trotskyists have become Stalinists. (Workers Age, Oct. 21)

A New "Theory" on the U.S.S.R.

The Thomas-Lovestone groups justify this anti-Soviet position by characterizing the Soviet Union in new terms: as an imperialist regime or program. Thomas' paper says editorially:

"Russian Bolshevism, which was never socialistic, not any more than is Hitler's brand of national socialism, has embarked on an imperialist program." (The Call, Sept. 30)

And Lovestone's paper approvingly reprints a declaration of the British Independent Labor Party, which says:

"Russia's present move marks the final stage in the departure by the Stalin regime from the principles of international socialism and its adoption of purely imperialist power politics." (Workers Age, Oct. 28).

The pseudo-radical application of the term, "imperialism," to the Soviet Union actually enables the Thomas-Lovestone groups to smuggle into the labor movement a reformist theory of imperialism. Lenin taught us that imperialism is the last stage of monopoly capitalism. He developed the scientific definition of imperialism, and he waged war against all other definitions of imperialism, and with good reason. For he was thereby fighting against Kautsky's theory of imperialism, which hides within it a justification of the war-mongers.

"The important thing," wrote Lenin, "is that Kautsky detaches the policy of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy 'preferred by finance capital,' and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which he alleges to be possible on the same basis of finance capital. The result is bourgeois reformism instead of revolution." Lenin pointed out, for the fight is reduced to supporting one bourgeois policy against the "worse" one.

They Sabotage Struggle Against Stalinism

The Bonapartist bureaucracy which exists as a parasitic disease upon the body of the Soviet Union must be destroyed, or it will de-

* Truth being insufficient to make the point, the Lovestoneites resort to invention; they quote me as saying at a public meeting that anyone who condemned the Russian invasion of Poland was an enemy of the Soviet Union, and that I also said that the Red Army—and they put it in quotation marks!—was "bringing liberation and socialism to the Poles." What I actually said was a mere repetition of the estimate of the Polish invasion which Leon Trotsky made in the *Socialist Appeal*, Oct. 10.

stroy the Soviet Union. But the struggle for the destruction of the Stalinist bureaucracy is not helped, but is rather sabotaged, by concessions to the democratic war-mongers. That is the crime of the Thomas-Lovestone groups.

That they are yielding to the wave of democratic chauvinism is obvious if one analyzes the logic of their present position. By what logic could they be for the defense of the Soviet Union in the period of the Franco-Soviet pact and against it now, in the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact? How is it possible to abandon now the fundamental distinction between the Stalinist bureaucracy and the Soviet Union? Only by one kind of logic: the logic of democratic patriotism: it is all right to defend the Soviet Union when it is allied with the democratic imperialists, but not when it is allied with the fascist imperialists. That is the open, avowed logic of the American Labor Party bureaucrats in their Oct. 4 resolution—and to this logic the Thomas-Lovestone groups have succumbed.

Unlike the ALP bureaucrats, the Thomas-Lovestone groups try to palm this off as "revolutionary." To expose this fraud one need only compare their intransigent language about Stalin with their duceit tone about the war-mongers in the camp which is opposed to Stalin—the British Labor Party, the French Socialist party, the CIO, AFL, ALP, etc.

For Defense of the Soviet Union

This article need not repeat at length that which has been made so clear in our numerous documents: our draft theses on war (1934), the program of the Fourth International, Trotsky's latest document, "The USSR in War" (November New International), etc. Our defense of the Soviet Union has nothing in common whatsoever with the "defense" provided by the Stalinist bureaucracy. We have been and remain the irreconcilable enemies of the Stalinist bureaucracy. We said, already in 1934, ("War and the Fourth International"), drawing the political conclusions from our analysis of the Bonapartist bureaucracy and the property relations established by the October Revolution:

"a) Only the proletarian revolution in the West can save the USSR as the workers' state in case of a long protracted war.

"b) The preparation for a proletarian revolution in 'friendly,' allied, as well as enemy countries is conceivable only with the complete independence of the world proletarian vanguard from the Soviet bureaucracy.

"c) The unconditional support of the USSR against the imperialist armies must go hand in hand with revolutionary Marxist criticism of the war and the diplomatic policy of the Soviet government, and with the formation inside of the USSR of a real revolutionary party of Bolshevik-Leninists."

They Called Us "Anti-Soviet"!

It is ironical to recall today that this position was characterized as "anti-soviet" by the Thomas-Lovestone groups. How many times was that epithet thrown at us by Thomas' caucus leaders, Jack Altman and Murray Baron, in their expulsion campaign against us (1936-1937)? The Thomasites, as usual, didn't attempt to organize their thoughts in orderly form, but the Lovestoneites did. Here is what they wrote about our 1934—and present—position:

"Trotsky is building an international upon the basis of an extreme anti-soviet and anti-comintern orientation."

"In this respect [socialism in one country] the Central Committee, and after its disruption, Stalin and his group, in spite of various crudities of formulation and blunders in detail, have been correct, and Trotsky's fiercely eloquent phrases about not 'socialism in one country' but 'world revolution,' served only to cloak a purely negative and defeatist pessimism as to the possibility of building socialism."