

# SOCIALIST APPEAL

Published Weekly as the Organ of the Socialist Party of New York, Left Wing Branches.

Vol. 1. - No. 8. 401

Saturday, October 2, 1937

5 Cents per Copy

## Left Wing Issues Convention Call

### Thomas Quits Mayoralty Campaign

### Left Wing To Act On Campaign This Week

On the same day that the Communist Party, in keeping with its People's Front policy, announced that it would throw all its support to the Republican-Fusion-A.L.P. combination and its Mayoralty candidate, La Guardia, the right wing of the Socialist Party, at a meeting in Town Hall, finally made public the decision to withdraw its regularly nominated candidate, Norman Thomas, as foretold in these columns last week.

### "First Time in History"

By their actions, as the New York Times properly concludes, "for the first time in their history, both the Communist and Socialist parties will refrain from presenting candidates for Mayor in the municipal election".

The meeting in Town Hall at which the Thomas announcement was made public, marked the lowest point reached by the right wing Socialists in years in this city. Called as a public "ratification rally", there were present less than 400 people, that is, a number considerably smaller than the membership of the Socialist Party itself, to say nothing of its normal circle of sympathizers outside its ranks.

### Left Wing to Act

The Campaign Committee of the Left wing Branches of the Socialist Party is immediately convening a meeting for the purpose of deciding upon the course to be taken in view of the Thomas withdrawal. It is expected that the Committee will make an important announcement this week-end which will guarantee a campaign in New York for an independent working class candidate, challenging the Democratic Tweedledum and Republican Tweedledee candidates for Mayor, despite the treacherous actions of the Stalinists and the right wing socialists.

## N. Y. and Chicago Join Four State Committees In National Appeal

To All The Locals and Branches  
of the Socialist Party:

COMRADES!

The Socialist Party is passing through a devastating crisis. This crisis can be resolved only by the united, speedy action of the rank and file of the organization throughout the country. No effective solution of the problems facing the movement can be reached without the immediate convocation of a national emergency convention of the Party.

The National Executive Committee of the Party is no longer entitled to the trust and allegiance of the Party membership. It is guilty of a gross usurpation and violation of power.

### The N. E. C. Has Betrayed Socialism

At its last meeting in New York, the National Executive Committee betrayed the principles of socialism. It directly violated the specific decisions of the 1937 convention of the Party in Chicago, adopted by the overwhelming majority of the delegates and endorsed by the great bulk of the membership. It decided to endorse the policy of the Right wing of withdrawing the Socialist candidate for Mayor in New York, in favor of La Guardia, the Republican-Fusionist-A.L.P.-Stalinist candidate. In face of the official Party position, solemnly approved in convention, the Party has been committed to cowardly and hypocritical support of a People's Front and of its mayoralty candidate.

At the same meeting, the National Executive Committee ordered the bureaucratic expulsion of all the revolutionary members of the Party who oppose and obstruct the execution of this sell-out policy. On the pretext of maintaining "discipline", which every right winger in the Party may and does violate with impunity, a nationwide expulsion drive is being conducted under the direction of the National Executive Committee with the aim of ridding the Party of all critics and opponents of La Guardia-Socialism.

### The N. E. C. Is Splitting the Party

The true socialists, who refuse to bow to the autocratic rule of the N.E.C. usurpers, are being kicked out of the Party without even the pretense of a trial or hearing. The charters of state organizations are arbitrarily suspended. Other State organizations are being brutally re-organized with only right wing supporters permitted to affiliate. In every branch and local, a heresy-hunt has been instituted against the revolutionary socialists. In every branch and local of the party, a "Loyalty Oath" has been established, with the aim of weeding out all those refusing to swear fealty to the La Guardia-Socialists who are splitting the Party.

Determined to rule or ruin, and conscious of the fact that the majority of the active party membership supports the Left wing, the National Executive Committee has trampled upon the Party constitution and all the principles of Party democracy by ignoring the demands of numberless Party locals for referendums and a special convention to register the will of the Party membership on these and other burning questions.

### The La Guardia-N. E. C. Stands Condemned

By these flagrant violations of the Party constitution and these betrayals of the Party policy and trust, the La Guardia National Executive Committee has forfeited its authority and lost all right to speak in the name of the party membership. By its record, both in the political field and in the field of organization—where it has reduced the national membership to a figure of less than 3,000—the National Executive Committee stands convicted of betrayal of socialist principle, usurpation of power, splitting of the movement.

There is no course left to the membership, to those socialists who hold dear the principles of revolutionary socialism, of Marxian internationalism, to those socialists who are revolted by cynical violations of Party democracy—no course but to call an emergency Party convention for the purpose of throwing out the traitors, determining the will of the Party membership on all the important Party problems; and re-establishing the Party on the foundation of revolutionary socialism.

### On to the Chicago Convention!

The undersigned therefore call upon all Party locals, Party branches, State Executive Committees, and left wing groups in all sections of the Party, to send a regular quota of delegates to the Rank and File Emergency Convention of the Socialist Party, to be held on the days of the Thanksgiving week-end, November 25, 26, 27 and 28, 1937, inclusive, in the city of Chicago.

The basis of representation for all locals and groups will be made available immediately by the Convention Arrangements Committee which is now functioning in New York.

In order that the delegates may best represent the will of the membership, we announce the immediate opening of the pre-convention discussion, based on the resolutions to be submitted for consideration and any documents or view presented by the supporters of the convention. This discussion is to begin immediately inside the ranks of the organization, in membership meetings and inner discussion bulletins, and publicly in the columns of the Socialist Appeal.

State Executive Committee of the  
Socialist Party of California  
State Executive Committee of the  
Socialist Party of Ohio  
State Executive Committee of the  
Socialist Party of Minnesota  
State Executive Committee of the  
Socialist Party of Indiana  
City Executive Committee of the  
Socialist Party of Local New  
York, Left Wing Branches  
Executive Committee of the Social-  
ist Party of Cook County (Chi-  
cago)  
National Executive Committee of  
the Young People's Socialist  
League.

# G.P.U. Murders Rebelling Agent

## Reiss Broke With Stalin Thugs Take Him for Ride

### Bullet Riddled Body Found By Police in Switzerland

PARIS.—On September 4, 1937 the Swiss police discovered at Chamblandes, in the Swiss Canton of Vaud, not far from Lausanne, the bullet-riddled body of a thirty-eight year old man bearing a passport in the name of Hermann Eberhardt. The publication of photographs of the assassinated man made it possible promptly to establish his true identity and the very peculiar nature of the crime.

The victim was a Polish Communist militant, Ignace Reiss, who belonged to the Secret Service of the Communist International. At the beginning of this year, he had given the Dutch Communist Opposition, through the former deputy to the Hague Parliament, his personal friend of long standing, Henrik Sneevliet, an exact warning on the decision adopted in Moscow to employ all methods against the anti-Stalinist communists abroad. At the end of July 1937 he had published in the Nieuwe Fakkel of Amsterdam, Organ of the Revolutionary Socialist Party an open letter to the leaders of the Comintern and the Russian Government. The letter was a categorical break. Ignace Reiss wrote:

#### Broke With Assassins

"I began my activity as a socialist militant twenty years ago. I have behind me sixteen years of illegal work.... Now the question is to save socialism.... I have remained silent before too many assassinations, thus burdening my conscience with a great error.... I should have broken with you on the day when the Father of the Peoples had the Sixteen shot in the cellars of the Lubianka" (street on which the Moscow G. P. U. is located).

Reiss disclosed that several officials of the G. P. U., who the Izvestia announced, had just been given the decoration of the Order of the Red Flag, were compensated for having participated in the execution of the former leaders of the revolution. Himself decorated in 1928 with the Order of the Red Flag for services rendered the revolution, he sent back his medal, "finding it unworthy to bear the same decoration as the executioners of the best men in the working class of Russia."

Ignace Reiss soon learned that the G.P.U. had received the order to kill him. He informed his friends and took refuge in Switzerland under the name of Eberhardt.

#### G.P.U. Sets Murder Trap

The crime was minutely prepared. The Swiss police has established that five persons, at least, who immediately quit the country and several of whom must have taken refuge in France, participated in the crime. A sixth, an accomplice, has been arrested. The principal author of the crime is known. She was a secret agent both of the Executive Committee of the Comintern and of the G.P.U., Gertrud Schildbach (born Neugebauer), 43 years old. A long resident in Paris, she lived recently in Rome, from where she was sent to Switzerland to draw Ignace Reiss into

a trap, Schildbach is short, masculine in figure, rather homely, graying, wears glasses, dresses plainly. She succeeded in finding Reiss, visited him on the eve of the assassination, told him of her plan to break with Stalinism as he had broken, and invited him to supper. She was with him when he was assaulted, kidnapped into an automobile, and riddled with seven bullets, five of them in his head. In the hands of the assassinated man were found strands of hair of Gertrud Schildbach.

In the automobile there was also found a top-coat with a Madrid label, which leads to the supposition that the assassins of Ignace Reiss belonged to the organization which did away with Nin....

Schildbach has probably taken refuge in France or in Italy. The Swiss police being in possession of her photograph, it is not very likely that she tried to reach the Soviet Union by the land route.

#### Revolutionary Record

Reiss was born on January 1st 1899, in a middle class Jewish family of the Austrian part of Poland. From his adolescence in high school, he came into contact with the revolutionary labor movement. He studied law in Vienna, but did not complete his studies, having too closely allied himself with the revolutionary movement. He joined the Communist Party of Austria, collaborated in the Polish paper, Swit, and was sent to Poland by the Party in 1920. There he was arrested, tortured and condemned to five years in prison. After six months, however, he was released on bail, thanks to the special regulations applying to former Austrian Poland. In 1923, he went to Germany where he was in contact with Russians who were supporting the German Communists. Up to 1926, he worked in the Ruhr, then returned to Vienna where he spent some time in prison. In 1927, he went to the Soviet Union where he became a member of the Russian Communist Party. Later the party charged him with missions in various cities of Central and Western Europe. From 1929 to 1932 he was again in the U.S.S.R., then resumed his activity abroad. In 1934-1937, finally, the decline of Stalinism and of the Comintern convinced him that it was no longer possible to serve Stalin. He decided to return to Lenin and wrote his letter to the Russian Communist Party, for which he was to pay with his life. Honor to his memory!

#### STALINISM and BOLSHEVISM

by  
10 C Leon  
TROTSKY

Pioneer Publishers  
100 Fifth Avenue  
New York, N. Y.

## Painters' Strike Settlement Arouses Dissatisfaction with Stalinist Leadership

Wednesday Sept. 15 marked the close of the 2½ weeks Painter's Strike. 12,000 painters, members of District Council No. 9, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America returned to work, their major demands (the 6 hour day 50 per cent hiring through the union) ignored not only by the bosses but also by the union administration.

The new agreement calls for a wage increase (from \$9 to 10.50 per day), recognition of shop stewards and continuation of the 25 per cent hiring through the union. The Master Painters' Association, the union of the big painting contractors, in their efforts to secure from the real estate owners a considerable increase in contract prices on the grounds of higher costs in what promises to be the best painting season in several years, had indicated as early as last spring their willingness to agree to a wage increase. Recognition of shop stewards, as it is worded in the present agreement, means little or nothing because the union has no power to appoint stewards in those shops where the bosses, through the threat of dismissal or discrimination can control the steward elections. This gain is essentially the candy coating of the bitter fact that the union got exactly what the Master Painters had been willing to give—strike or no strike.

#### Real Demands Ignored

The press reports testify eloquently to the above. From the New York Times through the Mirror down to the Daily Worker, all accounts during the strike agree that the 6 hour and 50 per cent demands were hardly raised by the union negotiating committee, and since there was no disagreement on wages, the only point which the committee fought for was the recognition of shop stewards. Ignoring the real demands—the committee was interested only in securing its candy coating,

Finally, the bosses agreed to the innocuous shop steward clause and Louis Weinstock, Stalinist, and secretary of the District Council was reported in the press as hailing the agreement as a complete victory.

The reasons for such a "victory" in a period of unparalleled advances of workers throughout the country can be found in the policies and actions of an administration composed of Stalinists and their "united front" allies, mostly former members of the old Zausner machine.

Future issues of this paper will deal with these questions and the record of the administration during its 20-month rule in detail. For the present it is sufficient to point out that the Peoples Front policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy, translated into terms of the present political and trade union situation in N. Y. C. compel the C. P. members in the union to avoid any appearance of radicalism in order to appear respectable in the eyes of the "friends" of labor in the leadership if the local Republican Party and the labor bureaucrats. A militant strike (God forbid) would only compel labor's "Little

Flower" to call the cops, to break the strike and a lot of workers might get a wrong impression about Our Mayor. Beside such a situation might play into the hands of Tammany Hall which is the current "main danger." Only last Saturday a general membership meeting called primarily to explain the new agreement was turned into an election rally for Thomas Dewey. Still fresh in the minds of the membership are the remarks of Weinstock at a meeting of Local 3 of the Electrical Workers a few months ago. The meeting was called to protest Dewey's move to investigate the union's activities and Weinstock in no uncertain terms denounced Dewey

and his committee as a union-busting outfit.

A good section of the membership, long dissatisfied with the administration's conduct, are greatly disturbed by the new agreement and provide the possibility of building a genuine progressive movement in the union. A sufficient number of militant workers, not reactionary elements talking progressivism, to begin this work already exist. They must band together, adopt a program and decide on a line of strategy. The problems connected with this will be discussed in the columns of this paper. The road of class struggle is the only road to effective unionism. There is no other way.

## W. Green Splits up Akron Labor

By Blake Lear

AKRON, Ohio.—Under orders of the callous bureaucrats of the A. F. of L., Wilmer Tate, progressive president of the Akron Central Labor Union, has been suspended from office and is to be placed on trial on Oct. 8.

The trigger man for the A. F. of L., was H. A. Bradley, a creature notorious in local labor circles. Bradley, who later announced, "I am not here to argue legality," seized the gavel at the September 23 meeting of the C. L. U., refused to show any mandate whatever for the action, arbitrarily ruled motions out of order, refused to entertain appeals from decision of the chair, threatened to lift the charter of the C. L. U., and refused to accept the democratic and vehemently expressed will of the majority of the delegates.

#### Majority Fights Bradley

The will of the majority, though distorted by the exigencies of a roll call vote demanded by the representatives of the building trades, who forced their rank and file to support the trial motion upon penalty of refusing to send them on jobs, and by the rulings of Bradley, who recognized only the building trades' formulations, was clearly expressed in a 68 to 54 vote to table action until the next meeting.

Progressives, led by Chalmers K. Stewart of the Federation of Teachers, and delegates from the barbers', truck-drivers', and machinists' locals waged a bitter fight against Bradley in a meeting that was a riotous uproar from the moment that Bradley usurped the chair.

Motions to obligate packed delegations were defeated three times, a letter to Green demanding an A. F. of L. representative for Akron affairs other than Bradley was whooped through, a letter to Green condemning Bradley's high-handed, undemocratic action passed 66 to 41, and a resolution of the Minneapolis central labor body condemning the A. F. of L. stand on the C.I.O. question was heartily endorsed.

By this action against one of the most progressive central labor bodies in the country, the A. F. of L. shellbacks have demonstrat-

ed that they will go to any length to preserve their interests at the expense of the working class.

This action is the culmination of a long period of sniping and open struggle between the muscle boys of the building trades and the progressive A. F. L.ers grouped around the large rubber locals.

It was only late last August that the C.I.O. affiliates were expelled from the C.L.U. upon a direct order from Green. Previous letters seeking to drive a wedge between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. locals had always been perfunctorily filed. A joint board to mediate jurisdictional disputes was immediately set up in preparation for the maintenance of the unity of Akron labor.

#### Green Breaks Unity

This cooperation was rudely interrupted by Green, however, who utilized the initial advantage gained by the naive compliance to his letter (only one left-wing delegate having spoken against accepting Green's letter, the other delegates thinking that the joint board was the happy solution for everything) to begin his drive against progressive locals in the A. F. of L., a program that plainly seems to be heading towards expulsion from the A. F. of L.

An additional factor tending toward the wrecking of the C.L.U. is the activity of the supporters of Lee D. Schroy, present republican mayor of Akron, who are seeking control of the C.L.U. to split the labor movement and divert votes from Labor's Non-Partisan League's candidate, the self-styled New Dealer, Judge G. L. Patterson, who is endorsed by the democratic party, Akron labor generally, the Communist Party, and if we are to believe a speech of Earl Browder's last Thursday, by Thom Paine, Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln and Stalin—all good boys in their way too.

Akron has come to be known as a barometer of the American labor movement, forecasting the political and trade union weather to come. Today the needle points to storms ahead. The Socialist Party of Akron, having already charted the correct course, can alone emerge with its prestige enhanced and all sails set.

# The Wall Streeters Behind LaGuardia

## Mayor Is "Liberial" Front for Prominent Reactionary Backers

By James Casey

With New York's election campaign well on its second lap, the political picture is now crystal clear.

On the one side are arrayed the Rockefeller-Morgan-duPont interests, the Stalin tailists (as Lenin would have called this alliance were he alive today) and the Altman-Thomas band-wagon chasers.

On the opposite side stand the Left Socialists, mobilizing the toilers for a class struggle with their own independent candidates, alone upholding the banner of revolutionary Marxism and fighting, at one and the same time, both Wall Street imperialism and the misleaders of the labor movement.

The painful surprise given many militant workers by the open alliance of the Wall Street Tories with the Stalinists and the Thomaites has been acutely intensified by recent events. As though it were not disgusting enough to witness the spectacle of the People's Fronters groveling before Fiorello H. LaGuardia, the Mayor suddenly added more stench to the betrayal by announcing his endorsement of George U. Harvey, Red-baiter, Ku Kluxer and supporter of European fascism.

### Wall Streeters Give Aid

But the Harvey incident is only one of a hundred to bring into bold relief the true political character of LaGuardia and emphasize more the need of acquainting the city's toilers with the Mayor's supporters. A careful survey shows that many of Wall Street's most notorious reactionaries are working actively for LaGuardia's re-election.

Consider, for example, the person of William M. Chadbourne, the Republican Party's chairman for the LaGuardia campaign. Chadbourne has been brought forward as a "progressive" but the facts of his political and economic background have been cleverly concealed from the city's voters.

In 1920 Chadbourne was an active campaigner for the election of Warren G. Harding, whose cabinet (how can anyone forget?) reeked to the skies with graft, bribery and corruption of the foulest kind. On May 16, 1920 Chadbourne was host at a dinner to prominent backers of the oil-smearing President.

In February 1932, Chadbourne, who is a millionaire corporation lawyer, was found to be working with the Trade and Commercial Bar Association to break down the nation's anti-trust laws in behalf of Rockefeller and Morgan and impose new burdens on the already much harassed population. Chadbourne was a charter member of this Wall Street group.

The campaign chairman is also connected with big business interests exploiting millions of workers in the South American semi-colonies of Wall Street imperialism. He is a member of the Maracaibo Corp. This concern controls the capital stock of the Unisca Petroleum Corp. and many other concessions in Venezuela, where workers are employed at the starvation scale. The Maracaibo outfit has interests in the Barco concession in Columbia. Through this connection, Chadbourne is associated with the Carib Syndicate (a House of Morgan affiliate) and the Gulf Oil Corp. (belonging to the Mellon state).

He is a director of the Commonwealth International Corp.; the U. S. Distributing Corp.; the Drilling and Exploration Co., and

the Bruck Silk Mills, Ltd., a British Company. He is also chairman of the board of directors of the MacArthur Concrete Pile Corp.

No picture of Chadbourne would be complete, however, without mention of his political activities abroad. Several years ago, Chadbourne was a member of the United Russian Relief, Inc., an organization raising funds for monarchists and white guards in Paris and other parts of Europe. Since the Stalin regime is executing and "isolating" revolutionary leaders and workers by the tens of thousands, it is not out of keeping with Stalinist policy for People's Frontists in America to work hand in hand, with Chadbourne against the toiling masses.

### Fusion's Chairman

Lest some naive worker may feel that the appointment of Chadbourne was not deliberate, but just a horrible mistake on the part of the Republicans, it is only necessary to call attention to the director of the La Guardia campaign for the City Fusion Party. This Fusion crowd is made up of those "progressive forces" that the Daily Worker hails so proudly as the new political cronies of the Stalinists. And the Fusion Party's selection of chairman for the Mayor's campaign carries indisputable evidence that Wall Street has placed its best-trained men in the most strategic spots to assure the re-election of its pet candidate.

Maurice P. Davidson is not a labor man and has never been connected with trade unions. Indeed, the Fusion campaign Chairman, although on the city payroll as one of LaGuardia's department heads, is closely identified with the city's biggest business interests.

This new political associate of the Stalinists and the Thomaites is a director of the Clinton Gates Corp.; director of the Tri-National Trading Corp.; director of Warren Securities Corp.; secretary and director of the Alaned Realty Corp., and a director of the Brierfield Operating Corp. He is also associated with the corporation law firm of Davidson and Mann.

Another leading backer of La Guardia is Col. Henry Rogers Winthrop. This man, a Wall Street financier, has raised more money in political campaigns than any other individual in America. Winthrop will probably serve as a member of the Fusion finance committee. In 1924 he was national treasurer for the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. In 1932 Winthrop was head of a powerful group raising funds for the Herbert

Hoover campaign. In 1933 he raised funds for the first La Guardia mayoralty campaign.

Winthrop is a director of the Chase National Bank, a Rockefeller institution. He is a director of the Long Island Railroad, the Wabash Railway, the Ann Arbor Railroad, the U. S. Rubber Co., (a Morgan concern) and the American Express Co. He is a member of the New York Stock Exchange.

### G.O.P.'ers In Lead for Mayor

Still another active supporter of LaGuardia is William M. Calder, former U. S. Senator from New York and an Old Guard Republican. While in the Senate, Calder was a mouthpiece for General Motors, U. S. Steel Corp., General Electric and other Morgan-duPont interests. He is a director of the Mutual Life Insurance Corp.

Other reactionary backers of the Mayor include Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State under Hoover; General John F. Ryan, militarist and Big Business man, and Charles E. Hughes, Jr., corporation lawyer and son of the Republican Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. A leading woman supporter of the Mayor is Mrs. H. Edward Dreier, chairman of the Republican Women's Campaign Committee, and a Social Registerite (one of America's 400).

All of the aforementioned are members of a Committee of One Hundred—bankers, industrialists, manufacturers, Social Registerites—who, together with the Stalinists, have announced their endorsement of LaGuardia, whose anti-labor record already has been outlined by the Socialist Appeal.

(The next article will tell why Wall Street favors the re-election of LaGuardia).

## 'Call' Has Alibi On La Guardia

In reporting the decisions of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, the Socialist Call of Sept. 11th states: "The withdrawal of Thomas as candidate for mayor will be permitted if it is felt that such action would promote cooperative relations between the ALP and the Socialist Party in the future." Everyone naturally understands that "cooperative relations" will beyond doubt be "promoted" by withdrawal of Thomas, and that such withdrawal is a foregone conclusion.

The Call, however, goes on to say: "In no case is the Socialist Party to give an endorsement to any candidate, like La Guardia, who appears on the ticket of a capitalist party". And the "conditions" under which the NEC endorsed the Altman-Thomas motion include the following: "2. It shall be made clear to the ALP that no support is to be given by the Socialist Party to La Guardia".

### Means Endorsement

No endorsement of or support to La Guardia? We would like to ask the Call, then: Whom will you endorse or support as candidate for Mayor? When workers who are planning to vote the Socialist ticket notice that there is no mayoralty candidate, and ask you whom to support for Mayor, what are you going to tell them?

But perhaps the Call is play-

ing us a little trick. Perhaps it merely wants to cover its own tracks, and to do a little face-saving for Tyler, in order to make Tyler's capitulation somewhat more graceful. Tyler himself, it should be remembered, was so certain that the NEC decision meant support of La Guardia that he resigned as editor of the Call in protest. A few hours later he was persuaded to change his mind (in order to keep an unbroken front against the left wing), and the Call article might have been part of the bait used to lure him back.

Our view is notoriously prejudiced in these matters. Maybe we are just slandering when we say that the NEC decided to support La Guardia. Let us recall again what the Clarityite members of the NEC said themselves about the motion which the NEC adopted. (Quoting from the deliberations of the NEC) Kreuger: "The step proposed by the New York majority is a step which commits us to a People's Front, which permits our participation in the labor-liberal-capitalist party which is appearing on the horizon..." Tyler: "If the majority proposition goes through, the SP will be taking the first step in class collaboration... There is a limit to compromise when you begin to cross class lines..." Felix: "The Chicago Convention was hoodwinked. It did not elect a sufficiently large majority of left wingers on the NEC..." And Kreuger again, after the vote had been taken: "We are starting on the road to class collaboration."

The document signed by Max Delson and Herbert Zam (as the minority of the Municipal Campaign Committee) in opposition to the Altman-Thomas motion, is even more explicit. A few pearls: "This policy will eventually lead to the elimination of the Socialist Party as a political factor in this country... Capitulation to the backwardness of the workers, or of the trade unions can only give us another German Social-Democratic Party, never a revolutionary Marxist party... The support of La Guardia is in effect People's Frontism, a policy categorically and almost unanimously rejected by the convention... But the position of the Local New York administration is a direct repudiation of the Socialist Party's position in the presidential campaign IT IS A CAPITULATION TO THE C. P. AND TO PEOPLE'S FRONTISM." (Capital letters in the original).

### Delson-Zam Estimate

But does the motion mean "support of La Guardia"? Let Delson and Zam give the answer: "THE MAJORITY PROPOSAL MEANS SUPPORT OF LA GUARDIA, EVEN THOUGH THE LANGUAGE IS DELIBERATELY AMBIGUOUS. But it is not frank, forthright support, such as that given La Guardia by the ALP and the Communists. It is hidden and cowardly support, even more cowardly than that given by the Communist Party to Roosevelt last year."

## C.P. Pushes LaGuardia-F.D.R. In East Coast Marine Union

At the September 14 meeting of the Deck division of the National Maritime Union, some of the members came to realize what was really meant when a motion was passed at the previous meeting to form an "Anti-Copeland committee". The report of the committee this week revealed that it is pushing for La Guardia to the fullest extent under the guise of anti-Copeland activity. The question by a member, "Who the hell said we were for a phoney labor party" was sidestepped. Militants attempted to get the floor but the chairman succeeded in giving it to someone who moved discussion be closed: A motion which invariably passes.

The CP group again showed its colors to be yellow and not red. Joe Curran has been following their lead right along. The question of demanding a bonus of a few hundred dollars from the shipowner for each seaman employed on ships carrying cargo into war zones was being discussed. A militant worker arose and reminded the Stalinist leadership that, "we have brother unionists over there fighting against Spanish Fascism and you guys are advocating that it's O.K. to send ammunition to the Fascists who are shooting my pals as long as I get two hundred dollars for it." Chairman Curran, who always blusters thru such situations by humorously ridiculing the speaker, succeeded in shielding the CP again by stating that the bonus is demanded only on those ships going

"through the war zone" thus evading the fact that some of these ships bring "cargo" to Franco's forces.

It seems contradictory that on one hand the N.M.U. has a committee functioning to collect money to buy an ambulance, cigarettes, candy, etc. for their shipmates fighting in the Loyalists ranks and on the other hand they are hollering for a "bonus", to save their conscience for they know they are sending bullets to Fascist forces; bullets that will murder their shipmates to whom they are sending cigarettes, candy, and an ambulance.

The CP fraction of the N.M.U. is doing its damndest to exonerate the government for all of its repressive measures against the little bit of hard-won freedom that the seamen at present have. The government faithfully carried thru the interests of the class it serves when it ordered, thru the person of J. P. Kennedy, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, that the seamen of the "Algic" be placed in irons.

The seamen of the "Algic" are guilty of putting into action the slogan, "Workers of the World, Unite." They refused to handle the cargo and break the strike of their fellow longshoremen of Montevideo, Uruguay. And the Communist Party says, in an effort to save the face of the government, "Copeland Puts Seamen in chains". What a damned lie. The government ordered it.

### SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. 1. - No. 8 Saturday  
October 2nd, 1937

Published every week by the  
Socialist Appeal Pub. Assn.

Published at Room 1609  
100 Fifth Avenue, New York

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year;  
\$1.00 for 6 months. Bundle  
orders 3 cents per copy. Single  
copies 5 cents.

All checks and money orders  
should be made out to the  
Socialist Appeal.

Application for entry as  
second class matter is pending.



# Stalinism and Bolshevism - An Article Concerning the Movement

(Concluded from the last issue)

Marxists are wholly in agreement with the anarchists in regard to the final goal: the liquidation of the state. Marxists are "state-ist" only to the extent that one cannot achieve the liquidation of the state simply by ignoring it. The experience of Stalinism does not refute the teaching of Marxism but confirms it by inversion. The revolutionary doctrine which teaches the proletariat to orientate itself correctly in situations and to profit actively by them, contains of course no automatic guarantee of victory. But victory is possible only through the application of this doctrine. Moreover, the victory must not be thought of as a single event. It must be considered in the perspective of an historic epoch. The first workers' state—on a lower economic basis and surrounded by imperialism—was transformed into the gendarmerie of Stalinism. But genuine Bolshevism launched a life and death struggle against that gendarmerie. To maintain itself, Stalinism is now forced to conduct a direct civil war against Bolshevism, under the name of "Trotskyism", not only in the U. S. S. R. but also in Spain. The old Bolshevik party is dead but Bolshevism is raising its head everywhere.

To deduce Stalinism from Bolshevism or from Marxism is the same as to deduce, in a larger sense, counter-revolution from revolution. Liberal-conservative and later reformist thinking has always been characterized by this cliché. Due to the class structure of society, revolutions have always produced counter-revolutions. Does this not indicate, asks the logician, that there is some inner flaw in the revolutionary method? However, neither the liberals nor the reformists have succeeded, as yet, in inventing a more "economical" method. But if it is not easy to rationalize the living historic process, it is not at all difficult to give a rational interpretation of the alternation of its waves, and thus by pure logic to deduce Stalinism from "state socialism", fascism from Marxism, reaction from revolution, in a word, the antithesis from the thesis. In this domain as in many others anarchist thought is the prisoner of liberal rationalism. Real revolutionary thinking is not possible without dialectics.

## THE POLITICAL "SINS" OF BOLSHEVISM AS THE SOURCE OF STALINISM

The arguments of the rationalists assume at times, at least in their outer form, a more concrete character. They do not deduce Stalinism from Bolshevism as a whole but from its political sins.\* The Bolshevik—according to Gorter, Pannekoek, certain German "spartakists" and others—replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the party; Stalin replaced the dictatorship of the party with the dictatorship of the bureaucracy. The Bolsheviks destroyed all parties but their own; Stalin strangled the Bolshevik party in the interest of a Bonapartist clique. The Bolsheviks made compromises with the bourgeoisie; Stalin became its ally and support. The Bolsheviks preached the necessity of participation in the old trade unions and in the bourgeois parliament; Stalin made friends with the trade union bureaucracy and bourgeois democracy. One can make such comparisons at will. For all their apparent effectiveness they are entirely empty.

The proletariat can take power only through its vanguard. In itself the necessity for state power arises from an insufficient cultural level of the masses and their heterogeneity. In the revolutionary vanguard, organized in a party, is crystallized the aspiration of the masses to obtain their freedom. Without the confidence of the class in the vanguard, without support of the vanguard by the class, there can be no talk of the conquest of power. In this sense the proletarian revolution and dictatorship are the work of the whole class, but only under the leadership of the vanguard. The Soviets

\* One of the outstanding representatives of this type of thinking is the French author of the book on Stalin, B. Souvarine. The factual and documentary side of Souvarine's work is the product of long and conscientious research. However, the historical philosophy of the author is striking in its vulgarity. To explain all subsequent historical mishaps he seeks the inner flaws of Bolshevism. The influence of the real conditions of the historical process on Bolshevism are non-existent for him. Even Taine with his theory of "milieu" is closer to Marx than Souvarine.

are only the organized form of the tie between the vanguard and the class. A revolutionary content can be given to this form only by the party. This is proved by the positive experience of the October Revolution and by the negative experience of other countries (Germany, Austria, finally Spain). No one has either shown in practice or tried to explain articulately on paper how the proletariat can seize power without the political leadership of a party that knows what it wants. The fact that this party subordinates the Soviets politically to its leaders, has, in itself, abolished the Soviet system no more than the domination of the conservative majority has abolished the British parliamentary system.

As far as the prohibition of the other Soviet parties is concerned, it did not flow from any "theory" of Bolshevism but was a measure of defence of the dictatorship in a backward and devastated country, surrounded by enemies on all sides. For the Bolsheviks it was clear from the beginning that this measure, later completed by the prohibition of factions inside the governing party itself, signaled a tremendous danger. However, the root of the danger lay not in the doctrine or in the tactics but in the material weakness of the dictatorship, in the difficulties of its internal and international situation. If the revolution had triumphed, even if only in Germany, the need of prohibiting the other Soviet parties would immediately have fallen away. It is absolutely indisputable that the domination of a single party served as the juridical point of departure for the Stalinist totalitarian system. But the reason for this development lies neither in Bolshevism nor in the prohibition of other parties as a temporary war measure, but in the number of defeats of the proletariat in Europe and Asia.

The same applies to the struggle with anarchism. In the heroic epoch of the revolution the Bolsheviks went hand in hand with the genuinely revolutionary anarchists. Many of them were drawn into the ranks of the party. The author of these lines discussed with Lenin more than once the possibility of allotting to the anarchists certain territories where, with the consent of the local population, they would carry out their stateless experiment. But civil war, blockade, and hunger left no room for such plans. The Kronstadt insurrection? But the revolutionary government naturally could not "present" to the insurrectionary sailors the fortress which protected the capital only because the reactionary peasant-soldier rebellion was joined by a few doubtful anarchists. A concrete historical analysis of the events leaves not the slightest room for the legends, built up on ignorance and sentimentality, concerning Kronstadt, Makhno and other episodes of the revolution.

There remains only the fact that the Bolsheviks from the beginning applied not only conviction but also compulsion, often to a most brutal degree. It is also indisputable that later the bureaucracy which grew out of the revolution monopolized the system of compulsion for its own use. Every stage of development, even such catastrophic stages as revolution and counter-revolution, flows from the preceding stage, is rooted in it and takes on some of its features. Liberals, including the Webbs, have always maintained that the Bolshevik dictatorship was only a new version of Czarism. They close their eyes to such "details" as the abolition of the monarchy and the nobility, the handing over of the land to the peasants, the expropriation of capital, the introduction of planned economy, atheist education, etc. In the same way liberal-anarchist thought closes its eyes to the fact that the Bolshevik revolution, with all its repressions, meant an upheaval of social relations in the interest of the masses, whereas the Stalinist thermidorian upheaval accompanies the transformation of Soviet society in the interest of a privileged minority. It is clear that in the identification of Stalinism with Bolshevism there is not a trace of socialist criteria.

## QUESTIONS OF THEORY

One of the most outstanding features of Bolshevism has been its severe, exacting, even quarrelsome attitude toward questions of doctrine. The twenty-seven volumes of Lenin's works will remain forever an example of the highest theoretical conscientiousness. Without this fundamental quality Bolshevism would never have fulfilled

its historic role. In this regard and thoroughly empty.

The Opposition declared its program: "Since Lenin's theories have been created, they testify the backsliding of the international proletarian movement. A few years ago an American writer, who participated in the Spanish Revolution, testified that the Bolsheviks in fact are today the American Bernstein and Lenin—Bernstein did not do this, but Lenin—Bernstein did this in revising Marx." We must add only that Bernstein revised Marx for tactical needs: he tried to create a relationship between the Soviet democracy and its program, but however, not only has nothing been achieved, but is in general foreign to the Soviet movement. Its "ideology" is police subjectivism, its practice crude violence. In keeping with the caste of usurpers is hostile to the account of its social role and its role else. Stalin revises Marx and Lenin in the dictator's pen but with the hee-

## QUESTIONS

Complaints of the "immoral" particularly from those bourgeois masks were torn away by the bourgeois, intellectual, democratic

## COMING AS

The essay *Stalinism* reprinted here by arrangement of the Publishers. It will appear as a page pamphlet for mass circulation and are available at 10 cents each at reduced rates. Write to the Publishers, Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

## JUST PUBLISHED

## RUSSIA TWENTY By Victor Serge

Do Soviet workers enjoy freedom of opinion?  
What are the hidden institutions of the Soviet state?  
Who are the men and women who rule the penitentiaries and the courts?  
What is behind the secret police?  
What actually took place in the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial?

All of these questions and fearlessly by a man who has lived through it and fought for it.

Victor Serge describes the regime envisioned by Lenin and the present social conditions. Using the example of the Soviet Union, he shows the aspects of soviet life as the result of the inequalities of the wage scale, the growth of a police dominated state, the truth behind the Stakhanovite growth of a police dominated state, and the growth of a police dominated state.

298

PIONEER PRESS

100 Fifth Avenue

# Bolshevism - An Article Concerning the Roots and Traditions of the Movement for the Fourth International

the organized form of the tie between the vanguard and the class. A revolutionary content can be found in this form only by the party. This is proved by the positive experience of the October Revolution and by the negative experience of other countries (Germany, Italy, and finally Spain). No one has either shown in practice or tried to explain articulately on paper how the vanguard can seize power without the political leadership of a party that knows what it wants. The fact that the party subordinates the Soviets politically to the workers, has, in itself, abolished the Soviet system and replaced it by the domination of the conservative majority which has abolished the British parliamentary system.

As far as the prohibition of the other Soviet parties is concerned, it did not flow from any "theory" of Bolshevism but was a measure of defence of the dictatorship in a backward and devastated country, surrounded by enemies on all sides. For the Bolsheviks it was clear from the beginning that this measure, later completed by the prohibition of factions inside the governing party, signaled a tremendous danger. However, the danger lay not in the doctrine or in the tactics but in the material weakness of the dictatorship, in the isolation of its internal and international situation. If the revolution had triumphed, even if only in Germany, the prohibition of the other Soviet parties would have fallen away. It is absolutely indisputable that the domination of a single party served as a cardinal point of departure for the Stalinist totalitarian system. But the reason for this development lies neither in Bolshevism nor in the prohibition of other parties as a temporary war measure, but in the numerous defeats of the proletariat in Europe and Asia.

The same applies to the struggle with anarchism. In the early epoch of the revolution the Bolsheviks went to hand with the genuinely revolutionary anarchists, many of them were drawn into the ranks of the party. The author of these lines discussed with Lenin the possibility of allotting to the anarchists certain territories where, with the consent of the revolution, they would carry out their stateless experiments. But civil war, blockade, and hunger left no room for such plans. The Kronstadt insurrection? But the revolutionary government naturally could not "preach" to the insurrectionary sailors the fortress which they had seized only because the reactionary peasant rebellion was joined by a few doubtful anarchists. A concrete historical analysis of the events of the revolution, free of the slightest room for the legends, built up on emotion and sentimentality, concerning Kronstadt, the Kronstadt trials, and other episodes of the revolution.

It remains only the fact that the Bolsheviks from the beginning applied not only conviction but also compulsion, often to a most brutal degree. It is also indisputable that later the bureaucracy which grew out of the party monopolized the system of compulsion for its own ends. Every stage of development, even such catastrophic stages as revolution and counter-revolution, flows from the preceding stage, is rooted in it and takes on its own features. Liberals, including the Webbs, have maintained that the Bolshevik dictatorship was a new version of Czarism. They close their eyes to the "details" as the abolition of the monarchy and the handing over of the land to the peasants, the expropriation of capital, the introduction of planned production, atheist education, etc. In the same way liberal thought closes its eyes to the fact that the Bolshevik revolution, with all its repressions, meant an alteration of social relations in the interest of the masses, the Stalinist thermidorian upheaval accompanies the transformation of Soviet society in the interest of a privileged minority. It is clear that in the identification of Stalinism with Bolshevism there is not a trace of liberal criteria.

## QUESTIONS OF THEORY

One of the most outstanding features of Bolshevism is its severe, exacting, even quarrelsome attitude towards questions of doctrine. The twenty-seven volumes of Lenin's works will remain forever an example of the theoretical conscientiousness. Without this fundamental quality Bolshevism would never have fulfilled

its historic role. In this regard Stalinism, coarse, ignorant and thoroughly empiric, lies at the opposite pole.

The Opposition declared more than ten years ago in its program: "Since Lenin's death a whole set of new theories has been created, whose only purpose is to justify the backsliding of the Stalinists from the path of the international proletarian revolution." Only a few days ago an American writer, Liston M. Oak, who has participated in the Spanish Revolution, wrote: "The Stalinists in fact are today the foremost revisionists of Marx and Lenin—Bernstein did not dare to go half as far as Stalin in revising Marx." This is absolutely true. One must add only that Bernstein actually felt certain theoretical needs: he tried conscientiously to establish the relationship between the reformist practices of social democracy and its program. The Stalinist bureaucracy, however, not only has nothing in common with Marxism but is in general foreign to any doctrine or system whatsoever. Its "ideology" is thoroughly permeated with police subjectivism, its practice is the empiricism of crude violence. In keeping with its essential interests the caste of usurpers is hostile to any theory: it can give an account of its social role neither to itself nor to anyone else. Stalin revises Marx and Lenin not with the theoretician's pen but with the heel of the G. P. U.

## QUESTION OF MORALS

Complaints of the "immorality" of Bolshevism come particularly from those boastful nonentities whose cheap masks were torn away by Bolshevism. In petty-bourgeois, intellectual, democratic, "socialist", literary, par-

liamentary and other circles, conventional or a conventional language to cover their... This large and motley society for "mutual aid" "live and let live"—cannot bear the touch of a lancet on its sensitive skin. The theoreticians and moralists, hesitating between diffidence and thought and continue to think that the Bolsheviks exaggerate differences, are incapable of collaboration and by their "intrigues" disfigure the workers' movement. Moreover, the squeamish centrist has always thought that the Bolsheviks were "calumniating" him—simply carried through to the end for him his own thoughts: he himself was never able to do otherwise than remain that only that precious quality, the missing attitude toward all quibbling and toward educating a revolutionary party which will be unawares by "exceptional circumstances".

The moral qualities of every party flow from its analysis, from the historical interests that it represents. The moral qualities of Bolshevism, selflessness, disinterestedness, audacity and contempt for the tinsel and falsehood—the highest quality of nature!—flow from revolutionary intransigence in the service of the oppressed. The Stalinist imitates also in this domain the words and deeds of Bolshevism. But when "intransigence" and "inflexibility" are applied by a police apparatus of a privileged minority they become a moralization and gangsterism. One cannot tempt for these gentlemen who identify their own petty heroism of the Bolsheviks with the burlesque heroism of the Thermidorians.

\* \* \*

Even now, in spite of the dramatic character of the recent period, the average philistine prefers to see the struggle between Bolshevism and Stalinism as a clash of personalities or, at best, a conflict between two "shades" of Marxism. The crudest expression of this opinion is given by Norman Thomas, leader of the American Socialist Party. "There is little reason to believe," he writes in the *Review*, Sept. 1937, pag. 6) "that if Trotsky instead of Stalin, there would have been no intrigue, plots, and the reign of fear in Russia. Norman considers himself... a Marxist. Or the same right to say: "There is little reason to believe that if instead of Pius XI, the Holy See were headed by Norman I, the Catholic Church would have transformed into a bulwark of socialism." To understand that it is not a question of a clash between Stalin and Trotsky, but of an antagonism between the bureaucracy and the proletariat. To understand that the governing stratum of the U. S. S. R. is for the sake of to adapt itself to the still not wholly liquidated system of revolution, while preparing at the same time for direct civil war (bloody "purge"—mass arrests of the discontented) a change of the social relations. In Spain the Stalinist clique is already acting as a bulwark of the bourgeois order against so-called struggle against the Bonapartist bureaucracy before our eyes into class struggle: two programs, two moralities. If Thomas had understood the caste of oppressors would not politically regenerate the Soviet regime, he proves that all his reservations, shufflings and piousness are nearer to the Stalinist bureaucracy than to the proletariat.

Like other exposers of Bolshevism, Norman Thomas has simply not grown up to the task of moral analysis.

## THE TRADITIONS OF BOLSHEVISM AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

The "lefts" who tried to skip Bolshevism and "return" to Marxism generally confined themselves to isolated panaceas: boycott of the old trade unions, boycott of parliament, creation of "genuine" workers' parties. This could still seem extremely profound in

### COMING AS A PAMPHLET

The essay *Stalinism and Bolshevism* is being reprinted here by arrangement with the Pioneer Publishers. It will appear in a few days as a 32 page pamphlet for mass distribution. Single copies are available at 10 cents, with orders of five or more at reduced rates. Write to the publishers at 100 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

### JUST PUBLISHED

## RUSSIA TWENTY YEARS AFTER

By Victor Serge

- Do Soviet workers enjoy freedom of the press and opinion?
- What are the hidden implications of the new Constitution?
- Who are the men and women incarcerated in the penitentiaries and -solitaries? What are their crimes?
- What is behind the secret service? Is there an effective opposition movement and how does it manage to survive?
- What actually took place behind the scenes of the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial?

All of these questions and more are answered and fearlessly by a man who actually lived and fought for the revolution.

Victor Serge describes the democratic character of the regime envisioned by Lenin and Trotsky and contrasts it with present social conditions. Using the rise of the vast conservative bureaucracy as an axis, he takes up such important aspects of soviet life as the conditions of the workers and the inequalities of the wage scale, the methods by which industrialization and collectivization of agriculture was carried out, the truth behind the Stakanov movement, the all-pervading growth of a police dominated state and the new system of legislation which has replaced that of Lenin.

298 pages \$2.00

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

100 Fifth Avenue, New York City

# Tracing the Roots and Traditions of - By Leon Trotsky

## for the Fourth International

ard Stalinism, coarse, ignorant, lies at the opposite pole. more than ten years ago in a death a whole set of new whose only purpose is to justify Stalinists from the path of the revolution." Only a few days ago M. Oak, who has participated in the revolution, wrote: "The Stalinist revisionists of Marxism dare to go half as far as this is absolutely true. One actually felt certain theoretical practices of social reformism. The Stalinist bureaucracy, in common with Marxism, any doctrine or system what- thoroughly permeated with practice is the empiricism of its essential interests the to any theory: it can give an either to itself nor to anyone and Lenin not with the theoretical of the G. P. U.

### OF MORALS

ality" of Bolshevism come useful nonentities whose cheap Bolshevism. In petty-bourgeois, "socialist", literary, par-

### A PAMPHLET

and Bolshevism is being ment with the Pioneer in a few days as a 32 distribution. Single copies with orders of five or more to the publishers at 100 N. Y.

### PUBLISHED

## YEARS AFTER for Serge

freedom of the press and conditions of the new Con-

women incarcerated in the factories? What are their

service? Is there an effort and how does it

behind the scenes of the

and more are answered in who actually lived the revolution.

democratic character of the Trotsky and contrasts it with the rise of the vast conservative takes up such important questions of the workers and the methods by which industry, agriculture was carried out, movement, the all-pervading and the new system of of Lenin.

\$2.00

PUBLISHERS

New York City

liamentary and other circles, conventional values prevail, or a conventional language to cover their lack of values. This large and motley society for mutual protection—"live and let live"—cannot bear the touch of the Marxist lance on its sensitive skin. The theoreticians, writers and moralists, hesitating between different camps, thought and continue to think that the Bolsheviks maliciously exaggerate differences, are incapable of "loyal" collaboration and by their "intrigues" disrupt the unity of the workers' movement. Moreover, the sensitive and squeamish centrist has always thought that the Bolsheviks were "calumniating" him—simply because they carried through to the end for him his half-developed thoughts: he himself was never able to. But the fact remains that only that precious quality, an uncompromising attitude toward all quibbling and evasion, can educate a revolutionary party which will not be taken unawares by "exceptional circumstances".

The moral qualities of every party flow, in the last analysis, from the historical interests that it represents. The moral qualities of Bolshevism, self-renunciation, disinterestedness, audacity and contempt for every kind of tinsel and falsehood—the highest qualities of human nature!—flow from revolutionary intransigence in the service of the oppressed. The Stalinist bureaucracy imitates also in this domain the words and gestures of Bolshevism. But when "intransigence" and "inflexibility" are applied by a police apparatus in the service of a privileged minority they become a source of demoralization and gangsterism. One can feel only contempt for these gentlemen who identify the revolutionary heroism of the Bolsheviks with the bureaucratic cynicism of the Thermidorians.

\* \* \*

Even now, in spite of the dramatic events of the recent period, the average philistine prefers to believe that the struggle between Bolshevism ("Trotskyism") and Stalinism concerns a clash of personal ambitions, or, at best, a conflict between two "shades" of Bolshevism. The crudest expression of this opinion is given by Norman Thomas, leader of the American Socialist Party: "There is little reason to believe," he writes (*Socialist Review*, Sept. 1937, pag. 6) "that if Trotsky had won (!) instead of Stalin, there would have been an end of intrigue, plots, and the reign of fear in Russia." And this man considers himself . . . a Marxist. One would have the same right to say: "There is little reason to believe that if instead of Pius XI, the Holy See were occupied by Norman I, the Catholic Church would have been transformed into a bulwark of socialism." Thomas fails to understand that it is not a question of a match between Stalin and Trotsky, but of an antagonism between the bureaucracy and the proletariat. To be sure, the governing stratum of the U. S. S. R. is forced even now to adapt itself to the still not wholly liquidated heritage of revolution, while preparing at the same time through direct civil war (bloody "purge"—mass annihilation of the discontented) a change of the social regime. But in Spain the Stalinist clique is already acting openly as a bulwark of the bourgeois order against socialism. The struggle against the Bonapartist bureaucracy is turning before our eyes into class struggle: two worlds, two programs, two moralities. If Thomas thinks that the victory of the socialist proletariat over the infamous caste of oppressors would not politically and morally regenerate the Soviet regime, he proves only that for all his reservations, shufflings and pious sighs he is far nearer to the Stalinist bureaucracy than to the workers.

Like other exposers of Bolshevik "immorality", Thomas has simply not grown up to revolutionary morals.

### THE TRADITIONS OF BOLSHEVISM AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

The "lefts" who tried to skip Bolshevism in their "return" to Marxism generally confined themselves to isolated panaceas: boycott of the old trade unions, boycott of parliament, creation of "genuine" soviets. All this could still seem extremely profound in the first heat

of the post-war days. But now, in the light of most recent experience, such "infantile diseases" have no longer even the interest of a curiosity. The Dutchmen Gorter and Pannekoik, the German "Spartakists", the Italian Bordigists, showed their independence from Bolshevism only by artificially inflating one of its features and opposing it to the rest. But nothing has remained either in practice or in theory of these "left" tendencies: an indirect but important proof that Bolshevism is the only possible form of Marxism for this epoch.

The Bolshevik party has shown in action a combination of the highest revolutionary audacity and political realism. It has established for the first time the only relation between vanguard and class that can assure victory. It has proved by experience that the alliance between the proletariat and the oppressed masses of the rural and urban petty-bourgeoisie is possible only through the political overthrow of the traditional petty-bourgeois parties. The Bolshevik party has shown the entire world how to carry out armed insurrection and the seizure of power. Those who propose the abstraction of soviets to the party dictatorship should understand that only thanks to the Bolshevik leadership were the soviets able to lift themselves out of the mud of reformism and attain the state form of the proletariat. The Bolshevik party achieved in the civil war the correct combination of military art and Marxist politics. Even if the Stalinist bureaucracy should succeed in destroying the economic foundations of the new society, the experience of planned economy under the leadership of the Bolshevik party will have entered history for all time as one of the greatest teachings of mankind. This can be ignored only by bruised and offended sectarians who have turned their backs on the process of history.

But this is not all. The Bolshevik party was able to carry on its magnificent "practical" work only because it illuminated all its steps with theory. Bolshevism did not create this theory: it was furnished by Marxism. But Marxism is the theory of movement, not of stagnation. Only events on a tremendous historical scale could enrich the theory itself. Bolshevism brought an invaluable contribution to Marxism in its analysis of the imperialist epoch as an epoch of wars and revolutions; of bourgeois democracy in the era of decaying capitalism; of the correlation between the general strike and the insurrection; of the role of party, soviets and trade unions in the period of proletarian revolution; in its theory of the soviet state, of the economy of transition, of fascism and Bonapartism in the epoch of capitalist decline; finally in its analysis of the degeneration of the Bolshevik party itself and of the soviet state. Let any other tendency be named that has added anything essential to the conclusions and generalizations of Bolshevism. Theoretically and politically Vandervelde, De Brouckère, Hilferding, Otto Bauer, Léon Blum, Zyromski, not to mention Major Attlee and Norman Thomas, live on the dilapidated left-overs of the past. The degeneration of the Comintern is most crudely expressed by the fact that it has dropped to the theoretical level of the Second International. All the varieties of intermediary groups (Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, P.O.U.M. and their like) adapt every week new haphazard fragments of Marx and Lenin to their current needs. They can teach the workers nothing.

Only the founders of the Fourth International, who have made their own the whole tradition of Marx and Lenin, take a serious attitude toward theory. Philistines may jeer that twenty years after the October victory the revolutionaries are again thrown back to modest propagandist preparation. The big capitalists are, in this question as in many others, far more penetrating than the petty-bourgeois who imagine themselves "socialists" or "communists". It is no accident that the subject of the Fourth International does not leave the columns of the world press. The burning historical need for revolutionary leadership promises to the Fourth International an exceptionally rapid tempo of growth. The greatest guarantee of its further success lies in the fact that it has not arisen away from the large historic road, but is an organic outgrowth of Bolshevism.

August 29, 1937.



# Spain and the Coming World War

## Civil War May Be Completely Transformed Into Imperialist Conflict

In an article published in last week's issue of the *Appeal*, I discussed the possibility that the new imperialist war might grow by a series of gradual stages out of present (Ethiopian, Spanish, Chinese....) and future armed conflicts on the world arena, without any sharp gulf between "peace" and war, and without formal "declaration of war" by the great powers.

It should be emphasized that it is only a possibility that I am dealing with. In the last analysis, only the very realistic criterion of a sufficiently large number of the armed forces of the great powers in the field fighting against each other, can test whether or not the war has begun. By this criterion the war has not begun. None of the great powers is yet at war, with the exception of Japan; and Japan is engaged not in an inter-imperialist war, but in a war against the semi-colonial country, China. The extent of Italian and German operations in Spain is not enough to constitute war in the full sense from the point of view of Italy or Germany; their troops in Spain are an "expeditionary force", not "national armies".

### England's Position

The great fact weighing against the possibility I have been discussing is, of course, the position of England—this along with the fear of revolution by all of the powers. England is not ready for war, and seeks consequently to delay its outbreak. England may succeed in keeping the Spanish and Chinese events sufficiently localized to prevent their spread into general war; and may even achieve temporary "solutions" for them. Even then, however, there are already France and the Near East approaching the boiling point. It is almost inconceivable that an analogue of the Spanish conflict, occurring in France—by no means unlikely, even in the comparatively near future—could remain within French national boundaries.

The key importance of understanding this possibility—and of preparing for it—is seen in this: that the attitude of Marxism toward inter-imperialist war is basically different from its attitude toward many other kinds of war. Marxism shows that the coming imperialist war, like the War of 1914-18, will be a struggle of two coalitions of the great powers over the "division of the spoils", over colonies, spheres of influence, means of exploitation. From the point of view of both sides, it will be a reactionary and decadent war, no matter how it may be dressed up under slogans of "resist the aggressor", "defend democracy against fascism", "defend the U. S. S. R.", or what not. Marxism therefore advocates in the coming war as in the last war, a position of defeatism with respect to both sides and all the respective governments, with the exception of the Soviet Union. The masses have nothing to gain from victory on either side.

But Marxism supports, in the present era, the armed struggles of colonies and backward nations against their imperialist oppressors. Politically, of course, in the case of colonies or backward nations as in the case of every nation, Marxism supports only the revolutionary program and its adherents. But materially it supports the struggle of the colony or backward nation as such, and rejects the conception of defeatism in these cases. It does so because these struggles

weaken imperialism and because the road to the proletarian revolution in the colonies and backward nations lies through resistance to the imperialist oppressors.

Marxists, consequently support Ethiopia against Italy, and support China against Japan.

### Fascism and Democracy

Even more obviously, in the case of a civil war which is not a mere palace intrigue or military-bureaucratic shift, do Marxists support the side of the workers and popular masses against the side of straightforward reaction. They do so not merely in the case of an outright civil war for proletarian power (tragically rare in history), but likewise when the class struggle assumes other forms: e.g., the form of an armed struggle between bourgeois democracy and fascism. Thus, Marxists support the struggle of the Loyalist army in Spain against Franco. They do make a distinction between the regime of Caballero or Negrin, on the one side, and of Franco on the other. Their tactics, with respect to Franco's government and armies, advocate defeatism, sabotage, boycott of supplies, etc.; the tactics with respect to Caballero-Negrin advocate none of these.

The tactics of the Marxists toward the Spanish events flow from their conclusion that the dominant character of the struggle is that of civil war, in form of a war between bourgeois democracy and fascism, in substance a defense by the Spanish workers and peasants of their rights and positions against the certain annihilation of these by the victory of Franco. Though this is the dominant aspect of the Spanish struggle, from the beginning it has also had as secondary aspects: (a) that of a war of aggression against a backward nation by Italy and Germany; (b) that of an episode in the world-wide inter-imperialist conflict, which conflict is destined to issue in world imperialist war. It is in spite of (b) and in spite of the bourgeois coalition government which heads Loyalist Spain politically that Marxists support the Loyalist struggle against Franco, that they fight to win in the Loyalist armies, that they send aid to the Loyalist workers and soldiers even at the risk that such aid, controlled by the government, will in part be used against the workers, that they attempt to boycott aid to Franco and to agitate for a defeatist position in his ranks.

### Two Kinds of Support

The Marxists give such support to the Loyalist struggle "for their own reasons"; they give it in absolute independence of the Loyalist government itself and of all bourgeois governments; they give no political support whatever to the People's Front government; they defend the rights and conquests of the workers against the government; and by their propaganda they prepare politically for the overthrow of the government and the victory of a workers' regime when a decisive section of the Spanish masses shall have been won to the program of workers' power. Such support and such support only is the road to the revolution in Spain.

The Stalinists, social-democrats, and other types of reformists and social-patriots also support the Loyalist struggle, but their support is at the opposite pole from that of the Marxists. Their ma-

terial support is subordinate to political support of the People's Front government. Since the People's Front government is a bourgeois government and thus ultimately counter-revolutionary in nature, political support of such a government is political treachery; it is, as the Barcelona events proved, not support of the Spanish workers but defense of a capitalist government, against the workers and the revolution.

Marxists support, the Loyalist struggle, entailing for a period "defense of the government" against Franco, in order to aid the Spanish workers and to prepare the ground for the definitive victory of workers' power, thus for the overthrow of that same government. The reformists support the government precisely in order to defend capitalism against socialism as well as against fascism, to betray the workers and to prepare the ground for the complete liquidation of the revolution. This is the harsh reality.

In order to bolster up their case not merely Franco but also Hitler and Mussolini are making war against "the legitimate democratic government" of Spain; and that therefore all "peace-loving democratic people" should unite to resist the mad dogs of Nazism and Fascism, the "aggressor nations" Germany and Italy. It happens to be false that Germany and Italy are making war against Valencia (though if true it would not at all alter the Marxist attitude toward the Spanish events), but the falsity of this contention is its least sinister aspect. Let us examine further.

The conclusion that the Stalinists and reformists draw from their argument that Germany and Italy are at war with Valencia is not, primarily, that independent working class action should be taken against them, but that governmental action by the "democratic" powers should be taken against the "aggressor nations". "Collective action" of the democratic nations is the password; action by the governments assembled in the League of Nations or on the basis of the Kellogg Pact, or through the Non-Intervention Committee, or the Nyon Conference—the mechanism chosen is incidental. In this country precisely the same conception leads to a demand essentially the same; invocation of the Neutrality Act against Germany and Italy, advocated alike by Browder, Thomas, Waldman, and the Socialist Call.

### The Call for Government Action

What is the meaning of this? Put simply and bluntly, the Stalinists and reformists are demanding war, imperialist war, and agreeing in advance to support it. Their entire international propaganda in connection with the Spanish events has, in fact, been consistently social-patriotic, and is merely a rehearsal for the betrayal to the new war. And their position could result in nothing else: they support, politically and materially, the Valencia government, and defend politically and materially democratic capitalism against fascist aggression, whether by Franco, Hitler or Mussolini. If allies come in—England, say, or France—to aid in defending Valencia and in attacking Hitler and Mussolini, they can only welcome this with open arms, and support these allies just as they support

Negrin. And they will do so.

Marxists, on the direct contrary, are against all intervention by capitalist governments in the Spanish struggle, and for working class aid only. If England and France should intervene on a large scale, if the Spanish struggle should thus be transformed into an inter-imperialist war, Marxists explain that under such circumstances, the dominant character of the Spanish struggle would be entirely changed; its aspect as a civil war would be subordinated to its aspect as one episode or phase in the inter-imperialist conflict. The imperialist "allies" of the Valencia government would be entering armed conflict only for their own imperialist interests, and the Valencia government would be in every respect subordinated to those interests. At that time, to fight loyally, to fight to win, in the Valencian armies, would in actuality be to fight to defend one set of imperialist interests as against another. The workers, then, could defend their own interests only by struggling, in every possible way, against the war, in Spain and in all countries. Marxists would go over to a position of defeatism with respect to the Loyalist armies, since only such a position would correspond with the changed character of the struggle itself.

### Dangers of Spain

This change in the struggle, its complete subordination to the inter-imperialist conflicts, is possible even short of its transformation into imperialist war on a grand scale. In fact, the growing subordination of the progressive aspects of the Spanish struggle as a civil war, to its reactionary aspects as an episode in the

inter-imperialist conflicts, is apparent during these last months, and corresponds closely to the growingly reactionary character of the Valencia regime internally. The inter-imperialist conflicts could become dominant not merely through war, but, for example, through large scale intervention by England and France either independently or through the League; or by a sell-out deal by Valencia with Franco engineered along the lines long ago suggested by England. Under any of these circumstances, the same conclusion would have to be drawn by Marxists: the continuation of struggle of the workers for their own interests and for the socialist revolution would become incompatible with any attitude even of temporary "toleration" or "defense" of the People's Front regime; that regime would have become indistinguishable, for practical purposes, from the regime of Franco and from the imperialist regime which controlled it. This situation has not yet been reached, and it would be altogether false to anticipate it in action. The way for the Spanish workers is still to beat Franco, which now means fighting loyally in the Valencia armies, without any confidence at all in the People's Front and its governments, and preparing politically for the establishment of workers' power which alone will carry the war to a successful conclusion in the interests of the masses. But if the workers not merely in Spain but on a world scale, are not to be caught in the web of social-patriotism later on, the political preparation must also look forward to these possible outcomes, which, from all indications, are neither far off nor unlikely.

**Dr. S. D. Schmalhausen**  
Brilliant and Witty Lecturer  
In a New Series of Lectures  
Friday, October 1st at 9 p. m.  
"The World-Shaking  
Crisis in Radicalism—  
Reform or Revolution—  
Which?"  
Admission 50 cents  
Questions and Discussion  
The Thomas Paine Society  
88 Seventh Avenue South  
Greenwich Village, N. Y. C.  
(7th Avenue Subway to  
Christopher Street)  
Send For Free Programs

### UNSER WORT

The attention of comrades familiar with the German language is called to "Unser Wort", the official paper of the German Section of the 4th International.

Comrades wishing to subscribe to the paper, or to receive bundle orders should use the following address for communications:

Jean Meichler, B. P. 11  
248 Rue des Pyrenees  
Paris (20e), France

ANNOUNCING the new

## PARTISAN REVIEW

a Marxist literary monthly  
reappearing November, 1937

INDEPENDENT and EXPERIMENTAL: politically independent of all parties and groups; providing a forum for a free discussion of critical problems and for new tendencies in creative writing.

Publishing fiction, poetry; critical essays and reviews on literature, the theater, movies and the arts; articles of a general cultural character; editorials and communications.

Edited by: F. W. DUPEE, DWIGHT MacDONALD, MARY McCARTHY, GEORGE L. K. MORRIS, WILLIAM PHILLIPS, PHILIP RAHV.

### PARTISAN REVIEW

25c a copy 22 East 17th St. \$2.00 a year  
New York, N. Y.

# Auto Convention Shows Growth

## Victory of Bureaucracy Shows Left Wing Need

By a Delegate

The reports of the United Auto Workers Union convention in the capitalist press gave no hint of the spirit, the boldness, the courage and the resourcefulness displayed by the delegates. Some 1100 of them gathered at Eagle's Hall, Milwaukee, on August 23. Their organization in one year had grown from 30,000 members to almost 375,000. The treasury at the first convention had consisted of some \$34,000. The Auditor's report showed on June 30, 1937 a balance of \$428,000. In the brief period of the year since the South Bend convention, the auto workers, by a series of swift, bold and dramatic sit-down strikes had broken down the fear of the auto workers, paralyzed the resistance of the employers, established unions and signed agreements with all of the major automobile and auto parts manufacturers with the single exception of Ford. On the first day of the convention, the 1100 delegates paid tribute to this glorious achievement in a wild, uncontrollable demonstration which continued unabated hour after hour.

Uniformly the delegates were rank and file representatives from the shops, young men, who felt a deep responsibility to the membership of their locals. Not once was the convention called to order but that practically every delegate was in his seat, ready for business. Repeatedly they complained to the chair about the long meaningless speeches of lawyers, governors, politicians, which only interfered with the serious work of the convention. Every motion for special night sessions to complete important business, was greeted with a storm of applause.

### Background of the Convention

In the great struggle with General Motors and the state forces of Michigan, President Martin had proved to be just another sky pilot with a "gift of gab". During all of the crucial negotiations with the General Motors management, Martin was in the east, addressing local union meetings.

As soon as the General Motors strike was settled, the Michigan newspapers had abruptly "changed their line" towards the union organization. The previous policy of frankly espousing the open shop was abandoned. Now the papers discovered great virtues in the United Automobile Workers Union. As a matter of fact, the union was the finest thing in the world. The only thing they objected to, for the good of the workers themselves it goes without saying, was some of the "excesses" that the union committed.

### Bosses' Advice?

Union headquarters were bombarded with a shower of gratuitous advice. What the union needed was "responsible leadership". What the union needed was to get rid of the irresponsible agitators, discipline its membership and put an end to wildcat unauthorized strikes. Then the union could grow big and strong like the United Mine Workers of America and Homer Martin would unquestionably become another John L. Lewis.

Martin swallowed the oily flattery of the press. The more events revealed his own incompetence, lack of backbone and total inexperience, the more he insisted he was the chosen one to lead the auto workers out of wilderness, and the more determined he became to suppress the opposition of the rank and file, and destroy their democratic rights.

Martin set to work. Using the power of appointment, he gathered all the job hunters, all the opportunists in the union. With ample resources in the treasury, he sent his organizers up and down the countryside in a vicious red baiting campaign to throw fear and confusion into the hearts of the union membership.

Industrialists and the capitalist press were informed that henceforth "Communists" would be expelled, unauthorized strikes would be tolerated no longer.

### Martin's Lovestonites

As the rank and file membership grew alarmed at Martin's actions, Martin felt the need of expert advice. Through Charles Zimmerman of the I. L. G. W. U. he secured the assistance of a "brain trust" from the Lovestone group. Munger was appointed editor of the *United Automobile Worker*, several other Lovestonites were placed on the payroll and the Lovestonites began acting as the stool pigeons, the spotters hatchet men, the "theoretical experts" for the reactionary Martin faction. The Stalinists in the union feared that this campaign of red baiting would mean their elimination. With the aid of several of the international officers and two of the executive board members, a national progressive group was organized. Outright reactionaries, union politicians, and anybody who cared first meeting of the progressive to join, were accepted.

### The Toledo Meeting

At the first meeting of the progressive caucus held in Toledo some two and one-half months prior to the Milwaukee convention, delegations from Flint, Detroit and other centers reported how local organizations were thrown into turmoil by the red baiting campaign, how local unions organizers were fired and arbitrarily replaced by Martin's henchmen, etc. The purpose of the caucus, it was explained, was to fight these arbitrary acts, re-establish union democracy and the militant policies which had built the organization. Plans were elaborated for an enlarged meeting of the caucus in the near future, and all delegates instructed to return to their localities and arouse their membership to the danger facing the union organization. So far, so good.

### Browder Steps In

Then something happened. The Communist Party told its auto people, they had no business fighting Martin. Browder brought the matter up at the plenary session of the Central Committee in June. "On occasion", he said, "we see developments which give rise to great uneasiness when comrades rush into snap judgments on big questions of trade union policy, consider that trade union

leaders have unnecessarily compromised the workers' demands, and from this conclusion pass immediately into a head-on collision with those leaders and those workers who follow them. There were dangerous movements of this sort in the Detroit district in connection with the Chrysler strike". He continued, "Labor generally including us Communists who approach this question with our standards, have every reason to proceed to the particular tasks and problems facing us with great confidence in the strategical line of the C.I.O. leadership and of John L. Lewis".

Before the next meeting of the progressive group, a leading Communist Party member introduced a motion in the Detroit district auto council, that all caucuses be prohibited in the auto union. At the next meeting of the progressive group held in Toledo, the group was re-named the "unity caucus", and a program submitted practically identical with the program of the Martin machine — the so-called Martin-Frankensteen progressive caucus.

It included such points as (1). No caucuses or groups to be allowed in the auto union, (2). Against the influence of "outside organizations" who have members within the automobile union, (3). For support of Labor Non-Partisan League, etc. Those clever Stalinists! They were going to disarm the Martin faction by stealing their program. So determined was this Stalinist crowd to achieve unity with Martin, that in the caucus they fought and finally succeeded in defeating the motions of several Cleveland delegates for the right of members with similar ideas to form groups within the union, for independent labor political action etc. All they asked of Martin was his agreement to allow Mortimer and Hall to remain as vice-presidents of the organization and the retention of the secondary leadership of organizers. At this point, the battle had degenerated into an unprincipled clique fight for union posts.

### C. P. Has to Fight

At Milwaukee itself it finally dawned on the Stalinists that they must either fight or they were licked and on their way out. Hastily the "unity group" was re-named again, the "unity and democracy group. No longer were speeches made about there being no differences between the unity group and Martin-Frankensteen. Against their own will the Communist Party combination was compelled to fight, however timidly, however inadequately against the Martin-Frankensteen bureaucracy.

Now the delegates proved eager to fight for democratic rights and for the aggressive policies which had built their union. Time after time Martin was stopped cold in his attempts to wield the gavel and run the convention in the high-handed manner characteristic of labor conventions. Repeatedly the Flint, Detroit, Toledo and Cleveland delegations, all on their feet, would refuse to let Martin go on until some opposition speaker received the floor or until the point of order was recognized.

### Lewis Man Boomed

The delegates showed more determination and fight than has probably ever been shown in any labor convention in recent years. Ora Gassaway, personal representative of John L. Lewis in this convention, was twice boomed by

the convention when he attempted to use the prestige of his position to back some reactionary move of the Martin faction. So white hot was the general temper that Martin throughout the convention did not dare chance any open attacks upon the sit down strike or the so-called "unauthorized strikes", but again and again was forced to play up to the militancy of the convention. A resolution introduced by Cleveland Local 217 upholding the sit down strike, was passed by the convention unopposed by the Martin machine.

### Lewis Arrives

On Friday, the fifth day of the convention, Lewis himself finally arrived in Milwaukee. But he did not stay long in town. He found at the convention the same specter that had haunted him years back in the United Mine Workers, and Lewis was not in a position today to ruthlessly slug the opposition out of existence. After a tactful diplomatic oration, he quickly left Milwaukee, leaving precise instructions with Dubinsky and Gassaway that he wanted an agreement reached on the Executive officers that night and the convention must be adjourned the following day.

Late into night the negotiations between the unity group and the Martin forces continued, with Gassaway and Dubinsky in the role of mediators. An agreement was finally announced—seven officers, three from each side with one so-called independent. The Communist Party leaders were jubilant. In reality the "victory" was a defeat. The president has all the powers, the vice-presidents have practically none. Three quarters of the new gen-

eral Executive Board are Martin supporters.

Like all phony compromises, it was short-lived. Saturday, shortly after the installation of the general officers, the convention again broke into bedlam over some bureaucratic ruling of Martin and, from then on an almost constant uproar continued until Sunday night when the convention was hastily adjourned.

### Militancy Diverted

The delegates fight for democracy, for rank and file control, for a militant policy of struggle to preserve the union against the bosses—all this was channelized by the Communist Party strategists into a fight for a couple of union posts. Martin still retains in many cases even greater power and control than he held before the convention. His bureaucratic campaign, he has already announced, will continue with even greater determination.

The convention, however, revealed superbly the auto workers' ability to fight, their determination to preserve the union, the militancy they are capable of. Several of the leading rank and filers realized before the convention was over that the Communist Party and the right wing Socialists, did not want to, and were not capable of organizing or leading a fight of this kind.

Plans are already under way to build a new group in the auto workers union, on the genuine basis of principles and policies, to oppose the reactionary Martin clique and to build the auto workers union into a fighting organization for the class interests of the automobile workers and labor as a whole.

## Browder and LaGuardia

### By Fore and Aft

Hard on the heels of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, Earl Browder has now announced officially the Communist Party support of La Guardia for re-election. It must be admitted that this was not much of surprise. However, some others of LaGuardia's friends feel that Browder really ought to have waited for official action until after the primaries—they are afraid that some of the La Guardia Republicans will be embarrassed slightly by the wholehearted embrace of the La Guardia Communists.

Browder's official statement is in the best People's Front manner. In political content of course, the arguments are identical with those used during the national election campaign last year in justifying indirect support of Roosevelt. "Defeat Land on Liberty League-Hearst!" was the slogan then; now it is, "Defeat Tammany!" "Forward to the victory of the people over Wall Street!" shouted Browder over Station WINS.

But last year the People's Front line in the United States had not yet been devoted to its fuller stage. A Communist candidate still appeared on the ballot, even though he was forgotten in the campaign. The Stalinist members themselves were not yet prepared to swallow a completely open capitulation.

Today the further step can be taken. Israel Amter, New York State Chairman of the Communist Party, declares: ".....the New

York State Committee is refraining for the first time in its history from running a Communist Mayoralty candidate. The Communist Party will throw the full weight of its influence behind the American Labor Party's candidate for Mayor, Fiorello H. LaGuardia." (Amter's emphasis.)

And are the Stalinists giving "critical support" to La Guardia? Not a bit of it. No such half-way measures for Browder. "The ticket offered is such a serious effort; it satisfies all the conditions which we demand."

"The significance of this election," states Browder, "is even international." And in saying this Browder is entirely correct. In supporting the capitalist candidate, LaGuardia, in this election, Browder is carrying out faithfully the international line of the People's Front, is putting through in the given national and local conditions the same policy of treachery and betrayal which now strangles the fight of the workers in Spain, China, and France. It is not in the least an accident that at the same time that the *Daily Worker* comes into the open with its support of La Guardia, it carries on an openly chauvinistic campaign with respect to the Chinese events, virtually advocating war by the United States against Japan, and promising in advance complete support of such a war. Indeed from the fundamental class point of view, the policy of support of LaGuardia is an inseparable link in the general class policy which leads direct to support of the coming war.



# Calif. Aviation Strike Firm

LOS ANGELES. — Striking members of Local 229, United Auto Workers, have now for the fourth week completely shut down the Northrup division of the Douglas Aircraft Corp. in El Segundo, Calif. The union is now preparing to prevent a back-to-work movement sponsored by the Company Aircraft Workers union. Several days ago Donald Douglas published a statement that he was permanently closing the Northrup plant. Charlie Rogers, International Representative of the U.A.W.A. in charge of the strike, answered this by declaring this threat was propaganda issued to demoralize the union men and that in several days the Douglas Corp. would attempt to effect a back-to-work movement.

The prophecy of Rogers has already been proved correct. The union has obtained a copy of a form contract whereby strike-breakers promise to put up a \$15 bond to guarantee their promise not to sit down, strike, or damage company property for a period of one year. In consideration of this agreement, the Douglas Co. promises to make a strong effort to resume operation of the plant and to do all in its power to provide employment for the men for one year.

## Company Fights Union

The Northrup strike was called August 26th, 1937, in order to enforce an agreement secured by the union after the sit-down strike in February of this year. The contract recognized the union, protected rights of seniority, and provided for a plan of negotiation to settle labor disputes. Every provision of the contract has been broken by the Douglas Co.

In August an N.L.R.B. election was held at the plant employing 1500 men. The U.A.W.A. received a majority of the vote over its opponent, the company controlled Aircraft Workers Union. Prior to this election the Company and the Company union had attempted to obtain a Federal injunction to prevent the election and were defeated in this attempt. Immediately after the election the Northrup Company, then controlled by the Douglas Company through ownership of a majority of the stock, was dissolved and made a branch of the parent corporation. The Douglas Company then refused to negotiate with the union committees, and began its campaign against the union by discharging union men. The strike vote was held after 150 men had been fired.

## Profits from Government Contracts

The Douglas Company with over \$6 million dollars of contracts with the U. S. army and navy, and large contracts with foreign governments for the production of planes is determined to destroy trade union organization within its factories. Anticipating expansion of the plants as a result of the war developments, the Company will proceed with its policy of utilizing the most ruthless methods to crush the U.A.W. of A. locals.

At the beginning of the strike many of the union men believed that Lewis through Roosevelt would bring pressure on Douglas to settle the strike. Most of the men have now discarded this illusion and now recognize that neither Roosevelt nor the agencies of the government such as

the N.L.R.B. will assist them. The government is just as interested as is Douglas in crushing trade union organization within such a basic war industry.

## Strike in Danger

The greatest danger facing the strike is the weakness of local 214 of the U.A.W. at the Douglas plant in Santa Monica. At this plant, employing 6500 men, the union has not recovered from the set back suffered at the sit-down strike in February. In the period of reaction after the above strike the Union suffered from the attempt of the Communist Party fraction to obtain control of the union.

Attacking Socialist party members from the floor of the union meeting, slandering them in a whispering campaign, calling them Trotskyist-Fascists in an effort to bring the Moscow frame-up into the union affairs, attacking any rank and file member who opposes their policy and control, has discouraged many members from participating in union affairs. However, the number of C. P. members in the union is comparatively very small and opposition to their tactics is growing in the rank-and-file

Because of the present weakness of the Douglas local there is a danger that company union men will be used as strike breakers in the Northrup strike. There is the further danger that the Douglas plant will be able to absorb enough of the work that was done at the Northrup plant to lock-out the Northrup men long enough to break the strike.

The aircraft industry is again the spearhead of the movement to organize Southern California and the defeat of the C.I.O. in this strike will set back the entire movement started in the February strike. The Merchants and Manufacturers Association is aware of this, and more has to be done to make the trade-unionists of this area aware of it also.

## Compare The "Appeal"

with the Socialist Call. The Appeal is doing a job that the Call might have done had the expulsions of the revolutionary socialists not left it in the slough of reformism and class collaboration. With centrists and right wingers controlling the policy of the Call, there is only one paper left that presents the revolutionary Marxian point of view, editorially and in reporting the news—THE APPEAL.

With the APPEAL to back us in our activities, we will go

# The United Front from Below

By  
Carlo



# Times Change in the S.P.!

By John Hall

It has been remarked before that history has a tendency to repeat itself. Today, in the Socialist Party this is taking place, to an extent perhaps not realized by many comrades. Two years ago, the Old Guard, with their New Leader, were greatly agitated over the appearance of the Socialist Call, which was invading the field of Socialist journalism, monopolized for years by Oneal and Cahan. They demanded that the NEC do something, and do it quick.

In the August 3, 1935 issue of the Call appeared an editorial which has a very timely sound today. "Whether or not some

papers continue their factional policy is not the chief issue. What is important is that revolutionary socialism must have its own organ!"

"The Call is operated in accordance with present procedure in the Party. The NEC has neither the desire nor the authority to suspend the Call."

It was a swell editorial. On the editorial board were, among others, Murray Baron, Robert Delson, David Felix, Aaron Levenstein, August Tyler, and Herbert Zam. And Jack Altman was business manager! To them, any claim that starting a new Socialist paper was "a gross breach of discipline" was plainly ridiculous. But that was in 1935!

Today, thousands of revolutionary Socialists face expulsion from the Party on the technical ground of supporting the Socialist Appeal. And the very ones who supported the position quoted above are among those demanding the expulsions. Obviously, something has changed. Just as obviously, it must be these former militants, for the Party rules have not changed. I think that the reason can be found expressed in the lucid style of August Tyler, writing in the lone issue of Socialist Clarity. "They (the Stalinists) have merely consigned theory to the realm of theory. Their principles are like the ritual of some dead religion; something to which one pays homage on high days, holidays and conventions. But which, as all practical people know, has nothing at all to do with their daily practices".

The rise of the militant movement in the Socialist Party was a necessary response to the clear indication, by world events, that the working class lacked one prerequisite to a successful struggle for Socialism—a clear revolutionary party on the international scene. Only the ossified (like the Old Guard) could deny that. A thousands varieties of radicals and semi-radicals pro-

claimed it. It was the best way to assure one's self of a hearing. As a result, it was comparatively easy for the Militants to win control of the Party away from the aged, time-serving Old Guard, though the so-called leadership of the Militants showed a touching reluctance to be rough with the Old Guard in taking over the Party. Then, faced with the necessity of building the revolutionary party, many of the Militants began to show a curious shyness. Such a task is not for playboys, lovers of large words, or sentimental pacifistic parsons.

The challenge to apply Marxist principles in action faced the party almost immediately. The hardships of carrying on our independent Socialist campaign last year slowed the bright young men right down to a walk. And today those who talk radical and do whatever is easiest can see an easy way out. The People's Front appears to be taking shape here in America (and kicking its god-mother, the C. P., in the face at every turn) in the form of "progressive" and "labor" Parties. Best of all, LaFollette and La Guardia and such have a habit of winning elections, such a change from the dismal business of running campaigns which do not get you an office, but simply serve to build a revolutionary party. And in the rush to climb on the bandwagon, the peanut politicians and muddleheads, are not going to let Party legality, Socialist ethics and principles, or even common honesty stand in their way.

## BULLETIN

There will be a protest demonstration against the Nazi rally at Madison Square Garden, this Sunday, Oct. 3.

We must reply! Every comrade out.

Mobilize at headquarters, 116 University Place at 5:30 P. M.

All others should report as soon as possible at the Garden, 50th St. and 8th Ave. Down with Fascism!

## Socialist Appeal

100 Fifth Ave.  
Room 1609  
New York City

Date .....

I enclose \$..... for which please send me the Socialist Appeal. One year—(\$2.00); Six Months—(\$1.00).

I enclose \$..... as my contribution toward building the Socialist Appeal.

Name .....

Address .....

City .....