

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. IV, No. 31 Saturday, August 3, 1940

Published Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Editorial Board:

FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN

General Manager:
GEORGE CLARKE

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 5 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Fight with the Socialist Workers Party for:

1. A JOB AND A DECENT LIVING FOR EVERY WORKER.
2. OPEN THE IDLE FACTORIES — OPERATE THEM UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL.
3. A TWENTY-BILLION DOLLAR FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS AND HOUSING PROGRAM.
4. THIRTY-THIRTY—\$30-WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE—30-HOUR WEEKLY MAXIMUM FOR ALL WORKERS ON ALL JOBS.
5. \$30 WEEKLY OLD-AGE AND DISABILITY PENSION.
6. EXPROPRIATE THE SIXTY FAMILIES.
7. ALL WAR FUNDS TO THE UNEMPLOYED.
8. A PEOPLE'S REFERENDUM ON ANY AND ALL WARS.
9. NO SECRET DIPLOMACY.
10. AN INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY.
11. WORKERS' DEFENSE GUARDS AGAINST VIGILANTE AND FASCIST ATTACKS.
12. FULL SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY FOR THE NEGRO PEOPLE.

Arming the Workers

"British Miners Ask Arms" was the head on a story which you may have missed, for it got into only one paper that we saw, the New York Times, July 18, and there it got the smallest head-type that the Times uses, and was buried away in an obscure corner.

It tells that a miners' convention at Blackpool unanimously adopted a resolution asking that miners be armed to meet a possible invasion.

We should like to see every union in this country adopt a similar resolution. The government tells us that fascism, the mortal enemy of the labor movement, is threatening to invade our shores? Then let the government provide arms for the mortal enemies of fascism everywhere—the trade unions. Let the government also provide technical instructors to teach the unions the military arts. Let the unions, on their part, see to it that every physically able member is required to participate in this military training under direction of the unions.

If this were to be done, we predict in advance that for every young worker who has enlisted in the army or navy, a hundred will devote not only the time for military training required by their union but will concentrate their spare time on becoming military experts. The master and servant relationship existing between officers and men in the armed forces, the anti-democratic atmosphere of the barracks, can inspire few, and least of all workers who, as union men, are accustomed to stand up as equals—and better—to their bosses. But organize a program of military training around the union hall and it will inspire every vigorous young worker to become adept in the military arts.

And we can also predict in advance that, if the organized workers of this country were thus armed and trained, what happened in France could never happen here. No "democratic" government could ever turn fascist with impunity.

We propose that what the British miners are now asking should become a central demand upon the American government by the trade union movement of this country.

J.P. Morgan's Refugees

"J. P. Morgan Host to Refugees", was a front-page headline in Monday's issue of the New York Post. In spite of our notorious bias against the banker, we were prepared to be touched. We have never been among those who found it irrelevant that a murderer was good to his mother. On the contrary, we have always been anxious to find a redeeming feature in anyone, even in a banker. Our hopes were quickly dashed, however. It turned out that the refugees to whom Mr. Morgan has opened his home are young Lord Primrose, son of the British magnate Lord Shrewsbury, and two children of Hugh Vivian Smith, partner in Mr. Morgan's London banking house of Morgan & Grenfell. The refugees arrived accompanied by a tutor and a governess.

They came on a boatload of such refugees. All told there were 272 such refugees on the Cunard liner *Britannic*. The passenger list consisted of a half-dozen pages from Burke's *Peerage*. Other such boatloads have come and still others are coming. In many cases the parents come with the children.

These boatloads give us an insight into the real situation in Great Britain. To believe the "democratic" and "socialist" press, there is utter

equality today in England, now that the Labor Party is in the government. Wealth is being conscripted, etc. etc. And British law, in its majestic equality, permits both the rich and the poor to send their children out of the country to a safe haven.

But the poor insist on keeping their children where bombs will rain down upon them, while the rich pursue the more intelligent course of purchasing expensive steamship tickets and paying all other expenses necessary for transporting and maintaining their children in America or Canada (and not forgetting to send along governesses and tutors).

Well, dash it, do you expect the British government, amid its preoccupations, to take time out to arrange for transporting the poor children out of the country? No, that's not the task of British "democracy". We agree. That's not the kind of task for which the Labor ministers were taken into the government.

Which Is the Crime?

Dan W. Tracy has resigned as international president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) to accept the post of Second Assistant Secretary of Labor. The War Deal has need of men like him. The capitalist class found out nearly forty years ago (the French bosses tried it first when they got the "socialist" Miller and to sit in the same cabinet with General Gallifet who had massacred the Communards of Paris after they surrendered) that a "labor leader" can commit more crimes against labor than an ordinary bourgeois government official. As the workers resist the anti-labor consequences of the War Deal, more and more labor leaders of the stripe of Tracy will be handed government portfolios.

An ironical touch in connection with Tracy's appointment is the fact that, as president of the electrical workers, he was gathered in by Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold's "anti-trust" dragnet, and was indicted along with other union leaders on December 18, 1939. That indictment, involving a jail sentence, still "hangs" over him. Six months after it was handed down, however, the government which indicted him finds him more useful to it in the government than in jail.

It is characteristic of this servile type of labor "leader" that he does not even have the dignity to demand that the unjust indictment against him and his fellow-unionists be quashed before he will enter the government service.

The members of the electrical workers' union may well ask themselves: when did Tracy commit a crime? When, in maintaining union conditions, he incurred the wrath of the capitalist government?

Or when he joined that capitalist government? Tracy's anti-labor role as an integral cog in the government machine will, we confidently predict, bring to the members of his union the realization that union officials who enter the government can thereby serve only the capitalist class and never the working class.

Conscientious Objector

The Quakers and other pacifist sects are singing the praises of the government because the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill, with the consent of administration spokesmen, contains a clause providing that conscientious objectors who for religious reasons wish to do so may be assigned to non-combatant work instead of military training.

Stop and consider what a weird conception of democratic rights these pacifists and civil libertarians have. They are not troubled about the fundamentally anti-democratic character of the army, the utterly reactionary relationship between officers and men, the fact that unions or any other form of collective organization of the rank and file soldiers for protection of their rights is forbidden by army regulations as mutiny. They are not, therefore, worried about the rights of the great masses of workers and farmers who, willy nilly, are dragged into the armed forces. All they're worried about is that handful of "conscientious objectors" who lay claim to a special dispensation for themselves, regardless of what happens to the millions who will go into the army.

Being a "conscientious objector", it has been claimed, constitutes a form of resistance to war. That is false. Anyone who has read some of the proceedings of the conscientious objectors' tribunals in England cannot but realize that it is not a form of resistance; it is a form of exemption from war.

Our British comrades, who have seen these conscientious objectors' tribunals at work, have adopted a strong resolution, categorically forbidding any member of our movement from appealing to these tribunals, no matter what his purpose. So seriously do our British comrades view this question, that they have suspended a branch in London which refused to agree that no revolutionist shall appeal to the conscientious objectors' tribunals.

We agree wholeheartedly with our British comrades. No class-conscious worker in America should attempt to utilize the provision for conscientious objectors, which the conscription law may contain. We are irreconcilably opposed to capitalist conscription and capitalist war, as we are opposed to all that capitalism stands for. But we seek no individual way out. The only way out that we want is the way out for all the workers and soldiers—the way of the socialist revolution.

Those are the real heroes of the struggle against war, the nameless soldiers of socialism who, abhorring war as only those can who understand the war, nevertheless take their place beside the masses who do not yet understand.

War Deal Easy on the Rich; Doesn't Try to Draft Wealth

By W. F. W.

Easy on the rich and tough on the poor. That's the way the War Deal works. Under the Compulsory Military Service Bill every man from 18 to 64, aliens included, is made liable to military service and everyone from 21 to 45 may have to serve for at least one year. At first the sponsors of conscription proposed to pay the conscripts five dollars a month but now the government, "to avoid dissension between the professional soldiers and the draftees," is going to pay them equal wages — twenty-one dollars a month!

One might suppose, as a matter of equity, that capital would be called upon to make similar sacrifices. If the government is going to take millions of workers away from their jobs and draft them for military service, why not also billions of dollars? Far from drafting wealth and imposing any comparable sacrifices upon it, however, Congress and the administration are wooing the capitalists and making every possible concession to them.

On July 25th, for example, the *N. Y. Times* reported that "the Treasury has approved a method by which corporations undertaking defense contracts may, over a short period of time, charge off to depreciation the cost of new plant and equipment necessary for defense orders." While the workers are being coerced into military service and asked to refrain from making further demands or striking, the big armaments firms are being relieved of taxes and are extending their properties at government expense.

This is how a capitalist government prepares for an imperialist war. The workers are compelled to sacrifice their material interests and risk their lives but the administration protects the material interests of the capitalists by seeing that their investments take no risk. Money, you see, is more important than lives.

Roosevelt has repeatedly promised that no one is going to get rich from the armaments boom. Congress is making sure that the draftees won't be rolling in

wealth at twenty-one dollars a month. But let's see what's happening to the arms-manufacturers. Eugene Grace, President of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, made a report to his stockholders last week. "The first 10 percent of the expansion program of the U. S. Navy," Grace announced, "has increased the unfilled orders of the corporation to nearly \$500,000,000!" Operations for July were at 99 percent of full capacity, orders booked during the month have been at nearly 140 percent of basic productive capacity; and earnings of \$3.07 a share were the second best for the second quarter of the year in the history of the company!

This is one of the corporations which continues to violate the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act that prevailing union scales should be paid on government work. And what is its reward? Not only is it a principal beneficiary of the arms program but, as Grace incidentally revealed, the government is making additions to its plant. "The Government already is paying for certain extensions of Bethlehem's facilities and owns these extensions outright," Mr. Grace said, declining to reveal the nature of the additions," according to the *N. Y. Times*. Where the government made such additions in the last war, the capitalists were able to buy them later at bankruptcy prices.

On behalf of his stockholders Grace issued the following ultimatum to the government. "I believe that where the facilities to be created have no commercial value, we are not warranted in spending our stockholders' money for the added plant. The Government must either purchase and own the facilities, or it must finance the construction of the new plant which is to be operated by private industry, or permit private industry to create the facilities needed to get sufficient business and make sufficient profit to compensate them for creating these facilities."

Why should these labor-sweating corporations amass wealth and increase their properties at the expense of the workers? Why

shouldn't the government take over and operate all the arms industries, as it already does in the case of certain shipyards? The government could begin this program of nationalization by taking over the three leading violators of the Walsh-Healey Act among the arms-manufacturers, Bethlehem Steel, Douglas Air-Craft, and Electric Boat Company.

MAKE THE RICH PAY FOR THEIR WAR!

The War Dealers hope to make the poor pay for the war-preparations by imposing heavy hidden taxes upon the necessities of life, thus boosting the cost of living; by driving down wage-scales and doing away with union standards; and drafting labor into government service at coolie wages. The workers should not let the War Dealers get away with this. They ought to insist upon trade union wages on all defense work and defend the full freedom of the unions to exercise their right to strike, if necessary, to gain their demands.

We are just as much in favor of conscripting capital as we are opposed to the conscription of labor. During the hearings on the Conscription Bill, Senator Lee of Oklahoma introduced a bill which would empower the President to draft the use of money according to each individual's ability to lend. This bill is not a real "Draft-The-Wealth" measure. It would do no more than enable the government to get money at low interest rates.

But the idea of drafting wealth is a good one.

The corporation owners, the coupon-clippers and all the spokesmen for America's 60 Families will doubtless howl to the heavens against such terrible measures of expropriations. But a government that is getting ready to expropriate millions of men from their jobs and their lives, should at least be forced to do the same in regard to capital. The National Association of Manufacturers may consider their property interests more valuable and their profits more precious than human life, but the workers and their families do not think so.

U.S. Makes Hay at Havana

(Continued from Page 1)

The matter of transferring British and French colonial possessions located way up above the "bulge" could only be of secondary importance to Argentina and Brazil; the Falkland Islands is the only British possession near Argentina. This one of the main reasons for the opposition of the bloc of countries led by Argentina was fear of new designs of American imperialism with regard to British investments. It was one of the main preoccupations of the conference, if not the main. It is plain why a British representative was not welcome at such a conference.

Cartel Plan Shelved

The Hull-Berle cartel plan seems temporarily to have been shelved by the conference or at least to have been relegated to a secondary position.

Powerful sections of American finance capitalism immediately realized major defects in the Hull-Berle scheme. They particularly pointed out the tremendous capital outlay involved and questioned the feasibility of the plan in the light of the ever-increasing acuteness of imperialist contradictions raging in the agrarian countries south of the Rio Grande.

In the decades when capitalism was progressive the United States exported millions of commodities to Latin America and reaped huge profits from them. Later in the epoch of monopoly capitalism (imperialism) the U. S. began to export capital (in the form of loans and machinery) and reaped fabulous profits through the super-exploitation of the Latin American masses. Since the crisis of 1940, however, successive capital loans, private as well as to governments, and investments in general, whenever made to Latin America, have sunk like into a bottomless well, never to arise.

Today, \$674,000,000 worth of South American bonds, representing 70% of the total bonded debt, is in default. Only Argentina, Haiti and the Dominican Republic regularly meet their interest payments. Hence the most powerful sections of American finance capitalism oppose the further pouring of millions of dollars into the economic pores of Latin American economy. They see in

it merely an extension of New Deal pump-priming and not a source of profit.

Force Has Its Drawbacks

The Birmingham News, sums it up: "We can no longer expect the profits and privileges of a generation ago." Perhaps they think that military force, would be cheaper. But that too, has its drawbacks. A glance at the map will easily convince even one not well versed in military and naval affairs that to "protect" the stretch of territory from the St. Lawrence River to the southernmost part of Patagonia would require at least as much as the cost of the Hull-Berle cartel scheme.

The posing of the problem in this manner has prompted a considerable section of the bourgeoisie of the United States to ask whether it is entirely in the interests of American imperialism to include within its orbit of military and economic "protection" the southern countries of Latin America, namely, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay and countries in their latitudes.

The spokesmen for this section of the bourgeoisie have suddenly discovered that the Latin countries south of the "bulge" are not really democratic countries, that culturally and ethnically they are far apart from North America.

"Appeasement" is Considered

Behind this plethora of deceptive phrases there emerges the real issue facing American imperialism immediately, with ever greater persistence: In view of the fact that the countries south of the "bulge" (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay) are really agrarian and raw material "supplements" to larger, competing parts of imperialist economy, would it not be wiser for U. S. imperialism temporarily to allow these southern countries of Latin America to trade with Nazi Germany, while the United States builds its two-ocean navy? That raises one of the most crucial points of American imperialist diplomacy. In a word it is: Temporary appeasement or immediate aggressive resistance to a Nazi-dominated Europe.

Difference Between Imperialisms? Yes, But Not Decisive

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

Practically up until the war started and, even for a while after that, many people who were on the fringe of the revolutionary camp recognized the truth that whatever differences there existed between capitalist democracy and fascism, those differences would not be involved in a war. Everyone who claimed to be a revolutionary Marxist agreed that the struggle would be one for raw materials, for markets, for colonies. That is, it would be purely and simply an imperialist struggle.

The war came, and now many who formerly swore allegiance to the revolutionary phrase have begun to discover differences of such a nature between Hitler Germany and England as to justify a change in their attitude. A Marxist analysis that holds good in time of peace does not seem to hold good in time of war when the pressure of the ruling group becomes really terrific.

In a series of articles written by Lovestone and in another series written by Herberg, the difference in the situation of the working class that would result from a victory of Hitler as against a victory of Great Britain is presented as the fundamental argument calling for a change in the position of the Independent Labor League (Lovestoneites) on the question of the war. Both Lovestone and Herberg now prefer the victory of British imperialism. And judging by their arguments they not only prefer the victory of British imperialism but are in favor of actively supporting it against Hitler.

It is true that they refuse to draw all the logical conclusions from their position. Somehow or other they stress the necessity of keeping this country out of the war as the primary consideration. To any intelligent worker who refuses to be bamboozled by sophistry it would seem that if a victory of the democratic imperialists would mean so much to him he would do his utmost to achieve that victory.

The attitude of Herberg and Lovestone is the same as the sickening one of Norman Thomas—semi-pacifist, semi-isolationist and semi-socialist.

Personally as between Thomas' and open chauvinism, I prefer the position of the Social Democrats who are at least logical. They want the victory of British imperialism and they do not beat around the bush, they openly state that the United States should do everything to assure that victory—and they omit the "short of war" business that is Roosevelt's stock-in-trade.

And why not? If a victory of British imperialism would further the cause of the working masses, as the Lovestoneites indicate, why not give whole-hearted support to Great Britain? It is characteristic of the Norman Thomas type of socialist to say "yes and no" at the same time.

We must admit of course that there are differences between "democratic" British imperialism and fascist German imperialism. But only he who looks upon those differences as purely static and fails to see the underlying forces at work both in the so-called democratic and in the fascist countries will determine his attitude on the basis of those differences.

No Differences in The Colonies

Those differences cannot be of very great importance to the five hundred million slaving under the yoke of British imperialism in the colonies and it is hardly conceivable that they would willingly sacrifice their lives to preserve those differences. It must never be forgotten that any party supporting British imperialism thereby loses the support of a half billion colonial slaves.

But let us confine our consideration to the privileged English workers and see whether the differences existing between British and German imperialism should determine the attitude of a revolutionary Marxist. It is in the first instance obvious that the difference between English "democracy" and German fascism becomes ever narrower as the war progresses. The British worker enjoys precious little democracy at the present moment. He will, however, regain all his rights after a British victory, insist those who advocate supporting British imperialism.

And here we come to the heart of the problem. Not that there is any use arguing as to whether the British worker will or will not regain his rights after the war. He undoubtedly will not, but that is not the major point at issue.

A revolutionary party must consider as fundamental, in addition to the fact that it is impossible to support one imperialism as against another, that we are living in the period of the decline of capitalism, when all tendencies favor the victory of fascism unless the victory of the socialist revolution intervenes.

A victory of the fascists will bring fascism, say Lovestone and Herberg and a victory of the "democracies" will still give us some lee-way. Even granting that, the disadvantages for a revolutionary party resulting from support of an imperialist war outweigh by far the advantages of a problematical short period of very limited democratic rights that might be granted to the workers as a result of a victory of the "democracies".

For by supporting any imperialist government a revolutionary party is bound to lose the support of that section which is most exploited by the imperialist regime. In supporting an imperialist war a revolutionary party must inevitably make compromises on the home front, discouraging and demoralizing the workers and making impossible an effective struggle against fascism.

A Marxist party, to preserve its revolutionary integrity, must under no circumstances assume a share in the responsibility for capitalist war or capitalist peace. In the period of the decline of capitalism it must show its bitter hostility to the capitalist order by an uncompromising struggle against its own capitalist enemy.

It must stress the fundamental idea that to defeat fascism, foreign or domestic, it is necessary to destroy the capitalist system.

It dare not stress the fleeting differences, but only the essential identity between "democratic" and fascist exploiters.

YOU CAN HELP!

Buy A Set of

Trotsky's Historic Speech
(In English)

Made for the New York mass meeting celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the Fourth International

Recorded on two 12-inch discs 78R

Specially Priced—\$3.50

Full Proceeds to:

TROTSKY'S DEFENSE FUND

Pioneer Publishers

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.