SOCIALIST APPEAL

OL. III, NO. 84

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

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

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year: \$1.00 for six months. Forsign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle orders
cents per copy in the United States: 3 cents per copy in
differeign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.

Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are \$1.50 for six
months: \$2.00 for one year.
"Reentered as second class matter September 29, 1939, at
the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March
1, 1879."

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN

PELIX MORROW EMANUEL GARRETT

General Manager: Assistant Manager: MARTIN ABERN SHERMAN STANLEY

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

- 1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
- Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
 A Twenty-Billon dollar Federal public works
- and housing program.
 4. Thirty-thirty-\$30-weekly minimum wage-30-
- hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.

 5. Thirty- dollar weekly cli-age and disability
- 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.
- Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.
- Fu l social, p'litical and economic equality for the Negro people.

India and the War

If you want to understand why what the newspapers call "this peculiar war" has not broken out into a series of round-house battles on the Western Front, take a look at the situation in India.

The hundreds of millions of British s'aves in India long for nothing so much as their independence from the imperia ist rule which has brought them untold and unspeakable sufferings for generations. It is no easy matter for even the cleverest British propagandist to wor; them up to a high pitch of indignation against "German fascism" and its well-known horrors, for the Indian masses have always felt the barbarism of dictatorial rule perpetrated on their own hides by the British ruling class.

With the sound instinct that rarely fails the masses, they now feel that, as the Irish a ways say, England's difficulty is their opportunity. With the British imperialists engaged on the Western Front, involved in a new world war, the Indian people realize that now is the time for them to strike off the fetters of colonial slavery. And they are, of course, one hundred percent right, and every genuine pro ressive, every consistent and not merely phrasemongering democrat, will enthusiastically wish the Indians win against the British pigs who lord it over them.

That is precisely what England fears. Chamberlain and Co. understand that the very existence of the old British Empire is imperilled, and along with it the very existence of the noble gentlemen who have fattened on it for generations. The crisis—the war—is speeding the inevitable disintegration of that Empire.

How the British would like to come to a comrade'y agreement with the German bandits! How they would like to call off this war! How they would like to combine—naturally, on their own terms—with French and German and Italian imperialism for a joint partition of the "still available" areas of exploitation—above all, the Soviet Union!

Only, Chamberlain, like Hitler, is not complete master of his destiny. The conflicts, rivalries and contradictions among the imperialist bandits themselves have been proved, by the reality of the war, to be so sharp that with the best will in the world, poor Chamberlain could not avert it.

But whether averted or not, the old Empires are doomed. One way or another, the off-exorcized specter of revolution continues to haunt the living and waking hours of the ruling classes. This war will never run its full, "normal" course without revolutionary interruptions everywhere. What it will be tomorrow is difficult to predict. Right now, it is India, which is seething with revolutionary ferment.

All power to the mighty arms of the multimillioned Indian masses! Now is their chance to strike a death-blow at imperialist rule—just as our chance, in this country, will surely present itself in the days to come.

Lee . . . and Debs

Among the statements issued on Browder's speech at Boston announcing the new Stalinist line in this country, the one of Mr. Algernan Lee, of the Social Democratic Federatio, is not the least interesting.

"We Social Democrats are proud to be attacked by Browder as well as by Fascists of ail breeds, native as well as imported. Our big job at present is to help the public to distinguish social democracy, the socialism of Debs and Berger and Hillquit, from the poisoned substitute that Browder is offering."

When Mr. Lee speaks of the "socialism" of Victor Berger and Morris Hillquit, he not only feels at home and knows what he is talking about, but he is undoubtedly true to himself.

But when he speaks in the same breath of Eugene Debs, he displays more impudence than this otherwise prudent and elderly gentleman is accustomed to show.

Lee and his friends are supporters of the imperialist war. They are servants of the American ruling class, its attorneys and apologists, just as Browder and Co. are the agents of the Moscow autoracy. Lee declares:

"No one is going to be really deceived by the pretense that France and Great Britain, aided and abetted by President Roosevelt and his Wall Street friends, are wagin; an imperialistic war against Germany. . . It is worth noting, however, that in this country Fritz Kuhn's Bund and all the fascistic adventurers got ahead of Browder in taking up this line of attack."

And this apologist for the war-mongers has the effrontery to speak of himself as a protagonist of the "socialism of Debs"! Lee defames the Bo'shevik Revolution of November 1917 as a "counter-revolution." Debs proudly proclaimed himself a Bolshevik from his toes to the crown of his head. Lee defames all opponents of American imperialism (not merely the Stalinist pseudo-opponents, but the genuine revolutionary opponents) as agents or friends of the German Nazis. Debs replied in excoriating and contemptuous terms to the scoundrelly patriots of the last World War who accused him and fellow-socialists of being German agents, friends of the Kaiser. Lee is out recruitin; for the French; English and American Empires in the Second World War. Debs said, in the Appeal to Reason of Sept. 11, 1915:

"It matters not to me whether this war be offensive or defensive, or what other lying excuse may be invented for it, I am opposed to it, and I would be shot for treason before I would enter such a war.

"If I were in Congress I would be shot before
I would vote a dollar for such a war. . .

"I have no country to fight for; my country

"I would not vio ate my principles for God, much less for a crazy Kaiser, a savage Czar, a degenerate king, or a band of pot-bellied para-

"But whie I have not a drop of blood to shed for the oppressors of the working class and the robbers of the poor, the thieves and looters, the brigands and murderers, whose debauched misrule is the crime of the ages. I have a heart-fu'l to shed for their victims when it shall be needed in the war for their liberation.

"I am not a capita ist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of the plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight from the ruling class, but I will not wait to be commanded to fight for the working class.

"I am opposed to every war but one: I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world-wide war of the social revo ution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ru ing class may make it necessary, even to the barricades.

"That is where I stand and where I believe the Socialist Party stands, or ought to stand, on the question of war."

Compare this bold, ringing declaration of defiance of Debs, the proletarian revolutionist, with the cowering, snivelling servitude to imperialism of Lee, the "social democrat"—and you will get the full measure of Lee's ghoulish inso'ence in even daring to mention the name of Eugene Debs to sanctify his own crimes.

Labor Looks Through The Press

- By Arthur Hopkins

Raymond Clapper citing the darger of the Roosevelt spy hunt says: "We are not at war and every American has the right to argue as to what our best course should be. It is only after we declare war when the time for argument is over." Like a true liberal Clapper thinks freedom of thought is a fine thing—except when it's necessary.

In London all venomous snakes, black widow spiders, scorpions, and other dangerous insects of the London zoo were destroyed as a war precaution. However, the most venomous insects of them all, the bosses, are still at large.

Bertrand Russell, speaking in Santa Barbara, sai dthat "after three or four more wars people will be willing to be under international law." But the Socialist Workers Party intends to make this tional workers' law.

the last war before the world is under interna-

A. P. Giannini, approaching 70, acknowledged that "this is a young man's day." The chairman of the board of the far-flung Transamerica Corporation said in an interview, "although I'm still chairman of the board, I'm really on the shelf; I leave everything to the young men." How about

the swag?

-By Dwight Macdonald -

SPARKS IN THE NEWS

The Color Line in Culture

Waite Phillips is a Tulsa, Oklahoma, oil magnate—an "oiligarch," in Time's vocabulary. Mr. Phillips, a great public benefactor of Tulsa, recently turned over his big Italian-style mansion to be used as an Art Center. The other day the Art Center had its grand opening. Every one in Tulsa was there, except those whose skins happened to be black. Their presence was most distinctly not requested. But the Tulsa oiligarchs are broad-minded. They recognize that it would be unjust to exclude the city's Negroes from the cultural advantages of the Art Center. Therefore, according to Time for November 6: "One Thursday a month will be set aside as Jim Crow day at the Art Center."

Blood Money

Bourgeois economists lament the disappearance of the economic frontier in American capitalism. But there does exist one last great economic frontier for world capitalism, one remaining major market for the consumption of manufactured goods-a frontier which is at present located between the Westwall and the Maginot Line. The bombing plane, furthermore, has extended the range of this sort of "consumption" from the actual battlefields to the whole of Europe. The beauty of air raids on industrial centers, from an economic point of view, is that not on'y are large quantities of those expensive and complicated mechanisms called bombs used up, but that their consumption destroys even vaster amounts of other machines and commodities on the ground. Thus is created a double-barrelled market for goods: to replace those destroyed, and to destroy still others.

Merely on the strength of such rosy prospects, our own capitalist system in the last few months has taken a new lease on life. The N.Y. Times weekly index of business activity has risen from \$2.3 of "normal" in the week ending August 26 last to 104.7 in the week ending October 28. Secretary of Commerce Hopkins has reported that the national income was \$50,800,000,000 in the first nine months of this year, as against \$48,700,000,000 in the same period last year. The American Federation of Labor, in its monthly sustness survey, states that since the war cris's began to sharpen at the beginning of August, about one million and a quarter American workers have found jobs.

The New Deal has been administering to American capitalism various reformist "shots in the arm" for the last seven years. But all sections of ourgeois opin on, from the AFL bureaucracy to the big business press, agree that the outbreak of the war has done more for American business than anything ever pulled out of the hat by Roosevelt and his brain trusters. This is flatly stated by the AFL business survey, and it is coitor ally echoed by the N.Y. Ti.nes, chief newspaper voice of big bus.ness. 'Much as one may deplore a business boom arising out of the tragedy of war," writes the Times in its usual sanctimonious style, "it is significant that the mere expectation of war demand has done more for relovery than our actual Government spending

Great Expectations

But it is also significant-and a little worrying -that so far the whole war boom has been based on nothing but expectations. The September merchandise exports of the United States were 17% higher than they were in the same month last year. But this increase was not to any great extent in war goods; over a third of it was in cotton, shipped under the subsidy plan, and the rest was largely other agricultural products. The war demand hasn't yet materialized. Steel production has gone up to over 90% of capacity, and more steel is now being produced per week than ever before in our history. But this is all based on the expectation of future war orders. And if the war fai.s to become 'serious" in the next few months, or if, even worse, some sort of peace is patched up, then American business will find itself far out on a limb.

The Continental Steel Corporation recently announced that it was setting aside in a special fund the equivalent of two-months' earnings as a "reserve for contingencies." The "contingency" it stated in these frank terms: "The war in Europe, together with a domestic business improvement, has brought about an inflationary condition that could be rapidly reversed if peace negotiations were effected." Or, in plain language, peace would be a disastrous blow to the Continental Steel Corporation, as to other American corporations.

The First Swallow

A.ready the first swallow of spring has arrived, a harb.nger of the fertile summertime in store for American capitalism if only the war doesn't peter out. This is the repeal of the Embargo. Writing in last Sunday's Times, Arthur Krock realistically summarized its significance: "The major ty in Congress was persuaded that repeal of the arms embargo was desirable for two purposes—to remove the disadvantage it imposed on Great Br.tain and France in fighting Germany, and to set up an industrial war mathing to the United States in the interest of national security."

As to the first point, it is reported that the aviation industry has already received from the Allies \$170,000,000 worth of plane orders. Englant is about to launch a \$1,000,000.000 war oandrive among its citizens, the proceeds from which will make go for the purchase of American minitions. Washington officials estimate that in the next few weeks the Allies will place over here war orders totalling \$500,000,000, and in the next eight months \$2,000,000,000.

Krock's point about repeal making it possible to build up, before the United States enters the war, a big native munitions industry has also received factual confirmation in the last few days President Reosevelt has personally urged that a steel-producing center be established on the Pacific Coast to turn out armaments. Also, the French Government has announced that it is lending \$5,000,000 to two American airplane manufacturers so that they can expand their plants sufficiently to produce the huge number of plane. France will need. Thus Allied capital will be used to help finance the expansion of our industrial war machine. This is what American "neutrality" means in the present war.

In the World of Labor

By Paul G. Stevens

Voices Against the War on the Increase in England

It is cheering to learn that right in the midst of the war, the revolutionary internationalists of the British Militant Labour League have decided to transform their excellent little paper, the Militant, from a monthly to a forth ghaly. Our comrades from the M.L.L. remain as before the clearest voices in the consistent socialist struggle agains, war there. The fact that they have combined political clarity with a practical knowledge of how to function from day to day in the official Labour movement augurs well for the future progress of revolutionary internationalism in England.

In the current issue of the Militant they define their stand in an article entitled "Working Class Attitude to War" as follows:

"This present war is a thoroughly reactionary war. The British capitalist class have embarked upon it in order to preserve their own colonial possessions, their own foreign investments against the growing menace of German imperialism. The working class have no possession; in the colcnies, no investments. They have nothing to defend except their living standards and their democratic rights which are threatened by the war, and these must be defended against the capitalists who are already attacking them. The enemy is in our own country, it is our own ruling class. The only victory which can bring any benefit to the working class is the victory over the exploiters. Only the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism can end wars, exploitation and poverty for all time."

Contrast this unequivocal presentation of the internationalist working class stand against war with that of the centrists in the Independent Latour Party as expressed in the latest issue of its paper, the New Leader, to reach here. That paper carries as its main head: "Will Revolution in Germany End the War." The headline itself could just as easily be the lead in the Conservative Times. As a matter of fact, the entire capitalist press of Great Britain features revolution in Germany.

The article in the I.L.P. paper takes up most of its space with a description of the possibilities of an overthrow of the Hitler regime. Only towards the end does it remind itself that "we must strive to secure than when this war ends (is it presumably to end only in one way, by revolution in Germany?—P.G.S.) the system of capitalism which causes poverty and war ends with it, and that here, too (we'l, well—Ed.) we begin to build a Socialist Britain and a Socialist World."

The I.L.P.'s "internationalism" has always been strangely coupled with a peculiarly nationalist behavior of its chief parliamentary spokesman, James Maxton. Here is an example of Maxton presenting the I.L.P. position, so to speak, at a time when anti-Munich sentiment ran high in

the Commons: courage—without thereby furthering
"I am not a fighting man. I am not bellicose. I struggle against war appreciably.

am reasonable and rational. Great Britain (!)
never disarmed, never without great resources
of men, money and materials, cou'd surely face
up and say something definite(!) to the powerful
dictatorial nations of Europe."

His speech greeting Chamberlain's efforts at Munich itself created a scandal which is still remembered. The social patriots used it to great advantage in Great Britain today. Thus, the Lord Prevost of Glasgow, whom we mentioned in a recent column, in the course of an article in Forward: 'Even James Maxton, the chief spokesman of the pacifists in Parliament, has admitted that the Primé Minister did everything possible to avert the catastrophe."

The difference between the I.L.P. stand and that of the Militant Labour League is the difference between opportunists to whom program is a matter of indifference and revolutionists who approach every problem precisely from the point of view of their fundamental program.

John McGovern, another I.L.P. parliamentarian, whose politics are not much better than Maxton's, nevertheless occasionally rises to a farhigher level of moral courage. The British press tells this story:

On September 2, when the declaration of war was being debated in the House of Commons. Arthur Greenwood, the leader of the Labour Party got up to make an impassioned speech pledging the support of the social patriots to the Chamberlain government. His ringing jingoistic phrases were greeted by "members of all parties" with cheers and cries: "Speak for England!" Greenwood reached the peak of his oratory with this sentence:

"If we march I hope we shall march in complete unity, and march with France." Suddenly, the papers report, "there was a dramatic intervention by Mr. John McGovern."

"Turning round and facing the crowded Socialist benches, Mr. McGovern shouted: 'You people don't intend to march, not a damn one of you!"

The press attacked McGovern's remarks as "in bad taste." He was not polite enough to refrain from reminding the war-mongering Labour generals behind the front that their generous pledges to "sacrifice all' were to be taken out exclusively from the hides of the millions of their trade union followers. Greenwood and Co., as is well known, are amply provided with soft berths in the administration at the rear.

McGovern's commendable "rowdyism" in the House of Commons is about the high point of the I.L.P.'s contribution to the struggle against war. While we admire McGovern's sense of the dramatic we cannot refrain from pointing out that even such completely middle class politicians as the elder LaFollette in the United States Senate have in their time shown a similar disregard for the amenities on occasion with similar personal courage—without thereby furthering the ultimate struggle against war appreciably.

Their By James Burnham Government

Any lingering doubts about the real meaning of Roosevelt's Neutrality Act, which honest men may have held on the basis of Roosevelt's own message to the Special Session and the Congressional debate which followed, should have been thoroughly cleared up during these few days since the Act's passage. Anyone in his right mind should now be able to see that Roosevelt's message was brazen demagogy, and the debate, on both sides, shameless hypoerisy from beginning to end.

Roosevelt and the Congressmen told us, beforehand, that they were trying to work out the best program for "keeping the United States out of the war." After the Act became law, not a single commentator tried to keep up the pretense any longer. All of the discussion centered on the questions of how exactly the Act would affect the war, how many hundreds of millions of war orders it would bring, and how world shipping would be reorganized in accord, ance with it.

ance with it.

In all of the European capitals the passing of the Act was recognized and proclaimed as a smashing victory for England and France. Paris and London didn't make any bones about it: they told their people how the Act brought the weight of the United States into their side of the scales.

What the Act Provides

The Act is supposed to establish elaborate restrictions which will prevent this country from becoming "involved." As finally amended and passed, the important restrictions boil down to little more than this: travel by U.S. citizens and ships to a small zone in the north of Europe is prohibited. Citizens, if they are of the right sort, can always get special permission. This leaves about n nety U.S. ships, heretofore in the north European trade, to suffer handicap. But even these ninety ships will be able to take care of the miss. A some will be able to take care of the miss. A some will be able to foreign registers will take the place of British and French ships in smally salling in unjestricted zones, which will be transleared to the north Atlantic routes.

There as so many loopnoise in the alleged provisions against granting credit that they will serve the fly to make the war commerce as safe and profitable as possible for U.S. corporations.

The original plan to promibit U.S. ships from all bell geten, ports was dropped. With the exception of the small "danger zone," they can go anywhere and carry anything except arms. There is no restriction on shipment into Canada.

There are no re-trictions of any sort on what U.S. business is permitted to sell to the belligerents. An amendment that would have prohibited the export of poison gas and flame-throwers was howled down in the Senate by a four to one vote. This vote was a rather ironic comment on the moral indignation of our democratic rulers over "inhuman methods of war-

One Foot In

With the passing of this Act, the United States has one foot soudly in the war. From now on, that foot will be pulling and straining to drag the other after it.

United States industry becomes part of the armory of Britain and France. Indeed, this is just the way in which the London papers put it.

But the Act is not an isolated event. It fits in exactly with the other moves of the Administration since the war began. The armed forces of the United States are also, in their own way, already in the war. The declaration that the be'ligerent, Canada, would be defended by the United States against its enemy in effect places a U.S.-manned Maginot Line around Canada. Just as the French Maginot Line, even when no shooting is going on, affects the military balance, so does the declaration on Canada.

Roosevelt's neutrality is no more genuine than would be that of the biggest bully on the block who, at the beginning of a street fight, would say: "I am not going to do any hitting, yet. But I am going to supply one of the gangs with all the rocks and bricks they need. And I am going to keep an eye on my special favorites: they can throw rocks at the other side as much as they want, but if they get any in return, you'll hear from me."

How Will the Act Affect the War?

It is generally conceded that at the beginning of the war German aviation was superior to both England and France combined, and Germany's factories were turning planes out at a faster rate than her enemies. This relation would be reversed if and when the flow across the ocean of U.S. planes—which are probably the best in the world—got into full stride.

The experiences of Spain and Poland, and of Ethi, opia and China in a less conclusive way, do not show that superiority in the air alone can win a modern war; but they seem to indicate that air superiority is a vital and perhaps necessary factor in winning a victory which is clinched by other means. At the very least, decisive superiority in the air seems able to paralyze transportation and reconnaissance to such an extent as to weaken vastly the ground forces. Whether planes can win out against sea power is not yet established.

Germany is of course fully aware of the alteration in the balance of air power which the U.S. action can bring.

It seems to me to follow, therefore, that within the next week or two—month or two at the longest—Germany will be compelled to "begin the war in earnest." This need not mean a mass campaign on the western fornt. But it would mean actions designed to gain and preserve superiority in the air: air bombardments of strategically important objectives (airfields, factories—especially those connected with plane manufacture—docks, key railroad junctions, etc.), and a big-time campaign on and under the sea.

I consequently expect such moves in the very near future. I do not see how they can be avoided. If they do not occur, only one explanation seems to me possible: that, below the diplomatic surface, really serious negotiations are under way between England and Germany, and that Hitler believes these negotiations are going to get results.

The British government advised the House of Commons that sportsmen might be asked to make sacrifices to aid wartime economy. The government was considering whether to restrict fox hunting and was consulting county war committees on the advisability of putting sheep to graze on golf courses. This impertinent suggestion must be voted down! Make the working cads do the sacrificing—they ought to be used to it seeing that they've been doing it all their lives.