

SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL III, NO 88 Friday, November 17, 1939

Published Twice-Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASSN.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgema 4-2647

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Single copies: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 5 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.
Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are \$1.50 for six months; \$2.99 for one year.
Reentered as second class matter September 29, 1932, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 1, 1879.

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN
Associate Editors: EMANUEL GARRETT
FELIX MORROW
General Manager: MARTIN ABERN
Assistant Manager: SHERMAN STANLEY

FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY FOR:

1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty—\$30-weekly minimum wage—30-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An Independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

Roosevelt's Russian Policy

With the careful deliberation that marks all its moves in the field of foreign policy, the Roosevelt administration has set about preparing the ground for American intervention in an eventual war of the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union.

Besides the open espousal of the Anglo-French cause in the present war, this is the cardinal premise right now of the Roosevelt foreign policy.

It is demonstrated in scores of ways, big and small. Hitler has theoretically been the main object of hostility but never after any of Hitler's many open attacks on the U.S. government did Roosevelt have his secretary make a public reply, as he had him do after Molotov's recent speech. Roosevelt stepped into the Finnish business in a manner precisely calculated to fan American hostility to Russia—and let it be perfectly plain: this hostility is not aimed at the perfidious Stalin, his crimes against the workers of Russia and of the world, but against the root and branch of the workers' state itself.

On the broader diplomatic field the chief field of American intervention is with respect to Japan. American diplomacy is engaged in trying to woo Japan into a bloc of powers for war against Russia. The Anglo-French reduction of garrisons in China is part of this game.

Just as Chamberlain tried at Munich to bring Germany and Russia into conflict rather than let events slide toward an Anglo-German clash, Roosevelt is now trying to embroil Japan and Russia and thereby spare Wall Street the expense of dealing itself with Japan first and Russia afterward. Where Chamberlain failed, Roosevelt thinks he can succeed.

The New York Times, which speaks with the voice of Wall Street imperialism, last Sunday drew a pregnant parallel between the present U.S. attitude toward Russia and the relations between the young American Republic and the revolutionary government in France nearly 150 years ago.

... Relations with France, not long after our Revolutionary War, were embittered to the extreme," said the Times editorial, "when the transitory sansculotte government at Paris, overriding all considerations of international propriety, undertook first to interfere in our internal politics, next to blackmail our envoys for the safety of our ships upon the seas. The return of friendliness with France, now unbroken for a century, came when orderly diplomatic relations had been restored by the ending of the regime of fanaticism."

With the vicious anti-Red campaign already in full swing and the City of Flint hullabaloo echoing in our ears, we have no difficulty in understanding just what the Times means. It means that this country aims at "ending the regime of fanaticism" in Russia in order to restore "orderly diplomatic relations." It issues a call for the overthrow of the Russian regime and will work toward that end, just as the British capitalists worked for years to crush revolutionary France 150 years ago.

We'll fight that attempt, not because we are interested in defending the foul regime of Stalin-

ism, but because we are vitally concerned in the defense of the workers' state that Stalin rules today as a usurper. And we'll defend that best, we'll ensure the end of all the Stalins, Hitlers, Roosevelts, and Chamberlains, by first establishing our own workers' power right here.

The War Boom

"Well anyway, the war's going to provide jobs"—how many hungry lads have thought that! But it isn't so.

The war boom is on. Industrial production has gone beyond the peak levels of 1929. But ten million unemployed, even by the government's conservative estimate, still walk the streets in vain search of non-existent jobs.

Madame Perkins made a speech in Washington, Nov. 13, boasting that "this Fall industrial production has gone to the peak levels of 1929." But she immediately had to add: "That does not mean that employment will be correspondingly quite as high, since machine processes are increasingly efficient and the amount of goods produced by each worker averages more than it did ten years ago."

It's a mad world, my masters, as even Shakespeare's fool knew. More is being produced now than was being produced ten years ago; every worker turns out more goods than each individual worker used to turn out. And the result? Disaster for the working class.

Where does the money go that used to be paid to some ten million additional workers to turn out the same amount of goods ten years ago? That money now goes into the pockets of the bosses. Instead of more money to the workers because they produce more, and less hours of work so that everybody can enjoy the improved productivity, ten million workers and their dependents take the rap.

The war's going to provide no jobs for the unemployed. What it will provide them with is a uniform and early prospects of a coffin.

The war is a good thing for the fat cats and for nobody else. That's why we're against the war and why every worker who wants to live should be against the war.

The real fight for jobs is a fight against the war and the war-makers. All war funds to the unemployed! Expropriate the Sixty Families—the war makers! A job and a decent living for every worker!

The New York Vote

In its first appearance on the ballot in New York City, the Socialist Workers Party polled 2,259 recorded votes in the borough of the Bronx for its Council candidate, Max Shachtman. The results of the Manhattan write-in for Lyman Paine will not be known until the final official tabulations are made public.

The votes recorded for Shachtman were the first-choice votes given him under the proportional representation system. As soon as he was eliminated the second and third and fourth choice votes given to the S.W.P. were naturally lost in the division of these returns among the other candidates. Shachtman's actual vote undoubtedly ran many thousands above the recorded figure.

But this is not the important thing. The fact that we won a place on the ballot, securing thousands more than the required signatures to get it, represents a long stride forward for our party. More important still is the fact that in this campaign with leaflets, street-corner meetings, and indoor meetings, we brought to many more thousands of Bronx workers the firm, uncompromising anti-war program of our party.

The boss parties and the American Labor Party came before the workers as the avowed supporters of the Washington-London-Paris axis in the present war. The Communist Party stood as the representative of the Berlin-Moscow axis. We emerged as the fighting representatives of the third camp that uncompromisingly fights all the war-makers and strikes for a workers' peace through workers' power.

That our vote was small was a reflection only of the fact that our party is still small and its voice barely heard among the thunder of its opponents. But its ideas are great and powerful and will one day encompass the world. The New York campaign was one step in bringing that day nearer.

JUST OUT!!

Why Negroes Should Oppose the War
By J. R. Johnson

A message that affects the life of every Negro!

ORDER NOW!

Price—5c per copy. Bundle rates—10 to 50—8c per copy. 50 or more—2 1/2c per copy

SPECIAL RATES TO ORGANIZATIONS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place, N.Y.C.

By Dwight Macdonald

SPARKS IN THE NEWS

The Food Stamp Plan again

When I wrote in the New Internationalist several months ago about the Government's ingenious orange and blue stamp plan for feeding the unemployed on Federal 'surplus commodities', I looked long and earnestly into the mouth of that particular gift horse.

There was at that time a plan to extend the sale of food stamps to families not on relief whose income was less than \$19.50 a week. As I pointed out then, this move, although it meant an immediate gain in living standards for these non-relief poor families, had some dangerous long-range implications.

One of these was that it tended to extend the stamp plan as a substitute for relief, since in many communities local officials, regardless of the intentions of Washington, would so use the plan. Another, which applies to the whole food stamp plan despite the raptures with which the liberal press has greeted it, is that the substitution of food stamps for cash relief is a step backward towards the old food basket relief of Hooverian days. Finally, this extension of Government control over the consumption habits of those on relief—and, in this latest development of the non-relief poorer families—was one more step in the process of tying down the masses with bureaucratic regulations.

Too Many Guinea Pigs!

The WPA's plan was to try out the new extension of the food stamp idea first in Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma. Recently, "after considerable delay," this initial test experiment got under weigh. A report in the N. Y. Times explains the reasons for this delay. At first, all non-relief families with an income of under \$19.50 a week were declared eligible for food stamps. "A survey of the county, however, showed that such a maximum would place on the eligibility list almost half the families in the county."

Thus the social breakdown of American capitalism has already gone so far—half the American Standard of Living, at \$19.50 per family per week!—that it is now found impossible to increase the income of the masses even in the niggardly and bureaucratic way proposed by the food stamp plans. The WPA officials temporarily avoided this difficulty by arbitrarily restricting the test experiment to four hundred families. But the other thousands of families with incomes of \$19.50 a week down still exist in Pottawatomie County. And they must still be reckoned with once the new plan gets out of the test tube stage.

Footnote on Girdler

If the Supreme Court upholds the recent decision of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, Tom Girdler's Republic Steel Company will have to rehire 5,000 employees fired during the 1937 steel strike. It will also have to pay each of them back wages for the entire period since the strike, an act of enforced philanthropy which will probably cost Republic in the vicinity of \$7,500,000.

Republic, which was put together just before the 1929 crash by the high-flying Cyrus Eaton, has never been able to accumulate the fat cash reserves of the other big steel companies. Financially, Republic has always been the weak link in the chain of the steel industry. If it actually has to pay out such a sum as \$7,500,000, Republic may be crippled or even put out of business.

This would be tough on Tom Girdler. But I must admit that this particular human tragedy leaves me unmoved. If ever there is a fascist drive to power in this country, Girdler will be one of the ringleaders. Even in the steel industry, Girdler stands out for his personal ruthlessness and barbarism. There is something warped and subhuman about his personality. He is a great hunter and horseman, and he makes it clear that he infinitely prefers horses to men. The only time I ever saw him, years ago, long before the Little Steel Strike and the Maudsloni and Memorial Day massacres, I received an unforgettable impression of inhumanity and even positive malice.

Like Shooting Rabbits . . .

Republic had just taken over the Corrigan-McKinney steel plant in Cleveland, and was "rationalizing" it—that is, firing about half the employees. In describing this operation, Girdler dwelt with evident pleasure on the hundreds of Corrigan-McKinney workers he had been able to eliminate. He told how he and four or five other top executives made a tour of the entire plant the day Republic took over, constituting themselves a sort of firing squad to "execute" on the spot the superfluous workers. "We'd see five or six men working around a blast furnace," he reminisced pleasantly. "We'd go up to them and point out three or four—'You . . . you . . . you . . . get your pay check. You're through!'" This seemed to amuse him. With a grin he summed up what the episode had meant to him: "It was some slaughter! Like shooting rabbits sitting!"

In the World of Labor

By Paul G. Stevens

French Labor Under the Heel of the War Dictatorship

Only the scantiest scraps of information regarding the labor movement have managed to come out of France. Labor news from that war-torn country is almost as rare as from Germany.

The labor press has been reduced to a shadow of its former self. All the Stalinist dailies have completely disappeared. Nor has there been any noticeable Stalinist effort to issue an illegal press. Only "La Vie Ouvriere," the Stalinist trade union weekly still appears with a semblance of regularity. The last issue of that paper whose contents have come to our attention shows that the Stalinists had not yet made their turn from social patriotism into the new, camouflaged, "anti-war" position by the end of September. Thus, G. Monmousseau, the editor, writes in a leading article:

"The struggle for liberty against Hitlerite barbarism does not signify for those who fight in the ranks of the countries subjected to this aggression merely defense at any price of the nation itself against foreign oppression; it also means, at the same time, defense of public liberties, of democracy and of all that which comprises the possibilities of social progress and human liberation."

In the Middle of the Crossing

This was written weeks after the C.P. had already been dissolved by the Daladier government, and only testifies in part to the great confusion in the ranks of the Stalinist functionaries, who for months now have been juggling phrases which try to reconcile "democratic" patriotism with approval of the Stalin-Hitler Pact and the line flowing from it.

The great trade union daily, "Le Peuple," has been transformed into a weekly. The social democratic press has likewise suspended most of its daily publications, with only "Le Populaire" still appearing regularly.

Naturally, as was to be expected, the entire social democratic leadership, both the "collective security" faction under Leon Blum and the "pacifist" faction under Paul Faure, is completely backing the Daladier government in its conduct of the war.

Syndicalism — Its Fruits

But even the pacifist syndicalists under Belin and Dumoulin have given up every pretense of an anti-war struggle. Thus, their weekly, *Syndicats*, declares that "we will take care not to give any council (sic) in the conduct of military operations" and further, that "in order to make all the arrangements corresponding to the necessities of such production as is indispensable to armament and to the human possibilities (sic), it is necessary that our syndicalism be freed from outside control."

In other words, their slogan "for the independence of syndicalism" turned out in practice to be a cover under which control of the trade unions was transferred from the Stalinists . . . to Daladier.

This inauspicious realization of "independence" has borne some pretty rotten fruit for the mass of the workers in the unions. Thus, their press is muzzled, hundreds of their militants arrested for "seditious" language, correspondence spied, communications suppressed, agreements violated, so-

Their Government
By James Burnham

The dead end which imperialism has reached is shown with striking clarity by the inability of any of the warring powers to state its "war aims." All the rhetoric of all the propagandists is unable to hide the fact that they cannot tell the people of the world, in simple and concrete terms, what they are fighting for.

Germany, in line with its "peace offensive," declared that there was nothing to fight about. What this meant, of course, was that Germany wanted to preserve its conquests while it got ready for new ones. The older Nazi talk about "re-uniting the German race" no longer makes sense, with Czechs and Poles and Slovaks now under Nazi rule.

Chamberlain has been trying to get by with the expressed goal of "wiping out Hitlerism." This was good for a speech or two, but it wears thin with repetition. Everyone is compelled to ask: what will take the place of Hitlerism? What will guarantee against worse than Hitlerism? Who will do the wiping out, and how?

The moral weakness in this inability to state war aims is already being widely felt in the belligerent countries. A clamor is arising—especially, it seems, in England—for something more definite in the way of a perspective and goal. A modest enough request, surely: if we are to die, we should at least be told what we are dying for.

Here and there, publicists, journalists and even statesmen are trying to put some sort of goal into words.

The Federal States of Europe

It is of very great interest to observe that, in almost every case, when imaginations get going they reach out toward the notion of a "federated Europe." Even before the war began, Clarence Streit's essay along these lines (Union Now) gained considerable popularity and a society has been formed to propagate his plan. In recent weeks, several British writers have presented their varieties of similar schemes.

In his Armistice Day address at Swarthmore College, no less a figure than the Marquess of Lothian, new British Ambassador to Washington, came out for the same slogan. True enough, Lord Lothian is hardly yet a fiery crusader. Nobody, he remarked, had offered "any practical scheme of Federation" and a "large scale European federation" was not yet in sight; but, according to the Times, the Ambassador foresaw the eventual application to Europe of the federal principle tried first on the American Continent a century and a half ago.

True enough, also, Lord Lothian found that "one necessary preliminary is the defeat of totalitarian imperialism." The British are always careful not to clutter up their wars with ideals; ideals are always a matter for an indefinite future.

But we cannot dismiss this spreading talk about a federated Europe as mere casual daydreaming. There is more to it than that, and we shall find it cropping up more and more prominently. We must be sure to understand what is at issue.

The Paralysis of Nationalism

It is a fact that the political organization of Europe into its madhouse of "sovereign" nations makes impossible a free, secure and expanding life for the peoples of Europe. And, when today we listen to the Lord Lothians, let us remember that it was the victors of Versailles who fastened on Europe these political lines, without regard to the economic, social or cultural needs of the peoples.

National states, the political form under which a young and vigorous capitalism pushed through the structure of feudalism, have become a most terrible obstacle to mankind. What an overpowering burden it is to Europe: these thousands of customs houses; the blood-sucking tariffs; the dozens of swarming bureaucracies; the border lines of billions of dollars worth of forts, with all the national armies and guns and planes to accompany them; the passports and identity cards and work cards. No rational organization of economic and human resources as a whole is even conceivable under such circumstances. And immeasurable human energies are squandered daily, even in peace-time, to sustain this mad national structure.

And, though these things are most conspicuously true of Europe, they hold for the entire world. Under the conditions of modern science, technique and production, the national state everywhere paralyzes the progress of mankind.

But Whose Federation?

This is why we, as socialists, agree a thousand times with the perspective of a federated Europe—we go much further, and call for a federated world.

But the question does not end with the bare concept of a federation. We must ask: who will do the federating?

It is not at all improbable that, whoever wins the war, some sort of federal plan for Europe will be set up. Too many persons have come to realize the impossibility of the nationalist structure; that structure has been proved too dangerously unstable.

But: whose federation?
Hitler, in his own way, has proved himself something of a federalist. If he has the chance, he will undoubtedly show great talents along federal lines. He has already constructed a federation out of Germany, the Saar, Austria, Czecho-slovakia, western Poland. It was, among other things, precisely the insane Versailles-born national structure that permitted him to do so.

And Hitler's federation of Europe would mean, exactly, the reduction of the national states of Europe to Nazi provinces.

Lord Lothian is now looking forward to a federation. It would differ from Hitler's only in having its capital at London (or possibly Paris) instead of Berlin, and in the reduction of the national states to provinces of Anglo-British instead of German imperialism.

For Lord Lothian and for Hitler, a federated Europe means merely a new name for an advanced type of imperialist tyranny.

If federation is to mean freedom and peace and progress for the peoples of Europe, there is only one basis on which it can be constructed: on the basis of socialism. And there is only one force that can set up such a federation: the workers and peasants of Europe struggling against their imperialist governments and against their war. In that struggle German workers fight not against but alongside of the workers of France and England.

A federated Europe? Yes: this is what we call for as the solution to the war. And we sum up that goal in our great slogan: **For a Socialist United States of Europe!**