

SOCIALIST APPEAL
 Vol. III, No. 36 May 26, 1939
 Published twice a week 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. For-
 eign: \$3.00 per year; \$1.50 for six months. Bundle orders,
 2 cents per copy in the United States; 3 cents per copy in
 all foreign countries. Single copies: 3 cents.
 Bronx and Manhattan subscriptions are: \$1.50 for six
 months; \$3.00 for one year.
 "Registered as second class matter February 16, 1939, at
 the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March
 8, 1879."
 Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN
 Associate Editors: HAROLD ROBERTS FELIX MORROW
 Staff Members: EMANUEL GARRETT JOSEPH HANSEN
 Business Manager: S. 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 vigilantes and Fascist attacks.

The Peace Front

When the New York Times speaks coldly and authoritatively in its editorial columns about political problems, it may be considered the voice of American capitalism laying down the "line."

Political agents, propagandists, and professional apologists of capitalism will take their cue, therefore, from the leading editorial in last Sunday's edition of the Times and make the following change in the slogans to be used in recruiting cannon fodder for the impending world war:

Instead of "Defend Democracy" change the slogan to read—"Defend the Peace Front."

"Democracy," states the Times, is too difficult to explain and requires too much apologizing. The new term, which was coined by Premier Chamberlain last week is "better than any other. It avoids the pretense that all governments which want peace are 'democratic' or 'liberal.'"

"Neither Poland, nor Turkey, nor Greece is a democracy," points out the Times. "There is no pure democracy south of the Panama Canal. The British in India, the Dutch in Java, the French in Africa have not achieved pure democracies."

(Naturally—the capitalists are too busy plundering those countries to concern themselves with whether they should establish a pure or an impure democracy under their rifles.)

Without wasting any time to explain or to apologize for its term "pure democracy" or to name a single spot on the globe where "pure democracy" exists, the Times asserts "The interests of the United States link us firmly with the 'peace front,'" and then advocates backing up the military strength of the "peace front" with our industry and raw materials.

Against whom and for what?

"Against the 'central dictatorships,'" explains the Times and for "economic power."

It's no longer the "democracies versus the dictatorships" for capitalist markets and capitalist profits.

It's the "peace front versus the central dictatorships" for capitalist markets and capitalist profits.

Strike up the band, war-mongers!

Bankers of the World, Unite!

The workers have no fatherland, and neither have the international bankers. In these hysterical days and star-spangled nights, when every one from Dorothy Thompson to Earl Browder is so exercised about defending what they call "democracy", it is refreshing to breathe the atmosphere of international finance a moment. Up here, the air is clear and things appear as what they really are—not as the cloudy abstractions of liberal-patriotic rhetoric. In this businesslike realm, no one bothers to pretend that an abyss yawns between democratic capitalism and fascist capitalism.

Even patriotism, the supreme virtue of our

age, is taken rather lightly in these upper regions. The European ruling class for many months now has been shipping its gold to this country for safe investment, though never has a strong gold position been so vital for the defense of their various fatherlands. In September and October of last year almost \$1,000,000,000 in gold was shipped into the United States from Europe, and the stream has continued ever since. So serious has this drain become for the British government and its Bank of England that Sir John Simon, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, has been issuing appeals to the "patriotism" of English brokers, bankers, and investors to "Buy British" in stocks and bonds as well as in pots and pans. The N. Y. Times of May 18 reports that "Simon's unofficial ban" on the buying of American securities may well become, in the near future, an official governmental edict. It is safe to predict that until this step is taken, the top-hatted gentry of "The City" will continue to put class interests ahead of national interests.

An even more dramatic example of the realistic approach of finance capital to international politics may be found in a dispatch from Otto D. Tolischus in the Times for May 16, reporting that the banking representatives of the democracies have just renewed the "standstill" moratorium agreement on the \$276,000,000 Germany still owes them and their clients.

"This agreement," bluntly writes Mr. Tolischus, "will continue to help finance the Reich's foreign trade and therewith the armament of the Axis powers. . . The financial representatives of the democracies proceeded on a strictly business basis and completely disregarded all the political considerations that dominate the economics of the totalitarian states."

The head of the American delegation, Harvey D. Gibson, a leading New York banker, told the press that "the greatest possible consideration was given by debtors and creditors alike to the requests of each other." The Reichsbank told the press that the negotiations "were again conducted in a spirit of mutual understanding." And Walter Funk, successor to Schacht and one of the chief devils in the Nazi hell, gave a special reception for the democratic bankers and personally thanked them for "their thoroughgoing consideration of the German proposals."

Whatever their political puppets may say for public consumption, these gentlemen understand each other perfectly. Bankers of the world, unite! You have nothing whatever to lose!

Strip Act

President Lebrun of France recently signed another of Premier Daladier's arbitrary decrees against the labor movement.

This decree makes it mandatory that an unemployed worker who is offered a job ANYWHERE in the country at ANY wage, at no matter what trade, must take that job; if not, he will be thrown off the relief rolls.

Democratic Marianne seems not only to have doffed the Phrygian cap for a steel helmet, but to have doffed other garments as well, leaving this democracy in a state that must be quite embarrassing to the "war for democracy" fakery.

Representative Sam Hobbes (D., Ala.) said the Japanese airplane that bombed and sank the United States gunboat Panay in China was powered by fuel taken from California's maritime oil fields. Well, business is business, as the bosses say.

Robinson-Rubens Case

On May 2 a Federal grand jury in New York found three men, associates of the "Robinson-Rubens" couple now imprisoned in Moscow, guilty of a conspiracy to obtain fraudulent American passports. The three have been sentenced to two years each in the penitentiary. The government prosecutor has declared that the men were acting for a foreign espionage service. The men offered no defense.

Eighteen months ago Stalin's organs, Pravda and the Daily Worker, declared that Rubens and his associates were Trotskyist agents of Hitler. If so, why did the Daily Worker fail to send a reporter to the trial in New York and fail to print a line about the trial? Eighteen months ago the Freiheit charged that some "Trotskyite" Yiddish writers were involved in the Rubens ring. Now that three members of the ring have been convicted, why does the Freiheit fail to name the Yiddish writers who would immediately be subject to arrest?

The answer is simple. The Stalinists are silent because it has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Rubens ring is Stalin's ring.

Now the G.P.U. must begin to manufacture a new lie to cover up Stalin and his blunderers. They will do this with as little consideration for the fanatically devoted trio who are going silently to prison as they showed for their Yezhov or their Yagoda. They will not hesitate, if it suits them, to declare that this convicted Stalinist trio is really a Trotskyist outfit. Whether the prisoners will play the game as prisoners do in Moscow courts is, however, another question.

Bow Down! Their Majesties Are Coming--to Weld War Relations

The Heads of an Imperial "Democracy" Whose History Is Written in Blood Have Been Sent Here on a "Good-Will-War" Mission by Britain's Real Rulers, the Bankers and Merchants

By SHERMAN STANLEY
 Wafted along by a gale of ballyhoo and expensive propaganda, His Majesty, George VI, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India, and his Queen, Elizabeth, are well entrained on their month-long tour of Canada.

On June 7th Their Imperial Majesties will enter the United States—the first time such an event has occurred in the history of the British Empire. They will proceed to Washington, there to be entertained royally by our democratic F.D.R. at a garden party whose cost has been estimated at a cool \$15,000! From Washington, our royal guests will be taken by special train to Red Bank, N.J., and then embark upon a destroyer which will land them at the tip of Manhattan island. A short visit to the World's Fair will be followed by ceremonies at Columbia University over which the perennial Nicholas "Miraculous" Butler will preside. Then comes the return trip to the isles of Britain and "home" in Buckingham Palace.

WHO ARE THE REAL RULERS?

Who are George VI and his queen, Elizabeth? In the eyes of the American press which is in danger of over-straining itself in its task of pumping up their majestic virtues, while at the same time attempting to depict them as ordinary, "homey" folks (Just like you and I) they appear as symbolic representatives of the world's greatest Empire. They are the leaders of our closest and noblest allies, the British. They represent "white supremacy"—the rule of Anglo-Saxon civilization. The American press, deliberately interested in fomenting the Chamberlain "peace front" conception, is engaging in a high-pressure campaign to put across Their Majesties.

We can easily understand the difficulties involved in this scheme. The British Empire, like all world empires, is ruled over by a handful of bankers, industrialists and coupon-clippers. The imposing facade of royalty can serve only as a deceptive front, covering up the naked imperialist banditry behind it.

HISTORY OF BRITISH "DEMOCRACY"

Secondly, every thinking person knows that there is no such thing as British democracy. How can a "democratic" government be presided over by a feudal king who sucks up countless millions each year of his futile existence? Has not everyone heard of the role of "Perfidious Albion" (the world's cleverest double-crosser) in world affairs? The entire might of the Empire rests upon the 500,000,000 native peoples who slave and sweat in the colonies of India, Ceylon, Africa, etc. The crown resting so precariously upon the head of George VI was carved and bejeweled by handicraftsmen of India. It will be toppled off by the mighty uprising of these enslaved Indian workers and peasants. The story of British imperialism rule in its colonies is one of endless murder, violence and treachery against the colonial masses.

And finally, in the very personalities of these imperial representatives we have a fine reason for the natural repulsion that every American worker feels towards them. Surrounded by countless lackeys and flunkies whose sole task appears to be an endless scraping and bowing (except when they have to change His Majesty's clothes, which apparently happens continuously), George VI emerges as a completely colorless, lifeless and dull personality.

England in its time produced dramatic and colorful kings. But in its period of decline, the British Empire can only be represented by this impotent, stammering dolt who only reminds us of the imbecilic "king" in the famous Russian puppet film, "The New Gulliver." To witness his feeble attempts at majestic posing in the newsreels, to listen in on his nervous, empty and useless efforts at speechmaking is to come face to face with the realities of this so-called king.

INTENT OF VISIT IS CLEAR

As for his wife, Queen Elizabeth, it is apparent that she is endeavoring to supply what is lacking in George VI. What would the American capitalist press have to say if not for her! This daughter of a Scottish earl, whose entire family is

connected with British industrialism—her brother is the chairman of an important English mining company—dominates the events of the visit. Her job is to prop up the failing king! At the host of petty and ridiculous functions that go to make up regal life, Queen Elizabeth tries bravely to cover up the deficiencies of her weakling husband.

Let the sob-sisters pile up column upon column of "human interest" stories! Let the press editorialize on their kingly virtues! Nothing can hide the obvious intent of these Canadian and American visits.

Canada over a period of years has evolved along lines that have made of it an independent capitalist nation in its own right. It is only nominally a part of the British Empire, much as King George is only nominally the ruler of the Empire. Actually, American imperialist interests are far more important in Canada and have much more to say about Canadian political affairs. The king's visit to Canada is a theatrical gesture having as its motive the effort to tighten up the loosening ties that bind her formally to England. The masses of Canada have long ago expressed their unwillingness to send men overseas to fight in another British war for the preservation of its imperialist hegemony. Chamberlain, more aware than ever of the cracking-up of the British Empire, is seeking support among the Canadian rulers for his war aims. That is why he has sent his royal puppets on their visit.

As for America—here too the motive is crystal clear. Chamberlain and the imperialists whose tool he is, realizes that he must depend to a large extent upon Roosevelt and the more powerful capitalism of America for support not merely in the approaching war, but especially in the suppression of the colonial revolts that are inevitable in the near future. Chamberlain seeks a tightening of the Anglo-American alliance because he needs American imperialism as a source of supplies in the suppression of the colonial movements. He needs America as an ally to help preserve the British Empire. Hence we are blessed with the visit of his "good-will" agents.

Huge Protest Meets British Plan To Reduce Jews to Ghetto Status

(Continued from Page 1)

building of a Jewish Homeland. But the Zionist leaders have deliberately hid from the Jewish masses the true facts about the hostile British government policy in Palestine. The Appeal ventured a prediction: "It is a safe wager to predict that the Zionist leaders will continue this deceitful policy."

And precisely this happened at the Hippodrome meeting. Not one of the speakers told the anxious, queuing audience that nothing can be expected from British imperialism and that the fight for the defense of the Jews from reaction must be fought with a clear recognition that to Britain the Jews are only a pawn on the political chessboard.

The Conservative, Liberal and Labor Parties—whatever politicians have ruled on behalf of the capitalist class of England—have all carried out the consistent British policy during these twenty-two years. It will be the policy of Britain so long as it remains a capitalist regime and controls Palestine.

Even not a hint of this crept out of the speeches at the Hippodrome. Mayor LaGuardia—who spoke after consultation with Zionist leaders on his speech—blamed the Holy Land situation not on imperialist Britain but on the "general confusion in Europe" and expressed faith in the "fair play, generosity and understanding" of Britain. His advice consisted of "don't lose your head," "keep cool," etc., and to "let the British people know what is going on in Palestine now." He concluded with the hope that "reason will come to those invested with the responsibility of guiding the destiny of the British empire."

Senator Wagner appealed to "British power and British honor" not to yield to the Arabs. "I cannot believe that

the British people will ratify such a decision," for "the real England" will thereby suffer. A message from Cyrus Adler made this contribution:

"I can only express the hope that the action of the present British Government does not indicate the will of the British people and that another and more just policy will come into being in the not too distant future."

The other speakers spoke in similar vein. And in the same tune, a resolution was adopted at the end, appealing to the "conscience of England."

The same tune is played everywhere by Zionist leaders. Ben Gurion, the Histadruth leader in Palestine, wrote Friday in Davar: "This document is not the final word of the British people. . . . The conscience of Britain can still be awakened."

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise issued a statement to the press on Friday in which he set himself up as a better manager of the British empire's interests than Chamberlain: "Chamberlain may cancel the Balfour Declaration but he cannot repeal the true and abiding purpose of the British Empire."

Why Zionists Lied
 Why have the Zionist leaders concealed from their following the fact of this consistency of British policy? Why, after every British move, have the Zionist leaders first bewailed, then devoted themselves to assuring their followers that the move is an accident, the next cabinet will repair it, the move

isn't really so bad, etc., etc.? Firstly and most immediately, because every British blow has been followed by a virtual collapse of Zionist income from voluntary collections; and so the Zionist Organization proceeded to reassure its followers that they should give money because the British blow was not what it appeared to be.

The Main Reason
 But secondly and more fundamentally, the Zionist leaders have concealed from their followers the consistent course of British policy because these leaders have never been, nor would they now be, willing to transform the policy of the Jewish nationalist movement as it would have to be transformed, if hope in Britain were recognized to be futile.

They will turn to the Great White Father in the White House and implore him to change Chamberlain's mind. They will begin a new series of the back-stage conferences so beloved by Weizmann, hoping against hope to get Chamberlain to retreat an inch, and get ready to hail that as a great victory.

Even in the Jewish Agency's protest statement, they characterize themselves as "Britain's friends," and deplore the White Paper because "it delivers Britain's friends into the hands of those who are biting her." The tragic Jewish youth in Palestine, misled by the Zionist leaders, will fight now and many of them will die at the point of British bayonets; but the Zionist leaders will continue, as ever, hanging on the coat-tails of the British government.

They will not, cannot let go, because to break with the British implies a new kind of policy which these respectable bankers and businessmen of the Jewish Agency cannot and will not undertake and carry out. For that new policy, an entirely new kind of Jewish leadership will be required.

Their Government By James Burnham

The speech on the 1940 elections delivered by Earl Browder to the Ninth National Convention of the Young Communist League, and immediately issued as a pamphlet, carries the very impressive title, "How the People Can Win". Nowhere, however, is it specified what it is that the people can win, nor what people are going to win it, whatever it may be.

The speech was reported in the general press as advocating the re-election of Roosevelt. This is not strictly accurate. Week by week, the Stalinists grow more modest in the "demands" that they put to the American ruling class. The ruling class doesn't like socialism, so they give up socialism. A labor party might stir up class divisions, so they abandon the labor party. A popular front is rather advanced for the United States, so Roosevelt and his special brand of "democratic front" will do as a substitute. But even Roosevelt is a bit leftish for these days, so the Stalinists will be content with whatever the "New Deal wing" of the Democratic Party has to offer.

Browder as Democratic Elder

A candid reading of Browder's speech might easily suggest that Browder is making a bid for a place on the Democratic Party's national committee. More than half of it is devoted to explaining how the Democratic Party can win the 1940 election. Jim Farley is doubtless studying it carefully between stops on his tour. Jim, after all, is hardly more than an amateur in these questions; and, besides, does not have the benefit of the private Kremlin cables.

"The progressive and democratic majority" in this country, which put Roosevelt into office, "is a coalition between the Democratic Party and the independent radical one-third of the electorate". The Democratic Party can win the next elections if it continues this coalition through defeating the Garner-Glass-Wheeler combination in the convention. "The radical one-third of the voters," for whom Browder so authoritatively speaks, "find it necessary, therefore, to wish for and work for victory for the Roosevelt wing in the Democratic Convention".

Here, then, is set the task of the Stalinists and all other men of good will for the next period: to wish for and work for victory for the Roosevelt wing in the Democratic Convention. You can see now why any attack against the Roosevelt relief slashes is obviously the work of the U. S. Fifth Column.

Looking the Gift Horse over

But what is it that "the people" are going to win by dutifully returning the Democratic Party to office? and what have they won by keeping it there during the past six years? Search most minutely, and you will have a hard time finding any answer to these seemingly appropriate questions in Browder's speech.

The people, one would imagine, want to end unemployment and to get jobs. But not a word does Browder say about unemployment and jobs, not a single word. Can it be that "the people" to whom Browder is talking already have their jobs?

Browder can hardly, at this date, pretend that the New Deal has ended unemployment. Nor does he feel called upon to claim that it is going to. Browder's policy is firm: it is not going to be affected by a little item like ten or fifteen million unemployed.

You might think that "the people" would be interested in the campaign against the democratic rights of labor that is now advancing on a national scale. But there is no mention of it in Browder's speech. Indeed there is no mention of any economic or social issue, save for a housing program which Browder discusses not to advocate but only to argue that such programs help and do not hurt capitalism.

In fact, the outstanding point of Browder's speech is not his brazen, shameless acceptance of outright capitalist politics, but the appearance in this speech of the sharpest criticisms in several years of Roosevelt and New Dealism. That these criticisms directly contradict his conclusions does not, of course, bother so old a hand at dialectics as Browder.

He goes out of his way to stress the "retreats" of the New Deal, which "unquestionably weaken and demoralize the mass support of the New Deal, and open the way for reactionary demagoguery". He objects to "the weakening and partial withdrawal of governmental intervention in economy, the retreat made by the New Deal under the pressure of monopoly capital's attack". These are strong words from Elder Statesman Browder, not heard for many a moon.

Browder Names His Price

But the tone gets really sharp in discussing foreign policy: "We cannot fail to note and criticize those mistakes, weaknesses and inconsistencies in the Administration's execution of these policies in practical life. Gravest of these was the unforgivably stupid and criminal surrender to the Chamberlain 'non-intervention' policy toward Spain, brought to a climax by the indecent haste with which Franco was handed unconditional recognition. . . . Thus did the Roosevelt Administration gratuitously smear itself with complicity in the fascist aggression and destruction of democracy in Spain. . . ; by this act the Administration weakened and undermined its own prestige and moral authority. . . ."

Thus does Browder echo Stalin's speech to the Soviet Party Congress, criticizing democratic imperialisms to cover up overtures to Hitler; thus does he attempt to safety-valve growing discontent among his own followers with the pro-Roosevelt policy; and thus does he reveal the real crux of his own proposals.

"Thus, it becomes a necessity of American national security to . . . create a solid foundation for the inevitable cooperation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R."

This is what it all boils down to: the rest is so much hogwash. Give the Kremlin an alliance, says Browder, keep a pro-Soviet orientation in the State Department, and forget the rest; forget unemployment and wages and democratic liberties. Never mind the candidate or even the party. Give me that, and only that. On that basis, I'll go along.

The Fascist Spanish Falange organization in Cuba was dissolved by the government under terms of a decree prohibiting anti-democratic foreign organizations in the island republic.