

How Labor Can Strike Hitler A Mortal Blow

An Editorial

When asked: "Is an internal collapse of Germany likely?", the answer of British Prime Minister Churchill at his White House press conference on Dec. 23 was: "Don't let us bank on that. We have got to bank on an external knockout."

And from his point of view, from the point of view of capitalist politicians, this answer was the only one he could give. Churchill is unable to bank on a revolution against Hitler in Germany. He speaks the truth when he says that he can hope for a victory over the Axis by superior military force alone.

Right now the military initiative is with Hitler. Churchill has already admitted that it may be two or more years before the Allies will be able to engage the Axis with an equal or superior military force. Thus the military advantages are with Hitler. And according to Churchill, they will remain with him for some time.

But wars are not settled on this field alone. The successful struggle of the Soviet government in the days of the Civil War and imperialist intervention of 1918-20 is proof of this. While Hitler still has the military preponderance, at the same time it is generally recognized that the morale of the German soldiers and the German people is probably lower at this time than at any time since the beginning of the war, and the possibilities for an "internal collapse" greater than at any time since Hitler took power.

Consequently, when Churchill conducts the kind of war against Hitler that has to depend for the outcome solely on the military arena, and is unable to benefit from the political difficulties and internal contradictions of the enemy, he is conducting just the kind of war that Hitler wants him to, and that Hitler at this stage of the war fears least of all.

We do not mean by this that Churchill would not like "an internal collapse" in Germany under certain conditions that would be favorable to the Allied war aims. Churchill is after all fully aware of the gravity of Britain's position in the war and he is not an idiot. Nevertheless he has to conduct the war on the plane where Hitler wants it for two very good reasons.

The first is that he is incapable of arousing the German masses to revolutionary action against their own oppressors. They do not trust Churchill and the other Allied spokesmen and they feel from their experiences of the last war that they have no reason to trust them.

They remember from the last war that even after they had overthrown the Kaiser and the German war government, the Allies imposed a crushing peace settlement on them which starved their children, bled their industries white and created the economic and political conditions which made possible the seizure of power by the fascists.

And even if they did not have the experiences of the last war to go by, they would still have the declarations of Churchill in this war. How can they trust him when he told the world in the eighth point of the Atlantic Charter that after the war the Allies will disarm Germany and thus reduce it to the status of a secondary power?

His proclamations on paper that he stands for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they shall live" do not impress them very much as long as they see that in fact he refuses to grant freedom to the people of India.

They fear, when he says the Allied governments will teach "them" a "lesson which they and the world will never forget," that he means the German people as well as their oppressors. And as long as they do, they will also fear to take any steps — including the overthrow of their oppressors — which may place the German people at the mercy of the Allies.

In addition to being unable to arouse the German revolution, Churchill is afraid of it. That is the second reason why he does not "bank" on it.

Churchill would not be afraid of a "safe" revolution; on the contrary, if the German General Staff would overthrow Hitler and establish their own military dictatorship and sue for peace, or if the German capitalists decided to get rid of Hitler because they felt he was no longer able to safeguard their interests, he would welcome them with open arms.

But Churchill knows that these variants are extremely unlikely. He knows that when the German workers overthrow Hitler in spite of all the sacrifices, bloodshed and dangers that that will entail, they will be in no mood to re-establish a government of the people who were tarred with the Nazi brush or of the people who fought for the victory of the Allies and another Versailles. For then the German masses will establish their own Workers and Farmers Government, and appeal to the masses in the Allied countries to follow their example and together build the Socialist United States of Europe and the world, thus forever sweeping away war, fascism, imperialism and reaction.

Churchill would prefer a war that would last a hundred years to such a German revolution, and to the effects such a revolution would have on the workers in England and the masses in the British Empire.

This is why Churchill does not "bank" on a German revolution, and this is why the Allies dare not take advantage of the internal difficulties of Hitler, and this is why the war may last another two years — at least — and probably much longer.

And this is also why we Trotskyists, who want the destruction of Hitlerism and a "lasting peace" that will really last, continue to call on the masses in Britain and the United States to join the fight for Workers and Farmers Governments.

Such Governments would have nothing to fear from a liberating socialist revolution in Germany, and would do everything they could to bring it about. The masses in Germany, having observed the example of their British and American brothers in establishing such Governments and in granting independence to the colonies, and on being assured of a just peace and true collaboration from such Governments, would begin at once and with confidence the struggle for their own socialist revolution against Hitler.

That is how a Workers and Farmers Government would spell the doom of fascism and war everywhere!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 1

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

CHURCHILL URGES CREATION OF NEW LEAGUE OF NATIONS

N.J. CIO Votes Support of 18

State Council Hits Minnesota Convictions

Calls On Affiliates To Aid in the Appeal And Fight to Free 18

Dec. 30 — The New Jersey State Industrial Union Council of the CIO, representing more than a quarter million organized workers in the state, last night vigorously pledged its support to the 18 labor defendants convicted for violation of the 1940 Smith Gag Law in the Minneapolis prosecution of Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party.

The resolution adopted by the Council had been favorably recommended to the State CIO Convention on Dec. 7 by the Resolutions Committee and then referred for action to the incoming State Council upon the announcement that war had broken out in the Pacific.

The resolution declared that the New Jersey CIO "condemns the convictions in the Minneapolis case and protests the use of the FBI to interfere in the democratic procedure of the labor movement."

It calls upon its affiliates to give "support in this case, to aid in the appeal of this case to the Supreme Court to test the constitutionality of the Smith Act and to free the eighteen defendants."

It points out further that "these are the first convictions under the Smith Act which was sponsored by Representative Howard Smith, author of the vicious Smith Slave-Labor Bill" and that "this law is a dangerous weapon against labor and the democratic rights of the American people."

The Council also recognized

Protesting Priorities Lay-Offs



Detroit's streets once more resounded to the marching feet of thousands of auto workers, as these members of the United Auto Workers, CIO, last week picketed the Chrysler plant in protest against priorities lay-offs. Refusal of the auto corporations to effect speedy re-adjustment of their plants and machinery to war work was held responsible for the situation.

War Labor Policy Favors Interests Of Employers

Despite No-Strike Agreement, Economic Pressure Will Force Workers to Strike

By DON DORE

Still holding to their position that the open shop must be "frozen" for the duration of the war, the employer representatives at the labor-industry conference unwillingly yielded last week to a direct request of President Roosevelt and accepted a three-point proposal for the handling of labor disputes during the war that did not contain the open-shop demand.

The employers, however, had already gained their main immediate objectives. The proposals finally accepted included the surrender of the right to strike, the settlement of all labor demands through negotiation, mediation and arbitration, and the establishment of a War Labor Board empowered to handle all disputes.

In accepting these terms, the employers did not give up their expressed aim of continuing to fight for the elimination of the union closed shop issue as a proper dispute for consideration by the War Labor Board.

A few hours after accepting the agreement, the employer representatives joined in a formal statement which declared that: "We believe that, in determining the procedure of the board, consideration should be given to the principle we have consistently maintained — namely, that the board should not accept for arbitration or consideration the issue of the closed shop."

OPEN SHOP STILL ISSUE

The fact that the War Labor Board will have the power to consider cases involving the question of the union or closed shop does not mean that it will use this power. The board is not compelled to consider such cases, it will merely have the right to do so. If the board should refuse to consider any closed-shop demands,

(Continued on page 3)

Stalin And Eden Reach Agreement On War Policy

By ANTHONY MASSINI

The most important developments of the Soviet-German war last week did not take place on the front. It took place in the Kremlin where Stalin and Anthony Eden concluded an agreement between the Soviet and British governments on the conduct of the war and the kind of peace to be established by them after the war.

The effects of this agreement on the war will be far-reaching. Instead of strengthening the Soviet Union, Stalin has placed a powerful weapon in the hands of Hitler and Goebbels. For the conference dealt not only with military and political problems relating to the conduct of the war, but also with the "post-war organization of the peace and security of Europe."

According to first London reports on the conference, printed

in the New York Times, Dec. 28, Stalin and Eden came to an agreement on a policy for "post-war reconstruction along the general lines laid down by the Atlantic Charter declaration of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill in their conference at sea last summer."

But while the eight points of Roosevelt and Churchill were vague on the all-important question of revolution in Europe, Stalin and Eden were quite specific.

ALLAYING FEARS OF REACTIONARIES

"It was also emphasized," says the London report, "that the negotiators had produced a unity of British and Russian views concerning postwar Europe — a development expected to be of special importance in view of fears in some circles that an attempt might be made to spread bolshev-

ism in the future Europe. . . "It was suggested that there might be something like a 'Continental Charter' for Europe that"

(Continued on page 3)

Proposes Plan That Failed To Halt Present War

Discredited System That Grew Out of First World War No Hope for Lasting Peace

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill resurrected the ghost of the League of Nations in his address before the United States Congress on Dec. 26.

His answer to the growing demand of the masses for some permanent solution to the problem of war was to reach into the trash barrel of history and pull out the tattered remnants of the League of Nations idea. What failed to prevent World War II was offered as a means of preventing World War III.

It is necessary, Churchill stated, that "an adequate organization be set up to make sure that the pestilence (war) can be controlled at its earliest beginnings before it spreads and rages throughout the entire world."

What that "adequate organization" is to be is bluntly stated by Edwin L. James, political commentator for the New York Times on Dec. 28. "It may be called the 'League' or it may be called something else; that makes small difference. But it is plain that both Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt look forward to the fair day when they can take up where Woodrow Wilson left off."

EXPLAINING PAST FAILURE
Anticipating the skepticism that would undoubtedly greet his proposal, the Prime Minister sought to give some explanation for the failure of the past League of Nations to prevent the present war.

"If we (America and Britain) had kept together after the last war, if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us. . . Five or six years ago it would have been easy without shedding a drop of blood for the United States and Great Britain to have insisted on the fulfillment of the disarmament clauses of the treaties which Germany signed after the Great War. And that also would have been the opportunity for assuring to the Germans those materials, those raw materials, which we declared in the Atlantic Charter should not be denied to any nation, victor or vanquished."

The failure of the League, according to Churchill, was due to the failure of the United States to participate in it, to enforce the disarmament of Germany, to afford Germany access to raw materials.

FALSE ARGUMENTS
These are specious arguments on the face of it. Is it reasonable to believe that that the old League, which con-

(Continued on page 3)

Pope Offers A Peace Program

To the half-billion Catholics who awaited his Christmas Eve message as a divine revelation, the words of Pope Pius XII conveyed little comfort and even less hope. The New York Times, Dec. 25, with all due respect described the message as "the most pessimistic speech he has uttered since the war began."

Gazing down from his spiritual eminence, the Pope surveyed the bloody conflict among nations. He confessed he could "scarcely find any reason for

comfort." Indeed, the sights on which his pontifical eyes dwelt caused him "depressing anguish."

However, the Pope offered more than consolation. He sought to enlighten mankind on the causes of the war and give guidance for the future.

"Men have rebelled" against the true doctrines of the Church; they have cast aside "moral principles". That is the reason for the war and all social evils, declared the Pope. "... There is no other remedy than that of a return to the altars. . . a return

to the wise and unshakable norms of the social order. . . " The Pope may be forgiven if he failed to be more specific as to the nature of these moral principles and "wise and unshakable norms".

SOME EXAMPLES OF "MORAL PRINCIPLES"

For it seems that every Christian ruler and statesman already lays claim to them. Indeed, Hitler, Mussolini, Petain, Roosevelt and Churchill do not lack Catholic sanction for their respective causes. In Germany, Italy,

France, England and America, the Catholic clergy, or important sections of it, have blessed the aims and aspirations of their respective nations.

(Continued on page 3)

Albert Goldman Explains To The Jury The Conditions Under Which The Unionists Organized Defense Guard

This is the third installment of the historic final argument delivered at the Minneapolis "sedition" trial by Albert Goldman, chief defense counsel and one of the leading defendants.

I shall now deal with the question of the Union Defense Guard of Local 544. What relationship did the existence of this Union Defense Guard of the Minneapolis truck drivers have to our proposal for a Workers Defense Guard? The idea of a Workers Defense Guard, as has been explained to you, is not something new. It has not only been propagated by us, but we have actually, on certain occasions, created a defense guard to defend our meetings against Stalinist and fascist hoodlums. As a matter of fact, there have been defense guards ever since the socialist movement began, because there have always been elements who wanted to use violence against socialists.

And when a situation arose in Minneapolis which demanded the formation of some kind of defense organization to defend the right of union men to hold their meetings undisturbed and to protect the halls and property of the union, our members, trained in the idea of having defense guards, naturally thought of creating such a guard to protect the interests of Local 544.

Members of our party are superior to the average worker, if they are superior at all, because they have a certain theory as to the basis of their activities, and this theory enables them to predict and act upon their predictions. The average worker lives from day to day — he works, earns his living, is thrown out of his job, goes on relief, has children and tries to feed them. He is unable as yet to generalize the reasons for his difficulties. A member of the Socialist Workers Party thinks in general terms about the situation of the workers in society. He is trained to understand that his life is bound up with the life of his class.

WHY LOCAL 544 FORMED A UNION DEFENSE GUARD

Why did Local 544 and not any other union in Minneapolis organize a Union Defense Guard? Everyone knows that Local 544 is the most important union in Minneapolis. It was considered the arch-enemy of the reactionary employers and of the fascists, and everyone with any common sense understood that when fascists were organizing in Minneapolis, they would attack 544 first of all. Our members understood that and that is why Local 544 took the initiative and organized the Union Defense Guard. But it must be remembered that they invited the members of other unions to participate in this defense guard.

THE UNDISPUTED FACT ABOUT THE GUARD

The government witnesses practically proved everything we wanted to prove to the jury on the question of the Union Defense Guard. The evidence on that question was the greatest dud that the government produced. I am only amazed that the prosecutors still insist on injecting the question of the Union Defense Guard into this case. Were they really fair-minded, they would openly state to the jury that the Union Defense Guard is not to be considered by the jury as evidence against the defendants. Their failure to do so is another indication to me that the prosecutors are unable to act independently in this case, and must follow orders of people higher up.

By the testimony of the government witnesses it has been proved that the Union Defense Guard was organized at the time the Silver Shirts became active in Minneapolis late in the summer of 1938. Our evidence that the Minneapolis newspapers carried news items describing the activities of the Silver Shirts has not and cannot be denied. All the government witnesses, with the exception of one, testified that at the Union Defense Guard meetings Vincent Dunne and other defendants explained the necessity of organizing the Guard against the possible attacks of the Silver Shirts.

The only one who testified that Vincent Dunne told 150 members of the Union Defense Guard that the purpose of the organization was to overthrow the government was Elmer Buckingham. If you remember that witness, you remember that he was slouching and constantly looking at the floor. He testified that he did not remember anything about the Silver Shirts, but that he remembered Vincent Dunne, in the presence of about 150 men, state that the purpose of the Defense Guard was to overthrow the Government of the United States.

All I ask is that the jurors ask themselves one question: Is it credible that Vincent Dunne, an intelligent individual, if he actually organized the Union Defense Guard to overthrow the government, would state this purpose at an open meeting in the presence of 150 men? When one takes that factor into consideration and in addition remembers that no other government witness heard Vincent Dunne say anything of the kind, then it becomes clear how much credence can be placed in the testimony of Buckingham.

It is not denied by us that the Union Defense Guard had target practice. One government witness testified that target practice was decided upon as a form of entertainment. I do not even deny that there is a possibility that the members

Everyone Knew That Fascist And Vigilante Groups Were Preparing To Attack Union And Its Leaders

As I said, we have a theory of society, and on the basis of that theory, we are able to predict that certain people will act in a certain way. We know, for instance, that the fascists will at one time or another make an attempt to destroy the unions. When our members saw in the Minneapolis newspapers in 1938 reports that the Silver Shirts were organizing, they also understood that the Silver Shirts were not organizing to benefit the trade unions, but to destroy them. Our members immediately considered what to do to defend the union hall, the union property and the union meetings against the attacks of the Silver Shirts. Whereas the average worker does not think of the future, our members do.

Yesterday, in his argument, Mr. Anderson made a very peculiar remark. "What business," he asked, "is it of theirs to bring the history of the Russian Revolution into the United States?" I am sorry that Mr. Anderson is puzzled by that, but our party members are taught to study everything that happens in the world. What happens in Russia, in England, in Africa, is our business. We do not believe that the United States can be separated from the rest of the world. It is part of the world, and whatever happens in any section of the world affects us. We studied what the fascists did in Germany and in Italy, and because we studied the activities of the fascists there, we know what the activities of the American fascists will be here. And we teach the workers not to wait until the fascists succeed here, as they succeeded in Germany and Italy. We teach workers to organize their Workers Defense Guards and prevent the fascists from doing here what they did in other countries.

of the Guard wanted target practice with the idea in mind of training the members to shoot so that they could defend themselves against any armed attack. They had a perfect right to have target practice even if the intention was to learn how to shoot so that they could defend themselves against any armed attack.

WAS THE GUARD NECESSARY?

Mr. Anderson asks why the leaders of Local 544 did not ask the government authorities for protection. Why was it necessary to organize the Guard? In the first place, even if a person notifies the authorities and asks for protection against a possible attack, he is not thereby prevented from preparing to defend himself. Local 544 could have notified the authorities and then proceeded to organize a Union Defense Guard. There was no attempt to conceal the fact that a Union Defense Guard was organized. The organization met openly. Many people in Minneapolis knew about the existence of the Guard. The *Northwest Organizer*, official organ of all the Minneapolis Teamsters unions, was full of news about it. And there can be no question but that the police knew about it.

Indeed the leaders of Local 544 did not have very great confidence in the authorities and did not rely upon them very greatly for protection against the Silver Shirts. It is evident to everyone that neither the city, nor the state, nor the federal government was favorably inclined to Local 544. Under such conditions the leaders of Local 544 would have been derelict in their duty had they not taken steps to organize a Guard to protect the members and their union.

That the Guard was organized, not for the purpose of overthrowing the government but to defend the union against the Silver Shirts, is proved conclusively by the fact that it was organized when first the Silver Shirts came to Minneapolis, and that it ceased to exist as a functioning organization in the spring of 1939 when the Silver Shirts no longer held meetings in Minneapolis. After 1939 the Union Defense Guard was called together only for the purpose of policing picnics or Christmas parties. Only the prosecuting attorneys can draw from that fact the conclusions that the Union Defense Guard still exists as a functioning guard organization.

Undoubtedly the members of our party in Local 544 took the initiative in organizing the Union Defense Guard. They prepared for any eventuality; and the fact that the Silver Shirts did not attack does not prove Mr. Anderson's point that the Union Defense Guard was not organized to defend the union against the Silver Shirts, but simply proves that "an ounce of preparation is worth a pound of cure." As a result of the readiness of the members of Local 544 to defend themselves, the Silver Shirts did not dare launch any attack.

The Union Defense Guard, the one issue which the government announced with great fanfare before the trial as indicating that there was a real conspiracy to overthrow the government by force, has been completely shattered, and by the government's own witnesses. That the government has not honestly and frankly admitted its mistake is an indication, as I said before, that in this case the government wants a conviction regardless of the evidence.

WHAT IS OUR STAND ON THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION?

The prosecution was very anxious to prove two things about the Russian Revolution — one, that we consider it a great event and were consequently interested in it and, two, that we studied it in order to imitate here the tactics that were used by the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky.

I simply want to emphasize the one fact that should by this time be clear, even to the prosecution. The Russian Revolution was not the result of a conspiracy organized by a minority. It was the work of the immense majority of the workers and peasants supporting the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin and Trotsky.

Conclusive evidence of the fact that the vast majority of the people of Russia supported the Bolshevik Party is the successful struggle of the Red Army, organized by Leon Trotsky, against a powerful combination of forces consisting of Russian White Guards, the Czecho-Slovak army, Japanese, English and even American soldiers. Had the Bolshevik Party not been supported by 95 per cent of the Russian people, it

could never have withstood such a powerful attack.

The second lesson to be drawn from the Russian Revolution, as far as this case is concerned, is that it was a minority of capitalists and landlords who began the civil war in order to prevent the majority from trying to establish the foundations of a new social order.

For us, the Russian Revolution is all-important because for the first time in history the masses of people actually took the productive wealth away from the capitalists and landlords. The foundations of socialism were created by the Russian Revolution. Unfortunately, historic conditions, which I am unable to discuss because they are not germane to the case, permitted a bureaucratic clique under the leadership of Stalin to usurp power and to crush every form of democracy in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Anderson advises the defendants to go to Russia if we are so interested in that country. It should be known, even to Mr. Anderson, that Trotskyists have no chance at all to live in the Soviet Union; thousands of them have been

executed. The best army and naval officers have been executed and this is why the Russian soldiers, in spite of the most heroic resistance, have sustained defeats at the hands of the Nazi army.

MR. SCHWEINHOUT: Is that evidence?

MR. GOLDMAN: No, that is not part of the evidence in this case. It may be disregarded by the jury. It is in evidence, however, that the Trotskyists in the Soviet Union struggled for democratic rights in that country just as we struggle for democratic rights here. Mr. Anderson should know that most of the defendants were born in this country and he above all should know that this country was built by so-called foreigners, by the Irish, Swedes, the Russians, the Hungarians, the Italians, by the foreign workers who slaved in the mines, who built the railroads, who created the most powerful country in the world, now in the hands of the Sixty Families and their satellites. He should know that the Swedes and Norwegians were the ones who settled in Minnesota and helped build up this state. It is indeed a shame that people who were born here or who were raised here and who worked here should be told to get out of this country by the prosecution.

The defendants, of course, as I indicated yesterday, are internationalists. We make no distinctions between races and nationalities. Wherever we are, there we fight to the best of our abilities for liberty and democracy.

"History repeats itself" is a phrase that is frequently heard. But that is true to only a very limited extent. History actually never repeats itself. We do not know what the conditions will be under which the masses of this country will decide to establish a socialist regime. We do know that they can never be exactly the same that existed in Russia in November, 1917. Russia was largely an agricultural country with 80 per cent of the people illiterate, without any tradition of democracy. The farmers in the United States are not the same as the peasants of Russia. We have a right to hope that the higher standards of education in this country and the democratic traditions of the people will prevent the great tragedy that occurred in the Soviet Union subsequent to the revolution — I refer to the usurpation of power by the Stalinist clique that has crushed every form of democracy.

WE WILL DO WHAT THE BOLSHEVICS DID

What did the prosecution succeed in doing by introducing our articles dealing with the Russian Revolution? Has it succeeded in proving a conspiracy on our part to overthrow the government by force and violence? It has succeeded only in proving that we, like the Bolsheviks in Russia, aim to win a majority of the people of this country to our ideas. If that is a "conspiracy", it will be a conspiracy of

WE ARE FOLLOWERS OF MARX AND LENIN

We, of course, must plead guilty to that charge. For us internationalism is the very heart of socialism. We conceive of the world as an economic unit. No nation, no matter how wealthy or powerful, can separate itself from the rest of the world. We are not isolationists. We do not believe that it is possible to isolate this country from the rest of the world. As I indicated to you before, socialism is a world system under which all nations and all peoples will cooperate to produce enough goods to satisfy the reasonable needs of every human being. Every country will produce that which it is best fitted to produce. If a country can produce good machinery then let it not busy itself with producing agricultural products. Let some other country best fitted for the production of agricultural products produce those products and exchange its products for the machines produced by another country. Peace will come to a world cooperating in this way, which will be made possible only by socialism, which will do away with imperialist cliques fighting for colonies and markets.

Lenin as well as Marx was dragged into the case by the prosecution. And again we must admit that we consider Lenin as one of the great men of all times. His greatness lies in that fact that he was willing to stand alone with a few people supporting him in his opposition to the first World War when the vast majority of the Socialists betrayed their principles and supported their own imperialist governments. Lenin in Switzerland and Trotsky in Vienna, in Paris and New York (he was expelled from Vienna and Paris during the war) both raised their voices against the first World War which they designated as imperialistic. Lenin predicted that the war would result in a revolutionary situation in Russia. His prediction came true and when that revolutionary situation actually came into existence, Lenin and Trotsky took advantage of it and led the masses in the revolution that destroyed capitalism in Russia.

THE PROSECUTION ON LEON TROTSKY

The arch conspirator in this case, according to the government, is Leon Trotsky.

How absurd is the idea of designating Leon Trotsky as a conspirator! He has written three thick volumes on the history of the Russian Revolution; he has written innumerable books and pamphlets explaining his ideas about society and current events. Critics have recognized his history of the Russian Revolution as the greatest history penned by any man at any time. He is the type of man who, in addition to being a great theoretician and writer, could and did also organize and lead a great army.

We guarded his life because he meant so much to the movement that the defendants represent. Five or six secretaries gave their lives to guard him. We spent thousands of dollars in an effort to shield him from an attempt on his life that we were certain would some day be made by the Kremlin dictator. We do not deny that he was the one who guided our movement in its general aspects. Many of us visited him in Mexico many times. We asked for his advice and he gave it to us, not on minor questions such as the organization of a Union Defense Guard in Local 544, but on major questions of world importance. He discussed with us the role that the United States is playing and will play in world affairs. His analysis of evidence and his predictions on the basis of that analysis will always remain as evidence of his remarkable intellect. To call him a conspirator is an insult to human intelligence.

YES, WE ARE INTERNATIONALISTS

The prosecution charges us with being internationalists

the vast majority of the people to change the present social order and to organize a government that will best protect their economic, political and social interests.

And should the minority attempt to use violence to thwart the will of the majority, then I hope that the masses will organize their Workers Defense Guard, just as the Russian workers organized their Red Army and just as the workers of 544 organized their Defense Guard to put down the violence of a minority.

It may be of some interest to note that this indictment was written subsequent to June 22, 1941, the date when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. Since then there has been a very close and friendly relationship between the present administration and Stalin's government. It so happens that the former American ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr. Davies, wrote an article recently in a popular magazine wherein he claims that the Trotskyists were fascists and that Stalin did well to have them executed. It is indeed peculiar that whereas Stalin accused the Trotskyists of being fascists, we here are accused of being revolutionists. Different governments have different ways of framing the Trotskyists.

PROSECUTION IS FORERUNNER OF FASCISM

I did not know whether to laugh or to weep when Mr. Anderson, in his opening address, accused us of being Marxists. I was tempted to laugh because throughout this country in every institution of learning there are people teaching history, sociology and even the physical sciences who consider themselves Marxists.

There are many people who claim to be Marxists. We may not agree that they are but at least they claim to be. And for Mr. Anderson to get up in a court of law in the United States and accuse people of being Marxists as if that were a crime is, to say the least, somewhat absurd.

But that accusation also had a very serious connotation. For it is in Germany and Italy that Marxism is considered a crime and where Marxists are exterminated.

I wonder if counsel for the government understood the full significance of their introduction into evidence of the "Communist Manifesto". Their purpose in introducing the "Communist Manifesto" was, of course, to get the jury to convict the defendants. But that means practically banning a book which is being sold in every good bookstore in the United States, which is on the library shelves of every decent library, and which is studied in every university. For if we can be convicted for circulating the "Communist Manifesto" then, in effect, a ban is placed upon it. Hitler started the practice of burning books distasteful to him; and among the first books that he ordered burned were the books of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, including the "Communist Manifesto". I do not mean Mr. Schweinhaut actually wants the "Communist Manifesto" burned but, in effect, by introducing the book into evidence, he condemns it and warns the world not to read or circulate it.

and, of course, we must plead guilty to that charge. For us internationalism is the very heart of socialism. We conceive of the world as an economic unit. No nation, no matter how wealthy or powerful, can separate itself from the rest of the world. We are not isolationists. We do not believe that it is possible to isolate this country from the rest of the world.

As I indicated to you before, socialism is a world system under which all nations and all peoples will cooperate to produce enough goods to satisfy the reasonable needs of every human being. Every country will produce that which it is best fitted to produce. If a country can produce good machinery then let it not busy itself with producing agricultural products. Let some other country best fitted for the production of agricultural products produce those products and exchange its products for the machines produced by another country. Peace will come to a world cooperating in this way, which will be made possible only by socialism, which will do away with imperialist cliques fighting for colonies and markets.

We reject the idea that one nation or one people is superior to any other nation or any other people. To us all human beings are equal. The prejudices that exist are a product of the social system and not inherent in human nature. The brotherhood of man will be made possible and real under a socialist society which will do away with economic conflicts.

Our party belonged to the Fourth International. But when the Voorhis Act was enacted making it illegal for any organization in this country to belong to an international organization, we obeyed the law and severed our connection with the Fourth International. We did not like the law; we were opposed to it, but as a minority there was nothing for us to do except to obey it and try to have it repealed.

NEXT WEEK — GOLDMAN ON THE TRADE UNION QUESTION.

SPECIAL Subscription Offer

valid until February 1, 1942

2 issues of the **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** (20c each)

8 issues of the **MILITANT** (5c each) both for

50¢

THE MILITANT

116 University Place

New York City

The Negro Struggle

By Ernest Williams

Jim Crow in the Blood Bank

Many Negroes have volunteered in response to the call for blood donors — only to find their services rejected. The Red Cross has openly stated that it does not wish, nor will it accept, Negro blood.

The aim of the Red Cross is to collect a blood bank for use by the Army and Navy. The blood is contributed by healthy volunteers, and a large supply is stored for use during war time. Of course there is no limit to the amount which will be necessary as the war progresses.

Protests arose, it is said, from the Southern bourgeois against the use of Negro blood. In spite of the scientific fact that there is absolutely no difference between the blood of whites and Negroes, these prejudiced Southerners insist on interfering in an important phase of defense work.

The Army and Navy then issued a memorandum saying that only blood of white people would be acceptable and that if a Negro soldier needed blood and did not wish to use the white blood which was stored in the bank, then live, Negro blood would be provided. The Red Cross then issued its statement, repeating the same sentiment.

"In some chapters Negroes have generously offered to act as donors in supplying blood for plasma for the army and navy. The Red Cross deeply appreciates their desire to participate in this project.

"However, . . . the American Red Cross is acting pursuant to the requests and instructions of the army and navy and up to this time the Red Cross has been asked to supply only plasma from white donors."

Even in a project such as collecting blood for the Army and Navy, race prejudice rears its ugly head. As usual, there is no scientific or factual basis for this discrimination. To allow the continuation of such practices means to further insult the already mistreated Negro people.

. . . And in the Nurse Corps Too

Jim Crow in the Army Nurse Corps exists as flagrantly as in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, although comparatively little attention has been given to it.

The American Red Cross currently issued a request for 50,000 recruits for its First Reserve. Last week the announcement was made that there would be a quota of "about 50 colored nurses."

Widespread protests against limiting the opportunities for trained nurses solely on the basis of color have already been made. Statements have been made to the *Pittsburgh Courier* by the NAACP, the National Urban League, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, YWCA, as well as many leading individuals, placing these organizations on record against this discrimination.

* * *

Protest Meeting for Ex-Soldiers

The committee which has been set up to free Negro and white soldiers who were court-martialed during the last World War, and are still in United States prisons today, announces a protest meeting Wednesday night, January 7. Many of these soldiers were imprisoned on vague charges of rape, misbehavior, etc., and attempts to investigate the charges, or free these men have met with failure.

The meeting will be held at the Abyssinian Baptist Church, 138th Street, near 7th Avenue. Nat J. Humphries is chairman of the committee, and various other organizations will be represented at the meeting.

Where Is This "New Order"?

In his Dec. 2 column in the *New York World Telegram*, Major Al Williams, Scripps-Howard aviation writer, asks and answers an interesting question about the difference between the "new order" of Hitler and the ordinary old order of capitalism:

"Politicians have been shouting about some new order for Europe. Well, looking over the aviation financial reports from that Continent, I find reason to wonder why and where this new order differs, if at all, from the present order — or disorder — at least as far as money is concerned.

"British, German and Italian aircraft stocks are booming. The German Bruno Arms Works has recently increased its capital and paid a 6 per cent dividend, after allocations to reserves and bonus payments to labor. The Italian Societa Anonima Moto Garelli, manufacturers of aircraft accessories, has increased share capital from 1,000,000 to 2,450,000 lire. Daimler-Benz, German aircraft engine company, reports a customary dividend of 7½ per cent. The Rheinmetall-Borsig, A. G., of Berlin (Goering's concern), manufacturers of aircraft armament, declared a dividend of 7 per cent after allocations to reserves and bonuses to labor, and also reported an authorized capital increase of 25 million reichmarks. The Continental Gummiwerke, a German rubber company, declared a 5 per cent dividend.

"British aircraft manufacturers are running along on some 10 per cent dividends, although the government has attempted to limit excessive war profits by higher taxes. Up to about last July, German profits from munitions had been running so high that Hitler got busy with decrees attempting to limit profits to 6 per cent.

"The boys evidently aren't working just for fun.

"On top of all this come reports that the Berlin Stock Exchange is getting along briskly and London and American bankers are complaining that several Nazi banks are establishing branch offices in occupied territory. Where is this new order, and wherein is it new?"

CHURCHILL URGES NEW LEAGUE

War Labor Policy Favors Interests Of Employers

(Continued from page 1)

tained all the present warring powers save the United States, was disrupted only because one nation did not participate? If the United States could not enforce its own Kellogg Pact which "outlawed" war, it could no more have enforced the Covenant of the League of Nations. If the United States, together with Great Britain and France, could not enforce sanctions against Italy during the aggression on Ethiopia, there is no basis for the argument that a League of Nations with the United States in it would have prevented the present war.

As for the failure to disarm Germany five or six years ago, the question naturally arises: Why wasn't it done?

That is a question which Winston Churchill is not likely to answer. Great Britain itself helped to re-arm Germany. The British steel and munitions industries poured arms and war material into Germany. No group would have fought against the disarmament of Germany five years ago more vigorously than the British industrialists and their political agents.

And why didn't the League of Nations, with or without the participation of the United States, assure Germany access to raw materials?

Because that was the exact opposite of the intent of the League. The very purpose of the League was to ensure the economic

(Continued from page 1)

the employers will have won their point just as much as if last week's conference had adopted it.

The employers are likewise contemplating legislative means to impose their open-shop "freeze-out" program on labor. There is renewed activity in the Senate for the passage of anti-labor legislation. Open dissatisfaction with the outcome of the conference is being expressed by labor-baiting Senators.

An intimation of what the employers and Congressmen are cooking up is given in the *New York Times*, Dec. 26, which reports:

"One Administration supporter, who asked not to be quoted by name, said the failure of the industry-labor conference to arrive at a specific agreement on the closed shop question was like-

ly to result in immediate legislative action to take this question out of the realm of uncertainty."

The failure of the employers to put over their most extreme demand at the conference in no wise constitutes a victory for labor. In giving up the right to strike under the threat of anti-strike legislation, the AFL and CIO leaders at the conference received not a single guarantee that labor's rights and conditions would be safeguarded during the war.

Significantly, the final agreement did not include a chief point of the AFL-CIO original declaration of war labor policy which stated that "all workers have a right to a living wage, as a minimum, sufficient to maintain full efficiency, good health and well-being for themselves and their families." The employers balked

on nothing else. It was needless among nations of good-will and worthless among nations of ill-will."

But it is precisely "good-will" which is proposed as the cement for another League of Nations, that is, "good-will" plus a combination of overwhelming armed force. The nations of "good-will" will police those of "ill-will" until the third world war breaks out.

An international police agency of the democratic powers is exactly what Churchill now means by a new international organization, a new League of Nations to ensure that "the germ centers of hatred and revenge (the defeated nations) should be constantly and vigilantly curbed and treated in good time."

This raises no vision of lasting peace, but a vista of continuing armaments and armies, of "good-will" exercised with the threat of bombs and shells. That is a far cry from the kind of peace the masses of the world want.

To offer the masses at this late date nothing more assuring for the future than a replica of the shoddy League of Nations is an admission of bankruptcy.

Now more than ever it is apparent that the peace of mankind cannot be preserved within the framework of the old economic and social order, whose only stock-in-trade is insubstantial "good-will."

A lasting peace of freedom and security for the masses of the world can come only from an international cooperative social order, in which the conflicts over markets and raw materials, over the domination of the weak nations by the strong, will cease to exist.

The system of world socialism alone can ensure to all peoples access to necessary raw materials. It alone will be free of the economic rivalries that pave the road to wars. World socialism alone will permit that true "association of nations" which will need no "policing" to preserve the peace.

But "with good will" all this "could have been altered and shaped and changed."

Then he goes on to state: "We produced the tin nickel known as the Kellogg Pact. What bathos! Japan signed the Kellogg pact and so did Germany. It was worth nothing because it reposed on the good-will of nations and

Allies, serve only to intensify that danger. The workers who want to defend the Soviet Union must do everything they can to assist the development of that independent revolutionary movement of the masses which will forever destroy imperialism and permit the Soviet Union to go ahead, together with the workers of the rest of the world, to world socialism and lasting peace.

Steel Workers Strike Against Pay-Cut Plan

YOUNGSTOWN, Ohio, Dec. 19 — Last spring the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company tried to introduce the "incentive" system at its rod and wire plant in Struthers. This is a bonus system aimed at establishing more work for less pay. The workers, members of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, CIO, figured that under this system they would receive as much as eight cents per hour less pay, so they turned it down.

After being forced to bide its time, the company used the beginning of the war, when general anti-strike sentiment rose, to put over its plan.

This was met by a strike which began Wednesday morning, called originally by 200 workers in the electric weld conduit mill. These were joined by 1600 other workers, who were also aroused by the refusal of the company to settle grievances. The strike ended this morning when the men voted to return to work at the orders of SWOC officials.

This is a good example of how the bosses use the war situation to take advantage of the workers. It is a perfect example of how strikes are and will be provoked by the bosses, who then cry "treason" and "fifth columnists."

at the idea of writing into the agreement the principle that the workers have a right to a living wage.

The three-point agreement must be viewed as wholly in the interests of the employers. The no-strike policy is entirely in accord with the objectives sought most insistently by the industrialists. They know that labor gives up its most effective bargaining weapon when it sacrifices the right to strike. This virtually eliminates the possibility of the workers winning their just demands through direct negotiations with the employers, who will be able to stall and delay any negotiations without fear of strikes.

Moreover, the experience of the 1918 War Labor Board and particularly the pro-employer attitude of the present National Defense Mediation Board indicates to the employers that they will have little to worry about from any similar agency which the government will set up.

TRIOUBLED PEACE

However, the labor industry peace initiated in Washington is not likely to be untroubled. W. H. Lawrence, Washington political commentator, states in the *New York Times*, Dec. 28, that "there was no disposition in official quarters to believe that all work stoppages would be eliminated" by the conference agreement.

"Experience during World War I and in England since Dunkerque," writes Lawrence, "indicates that scattered stoppages . . . may be expected here in the months ahead. . ."

When the workers learn that the possibility of gaining favorable decisions through a board is decidedly limited, there will be increasing sentiment and pressure for strike action among the rank and file union men.

The rising cost of living is bound to be a constant factor in driving the workers to demand more wages. The bosses recognize this and are pushing for a wage-freezing policy as well as the stabilization of the open shop. If past experiences are any indication, the board soon to be established will strive to keep wage adjustments to the very minimum.

Another problem which will loom ever larger for the workers is that of longer hours and speed-up. Fatigue is bound to take its toll. The accumulated strain of speed-up and long hours will not be felt. The workers will not be as eager as they now are to work over-time.

That there will be labor struggles during this war, despite all the no-strike agreements, is something that cannot be doubted. But it likewise cannot be doubted that the efforts of the workers to defend their rights and living standards will be tremendously hampered by the no-strike program accepted by the labor leaders at Washington.

The system of world socialism alone can ensure to all peoples access to necessary raw materials. It alone will be free of the economic rivalries that pave the road to wars. World socialism alone will permit that true "association of nations" which will need no "policing" to preserve the peace.

Five Men Were Lynched In 1941, Says NAACP Report

NEW YORK, Dec. 26 — Five known lynchings and two fatal attacks on Negroes in Texas courtrooms marked the United States record of mob violence for 1941, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People announced this week.

The NAACP sees the beginning of a new lynching technique in the killing of Bob White in a courtroom at Conroe, Tex., and of Mott Flournoy in a Lufkin, Tex., court by allegedly aggrieved husbands of so-called rape victims. Bob White was shot by W. S. Cochrane, wealthy Texas landowner, June 10, when White was on trial for his life for the third time. Flournoy was stabbed in the chest by Roy Morehouse, Nov. 28.

Other known lynchings recorded by the NAACP in conjunction with Tuskegee Institute, Ala., occurred at Fort Benning, Ga.; Quincy, Fla.; Blakely, Ga.; Georgetown, S. C.; and in Gaston County, near Cherryville, N. C. In Georgetown, S. C., five white youths were found guilty by a coroner's jury of killing Bruce Tisdale, a local mill worker, after

a fight. The verdict was reported Feb. 22.

STILL WEARING AN ARMY UNIFORM

On April 3, Private Felix Hall, a colored volunteer, was found hanging to a tree, clad in the uniform of the U. S. Army, in a wooded section of Fort Benning. The NAACP and the Negro press demanded investigation and punishment of the guilty persons, but the last report of any action was early in May when the War Department was said to have been making an investigation. There has been no report of the results of the "investigation."

The mob rove in Gaston County, N. C., April 13, when Robert Walker was shot to death in his home by four men after an altercation with a white man.

Three white fellow employees of Robert Sapp, a mechanic's helper in Blakely, Fla., took him a short distance out of town and beat him with a club and a heavy piece of machine belting. On May 12 he died from "pneumonia." Sapp was charged with having stolen money from the safe of

Pope Offers The World His Peace Program

(Continued from page 1)

living embodiment of those principles among the earth's rulers, especially to those who have had the benefits of Catholic teachings. There is no lack of devotees of Catholicism among the rulers of men. We can point to that Austrian Catholic, Hitler, to Mussolini, Petain, Franco, and that Nazified man of the cloth, the priest and Gauleiter—President of Slovakia, Father Joseph Tiso.

Is it these men to whom the Pope addresses his appeal to "return to the altars?" Perhaps he addresses himself to Emperor Hirohito, whose own claim to God-hood and "moral principles" goes back three thousand years. Or it may be that the Pope has hopes of converting those who tread in the paths of Protestant heresy, like Churchill and Roosevelt. But on all this, the Pope was perhaps necessarily vague.

We can see what problems arise when we seek for the causes and solution of social evils, such as war, in the moral attitudes of individuals. Where and how shall we begin the moral transformation?

As the Pope himself recognizes, eliminating war through the establishment of a "new social order within the limits of moral principles" is a task requiring "almost superhuman strength and good-will."

Moreover, it is doubtful that anyone — not excluding the Pope — anticipates that any or all of the temporal rulers will re-examine their hearts in the midst of the war, or within a reasonable time thereafter.

WAR DOES NOT STEM FROM WICKED MEN

But even if they should chance to glance within themselves, they would fail to find there the roots of social evil. These evils would continue to exist even should every statesman and dictator attain to a state of moral grace tomorrow. For these evils are not the product of wicked individuals but of the social system itself.

The Pope did cite certain material conditions which must prevail if a lasting peace is to be established. He maintained that the powerful nations must respect the rights of the weaker nations, and particularly, that they must not "hoard the economic resources and materials destined for the use of all to such an extent that the nations less favored by nature are not permitted access to them."

This is a noble sentiment; but just how are the weak nations to go about convincing the strong of their rights? All the Pope indicates on this point is that the weak must trust to the benevolence of the strong.

BENEVOLENT IMPERIALISM

There must be no change, however, he says, in the status of nations, nor the dependence of the small upon the large states. "It is inevitable," declares the Pope, "that the powerful states should, by reason of their greater potentialities and their power, play the leading role in the formation of economic groups comprising not only themselves but also smaller and weaker states as well." Peace everlasting is to be dependent simply upon the exercise of sweet charity by the leading powers.

For our part, we are not as pessimistic as the Pope. We believe that long before that millennium transpires, the masses of the world will have eliminated the causes for economic rivalries and national conflicts by the establishment of a classless international social order. They will have found the roots of economic chaos and war within the social mechanism itself, and will have built an indestructible foundation for peace, freedom and security in the system of world socialism.

his employers.

On May 13 A. C. Williams, 22, of Quincy, Fla., was found dead on a creek bridge, his body riddled with bullets from a band of masked men. Williams had been arrested for an alleged attempted assault on a 12-year-old white girl. The *New York Times*, May 14, reported that four masked men armed with pistols took Williams from the county jail after compelling Dan Davis, an officer, to open the cell doors.

Increasing Pressure Draws Vichy Regime Closer to Nazis

By Max Rosen

The France of Petain and Weygand

The attitude taken by the democracies to Vichy France, and more particularly, to Weygand, has been attributed to the desire to encourage Vichy to resist Hitler's ever-increasing pressure. There cannot be any doubt that Hitler would like Petain to give up the French fleet and the naval and air bases in North Africa. The acquiescence on Vichy's part to any such demands would mean that France had reentered the war, but on Hitler's side.

The Nazi strategy with respect to French "collaboration" has been to win over the French bourgeoisie on the basis of economic interests. The earlier stripping of French factories in order to supply needed machine replacements in Germany, was discontinued or at least not carried out universally. The big plants of French monopoly capitalism (Renault, Citroen) were left more or less intact. Germany has given these plants tremendous orders for the production of all kinds of munitions and war material. In this way the interests of French big capital have been tied to those of the Nazis. Petain is thus under pressure of these interests to "collaborate" more and more fully.

Then too, the same motives exist that caused the French generals and the reactionary bourgeoisie to capitulate quickly to Hitler. If anything, these motives are all the stronger now. The capitalists feared a social revolution more than they feared Hitler. But this fear has not disappeared. The defeat of Hitler would raise the whole question of sovereign power in France. Who can doubt, for example, that defeat for Hitler would bring also the instantaneous disappearance of Petain and the collaborationists?

A Division of Labor

The French defeat in such rapid and stunning fashion left the political situation more or less suspended in air. The first impulse of the capitalists to place themselves under the protection of Hitler, gave way to doubts only when it became clear that England was still in the war. There then took place a division of labor in which the capitalists cautiously pushed out two wings to be ready for all eventualities. Laval-Darlan and Company became the outspoken proponents of collaboration with Hitler who, in their opinion, was certain to win the war. De Gaulle and his followers took their stand with England and the democracies. Petain tried to sit on the fence, facing first one way, then the other, but inclining more and more towards fascist Germany. Weygand was Vichy's timid tentacle reached out towards England, just in case. . .

The removal of Weygand unquestionably marks another step towards compliance with Hitler's demands. Petain would probably move faster in the direction of the Axis if he did not feel that an outright policy of this kind would arouse mass opposition in France. The policy of sitting tight and forcing concessions first from one camp and then from the other, has become out-dated. The contact-man with the democratic allies who could gain such concessions, Weygand, has gone. Furthermore Hitler can no longer afford patience with the defeated foe. His needs have become more urgent with the prolongation of the war. The defeats in both Libya and Russia demand a partial revision of strategy and greater pressure for French cooperation.

The war does not stand still. It continues to spread to ever new sections of the world. The west coast of Africa will probably become a new battle-ground. If it does, then South America may also be dragged into the maelstrom far more actively than was thought possible. United States entry into the struggle has made the issue of control of Dakar a critical one for both camps.

Political, Plus Military, Considerations

The question arises as to whether the role of Weygand is finished for both the French bourgeoisie and for the democracies. It does not necessarily follow that Weygand has been retired for good. It is strange to those who do not understand politics that there should have been any regret on the part of those who believe in democracy at the ousting of Weygand. He was the firmest supporter of all the reactionary and fascist elements of France before the war. It would be a mistake to think that it was only military considerations that motivated Churchill and others in their relations with the general.

Military considerations can never be completely divorced from political ones. The old aphorism of Clausewitz must always be remembered, that war is the extension of politics but by other means. The democratic allies have given recognition to a whole series of "free governments in exile" who represent for the most part only a hope in the future. But the question of such recognition is of great importance. It establishes "legitimacy" for the victorious allies. The aims of the war in the democratic camp include the reestablishing of capitalist governments in the conquered countries of Europe. The nuclei of such governments are maintained at the expense of the allied governments. Not only will they be set up again by force of allied arms—but they will be kept in power by that force of arms. That has been made clear by the Polish-Soviet treaty.

Weygand represented one possibility for legitimist succession in France. De Gaulle represents another such possibility. The allies withheld recognition from De Gaulle so long as there remained any way of influencing Vichy to resist Hitler. Should Petain capitulate completely, the allies will lose no time in giving complete recognition to De Gaulle and aiding him to seize as much of the French colonial possessions as possible — before Hitler does so.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 1 Saturday, January 3, 1942

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALconquill 4-8547

Editor:
FELIX MORROW

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.

"Entered as second class matter February 13, 1941
at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of
March 3, 1879."

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, but under control of the trade unions. Special officers' training camps, financed by the government but controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
2. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
3. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces and the war industries—Down with Jim Crowism everywhere.
4. Confiscation of all war profits. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. For a rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living.
6. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
7. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
8. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.

AFL Workers And Our Military Policy

The Navy Department has announced that on Dec. 7 and afterwards, hundreds of members of American Federation of Labor building trades workers at Guam, Midway and Wake Islands participated in actual fighting alongside of the regular armed forces.

The AFL *Weekly News Service* reports that these workers, "sent out to the Pacific outposts to build fortifications and airplane bases", "flung down the tools of their trade; picked up whatever weapons were at hand and fought valiantly. . . ." The fate of the more than 400 AFL workers at Guam and Wake, captured by the Japanese, is still unknown.

The Trotskyist proposal for a system of "military training for the workers, financed by the government, but under the control of the trade unions," has met opposition from many corners. But if ever there was a verification of the correctness of a policy, it is the case of the AFL workers who came to erect buildings and found themselves fighting for their lives in the mid-Pacific.

We have pointed out again and again our opposition to sending workers into battle, ill-trained and equipped.

In modern, total warfare, the old distinction between the soldier and the civilian is rapidly diminishing. The workers cannot hide from the war. Where they do not go to it, it comes to them. We are opposed to exposing workers, as well as soldiers, to conditions of warfare for which they are totally unprepared.

Our answer is: Train the workers in the military arts. Teach them how to protect themselves. Introduce a bill into Congress appropriating money for this purpose. And let the workers get this training under the direction and control of their own organizations, the trade unions.

Island In Dispute

Loud were the howls of "shame" and "appeasement" from the liberal press when the State Department harshly protested the occupation of the Vichy-governed islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon by De Gaulle's "Free French" forces and rushed assurances to Hitler's puppets in Vichy that matters would soon be settled to their satisfaction.

The De Gaulle government is an officially recognized ally of the Allies. The Administration recently extended lease-lend aid to it. Canada recognizes it as the government of France. Above all, the Allied leaders have hailed General De Gaulle as the coming democratic liberator of France.

Moreover, the people of the islands voted by a 90 per cent majority in a plebiscite for the government of De Gaulle. True enough, this plebiscite was held with four warships in the offing and armed guards all around — not the most democratic way to decide questions — but not even Vichy has argued that the results are not a genuine expression of the sentiments of the population of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

However, the State Department is not moved by abstract sentiments. The people of the islands may hate the fascist-dominated Vichy government. They may prefer the De Gaulle government. But back under the control of Petain and Darlan must go the fisher-folk of St. Pierre and Miquelon, insists the State Department.

For the Vichy regime still has a navy: And it

is obvious that the State Department would like to have Vichy — and its navy — on the side of the Allies. In its conduct of this war for democracy, the State Department is most anxious to maintain friendly relations and even secure a formal war alliance with the regime which ruthlessly abolished the democratic rights of the French people.

It appears that the "so-called Free French", as the State Department calls them, are to be only a reserve, to be utilized in case Vichy, despite all the blandishments of the State Department, decides to definitely cast its lot with Hitler.

Truly this war for democracy seems to be moving in a mysterious way its wonders to perform.

Enemy Of Production

A Gallup Poll report issued Dec. 27 reveals the startling fact that sicknesses due largely to food deficiency caused an estimated loss of 24,000,000 man-days of work during the four week period Nov. 24-Dec. 20. 3,200,000 man-days of work were lost in direct war production.

The survey, which covered a cross-section of the entire working population, brought out the direct connection between the standard of living of the workers and their health. "A high proportion of people in poor health have poor diets," states the report, and adds:

"More than one-third of American families, or a total of approximately 12,000,000 families, say that lack of money for food impairs their health."

Here is glaringly revealed the great enemy of production. That enemy is capitalism itself, which breeds poverty and malnutrition and terrific loss of working energy even in so-called boom times.

But where is the whoop and the holler from irate Congressmen about this "defense sabotage?" They're too busy protecting the employers from strikes — strikes which have resulted in a fiftieth of the loss in working time due to sickness — to fight the ravages to health, life and production that stem from the ruthless exploitation of labor by the employers.

Navy Jim Crow

"With the announcement that Navy voluntary enlistments have fallen so far below par that it may be necessary to draft men for service, the first question that occurs to Negro Americans is, 'What will the Navy do about colored draftees?'"

"If Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox thinks he has solved the race problem by putting colored sailors below stairs and holding them to servants' jobs he is going to have to change his mind. Far from solving anything, like all forms of segregation, this policy on the part of the U. S. Navy has served only to emphasize the hypocrisy in the appeal for national unity and the glowing pictures of the Navy as 'democracy's first line of defense.'"

Strong words? Certainly these words in the December issue of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People *Bulletin* are strong. But who is there to argue that they are not wholly justified?

Like everyone else, the Negro people in this country have been asked to make sacrifices in the name of a war for democracy. But the term democracy means different things to different people. To the employers it usually means the right to exploit labor and amass huge profits and to control the rich markets of the world. To some politicians it means the right to misrepresent the interests of the majority of the people who elected them. To the Southern poll-tax Congressmen it means the right to rule and legislate in the name of people who are not permitted to vote for or against them. Obviously when such people talk about fighting for democracy, they do not mean the same thing as a worker who wants to protect his living standards, his trade union, his civil liberties.

But what must it mean to the Negro people to be told that they must be ready to give up their lives for a democracy and at the same time to be told that they must fight for this democracy on the ships of the United States only as mess stewards, scagoing dishwashers and bootblacks?

What must it mean to them to be told that not only must they be second-class citizens in time of peace, so far as jobs and political and social equality are concerned, but that they must also be second-class sailors, not trained to fight but only to serve meals to the fighters?

What must they think about this kind of democracy, and what must they think about the kind of democracy they will have to go back to after the war is over?

The indignation of the Negro people and the N.A.A.C.P. on this score is so obviously justified that no one — neither Secretary Knox, nor his Bureau of Navigation — has ever dared to try to convince them that the Jim Crow policy of the Navy is correct and in the interests of democracy.

All Knox ever said on this question before the war was that these are not times in which to conduct experiments. And all his Department has said since the war began is that "there has been no change (in this policy). . . and for the time being no change is contemplated."

Since receiving this reply, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has asked President Roosevelt, as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, to issue an immediate order to the Navy to abandon its Jim-Crow policy.

It is a request which will be fully supported by all those forces to whom democracy is not just a slogan or an abstraction, but an objective truly worth fighting and dying for. It is a request which must be supported above all by the labor movement, which together with all minorities has the most to lose from Jim Crowism, segregation and discrimination, wherever they exist.

On Guard Against The Stalinist Provocateurs!

Whole Labor Movement Must Be Alert to Oppose Stalinist Moves To Incite Lynch Terror Against Their Working Class Opponents

By ALBERT PARKER

The *Jewish Morning Journal*, a newspaper published in New York, on Dec. 24 printed the following account of the connection between the Stalinists and the attacks of the most reactionary forces in Britain on the revolutionists:

"Since the former Ambassador to Russia, Joseph E. Davies, came out with his well-known attack accusing the late Leon Trotsky of being in alliance with Japan and Germany to attack the Soviet Union, several of the more reactionary newspapers in London have begun a strong attack against the English Trotskyists."

"The Sunday Dispatch," one of the most reactionary newspapers in the country, which is also not free from anti-Semitism and formerly carried on a scurrilous campaign against the Communists, has now come out with a demand to intern all the Trotskyists because they are Stalin's enemies and hidden friends of Hitler's."

JUSTIFIED SUSPICION

The *Morning Journal* is not a radical paper; as a matter of fact it is probably the most conservative of the Jewish dailies. Yet it cannot help feeling suspicious of the motives of the Sunday Dispatch in its attacks on the Trotskyists. For the Dispatch, part of the Tory Rothermere chain, is truly one of the most reactionary newspapers in Britain, long noted for its attacks on the labor movement and the Jewish people.

But the *Morning Journal* tells only part of the story. The Stalinists play a much more direct and recent part in these provocations than the mere authorship of the slanders retailed second-hand now by capitalist spokesmen such as Davies and Harry Hopkins.

Not only do the Stalinists provide the reactionaries with lies about the Trotskyists from the Moscow frameup trials of 1935-37, but they also manufacture new lies and incitements for use by the reactionaries today.

The Sunday Dispatch of Nov.

16, for example, printed, as verification of previous slanders against the Trotskyists, a new Communist Party manifesto which declared in part:

LYNCH INCITEMENT

"Don't be deceived by traitors who call themselves 'Socialists' to cover up their Fascist activities."

"They aim to create disunity among the British people when all must pull together for the common good."

"They have nothing in common with the Labor, Trade Union or Communist organizations. They are doing Hitler's work in Britain. They are more deadly than paratroops. . ."

The manifesto concludes with the admonition: "Treat the Trotskyist as you would a Nazi."

Thus do the Stalinists provide lynch-inciting arguments for the very same anti-labor newspaper which only a few months ago was calling for the complete suppression of the Stalinists and urging its readers to treat the Stalinist as they would a Nazi!

Thus do the Stalinists, whose own "Daily Worker" was suppressed and still is suppressed by the government which they are now supporting, appeal for suppression of the anti-fascist revolutionists by the same government and reactionary forces whose repressive measures were directed at themselves only yesterday and will most likely be directed at them again at the next turn of the wheel!

USE WAR HYSTERIA FOR THEIR OWN ENDS

The labor movement in this country must be on guard against Stalinist frameups, lies, incite-

ments to lynch violence and governmental repressions. Stalinism is the syphilis of the labor movement not only in Britain but everywhere throughout the world. Its frameup and slander machine operates not only in the Soviet Union, but in the capitalist countries as well.

Especially now, in the spirit of general hysteria created by the war situation, militant workers everywhere must be on the alert to prevent the Stalinists, who cover their most reactionary policies with loud protestations of patriotism, from arousing lynch spirit against working class opponents of Stalinism.

Undoubtedly their provocations against the Trotskyists will be the fiercest because the Trotskyists are the most uncompromising opponents of their treachery and degeneration. But it would be a mistake to assume that such incitement will be directed at the Trotskyists alone.

Already in this country they have launched the most vicious attacks against the Norman Thomas Socialists, in no way connected with the Trotskyists or their policies. And they will not stop there. In their drive for totalitarian repressions against all opponents of their policies, they will stop at nothing. Trotskyists and Socialists are likened to the Nazis today, and tomorrow it will be any militant worker or group who wants to offer resistance to the attacks on their rights or living standards launched by employers who, like the Stalinists, are only too ready to utilize the war situation and hysteria to achieve their anti-labor objectives.

That is why all organizations and all workers who sincerely want to defend civil liberties and workers' rights in war time as well as in peace, must rally together against the provocations of the Stalinists.

How British Bosses Get Rich On Cost Plus 10%

(How the leading British industrialists have been milking huge profits out of the war program and safeguarding their monopolies at the expense of production is told in the following excerpts from the pamphlet, "Production Committees and the Soviet Union", published by the Revolutionary Socialist League, British Trotskyists.)

The British Iron and Steel Federation includes all the biggest armament firms and before the war was built up with the aid of the banks into "one of the tightest and most restrictive monopolies this country has ever known." (*Economist*, May 10, 1940) It is directly represented in the War Cabinet by Sir Andrew Duncan, its former executive head and director of the Bank of England. If, therefore, profiteering and inefficiency are established, the Government, the banks and the industrialists are all implicated.

The industry was built chiefly on imported iron ore from Scandinavia and Spain. These sources are no longer available but there is a determined resistance to developing home produced ore. This would involve a change of technique and reduced profits. The steel monopolists also hope that after the war there will be a return to the old methods, and the foreign ore-fields in which they are financially interested will resume paying them dividends.

Monopolization and Government subsidies have prevented the modernization of the notoriously out-moded British blast furnaces. The number in operation dropped from 394 in 1922 to 200 in 1937. Even as compared with 1937, the *Daily Mirror* estimates that present production is less by 20 per cent. It can clearly be seen that this "restrictive monopoly" is responsible for the shortage of steel.

Excessive sums are put aside for "depreciation" with Government sanction. Money spent on extending or improving the factory (thereby adding to the real assets of the owners) is calculated as costs and profits allowed on it. All income tax and surtax is paid before the dividend is declared. Other huge sums are put aside for exceptional war risks. All modifications to new types of armaments are included in costs. Production is held up for months while ridiculous modifications suggested by so-called experts are piling up costs. Expert legal advisers are engaged to falsify the books and seize on every loophole for increasing profits. This is called "robbing the National Exchequer". It is a game reserved entirely for capitalists.

But this is not the end of the profit making. The big firms sub-contract much work. Several different sub-contracting firms complete one part in the process

of production. These smaller firms are usually subsidiaries of the larger one. At each stage in the manufacture the same process is gone through and the cumulative profit piles up to record heights. And the representatives of this gigantic swindle occupy directing posts in the government.

THE CHAOS EXTENDS

Even the scrap iron merchants have their federation which insists that no scrap can be sent directly to the factories. This means that hundreds of trucks and wagons are engaged in centralizing scrap before taking it back again, often to the district from which it came. It is also a common practice for firms controlling various stages in different plants to have their steel supplied only by their own subsidiaries. These may be located hundred of miles away and adds to the chaos in the transport and railway systems. It may be that ample supplies are quite close at hand but this would mean yielding some of their profits to a rival and that is out of the question.

The government, of course, has power to prosecute firms for gross mismanagement and, in fact, several prosecutions have taken place. But these prosecutions have been against small firms which the monopolies want to drive out of business.

And now, in the interests of withholding information from the enemy, a number of firms are to be exempted from publishing accounts. The enemy in this case is the workers in the war industries who are becoming suspicious of the orgy of profiteering. Despite all the tricks of the legal experts and accountants the published figures show a continual rise in profits. This, plus the inefficiency and mismanagement of which every engineering worker has experience, is causing deep dissatisfaction.

Subscribe to the
"Fourth International"

Goldman's Article In The March 29 Militant

(In the recent Minneapolis "sedition" trial, Albert Goldman's article in the Mar. 29, 1941 MILITANT was introduced as evidence of the Socialist Workers Party position on war and fascism. During Goldman's final argument to the jury, now being printed in this paper, he made numerous references to this article. In response to numerous requests, we are reprinting it below.)

QUESTION: When you say that this is an imperialist war both on the side of Britain and Germany do you mean to say that you don't care who wins and that you contemplate a victory of Hitler without being disturbed by it?

ANSWER: It means nothing of the kind. When we characterize the war as imperialist, and say that all of the imperialist countries involved are fighting for their imperialist interests and not for or against democracy, we thereby simply indicate that it is impermissible for us as revolutionists to support either side.

QUESTION: But then it means, does it not, that you are willing to sit back and permit Hitler to conquer Britain and the United States?

ANSWER: No, it does not. It simply means that our task in this war is different from the task of the imperialists. They want to defeat their rival to protect their imperialist interests. We cannot and must not support them in such a task. Our task is to organize the working class for the purpose of taking over power and transforming this war into a real war for democracy.

QUESTION: But you claim to be revolutionary defeatists and that means that you want your country defeated by Hitler, isn't that so?

ANSWER: Not at all. Any one who says so either does not understand what revolutionary defeatism is or he is simply a vicious slanderer. We are more interested in defeating Hitler than is Churchill or Roosevelt. Both of these representatives of the capitalist rulers of their country can easily come to terms with Hitler.

QUESTION: But are you not helping Hitler win by not supporting the war?

ANSWER: Not in the least. All that we are doing now is educating the workers to our point of view. We are telling them the truth as to the character of the war and what to do to win the war against all the capitalists. Both our members and the workers whom we influence must go to war and do what they are told by the rulers of this country. So long as we do not have a majority behind us we are in no position to do anything except obey orders. It is true that we do not assume responsibility for this war in any way whatever, but to draw from that fact the conclusion that we thereby help Hitler win, lacks logic and common sense. The conduct of the war against Hitler is in the hands of Roosevelt and Churchill representing the American and British capitalists. That is unfortunate, and we are trying to convince the majority of the working class that they should take the power of government and the conduct of the war into their own hands, but we defy anybody to show that we are doing a single thing that helps Hitler, the greatest enemy of the working class.

QUESTION: But I am given to understand that, if the U. S. went to war against Hitler or against Japan, your party would try to prevent war materials from being shipped for the purpose of fighting the Japanese or the German armed forces.

ANSWER: I don't know who gave you to understand such a nonsensical idea, but I can tell you that there is absolutely nothing to it. We do not believe in individual action nor in the action of small groups. As I said before, until we gain a majority to our ideas there is nothing for us to do but to educate workers until we get a majority.

QUESTION: Then there is nothing to the idea that your policy of revolutionary defeatism has anything to do with sabotage?

ANSWER: Absolutely nothing. Reactionary red-baiters and those who know nothing about our program try to connect us with sabotage. Revolutionary defeatism to us is a political concept. It simply indicates that we do not support the war and that we carry on the class struggle at home regardless of the fact that it might have some effect on the front.

QUESTION: Doesn't that mean, then, that you would do certain things which interfere with the conduct of the war?

ANSWER: It means that we advise the workers to continue their struggle against the bosses at home, and if that affects the conduct of the war the blame is entirely on the bosses and their government. Why should the workers not take advantage of the increase in production due to war orders in order to organize themselves and better their conditions? The bosses are making huge profits; the cost of living is going up. It would be extremely foolish for the workers to be influenced by the propaganda of the bosses and refrain from demanding better conditions because such demands interfere with the conduct of the war. Let the capitalists grant the demands and then there will be no interference.

QUESTION: But then, if you will succeed in getting a majority of the workers behind you and try to take over the government, the capitalists will resist and will that not give Hitler a chance to win the war?

ANSWER: I don't think so, but if we have a majority of the workers behind us, we must take that chance. Because if the workers take over power, Hitler is sure to be defeated, while if we let the capitalists stay in power, Hitler's chances of victory are much greater. Look what happened to France. The capitalists were in control. And they led the war in a miserable manner and capitulated in a miserable manner. Why? Because important sections of the French capitalist class sympathized with Hitler and other sections were afraid that a French victory would lead to a workers' revolution. In general, the capitalist class cannot inspire the masses with the confidence and the determination to fight to the death against fascism. A workers' government has a thousand times better chance to win the war against Hitler. If the capitalists resist the attempt of the working class to take over power they will, to that extent, interfere with our struggle against Hitler; but it is far better for us to take that risk than to let the capitalist class continue to rule. For if the workers let the capitalists rule we will be conquered by fascism — either by a victory of Hitler or of the fascists in our own country.