

160 Protest Against C. P. Lynch Campaign In Mexico

— See Page 4 —

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI.—No. 8

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1942



FIVE (5) CENTS

FALL OF SINGAPORE SHAKES EMPIRE

Political Crisis In Britain

An Editorial

What are the fundamental reasons for the catastrophic defeats in the Far East? What fundamental changes must be immediately carried out by Britain in order to put an end to the defeats?

These are the two key questions which stared Churchill in the face when he addressed the British people on Sunday and Parliament on Tuesday. But Churchill did not even pose those questions, much less answer them. He talked about everything except the fundamental questions.

Churchill's latest speeches demonstrated that at bottom he is just another "Colonel Blimp". He is just another old-school-tie-boy. His policy is as bankrupt as that of his predecessor, Chamberlain. It is now abundantly clear that the British working class will seal its own doom if it permits the Churchills to remain in power.

The British working class, for its own salvation, must give the correct answers to the questions posed by the Far Eastern defeats. The fundamental reason for the defeats is that the 430 million peoples of India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya do not consider themselves allies of the 45 million people of Britain. On the contrary, they look upon the British as their oppressors, and will not lift a finger willingly to help the British. For hundreds of years Britain has squeezed them dry and so long as the only alternatives are British overlordship or Japanese overlordship, the great masses in the British colonies will not fight on behalf of either master.

These facts, verified to the full by the latest events in the Far East, dictate the answer to the question what fundamental changes must be made.

Alliance With Colonial Peoples

No matter what the Churchills do, they will not be able to establish a firm alliance with the great masses in the British colonies. No belated formula of "dominion status," or even "independence" will satisfy the colonial peoples. Such promises from the Churchills will mean nothing to India; the 400 million peoples of India will consider them merely wartime maneuvers which, if Britain is victorious in the war, will be withdrawn leaving India in slavery just as before. Likewise, if India now moves to national freedom and achieves it, — the Churchills are now impotent to prevent it — the peoples of India will feel no friendliness at all to the Britain which kept them so long in subjection.

Hence, it is clear, a real alliance between the British masses and the peoples of India can be brought about only by the establishment of a Workers' Government in Britain. The nationalization of British industry and the formation of a workers' state — these are the measures, and the only measures, which can establish a real alliance between the British proletariat and the Indian masses.

A Workers' Government of England

A Workers' Government of England can say to the people of India:

"We recognize your national independence and shall fight side by side with you against all those that threaten your national freedom. We have nothing in common with the Churchills who have oppressed you for centuries. On the contrary, we have overthrown the Churchills. We and you are the real enemies of fascism, military dictatorship, and of capitalism everywhere. We and you together shall be able to call upon the German proletariat and the masses of Japan to join with us in revolutionary war against all the imperialists everywhere."

Such a message from the proletariat of Britain would receive an immediate response from the great masses everywhere. It would be a clarion call to an alliance of the exploited and oppressed peoples of the whole earth to put an end for all time to imperialism, and its capitalist roots, which were responsible for two World Wars in twenty-five years.

The Workers' Government is the only way out for the British working class. That is no longer a mere theoretical argument but an immediate life-and-death necessity. Tomorrow, likewise, it will become clear that the only road for the United States, too, is a Workers' and Farmers' Government.

This is the lesson of Pearl Harbor and the Philippines, of Malaya, Singapore and Burma.

Today's political crisis in England can have only one progressive solution: a Workers' Government. Anything else means to continue the disastrous imperialist war of the Colonel Blimps.

Grace Carlson Files As SWP Candidate For Mayor

Will Offer Socialist
Program In St. Paul
Municipal Campaign

ST. PAUL, MINN.—In the coming St. Paul municipal elections, the Socialist Workers Party will present as its mayoralty candidate Grace Carlson, one of the 18 recently convicted in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial.

In her fifty-word campaign statement submitted February 17th when she filed for office, Comrade Carlson announced: "I solicit support on a platform concerned with great national and international issues, as well as with purely local issues. I stand for international socialism: for the principles of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. I believe only a socialist government can bring a lasting peace, and freedom and plenty for all."

Prior to the primary election on Tues., March 10, Comrade Carlson will present a rounded socialist program dealing with the basic issues of the campaign.

Comrade Carlson will oppose the incumbent, Mayor John McDonough, prominent Democrat who also has the backing of the right-wing Farmer-Laborites or-

Candidate For Mayor



GRACE CARLSON

ganized in the St. Paul "Labor-Progressive Association."

This is the third successive municipal campaign in which the Socialist Workers Party has been represented by a mayoralty candidate. In 1938 the SWP candidate received over 600 votes; in 1940 the vote was considerably increased.

In 1941 Grace Carlson first ran for public office as the candidate of the Trotskyist Anti-War Party (Socialist Workers Party) for United States Senator in Minnesota. She received a state-wide vote of 8,761, a large portion of which came from St. Paul. Her

vote was larger than the combined vote for the candidates of the Socialist and Communist Parties.

Comrade Carlson's campaign manager will be her sister, Mrs. Dorothy Schultz. A down-town campaign headquarters will be chosen this week, and plans laid for public campaign meetings and radio broadcasts.

The final election will be held Tues., April 28. Special issues of THE MILITANT, containing the socialist platform on which Comrade Carlson is campaigning, will be widely distributed thruout the city.

House Committee Knives Federal Aid To Jobless

Governors Also Gang Up Against Bill to
Increase Relief for Priorities Victims

An all-out employers' offensive to block federal aid to millions of jobless victims of priorities and delayed war plant conversions, is receiving strong support in Congress.

A majority of the House Ways and Means Committee last week expressed their intentions of knifing an Administration proposal for a skimpy \$300,000,000 appropriation to provide supplemental federal unemployment compensation to the war-made unemployed.

Six state governors, representing the views of every state administration in the country, appeared Monday before the Ways and Means Committee and put their reactionary shoulders behind the drive to make the unemployed starve on present state unemployment compensation allowances, which average \$10 a week.

Behind this vicious campaign is the determination of the boss class to keep unemployment relief down to starvation levels, in the belief that this will make the workers willing to take jobs at any wage, and to forego all

ine and adequate federal social security legislation.

CONGRESS PARALYZED

Tens of thousands of radio workers will be added to the 300,000 auto workers already thrown out on the streets when the government order to cease virtually all radio production goes into effect on April 1.

But Congress, which at a nod from President Roosevelt has poured \$115,000,000,000 into war appropriations, is paralyzed at the mere suggestion of a few hundred millions for jobless workers.

Current unemployment is the direct consequence of the policies of the big corporations. These corporations created the need for priorities by causing monopoly-induced shortages. They stalled plant conversion in order to hijack free new plants from the government. Yet it is the workers not the bosses, who are being smeared.

Typical of the attitude of the reactionaries, is the statement of Minnesota's Governor Stassen, who stated before the House committee that he was opposed to the proposed measure: "In this darker hour, America cannot afford to put a premium on idleness."

The frenzied efforts of the state officials to prevent passage of the Administration's extremely inadequate measure is an expression of their fear that this might somehow force them to raise their own unemployment insurance standards.

Henry Beers, chairman of the Connecticut Unemployment Compensation Commission Advisory Council, is reported in the New York Times, Feb. 15, to have stated that the proposed bill "might be a Social Security Board attempt to raise unemployment compensation standards generally."

After sitting back for five

Crisis Growing In Both England And Colonies

Singapore's fall has precipitated a profound political crisis in England and throughout the British Empire.

The British masses are bitterly criticizing the government. Their resentment at the manner in which the government and ruling class are conducting the war, and particularly at the British colonial policy, is finding reflection in every British newspaper and in Parliament itself.

Churchill's radio address last Sunday was an attempt to blunt the edge of this criticism. But he failed to answer the basic questions raised by the defeats. He demanded that the masses continue to support the government whose policies have led to these defeats, and thereby made it clear that he intends to continue these same policies.

While not daring to deal with the basic causes of this crisis, Churchill was compelled to admit its extent. The British Empire by itself, he admitted, is powerless to stave off defeat. He could visualize no alternative to such defeat but to entrust the fate of the Empire entirely to American military might — a confession that the British Empire is being reduced to the status of a second-class power and a satellite of the American ruling class.

If the pressure becomes strong enough, Churchill may attempt to ally mass resentment by reshuffling his cabinet a bit and giving a few posts to elements who may be palmed off as "friends of labor," etc. His statement to the House of Commons on Tuesday would indicate that for the time being at any rate he intends to forego even this gesture and to bludgeon Parliament into silence on the whole question of the defeats.

But neither superficial shifts and changes in the government, nor smothering Parliamentary discussion, will allay the crisis.

FERMENT IN THE COLONIES

For the crisis of Churchill's regime is inextricably linked with the crisis of British rule in the colonies, particularly in India, where the movement for national independence can no longer be side-tracked.

This is reflected in the most recent statement of Pandit Nehru, head of the All-India Congress, who said on Feb. 15 that "the Indian people will continue their policy of non-support of Britain's war and that 'he saw no solution to India's problems except a full transference of power to the national hands of a responsible people.'" (A. P. dispatch).

The Singapore defeat loosens the British grip upon India, and thus weakens the main force opposed to the freedom of the Indian people. This defeat has helped to explode the arguments of the Indian agents of Britain that British rule is necessary in India in order to protect India from fascist invasion. It is clear to the Indian people that they can depend only on their own strength to save them from fascist enslavement.

The military effect of the fall of Singapore will be to strengthen the position of the Axis powers. But this temporarily favorable circumstance for the fascists will be more than offset by the forces unleashed in the upsurge of colonial struggles for national and social liberation.

The fall of Singapore is a tremendous disaster for the British ruling class. But only case-hardened colonial rulers of the British type could dream that because of the reverses they have suffered the colonial peoples will suspend their struggle for freedom.

On the contrary, this struggle will unfold still more and increase in intensity.

British Rulers Were Afraid To Arm The Natives

Refused to Apply 'Scorched Earth' Policy;
Turned Property Over to Japanese 'Intact'

The fall of Singapore is symptomatic of the internal degeneration of the British Empire and its ruling class.

This imperial power, which boasted of its rule over 400,000,000 natives of Asia alone, has met a stunning defeat at the hands of a second-rate industrial power, Japan.

At the crucial moment, the British ruling class could not command the support of its own colonial subjects. Instead, as events in Singapore and Malaya testify, it aroused only their apathy, indifference and outright hostility.

Even in the face of catastrophic defeat, the British rulers did not dare to arm the native peoples in Singapore and Malaya because they feared that an armed native populace would be as great a menace to their power as to the Japanese.

Even at the last moment, they refused to follow a "scorched earth" policy because they were thinking ahead to the time when they might again regain control of the exploitation of the mines and factories and fields.

Harold Guard, one of the last American correspondents to leave Singapore just before its surrender, in a United Press dispatch from Batavia, Feb. 16, sums up the Singapore defeat in the following words, deleted from most newspapers carrying his dispatch, including the New York Times:

"Many believed the Japanese flood could have been stemmed by the natives early in December if there had been anyone to encourage them or even anyone to whom they could turn for leadership. But administrative officials displayed little interest in building up a native organization or of encouraging natives to prepare for their own protection."

Only after the Japanese forces had advanced deep into Malaya, did the Singapore Free Press, an organ of the British ruling class, dare to discuss the arming of the native peoples, declaring: "No invader relishes the task of subduing a population plentifully supplied with grenades, rifles, pistols and tommy-guns." The belated and hypocritical character of this suggestion was noted by the correspondent who cabled this account to the New York Post, Jan. 15, in his observation that such an appeal was "unthinkable and certainly unmentionable before the invaders passed Kuala Lumpur."

FEARED EVEN CHINESE
Cecil Brown, whose truthful CBS broadcasts from Singapore

United Front In Singapore

A London dispatch in the New York Times, Feb. 16, relates the information that "a Japanese Domei Agency dispatch late tonight said that under the capitulation up to 1,000 British soldiers would remain in Singapore City to maintain order until the Japanese Army completed occupation."

On Feb. 17, the New York Times published another London dispatch, announcing that Japanese troops had entered Singapore, relieved the British authorities of their obligation to "maintain order" and "immediately began 'cleaning up seditious elements.'"

When it comes to preserving "law and order" and suppressing "sedition" among the colonial peoples, British and Japanese military authorities display full international amity and accord. On this ground, even in the midst of war, both find a basis for co-operation.

were banned by the British authorities as "inimical to local morale", last week reported in a broadcast from Australia:

"Up until the day of the war, the Colonial Administration was unable to distinguish between Japanese as potential enemies and the Chinese as Allies. Prominent Chinese at the outbreak of the war beseeched the British to give them guns to help fight. A Chinese battalion was recruited 10 days ago."

Even the Chinese in Singapore, (Continued on page 2)

WDL Asks Aid To Save Odell Waller's Life

The Workers Defense League last week issued an urgent appeal for support to save the life of Odell Waller, Negro sharecropper sentenced to die on March 20 for the self-defense slaying of a white landlord in Virginia.

Signed by Alfred Bingham, A. J. Muste, Mary White Ovington, Freda Kirchwey, Frank Kingdon, George E. Haynes and Carl Raushenbush, the appeal pointed out that Waller's case is being sent to the Supreme Court of the United States. A new trial is being asked because Waller was not given a trial by a jury of his peers; the jury which tried him was selected from the upper ten per cent who could afford to pay the Virginia cumulative poll tax of \$1.50 a year.

NEED MORE TIME
TO PREPARE APPEAL
The appeal continued:

"Young Waller is scheduled to die March 20, which does not give us time to properly prepare our brief to the high Court. We need your help here. Please wire or write to Gov. Colgate W. Darden, Jr. (Richmond, Va.) asking him to grant a stay of execution. Ask friends to do the same. Send us a copy of your message."

"To have the stay do him any good, funds must be provided to help the League take the steps that can save Waller and indict the poll tax before the U. S. Supreme Court."

"Will you help save the life of this Negro sharecropper? He is guilty of one offense — he dared to defend his rights in his crop against victimization by a white landlord. Prominent attorneys are donating their services. You can do your part by mailing a generous contribution now."

Every opponent of Jim Crowism and the poll tax, every trade union and workers' organization, must respond to this appeal of the Workers Defense League. Do your part to save Waller's life. Donations should be sent to the Workers Defense League at 112 E. 19 St., New York City.

WPB To 'Streamline' Contract Letting

The recent disclosures about war profiteering on government contracts have worked under the skin of Donald Nelson, "czar" of the War Production Board.

Last week he came forward with a plan which he claims will put brakes on such profiteering.

As outlined before the Truman Senate Defense Investigating Committee on Feb. 12 by Douglas MacEachie, WPB Director of Purchases, the chief point of the plan is:

"That war procurement contracts be placed by negotiations rather than upon the basis of

competitive bids."

According to Nelson and the WPB, war contract profiteering is due to competitive bidding, a system which presumably hinders the playing of favorites, gives every company a chance for a contract, and provides that the company agreeing to do the work at the lowest cost shall get the contract.

HOW BOSSES GOT AROUND
"CONTRACT BIDDING"

Of course, competitive bidding hasn't prevented war profiteering, because of collusion between the big corporations making the bids, and between the corporation agents and the government procurement agencies.

Nelson's "cure" for this is to have the WLB's corporation dollar-a-year men simply hand-pick the companies to get the contracts and "negotiate" with their fellow corporation agents seeking contracts.

What this will result in, however, is that contracts will go where they "belong," to the handful of big monopoly corporations, and that the WLB will be saved the necessity of considering the claims of smaller companies offering to do the work at lower cost and thus perhaps forcing down contract costs.

"RE-NEGOTIATIONS"

If some smaller company

should then howl about a contract going to a monopoly at a high figure, the Nelson plan proposes that the WLB have the power to "re-negotiate" any contract. So the same dollar-a-year men will "review" their own contracts and possibly make them a little more water-tight.

What Nelson offers as a system of contract-letting to prevent war profiteering is actually a system of "negotiations" between the monopolies and their government agents, whereby the big corporations can keep their hands on all the juicy war orders and avoid the annoyance of interference from smaller competitors.

AFL Publication Urges Rising Scale Of Wages

Tie Wages to Price Rises, Say AFL Heads; But Oppose Real Struggle for This Demand

Automatic wage raises to keep the workers' incomes abreast with constantly rising living costs are proposed in the latest issue of the monthly review of the American Federation of Labor.

Wages should be tied to living costs, declares the AFL, calling for an upward readjustment of wages each month based on the percentages of increase in living expenses recorded in the Labor Department's index.

This is a timely and sound proposal, offering the only immediate solution to the problem of drastically curtailed real wages due to steadily mounting prices.

Workers generally are aware that securing fixed and limited pay increases does not necessarily ensure more real income. When prices are jacked up, such fixed wage gains are wiped out in a short while, and the workers find they are able to buy even less than before. A sliding upward scale of wages, constantly adjusted to price rises, is the only immediate means of protecting wage standards.

But the AFL leaders suggest no effective program of union action for realizing this absolutely essential and imperative demand.

The attitude of the employers and government to the idea of a rising scale of wages has been already expressed by Wayne L. Morse, in the opinion he presented before the War Labor Board on Feb. 12.

WLB'S POSITION

Morse, who is one of the so-called "public" representatives on the Board, wrote that "labor, especially workers in the highly paid brackets, have no right to expect that they should receive wage increases during this war

period which will enable them to keep day-for-day pace with upward changes in the cost of living."

The AFL leaders, who claim that a rising scale of wages is desirable and essential, are opposed to effective union action to obtain this demand. They have agreed to a no-strike policy and are curbing all militant expression in the union ranks.

Instead, their method of "fighting" for this demand is limited to pleading before the War Labor Board, a majority of which are employers and pro-employer "public" representatives like Morse, whose opposition to the plan has been stated in advance.

The workers must secure the rising scale of wages. But they won't get it through the servile policies of the union leaders. Only by rejecting the leadership's policies—adopted behind the backs of the workers to begin with—and by refusing to surrender all the traditional policies of militant union action, including the right to strike, can the workers hope to achieve this and their other justified demands.

(Continued from page 1)

let alone the Malaysians, were viewed with fear by the British administrators, to whom anyone lacking a white skin is a subject inferior and an enemy ever ready to challenge their rule.

"Under the circumstances," says Fletcher Pratt, in the New York Post, Feb. 9, "the British announcement that they have enlisted 1,000 untrained Chinese youths for the defense of Singapore is nothing but a bitter commentary on the Colonial office, which has spent so many years in not trusting the natives with weapons."

NATIVES' ATTITUDE

Little has been reported in the capitalist press on the attitude of the natives in Malaya. But that little is sufficient to indicate the natives' indifference and hostility to the British cause.

In a dispatch from Singapore on Feb. 6, C. Yates McDaniel relates that "alarm over the morale of Singapore Asiatics increased in some British quarters. There were forthright admissions that the flight of Europeans might do more damage to morale among Singapore's Chinese and Malay-

an population than all the bombs the Japanese have dropped."

"At Penang," reports Cecil Brown, "they (the British), refused to evacuate anyone except Europeans. All Chinese, Malaysians and Indians were left to their fate."

"That was the beginning of considerable difficulties with the natives in Malaya."

The United Press correspondent, Harold Guard, relates in a Singapore dispatch New York Times, Feb. 8:

"I am permitted also to mention what is called here the 'Asiatic labor problem.' On the initial trip of newspaper correspondents to the front two weeks ago, our train was operated by soldiers and sailors. For two weeks I have been without a servant."

WOULD NOT FIGHT FOR BRITISH MASTERS

We can only guess at what Guard was not "permitted" to say. Undoubtedly, it would have been a picture of the native workers seizing the first chance they could get to escape their British masters, regardless of the fate that lay in store for

them at the hands of the Japanese imperialists.

No, the Malay natives did not want Japanese rule; but they would not risk their lives to defend the "whiskey-swilling planters and military birds of passage" (London Daily Express, Jan. 15) who had "an apathy to all affairs except making tin, rubber, money, having stengahs," (Cecil Brown, Life, Jan. 12).

They would not risk their lives for a ruling class which found the cost of air-raid shelters too "prohibitive" in Singapore, and whose attitude toward the natives is exemplified in the following dispatch:

"SINGAPORE, Feb. 10 (AP) — The first Japanese bombs fell on Singapore nine weeks ago — Dec. 8.

"Yesterday — Feb. 9 — authorities announced their intention to build public air raid shelters at government cost in congested areas."

WHAT BRITISH DEFENDED

The British Colonial administrators might have proclaimed to the natives that the British were fighting to preserve "freedom" in Malaya, but the natives could see what their rulers were really defending.

What the British held dearest was their tin mines, rubber plantations and properties. These they sought to preserve at all costs, even abandoning them intact to the enemy in the hope that later they might regain them.

"The rich men again could not bear to see their property destroyed (in Malaya). They boasted their land instead of scorning it," bitterly complained the London Sunday Express.

Cecil Brown reported in his first Australia broadcast:

"He (a British officer) said the scorched earth policy in the first four weeks of the war was virtually a figment of the official imagination. Vast storehouses of food were left untouched for the Japanese. Sampans, boats, barges, and even steamers were undamaged."

"While it was stated that the British were destroying everything in the path of their retreat, facts told a different story. To give one instance, it was announced that they destroyed everything at Kuantan airdrome on the east coast. Two days later the RAF was sent over to bomb the undamaged hangars and the Japanese aircraft already using the field."

Hanson W. Baldwin, New York Times commentator, gives typical expression to what the ruling class feels has been lost in the Singapore defeat:

"With Singapore goes the greatest tin smelter in the world... and with Singapore and Malaya and Sumatra under the Japanese flag, our chief foreign sources of rubber and tin will have been captured by the enemy."

"WHITE MAN'S POSITION" He adds: "Politically and in prestige the blow is heavy — a blow that has struck at the very basis of the white man's position in the Orient."

"The white man's position in

How Britain Scorched Earth In Singapore

Final commentary on the so-called "scorched earth" policy pursued by the British in Malaya and Singapore is the picture, featured throughout the nation's press, of the beautiful, large, modern, completely untouched Ford plant in Singapore where the Japanese and British commanders met to arrange the surrender terms.

Harold Guard, one of the last American correspondents to leave Singapore, in a United Press dispatch from Batavia, Feb. 16, points out:

"Tokyo's announcement that the surrender took place in the Ford factory... indicates that the British did not apply the scorched-earth policy there any more completely than elsewhere."

the Orient" — the power of the white British ruling class to govern and exploit the native peoples — this is the loss in the Far East sustained by the British, and not the "four freedoms" which never existed there!

How staunchly the British attempt to cling to this position of "white supremacy" is indicated in the observation of Fletcher Pratt, speaking of the obsta-

cles to making Chiang Kai-shek commander of the forces of the United Nations in the Far East:

"... The old-school-tie spirit of the British Army would be outraged at the thought of serving under an Oriental high commander, even to win the war." (New York Post, Feb. 12).

Treated with contempt as inferiors, looked on only as beasts of burden to work for the enrichment of their British masters, it is no wonder that the native peoples of the East are not "outraged" at the thought of British defeat.

WILL STRUGGLE ONLY FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

The colonial peoples want an end to all oppression. They will not fight willingly to keep the British in control of tin and rubber resources. They will gladly fight to the death for their national independence from all oppressors.

Given their freedom and independence, the peoples of India, Malaya, Burma, the East Indies, would join with the Chinese to form an unconquerable host of a billion human beings who would sweep the Japanese imperialist armies into the seas.

Singapore could have been impregnable under the banner of national and social liberation for the Malayan peoples. But that was a banner which the British hated as much as the emblem of the Rising Sun.

GANGING UP ON BILL TO AID UNEMPLOYED

(Continued from page 1)

Weeks calmly watching Congress toss his proposal all over the lot, President Roosevelt finally called in some of the House leaders to suggest that they pass his measure, assuring them that it contained not a hint of "federalization". But the House Ways and Means Committee promptly kicked his "plea" under the table, an action they would never have taken if they felt that Roosevelt intended to make a stand-up fight on the issue.

Roosevelt had already indicated a month ago that he was willing to "compromise" on the issue, when he first proposed an appropriation of up to \$600,000,000, and promptly halved it at the suggestion of Congressional leaders.

The dangers that Federal aid might be indefinitely delayed or blocked altogether has served to obscure the vital issue of the amount of unemployment insurance supplements actually contemplated.

INADEQUATE RELIEF

The Administration's measure — which the Ways and Means Committee has stated it will not even permit to go on the House floor — would add benefits of 50 per cent to present state allowances, bringing the total benefits up to not more than 60 per cent of average wages and not more than \$24 weekly.

In effect, since the average of present state compensations is \$10 weekly per worker, this would provide not more than an additional \$5, a total of \$15 per week for a worker to sustain his family during a period of soaring prices.

Representative Doughton of North Carolina, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has proposed giving the unemployed only an additional 20 per cent of their state allowances — an average of \$2 weekly.

It is notable that these same Congressmen took no such begrudging attitude when they recently voted themselves handsome lifetime retirement pensions.

ADEQUATE RELIEF

The labor movement must take some real action to put a stop to this Congressional stall. The unemployed need adequate relief, and they need it right now.

Organized labor must insistently demand an appropriation of no less than \$1 billion to provide relief equivalent to the full wages received on the job and for the duration of unemployment. Just as has been customary with many leading corporations, which pay full time on the job while training workers in new skills, the government must provide every jobless workers with training for new jobs at war work, paying them full union wages during the training period.

How A German Worker Might Answer Manifesto Of German-Soviet Committee

By ANTHONY MASSINI

The Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee is reported in the 'Daily Worker', Feb. 10, to have made public a manifesto to the "workers of all the countries enslaved by Hitler Germany to aid the struggle against the Nazi war machine by all means at their disposal to bring nearer the day of their liberation." The manifesto was signed by N. M. Shvernik, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of the USSR, and Sir Walter Citrine, general secretary of the British Trades Union Congress.

The following is a letter which an advanced worker in German might write in reply to the manifesto of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee:

Dear Sirs:

It is not necessary for you to remind the German masses of "all the crimes, animal cruelty and conscious destruction and devastation committed by Hitlerism". The German people, and particularly the German working class, know better than anyone else what it means to have to live under the Nazi regime.

They have known what it means for more than nine years now, ever since Hitler was able to take power with the permission and connivance of the German capitalists and the aid of British capitalism.

Nor is any real purpose served by your calling on the German masses to "struggle against Hitlerism". In the first place, the revolutionary workers of Germany have all along fought against Hitlerism as best as they could, and they are trying to take advantage of the war to intensify this struggle and bring wide sections of the masses into it.

They did this before Hitler took power, when he was preparing to take power and when the German Shverniks were disorienting them with their treacherous theory that the reformist Socialist Party and the trade union leaders were the immediate enemy, and when the German Citrines were telling them that the only way to fight Hitler was by supporting the same Hindenburg who later appointed Hitler as Chancellor.

They did this after Hitler came to power, when many of their leaders ran away to other countries and left them to live under

the Nazi terror and they did this during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact too when the Stalinists ceased all opposition to Hitler and placed the sole responsibility for the war on British and French capitalism.

WHAT DO YOU WANT THEM TO FIGHT FOR?

In the second place, your appeals to the German workers to fight against Hitlerism are ineffective not only because they remember where your advice led them in the past but also because of what you want them to fight for now.

They still remember what happened after the last war when the Treaty of Versailles was imposed on them by the victorious Allies. They remember the starving children and unemployment and bankruptcy and inflation that resulted from it. And there are many who understand that it was this Versailles Treaty and its results which laid the ground for the rise of fascism and made possible the victory of the Nazis.

Do you really believe that you can get broad masses of the German people to struggle against Hitlerism only so that another Versailles and the rise of another Hitler will follow?

The German people are seeking a way of overthrowing Hitler, but they will listen only to people and parties who tell them how to do it so that they will not again have to go through the experiences of 1918-1942. What do you tell them, you gentlemen who have proclaimed your adherence to the Atlantic Charter,

the shrivelled caricature of Wilson's 14-Points?

"The hour is approaching," you write in this manifesto, "when the armed forces of all the Allies will come to your aid to overthrow the yoke of Hitlerism." But what will you substitute for this yoke? The trade union bureaucrats have not answered this question anywhere — but the spokesmen of the "senior partners of the United Nations" have already made abundantly clear what they intend, and none of you have voiced any objections.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE "UNITED NATIONS"

Germany is to be disarmed after the war and "kept disarmed" this time. The United States and Britain intend to "police" the world for the next hundred years. Do you think that you are going to get the German workers to fight Hitlerism so that this will be the outcome? Perhaps you do, but the German workers do not feel that they are criminals who have to be policed.

And what perspectives do the masters of the United Nations hold out for Germany itself? Your Anthony Eden told the world on Jan. 4 — and he was repeating an idea put forth by Stalin in his speech of Nov. 7 — that "the trouble with Hitler was not that he was a Nazi at home. The trouble with him was that he would not stay at home." Again you did not object. But the German workers do not believe that Hitler was all right as long as he stayed "at home" and oppressed them.

What can they expect will happen inside of Germany if it is left up to Eden and Stalin whose chief complaint is that "you can't do business with Hitler abroad." What reason have they for expecting that Hitler will not be replaced by a Quisling who may for some time be content to remain at home and oppress the masses?

We revolutionary opponents of German capitalist reaction and war are doing everything we can

to successfully conclude the "struggle against Hitlerism" of which you speak. But our task is made all the more difficult by you and your kind.

For when the German masses see the perspectives you hold out to them in the name of a struggle against Hitlerism, it becomes easier for Hitler and Goebbels to their propaganda that a defeat for Germany inevitably means another Versailles.

YOU MAKE THE JOB HARDER

When we tell the German workers to organize for the workers' revolution against their oppressors, they want to know what about the British workers, will they help them or will they join with the British capitalists to put down the German revolution?

We tell them that the British masses will support such a revolution, and that it would inspire them to renew the struggle against their own oppressors — but how hard it is to convince them when the official spokesmen of the British working class endorse the perspectives of the Atlantic Charter!

You tell the German masses in your manifesto that "the liberation of all freedom-loving peoples will come with the utter defeat of Hitlerite Germany."

But how can they believe it when they see with their own eyes and ears that the British government refuses to grant freedom to the "freedom-loving peoples of India and Africa, and that the British preferred to lose vast sections of their empire in the Far East to even granting the colonial peoples in those countries the right to arm and defend themselves?

Whatever your intentions are, gentlemen, your manifesto is of no help whatever to the struggle of the German masses against their capitalist oppressors. If it will help anyone, it will help Hitler who is desperately trying to convince the people that the only outcome of the war can be either his victory or the victory of another Versailles.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN BRITAIN AND USSR

But let me make one thing clear about my criticism of Stalinist policies. We German revolutionaries who bitterly oppose Hitlerism see a great difference between the war of Great Britain and the war of the Soviet Union.

Britain is fighting a war to maintain its empire and the right of the British capitalists to exploit that empire. It is a reactionary war, just as the war of the German capitalists to seize parts of that empire and exploit it themselves is a reactionary war.

But the war of the Soviet Union is a just war, a progressive war, a war worthy of the support of the workers of the world. The USSR is still a workers state, cruelly degenerated under the Stalinist bureaucracy, but still a state where the means of production have been and remain nationalized, and where no capitalists are able to exploit the masses or conduct a war for their own profit. Despite Stalin and against Stalin, we defend the Soviet Union and the conquests of the October Revolution, and we

try to get the German masses to understand that they too must come to the defense of the workers' state.

This task is difficult enough as it is because of the rule of Stalinism, which repels the masses. But it becomes ten times as difficult when Stalin and his Shverniks themselves try to identify the war of the Soviet Union with the war of Great Britain, when Stalin too endorses the Atlantic Charter and the war aims of Churchill and Eden.

And when in your manifesto you say that the war of Great Britain as well as the Soviet Union is "a just war", you help to confuse the German workers still further. Instead of awakening and organizing sympathy for the Soviet Union, you succeed in repelling the sympathies of those German workers who would gladly fight for a workers state but would never support a war of British capitalism.

THE KIND OF MANIFESTO THAT IS NEEDED

Your manifesto declares: "On behalf of the 30,000,000 workers organized in Soviet and British trade unions our Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee calls upon you to intensify the struggle and exert your efforts to hasten the overthrow of Hitlerism."

I have told you why it is useless and ineffective and how it is harmful. The only kind of manifesto that will arouse and inspire the German masses will be one that does not play with talk about "the overthrow of Hitlerism" but shows the German masses that the workers outside of Germany are ready to help them replace Hitlerism with socialism. Such a manifesto would say:

"German workers and soldiers! We extend our solidarity to the first victims of German fascism."

"We repudiate the Atlantic Charter and all treaties and agreements aimed at penalizing the German people for the crimes of the German ruling class."

"We are fighting for the establishment of Workers' and Farmers' Governments throughout the world."

"We intend to forever abolish war by the creation of a Free Socialist Federation of free nations collaborating with each other economically and politically against poverty and for the security of all peoples."

"We call upon the German workers to join us in this struggle and promise all our aid to the German people in their revolution against capitalist war and reaction."

"We will not permit anyone to aid the German capitalists against such a revolution or to deprive the German masses of the benefits of such a revolution."

We German revolutionaries are waiting for a manifesto of this kind to come from the spokesmen of the workers outside of Germany. Meanwhile we are continuing our efforts to arouse the German masses against Hitlerism. But we have no illusions that the manifesto we want will be forthcoming from the Citrines and Shverniks or that the revolution against Hitlerism will be achieved with their assistance.

Subscribe to the 'Fourth International'

HAVE YOU READ SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

The official court record of James P. Cannon's testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial, with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

116 Page Pamphlet . . Only 10 Cents!

This pamphlet — really a book — is an elementary introduction to the ideas of socialism.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK

The Negro Struggle

By Ernest Williams

Cause of Poverty in Harlem

Despite all the talk about "national unity" and increased job opportunities resulting from the war, one-third of the Negroes in Harlem are still unemployed, on relief, or on WPA. This applies to 117,000 out of Harlem's 350,000 Negroes, according to the statement of City Councilman A. Clayton Powell, Jr. Powell also accused employers of investigating the amount of relief allowances, and then offering to hire a Negro for only \$5 more a month.

At another conference held a few weeks ago in the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, the Birth Control Federation of America was told that crime, ill health and poverty were caused by the lack of planned parenthood. The speaker was Dr. Dorothy Ferebee, chairman of the family planning committee of the National Council of Negro Women.

She stated that the Negroes' need for family planning was greater than any other group in Harlem or elsewhere, using as an example the public attention attracted by the so-called "crime wave" of recent months. "Crime, ill health and extreme poverty," she continued, "cannot be eliminated in Harlem or anywhere else, until the principle of planned parenthood is fully recognized and applied."

Now certainly facilities for and information about planned parenthood and birth control clinics are extremely necessary and represent great progress over the days of superstition and ignorance. Especially among the poorer and unemployed sections of the working class, where children must be born into a world of poverty, and hardship, parents have found it imperative to curtail the number of the family.

But to suggest that the raising of large families is the cause of poverty and crime is as cruel a distortion of the facts as to say that wars are necessary to kill off large sections of the population. It is not lack of birth control that leads to poverty, but it is usually poverty that leads to birth control.

Why is there more poverty and disease in Harlem than in other parts of the city? Not because Negroes have larger families, but because every member of those families, no matter how large or small, faces discrimination on every front.

Because of discrimination, Negro workers have a far greater proportion of unemployed. They are not permitted to work in most defense industries. Because of discrimination, their children are not provided with adequate schools and recreational facilities. They cannot grow up with the same ambitions and opportunities as white children; too many doors are closed to them. BECAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION — here then is the root of the "crime, ill health, and extreme poverty" in Harlem.

To say that birth control is necessary to eliminate poverty implies that there is "not enough to go around." But the United States is a country rich in natural resources. Its potential ability to produce food, clothing, and the necessities of life is boundless. Therefore the problem is how the masses can benefit from the goods which they produce and can produce, and bring up healthy, well-fed children.

The Negro people, as well as the entire working class, must realize that as long as America's Sixty Families own and rule the wealth of the country, there can be a future only of more poverty, unemployment, and disease, and the discrimination which causes even greater misery for the Negro masses will continue unchecked. To fight poverty the Negro people must fight Jim Crow, and capitalism itself. No amount of birth control can ever serve as an acceptable substitute for that kind of fight.

Stalinist Desertion

Many people have not understood how completely the Communist Party has deserted the struggle for equality for the Negro people since it came out wholeheartedly for support of the war last June. One of the chief reasons this feature of their betrayals has been obscured has been the fact that they continue to devote a good deal of their literature to the Negro question.

But an analysis of their literature shows although they still write about the Negroes and address their appeals to them, the nature of their propaganda has changed completely. Instead of calling on the Negroes to fight for their rights in war time as well as in peace, 98% of their message is concerned with explaining to the Negroes why they must join the poll-tax Democrats and the lily-white Republicans in support of the war.

We urge you to look at James W. Ford's latest pamphlet, *The War and the Negro People*, as a good example of this. It is 16 pages long; but it has room for only 2 or 3 sentences dealing with the problems of the Negro people in the war. In one — the closest he comes to a program for the Negroes, — he says Negroes must "urge that the barriers of discrimination and Jim Crowism existing against them in the industries and in other phases of national defense be done away with. . . . Urge! That's real fighting language! Apparently he thinks "urging" the Jim Crow-bosses will do a lot of good now, although, it never seemed to work before.

Listen to this sentence from the same pamphlet, P. 14: "Four hundred years of Negro slavery are nothing besides Nazi persecution of Jewish people, peoples of the occupied countries, and 'races' of so-called 'inferior' status."

Maybe Ford and the Stalinist party now think that 400 years of slavery are nothing, just because Hitler uses some of the same methods used against Negroes in the South. But the Negro people aren't ready to forget their own problems just because other peoples are oppressed too. All that Ford's latest pamphlet will make them forget is that the Communist Party ever fought on behalf of their interests.

Two Candidates For One Job

Strasser and Grzesinski--Torchbearers Of German "Democracy"

By M. STEIN

When the "United Nations" declaration was signed at the beginning of the year, the State Department invited "appropriate authorities which are not governments" to support the principles embodied in the Washington document.

The object of the invitation is more or less obvious. The twenty-six governments and governments-in-exile who signed this declaration cannot possibly represent a complete picture of the world to come. What is to become of the Axis countries? Who are to be the torchbearers of democracy within them?

Suppose the war ended in victory tomorrow. The countries that have been occupied by the Axis powers would immediately make a long distance telephone call to Washington and ask: "Who are our democratic rulers?"

Thereupon they would get busy and arrange for the triumphal return of their conquering heroes: Poland would get back its Sikorsky, Holland its Queen, Norway its King, etc., and, as the story goes, democracy would reign forever after.

But what would happen in Germany without a Hitler; in Italy without a Mussolini; in Japan without the Mikado?

One must anticipate the worst. It is even possible that the workers, soldiers and farmers might take the situation into their own hands and do what the Russian masses under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky did in the last world war. All the gains on the battlefields might thus be lost on account of a couple of obscure agitators.

This is why the State Department, which has been noted for

its foresight, issued this invitation. Now, they feel, is the time to seek out the torchbearers of democracy for the Axis countries, and prepare them for the huge tasks and heavy responsibilities that lie ahead.

TWO CANDIDATES FOR THE JOB

One of the first to respond was Dr. Otto Strasser. From his refuge in Montreal he issued a statement reported in the New York Times, Jan. 6, declaring that "he had advised United States Secretary of State Cordell Hull that the Free German movement, of which Dr. Strasser is chairman, adheres to the Declaration of Washington to defeat Hitlerism."

Before we even had a chance to properly examine his record and references for the candidacy of torchbearer of democracy, another candidate for the same job made his appearance. The New York Times for Jan. 9, tells us:

"An association of Free Germans, consisting of leading representatives of the Weimar coalition that governed the German Republic, has been organized here and has declared its intention to adhere to the allied joint agreement signed by the twenty-six

United Nations on Jan. 1 in Washington.

"This declaration and the formation of the organization, whose certificate of incorporation was filed with the Department of Justice, . . . was announced yesterday, . . . and issued by its president, Albert C. Grzesinski, former Prussian Minister of the Interior."

The fact that we have two candidates for one position makes it incumbent upon us to scrutinize their qualifications more carefully than we might otherwise be disposed to do.

STRASSER'S "CREDENTIALS"

Otto Strasser is a man of action. While a soldier in the Imperial German army in the last war, he was decorated several times for acts of bravery and advanced himself to the position of Lieutenant. He had no use for Reds. When the last war ended in the German revolution and the Communists together with the left Socialists formed the government in Bavaria, he fought in the army which the monarchist Colonel von Epp together with the notorious Rohm organized for the purpose of overthrowing the revolutionary regime.

Later, the same Rohm plus Otto Strasser's brother, Gregor, plus Hitler, banded together to form the Nazi party. Otto came into the Nazi party later, — about 1925. For five years thereafter the Strasser brothers were the leaders of the Nazi party of North Germany, with headquarters in Berlin. Hitler operated

from Munich and reigned supreme in the party in South Germany.

In 1930 Hitler came to Berlin to eliminate the condition of dual leadership. Otto Strasser balked and quit the Nazi Party to organize his own Black Front, the "true" representative of Nazi ideology. His brother Gregor remained with Hitler but was shot together with Rohm and countless others in the purge of June, 1934. Otto Strasser fled Germany shortly after Hitler came to power and has been carrying on oppositional activities. His program is based on the argument that Hitler has betrayed the principles upon which the Nazi party was founded.

WITHOUT 'CHAOS'

It is clear from this that there is much to be said in favor of Otto Strasser as the leader of the "Free German" movement. A man like him might be able to take Hitler's place without creating any chaos in the country. His background and ideology make it possible for him to assume the leadership of the Nazi Party and institutions without drastic or revolutionary changes and merely carry out the tasks which the British rulers had hoped Hitler would carry out, i.e., leave the "civilized" countries and their colonies alone and expand Germany at the expense of the Soviet Union.

As a matter of fact, Strasser has been displeased with the war because Germany did not follow this course from the beginning.

He proposed long ago an alliance of Germany with Poland for an attack on the Soviet Union. A certain Britisher by the name of Douglas Reed was so impressed with the idea that he wrote a book about Otto Strasser which was published here in 1940.

This Reed is also very much impressed with Strasser's brand of anti-Semitism. It is far more refined than Hitler's and much more acceptable to the western world. Reed thinks it was a mistake for the British rulers to be taken in by Hitler. If they had helped to bring Strasser into power instead, the shape of things would have been different.

GRZESINSKI'S QUALIFICATIONS

But if we consider Albert C. Grzesinski, on the other hand, as a candidate for the one best suited to lead the "Free Germans", we will find very much in his favor. He is a man who has had variegated experience in government administration. From the post of union official he was quickly catapulted to the post of Undersecretary of State in the Prussian Ministry of War in 1919, Minister of the Interior of Prussia, and numerous other high posts including that of Police President of Berlin which he held on two occasions.

He was the Police President during the turbulent years from Nov. 1930 to July 1932, when the Nazi hordes were roaming the streets of Berlin breaking up workingclass meetings and institutions. Grzesinski is a Social-Democrat of the Scheidemann-Noske school. He was intimately tied up with the Weimar Republic which pursued a policy of merciless struggle against proletarian revolutionists on the one hand, and toleration for the Nazis, on the other. This was the gang that drowned the Spartacus uprising in blood and murdered Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

In a word, Grzesinski stands or falls on the record of the Weimar Republic which paved the way for Hitler; Strasser stands for a Fourth Reich founded on the original Nazi program, but without Hitler.

To keep the record straight and to emphasize our objectivity, we will mention the fact that William Green heads a committee of sponsors for Grzesinski. Also, while Otto Strasser has a certain claim to priority because he was the first to claim the leadership of the "Free Germans", Grzesinski had the foresight to file a certificate of incorporation with the Department of Justice, thus giving his claim an added touch of legality.

These are the facts about the two applicants for the leadership of the "Free Germans". Since nobody as yet asked us to state our preference, we will leave the choice entirely in the hands of the State Department and the President: You pay your money — you take your choice.

By way of footnote, however, we should remark that the German masses may be presumptuous enough to have their own say in the choice of their leaders. When they do have their choice — they will choose the scrap-heap for both Strasser and Grzesinski.

Lessons Of The Last War

By A. ROLAND

The second world war has now been on for two and one half years. The first world war lasted more than four years, but it offers no lesson as to the length of time the present war may last.

The United States was an active participant in the last war only at its tail-end. This country has just entered the new war, but its entry will not hasten the ending of the war as it did last time. Quite the contrary, this war may prove to be far more prolonged than the last one, at least in its world aspects.

The advocates of the last war to end all wars, the supporters of Wilson, included the vast majority of American liberals. Among them there was no group more enthusiastic to make the world safe for democracy than that which found a voice (not without the kindly assistance of a partner of J. P. Morgan, Willard Straight) in the magazine, *The New Republic*.

Every phase of the war found its democratic rationalization in this magazine. Its writers were close to Wilson and played up constantly his almost messianic role. But alas! The swing in opinion after the war, the opposition to the Versailles Treaty, found nobody more disappointed than the leader Wilson, than these same New Republicans.

George Soule was at that time one of the younger "finds" of the Alvin Johnsons and Walter Lippmanns. It seems fitting and proper that Soule should now write a special twenty-four page section of the self-same New Republic devoted entirely to the "Lessons of Last Time".

Naturally the function of the writer is to present a new liberal program which will avoid the pitfalls that beset democracy — indeed succeeded in snaring it — last time. Soule leads up to a presentation of his "new order" of society by a discussion of America's role in the first world war, the causes and aims of this war, and the terms necessary for a peaceful world order. There could be no more opportune time than the present for an examination of a program to accomplish so great an aim.

AMERICA AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Why did the United States enter the first world war? A Senate committee that investigated this problem long after did not fail to show the connection between the economic interests of the big financiers and the entry into the war. The loans made by Morgan and others to the Allies would have been endangered by a German victory. The issue of freedom of the seas existed with respect to both sides in the war, but the economic interest decided that this issue should be pressed against Germany rather than England. Furthermore it did not suit American capitalism to have a Germany dominant on the continent of Europe and taking away from Great Britain a part of her empire.

But Soule will not accept eco-

nomic, materialist causes as the primary ones. He says: "In my opinion neither economic interest, natural sympathy, propaganda nor incidents at sea could alone have united the people behind the great crusade. Though all these played a part, it was the ideals expressed by Wilson that led us to accept the war."

This may sound like an evasion of the issue, but it is the liberal's vague manner of making a statement, or getting round a fact. He tells us not what caused the war, but rather what led Americans to "accept" the war.

AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

Only the United States stood and stands in a different category for Soule. The reason for this harks way back to the foundation of American democracy.

"The nation was founded in an effort to escape the evil heritages of the Old World and give man a new opportunity." Yes, America was founded to create a new society free from the feudal, absolutist remnants of the European nations. If we except the institution of slavery (a big exception indeed), then the United States saw from the start the development of a pure and progressive capitalism, continually expanding its forces of production.

But time has caught up with the entire world system of capitalism, which also did not stand still while American capitalism was expanding. What was once the path of progress is no longer so. The first world war, as Soule forgets carefully to tell us, was the end of an epoch, the end of one epoch and the beginning of another.

The "American kind of promise" to which Soule refers had its fulfillment in the creation of the greatest technology the world has ever seen. With that fulfillment, any further "promise" has vanished from the present form of American and world society.

The first world war started the entire world on a decline. The second world war only hastens the decay and endangers civilization all the more. Whoever fails to see this with all its consequences, cannot hope to construct a program for the future, a program for a peaceful new order.

The pious wish of Soule's will

not avail him. "We do not want now to be caught up in, or be the inheritors of, the imperialisms, the political intrigue, the absolutisms in thought and action, that have brought Europe to its deathbed." Yet this liberal proves that the only course for the United States is to take on the entire world problem of economics and politics.

LOSING THE PEACE

Soule tells us that Wilson lost the peace after helping to win the victory in the last war. He failed to carry out his fourteen points in the peace treaty. Were these points intended seriously, or were they intended as propaganda for the purpose of keeping revolutionary Russia in the war (after the Bolsheviks had issued their invitation for a general peace on similar but more specific points), and for the purpose of undermining German morale? The outcome does not speak in favor of any serious attempt at self-determination of nations, or peace without indemnities.

"Apparently" Soule tells us, "he knew about the secret treaties when he decided to go in and either did not regard them seriously or expected to discard them when the time came." Certainly it was the Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia that made known the exact nature of these imperialist treaties, at the same time repudiating them publicly.

We are told that Wilson made a number of blunders that were responsible for his "defeat". In his campaign for the treaty at home he was opposed by "sinister forces". What were these sinister forces? The entry of America into the League of Nations was also prevented. "The dark forces that really controlled affairs had revealed themselves in the peace conference and in the reaction to the war in this country." Soule seems averse to saying that these "dark forces" were the forces of American monopoly finance capital, not yet ready to take over world domination.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

But Soule himself tells us what history has made a commonplace: The League was "chiefly a mask for the power politics of the great nations controlling it." That is, the League was the organization of the victors to maintain their victory. Clemenceau had little interest in Wilson's "ideals". He pursued the outright aims of French imperialism. "The politics of military strategy was to carve Central Europe up in such a way that it would be impossible to unite it again as a military force under German leadership, and this aim coincided with the intention of financial groups to exploit these backward regions by loans and investments."

Soule fails to indicate that what confronted Wilson, and what Clemenceau confronted him with,

was a stark reality. Europe was in turmoil. Russia had shown the way to proletarian revolution. Wilson had no choice of a middle ground. It was a case of either the preservation of the capitalist system, or the encouragement of the extension of the revolution. There could be not the slightest doubt of Wilson's choice. He was the spokesman for capitalism. The true self-determination of peoples carried out by a really democratic processes, would have brought on the explosion that all the diplomats feared.

Soule does tell us of the later period what he might have applied just as well to the time of the signing of the Versailles Treaty: "All through this period, the ruling powers were more afraid of the leftward revolutionary forces of Europe than they were of aggressive, nationalist war-makers." The conclusion is inevitable that if Wilson was really "defeated", then he took part in his own defeat. The premises of all his thinking were capitalist. The Versailles Peace could therefore have been nothing but an imperialist treaty dictated by the victors to the vanquished.

The reason that the American financiers opposed any United States guarantee for the treaty and the League was not their opposition to European power politics, but that as yet they did not feel that they had sufficient stakes involved on the side of the victor. The case is far different this time.

(More next week)

Clement Opposition In S.P. Is Typical Centrist Group

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

The division within the Socialist Party on its attitude toward the war has been expressed in two statements, in the January 17 Call, one by Norman Thomas and the other by Travers Clement. Thomas, speaking for the majority of the National Executive Committee, favors "critical" support to the war. Clement, the minority spokesman, takes a somewhat different and apparently more radical position on this all-important question.

Clement first complains of the "ambiguity" and "evasiveness" of the official NEC statement which "may be interpreted in any way one sees fit." This ambiguity is not accidental; it is deliberately designed to hold together the divergent tendencies within the Socialist Party under cover of a fictitious agreement, to maintain unity between supporters and opponents of the war. Thus Thomas insists upon "the general agreement of the NEC . . . with regard to the war." The dissenting Clement, however, exposes this calculated deceit by pointing out that: "I might interpret the present statement in line with my own convictions — were I not aware of the position of the NEC majority on this subject, as expressed verbally, at the NEC meeting."

The Thomas majority voted down the minority amendment calling for a clear-cut declaration that "we . . . cannot give our political support to any war conducted for imperialist aims." What has happened within the Socialist Party? The minority wishes to continue the peacetime policy of opposition to the war while the majority has determined to discard it, accepting the Anglo-American war as a lesser evil.

Nature of the Clement Opposition

The majority openly supports the war; the unregenerate minority seems to oppose it. But what is the nature of their opposition? It consists of the same petty-bourgeois pacifism that animated the entire Socialist Party leadership up to December 8. The Socialist-sponsored Keep America Out of War Committee was the chief agency for the execution of their pacifist policies. This motley outfit grouped together all kinds of pacifist, isolationist, Socialist, and religious elements from retired generals to tired radicals on the assumption that their combined weight — inconsiderable — at best could tip the national scales against intervention in the war.

The activities and agitation of the Keep America Out of War Committee had no more in common with a genuine working-class struggle against war than the Stalinist American Peace Mobilization which was cut from the same cloth. Both separated the fight against imperialism from the international revolutionary working-class struggle against capitalism. Both spread the poisonous illusion that a capitalist United States could be kept from entering the war.

By substituting platonic pacifist bleatings for the persistent prosecution of the class struggle, the Socialist pacifists duped their followers and left them utterly disoriented and demoralized when the war they were proposing to prevent broke out. Then? The Keep America Out of War Committee gave up the ghost, just as its Stalinist competitor passed away in June when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. Today most of the KAOWC, like Thomas, bows down before the Washington warlords; a minority, like Clement, maintains a pacifist opposition to the war.

It is far from enough to characterize the war as imperialist, as Clement does, to lead a real struggle against it. All sorts of people call this an imperialist war — Thomas himself does so — yet considers the Anglo-American purgatory preferable to the Axis inferno.

Moreover, not all the participants in this war are imperialist. The Soviet Union is waging a progressive war against Germany. But Clement places the Soviet Union in the same category with Germany and England as an imperialist power and does not urge the workers to defend it. China is conducting a just war against Japanese imperialism, just as India would be conducting a progressive war tomorrow if its people fought for independence against England.

"To Say One Thing — and Do the Opposite"

The real character of a party's or a person's opposition to imperialist war is determined, not by their words alone, but by the kind of political conclusions they draw from their opposition and the practical program of struggle they offer to the working masses. The least Clement is obliged to do to prove the worth of his anti-war position is to break his organizational ties with the supporters of the war in the Socialist Party. But how does he act in what he designates "a great historical crisis"? He gives up his editorship of *The Call* but continues as National Secretary of the Socialist Party. Are we then to assume that it is wrong to write editorials for the war but an excellent thing to organize branches on behalf of that policy?

Clement heads a group of centrists who vow that they will give no political support to this reactionary war and have rallied around "a Third Front" (Read Lillian Symes' masked polemic against Thomas in the Feb. 14 Call). But these partisans of the "Third Front" support the supporters of the war, working in the same party together with them. To say one thing and do the opposite — that is the essence of centrist politics. Who can take Clement's declaration seriously while he himself refuses to act in accordance with it?

Clement and his co-thinker, Symes, have written reams of copy on the "unprincipled politics" and "Bolshevik amorality" of the Trotskyists. Clement himself piously talks of the "crying necessity" to tell "the simple, unadulterated truth" to the people.

"The simple, unadulterated truth" about these professional preachers of Socialist morality in politics is that they have neither the courage of their convictions about the war — nor the opposition they profess to have. They will not surrender directly and openly, as Thomas has done. That, they say, is betraying Socialist principles. But they will, in practice subordinate the struggle for these principles to preserve their cozy relations with the patriotic majority of the Socialist Party. Pacifist Socialists who cannot conduct a struggle to the end for their ideas in their own petty party can scarcely be relied upon to lead the anti-war struggle against far more formidable forces.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS IN DANGER!

NEW PAMPHLET JUST PUBLISHED

The Meaning of the Minneapolis Convictions

by GEORGE E. NOVACK

foreword by JAMES T. FARRELL

Author of "Studs Lonigan," etc.

::

Why is this case so important for Civil Liberties?

Who instigated the Minneapolis Prosecution?

How does the Smith Act gag Free Speech?

How do these Convictions Violate the Bill of Rights?

How can further Labor Prosecutions result from this case?

5 Cents

Order from

CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE
160 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI.—No. 8 Saturday, February 21, 1942

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

Editor:
GEORGE BREITMAN

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

"Reentered as second class matter February 13, 1941
at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act
of March 3, 1978."

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.

Churchill Points To The Soviet Union

In his last Sunday's speech Mr. Churchill tried to explain to the English people why he and his cabinet should not be removed. He urged his countrymen to emulate the example of the Russians. He said in effect that since the Soviet have not yet overthrown Stalin, he, Churchill, should also remain in power.

The spectacle of this man urging the English people to learn from the lessons of Soviet Russia is indeed an instructive one. As is well known, Churchill was and remains one of the bitterest opponents of the October revolution of 1917. He was the spearhead of the imperialist intervention which tried to overthrow the young Soviet Republic under Lenin and Trotsky. If the workers' state still survives, it is most assuredly not because of but in spite of Churchill.

As a matter of fact, Churchill is now merely biding his time to resume his abortive attempts of the past to eliminate the social conquests of the Russian workers and peasants from the face of the earth. At present, he finds it expedient to pose as a "friend" of Soviet Russia. Because of Stalin's treacherous policies Churchill thinks that he can today appeal with impunity to the English masses to look to the USSR for their inspiration.

The English masses should take up Churchill's suggestion. Yes, they should emulate the example of the Russian workers and peasants who kicked out the Russian Churchills long ago. The English people should do what the Russian workers and peasants did in October 1917:

They should establish a government representing their own interests; they should become the masters of their own destiny like the Russian people did during the first world war. They will then be able to bring the second world war to an end; they will be able to join hands with the German masses to crush fascism, and together with all the workers in Europe they will be able to establish the Socialist United States of Europe.

Nelson Makes A Very Revealing Admission

Who holds up production? Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board is in a position to know. And last week, before a gathering of newspaper editors and publishers at the WPB headquarters in Washington, Nelson let out some of the truth:

"We've lost a lot of time because industry was fearful of what might happen after the war if all our productive facilities were overexpanded."

"We've wasted the golden months in which we could have got fully ready—the months in which we could have expanded our steel industry, our chemical industry, our copper industry, and all the others, so that we would have plenty of everything."

"... Industry has been lazy on this whole subject because the job has looked pretty difficult." (New York Times, Feb. 14).

Boiled down to its essential point, this is an admission that it's no one but the monopoly bosses who have been holding back production.

But the monopoly owners who are responsible

for hampering production aren't suffering because of it. Their profits have gone up by leaps and bounds.

It's the workers who are being thrown out on the streets by the hundreds of thousands because of plant closures due to monopoly-induced materials shortages and delayed plant conversions. It's the workers who must face rationing and price rises because of scarcity.

Just what monopoly-control of war production is going to cost the workers was indicated in the New York Times, Feb. 11, reporting that Commerce Department research specialists have stated that "the greater increase in war output will be accounted for largely by the decline in civilian production, which will apparently lower the standard of living by almost one third."

Because a handful of big corporation owners didn't feel it was to their interests to have expanded production—an attitude supported by the dollar-a-year men whom Nelson has brought along with him into the WPB set-up—the American workers must now suffer a one third slice in their living standards.

But Nelson and the Administration propose to do nothing about the monopolies which have struck this terrible blow at the masses. Nelson just chides the bosses in a fatherly fashion for their "laziness".

There is no reason why the bosses should be allowed to protect their monopolies and profits and strip the hides off the workers to pay the costs of the war. There is no reason why the bosses—who only impede production—should be permitted to control and operate the basic industries.

These parasites must be removed from the production system. The government must take over the war industries and operate them under the control and management of the workers. Let the "lazy" monopolists rest where they will—so long as they no longer clutter up industry and the production lines.

Supreme Court On War Profiteering

During World War I, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation made enormous profits on government shipbuilding contracts. After the war, the government instituted suit for restitution of some of these profits, on the grounds that they were extortionate and obtained under "duress".

In the midst of World War II, the U. S. Supreme Court on Feb. 17 finally handed down a decision in the 20-year old case not only denying the government's claim, but granting Bethlehem an additional \$3,800,000 bonus claimed by the company in a counter-suit.

The argument of the court majority was that if the government hadn't wanted Bethlehem to make such huge profits, it should not have issued the contracts. The majority decision argued that if Bethlehem had refused to produce, the government had had the alternative of confiscating its plants.

This decision is a go-ahead signal for the war profiteers. The Supreme Court says that war profiteering is O.K. if the corporations can "get away with it," if they do it "openly" and with the full knowledge, consent and connivance of the government.

Of course, the government "could" confiscate the war industries and operate them under the control of the workers if the bosses refused to accept contracts which they didn't like. But the government in World War I didn't—and it's obvious that the present government doesn't intend to either.

Instead, the War Production Board and the corporation monopolies are going to take the nod from the Supreme Court. The government war contracts can now be loaded down with unlimited profits, and as long as the government issues these contracts "with its eyes open", there can be no post-war kick-back against the companies. Says the Supreme Court.

'Enemy Aliens'

The Department of Justice is doing its bit in the war against "fascism" by cleansing the country of "enemy" aliens. Here is an example, in the following brief AP dispatch, of how the sterling vigilance of the Department of Justice rid the nation of one more "menace".

"RICHMOND, Cal., Feb. 17—Martina Battistessa, 65, couldn't understand why he was told to leave the home where he had lived for 20 years working as a locksmith."

"He thought he had been a good citizen, although not naturalized. But he was an enemy alien."

"Battistessa walked into a tavern last night and offered a friend \$50 to shoot him in the head. His friend refused."

"So he walked to the Southern Pacific tracks and lay across the rails. His friends sighted him just as a train sped down the tracks."

"They arrived too late."

Martina Battistessa is but one of thousands of workers who came to this country in the hope of finding security and freedom from oppression who are being hounded as "enemy" aliens, because they failed, for one reason or another, to take or pass citizenship examinations.

And there are other thousands, the mortal enemies of fascism, the anti-fascist refugees, who are likewise being branded "enemy" aliens, lumped together with outright fascists, and being thrown into concentration camps or driven to suicide.

American workers can have little hope of escaping fascist terror here, if they entrust their fate to those who either cannot or will not distinguish between fascists and anti-fascists.

160 Protest C. P. Lynch Moves Against Refugees

Send Letter to President of Mexico Asking Him to Prevent Deportation Or Violence Against Five Opponents of Fascism

More than 160 American labor leaders, educators, writers and public officials appealed on Feb. 9 to the President of Mexico for protection of five anti-fascist refugees in Mexico from a campaign of slander and terror launched by the Communist Party of Mexico, and protested moves initiated in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies by the Stalinists to deport these men. The five have been singled out because of their opposition to the policies of Stalinism.

If the deportation move is successful, these men will be returned to Europe where all of them have had prices placed on their heads by Hitler, Franco and Pe-tain.

The letter follows:

"New York, Feb. 9, 1942
"Excmo. Sr. Don Manuel Avila Camacho, Presidente de la Republica de Mexico, D.F.
"Your Excellency:

"We trust that you will not think us presumptuous if we call your attention to a campaign of slander that has been initiated against certain refugees in your country. These refugees, of widely varied political faiths, are united only in being opponents of the Communist International and of Fascism. Outstanding among them are: Marceau Pivert, Victor Serge, Julian Gorkin, Gustave Regler and Grandizo Munis.

"Against these individuals a slander campaign has been initiated by Mundo Obrero, mouth-piece of the Communist Party. This campaign has since spread with increasing violence to other sections of the press. The Communists have been able to prevent these refugees from getting any aid or publicity for their reply to the fantastic charges made against them.

"It is alleged that the persons in question are 'agents of Hitler,' 'shock troops of the Nazi Fifth Column,' 'gangsters,' 'spies,' and 'saboteurs.' On the basis of these charges a group of deputies sympathetic to the Communist International has introduced into the Chamber of Deputies a resolution demanding that these refugees be either expelled from Mexico or put into a concentration camp.

CHARGES ARE WITHOUT FOUNDATION

"These charges—suddenly whipped up months after these refugees were granted asylum in your country—are without any foundation in fact. It is a matter of public record that all of these men have for years been active anti-fascists. Specifically:

"Marceau Pivert, now actually charged with having collaborated with the French fascist group, Croix de Feu, was once the secretary of Leon Blum and was the former secretary of the P. S. O. P., a Socialist organization of workers and intellectuals now working against Hitler in France.

"Victor Serge, now called 'an agent of Otto Abetz,' is a left-wing novelist-journalist who escaped from Russia in 1935 with the aid of Andre Gide, Ignazio Silone and other writers.

"Julian Gorkin was a leader of the Spanish workingclass party, the P. O. U. M.

"Gustave Regler was also prominent, as a high commander in the military forces, in the heroic struggle of the Spanish Republic.

"Grandizo Munis was a Spanish revolutionary Socialist who worked with the P. O. U. M. in the Spanish Civil War and narrowly escaped execution by Franco.

"Such are the records of these refugees, now accused by the Mexican Communist Party of being Hitler's agents. As American anti-fascists, we have greatly admired the Mexican government for its generous hospitality

G. W. U.; Gertrude Weil Klein, general organizer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers CIO, and A. L. P. member of the New York City Council; Layle Lane, vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers.

Louis Nelson, manager of Local 155 of the I. L. G. W. U.; A. ex Rose, of the N. Y. Joint Board of the Millinery Workers Union, AFL; Joseph Schlossberg, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Mark Starr, vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers and ILGWU educational director; Louis Waldman, labor attorney; Matthew Woll, vice-president of AFL Executive Council and member of National War Labor Board.

Prominent figures in the defense of civil liberties who signed the letter to Camacho included: Roger Baldwin, director, American Civil Liberties Union; Margaret De Silver; John F. Finerty, labor lawyer; Arthur Garfield Hays, counsel for ACLU; Morris Milgram, executive secretary, Workers Defense League.

OTHER SIGNERS

Among the writers, educators, and public officials were: Louis Adamic, Anita Brenner, Walter B. Cannon, professor at Harvard; John Chamberlain, Merle Curti of Columbia, Ned H. Dearborn of New York University, John Dewey, John Dos Passos and James T. Farrell, authors and members of the Civil Rights Defense Committee; Waldo Frank, Elizabeth Gilman, president of League for Industrial Democracy; Frank P. Graham, president of University of North Carolina and member of the War Labor Board; Lawrence T. Hosie, B. W. Huebsch, Freda Kirchwey, editor of The Nation; Rev. A. J. Muste, Culbert L. Olson, Governor of California; Carlo Tresca, editor of Il Martello; Oswald Garrison Villard, Edmund Wilson.

David Dubinsky, president of the ILGWU, and A. Clayton Powell, member of New York City Council, signed too late to be included in the list on the letter sent to Mexico.

LABOR LEADERS

The letter was signed by many figures prominent in the labor movement, including George S. Counts, president of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL; Jack Altman, manager of the N. Y. United Retail and Wholesale Employees, C I O; George Balaban, vice-president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO; Frank Crosswaith, general organizer of the I. L. G. W. U. AFL; M. Garriga, vice-president of the Hotel & Restaurant union, AFL; Murray Gross of the N. Y. Dress Joint Board of the I. L.

and small business—and against production."

"The End of Auto Production" by Joe Andrews takes up the role of the auto industry in the war and the "business as usual" policies of the auto barons which resulted in the current layoffs of so many auto workers.

The international fronts of the war are the subject of discussion by A. Roland in "The Twilight of the British Empire"; by John G. Wright, in "Nazi Destruction of Soviet Economy"; by Marc Loris in "Europe Under the Iron Heel"; and by Piocho in "A Letter from Mexico".

William F. Warde contributes a slashing indictment of the war policies of the liberal intellectuals in "The Liberals and the War" and Larissa Reed rounds out the issue with another of her lively book reviews, "The Evasions of a Scientist."

Readers of THE MILITANT will be well repaid by securing a copy of this issue of Fourth International. Single copies are 20c. Subscriptions for one year are \$2.00. Write to Business Manager, Fourth International, 116 University Pl., New York City.

How Much Longer Can Capitalism Stand War Strain?

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The second world war is already in its thirty-second month. The arena of military activity is truly world wide, encompassing the five continents and all the seas. Far from envisaging a swift termination of this colossal conflict, all the belligerents are forecasting and planning for long term warfare. Decisive military decisions are being postponed further and further into the future. It goes without saying that the governments on both sides are ready to fight to the bitter end. The question naturally arises—are there objective limits to the duration of the war?

If one were to gauge the question by the experience of the first world war, then the answer would be in the affirmative. The war of 1914-1918 demonstrated that with the then existing alignment of forces, world economy as a whole could not withstand the strain of more than four years' major warfare. In the thirty-third month of the war the imperialist chain was broken at its weakest link, namely, the former Czarist empire. Approximately twenty months later came the collapse of German economy.

In what respects is world capitalism better equipped to wage protracted warfare today than was the case in 1914-1918?

Position of Capitalism Has Deteriorated

From the general economic standpoint—and this is decisive in the last analysis—the position of all the capitalist nations as a whole has not improved, but on the contrary has gravely deteriorated since 1914. As is well known, world imperialism entered the first world war at the peak of its development and power.

The present conflict is being waged by countries whose economy has suffered the ravages of almost a quarter of a century of economic depression, crises and decay. While draining the economies of the respective belligerents, the first war was waged under conditions when the advancement of two major sectors of capitalist world economy were still possible. The economy of the United States expanded at an unprecedented rate precisely in the period of the first world war. The same phenomenon but on a far lesser scale was to be observed in Japan.

No such advancement is possible at present. The basic productive forces of the major imperialist powers, which had already been weakened, are being diverted to an ever greater extent into military channels, and this acts to accelerate the process of deterioration.

Condition of World Market Then and Now

The condition of the world market has a profound bearing on the conduct of the war. Through 1914-1918 the colonies, although gravely affected by the hostilities, were left virtually intact. While Germany and her allies were barred from the world markets, the Allied powers were able to draw upon them. The economic progress registered by the United States and Japan helped bolster up capitalist world economy.

The situation today differs not only quantitatively but qualitatively from that in 1914-1918. The world market was shattered even prior to the outbreak of the war. With the collapse of Singapore and the establishment of Japanese supremacy for the period immediately ahead in the Western Pacific, it is impossible to talk any longer about the "world market". The effects of this condition must be felt by all the capitalist nations without exception.

Despite the tremendous advantages on their side, the victorious Allies were unable to prevent their world system from snapping at its weakest link in the first world war. As a matter of fact, it was only the intervention of the United States which prevented the complete collapse of Europe in general and France in particular after the termination of the war.

Supreme Crisis Approaching

Furthermore, the second war is far more costly in terms of money, men and machinery. The suffering of the masses in Europe already surpasses that of 1914-1918. The unprecedented strain under which world economy is tottering finds its reflection in the unprecedented speed of events. In the period immediately ahead this tempo can only increase.

Can the capitalists today prevent the weakest link of their system from snapping? They believe they can. And on this they base their perspective of a war which will terminate sometime in the distant future. In our opinion this task is insoluble under capitalism. Far from having incalculable time at their disposal, the contending governments are drawing closer and closer to the supreme crisis of the second world war. And in our opinion this crisis can only be a revolutionary one.

We leave it to crystal gazers to speculate just what country will experience the fate of the Czarist empire in 1917. The task of scientific prognosis is to determine the trend of the developments. The time table of the development of the second world war does not depend on the intentions or will of the present rulers of the world. They will not be able to forestall the impending collapse of their system at its weakest link or links.

V. R. DUNNE

will speak on

"The Meaning of the Minneapolis Case"

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 8:30 P. M.
106 CARMEL ST., NEW HAVEN.

Auspices:
New Haven Branch, Civil Rights Defense Committee

NEW YORK DINNER in support of the 18 MINNEAPOLIS DEFENDANTS hear

V. R. DUNNE, Minneapolis defendant, leader of Local 544-CIO

CARLO TRESCA, editor of Il Martello

GEORGE NOVACK, national secretary, CRDC

TUESDAY, MARCH 3 - 7:30 P. M.

WERDERMANN'S HALL

156 Third Avenue, New York

Auspices of the CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE

New York Branch

Tickets \$1.00