

Why Britain Is Bargaining With India

An Editorial

The British ruling class is now powerless to stem by force the surging tide of Indian emancipation. Freedom for India lies within the grasp of the 400 million people of that oppressed country.

But what it can no longer successfully retain by force, the British ruling class now hopes to hold by cunning, by bargaining and by promises.

From Downing Street come hints of inducements and concessions to India. Feelers are being put forth designed to determine how little the British ruling class will have to pay for India's support of the war.

Downing Street is tendering offers of a "greater political voice" for the people of India, "dominion status" — in short, anything but the removal of the British yoke from India.

Chiang Kai-shek, misusing the prestige of the Chinese masses who have fought so gloriously for their national independence against Japanese imperialism, is enlisted as an "honest broker" by the British ruling class. He is sent to India to convince the masses of the magnitude of Britain's offer.

Likewise the American ruling class rushes to add its assurances that India's independence is close to its heart. The American capitalist press suddenly raises a loud "anti-imperialist" chorus. The *New York Times* speaks of the "faded trappings of imperialism." Writers like Walter Lippmann and George Sokolsky, spokesmen for American capitalism, who never before have spoken on behalf of freedom for colonial peoples, now "insist" the British government must make "concessions" to India.

British imperialism offers its worthless IOU's to India. And Chiang Kai-shek and the American capitalist class offer to act as co-signers for these promissory notes, as though this might give them added value in the eyes of the Indian masses.

Some Indian elements — the native capitalists and landowners — undoubtedly will be willing to accept these latest promises and compromise proposals from Britain in return for a few privileges for themselves. They have always considered themselves to be the "junior partners" of the British rulers. They are as horrified as the Colonel Blimps at the idea of an India free of British rule — an India where there would no longer be British guns to support the native capitalists and landowning princes against the masses.

But the Indian workers and peasants will not be side-tracked from their struggle for freedom by any bargains, compromises and clever maneuvers. The shoddy offers of Downing Street will not induce them to sacrifice their tremendous manpower and resources in a war for the British ruling class.

The masses of India know that those who now keep them enslaved are speaking of concessions only in desperation. They know that the promise of "independence" is being made merely to maneuver them into saving the hide of the British master class. They know that the British ruling class has no intention of freeing them, that as soon as it has the power to do so, it will tighten their shackles once more.

The struggle for the national independence of India is not the battle of the Indian masses alone. It is as much the struggle of the workers everywhere, and of the British workers in particular.

The salvation of the British working class is indissolubly bound up with the struggle for national independence for India. The British workers must cement a firm alliance with the Indian masses to wage a common, victorious war against world capitalist reaction.

That alliance can never be achieved so long as the class which has brought centuries of oppression to the Indian people remains in power in Britain. The British ruling class can never win the friendship and loyalty of the people of India. The British rulers only alienate the colonial masses and make impossible an alliance between them and the British masses.

Such an alliance can be realized only when the British workers take their fate out of the hands of the Colonel Blimps, the Churchills and all their reactionary tribe, and establish their own Workers' Government.

A Workers' Government in Britain would remove from the ruling class the control of the means of production and determination of domestic and foreign policy. It would demonstrate to the people of India that they are fighting with the British workers in a common cause against a common enemy. It would immediately proclaim the unconditional national liberation of India.

Then, in the name of a genuine alliance of the oppressed masses everywhere, it would call upon the Indian people, the workers and peasants of the whole earth, to mobilize themselves into an unconquerable army of hundreds of millions, to join it in a struggle against fascism and all other forms of capitalist reaction.

Bosses Start Offensive To Block CIO's Demands

This week the War Labor Board began consideration of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee's demands for a dollar-a-day general wage increase and the union shop in "Little Steel". The Board's decisions in this case are expected to establish its future policies with respect to the CIO's general demands for wage increases and the union shop.

There is clear evidence that the Board majority, employers and pro-employer "public" representatives, will attempt to slice the CIO's demands to ribbons and force the CIO leaders to accept unfavorable "compromises". The threat is already being used that if unanimity is not reached, the

Board may evade responsibility for a decision and toss the issues into the lap of a reactionary Congress, eagerly awaiting the chance to pass legislation "freezing" wages and fixing the open shop status quo.

The sort of "compromise" which the Board may offer the SWOC in the Little Steel case

VOL. VI.—No. 9

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1942

FIVE (5) CENTS

FDR ASKS SACRIFICES OF LABOR BUT NOT OF BOSSES

Churchill Shuffles War Cabinet, Adds Cripps

But He Makes It Clear He Does Not Intend Any Change In His Fundamental Policies

On Feb. 20 Churchill announced the appointment of a new and smaller British war cabinet, the elimination of a few of the people originally appointed by Chamberlain, and the addition of "new blood", Sir Stafford Cripps. Later, on Feb. 22, he made other and less important replacements and substitutions in his war machinery.

Thus Churchill was able to keep his post as prime minister and to quiet for the time being most of the criticism directed at him by Parliament since the fall of Singapore.

But because he did not explain the fundamental reasons for the defeats in the Far East and because he was unable to present a program to put an end to those defeats, the basic problems facing his government still remain in full force and will lead inevitably to a new and greater political crisis in Britain in the future.

Churchill did not admit what is now clear to everyone — that Malaya and Singapore had fallen so easily to the Japanese forces because the natives in those countries, long oppressed and exploited by Britain and denied even the right to arm to protect themselves, did not feel they had anything to gain by fighting for their British masters.

Nor did he have anything to say about the key questions of the growing demand of the Indian people for national independence and the present attitude of the Indian people to the war being conducted by Great Britain.

On the contrary, by his brazen claim on Feb. 18 that "we have three-quarters of the human race on our side," he denied in effect that his colonial policy has been proved bankrupt and showed that he intends to continue the same policy that has brought only defeats up to now.

NO CONCESSIONS OF POLICY

Churchill did not make a single concession of policy to all the criticism directed at him; the only concessions he made were in personnel; it was easy for him to get away with this because most of the criticism in Parliament was of a superficial character, and



SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS

most of the dissatisfaction of the masses is still in a confused, groping state.

Churchill felt he had nothing to lose in the addition and promotion of people popular with the masses, as long as those people operated on the basis of his policy. Indeed, by having them associated with his policies and sharing the responsibility for them, he lessens the possibility of their leading a successful movement to replace him in the future.

By reducing the cabinet from nine members to seven, and appointing as three of these seven Bevin and Attlee, the Labor members, and Cripps, the man who was considered so "radical" that the Labor Party expelled him three years ago, Churchill lost nothing — first of all because he has them outnumbered four to three and secondly, because they have no program fundamentally different from his — and

gained new support from those workers who have felt that labor does not have enough of a "voice" in the government.

CRIPPS' RECORD

The most important change in the cabinet, of course, was the addition of Cripps as Lord Privy Seal and leader of the House of Commons.

A wealthy lawyer who joined the Labor Party in 1929, became Solicitor General in the MacDonald government and was knighted for his services by King George V; Cripps was expelled by the conservative bureaucrats of the Labor Party in 1939 for advocating the formation of a People's Front.

Shortly after the war began, he went to India as an unofficial representative of the Chamberlain government in an unsuccessful effort to get the leaders of the nationalist movement there to come all-out for support of the British Empire in the war.

In the spring of 1940 he served on a trade mission to Moscow and when Stalin refused to admit him without diplomatic standing, he was named ambassador; in this capacity he tried unsuccessfully to draw Stalin closer to the Allies until Hitler attacked the Soviet Union.

After the outbreak of the Pacific war he returned home to set himself up as a potential British Kerensky, writing articles on the need for closer collaboration with the Stalin regime, declaring that the Soviet Union would defeat Hitler within a year but that it would be better for all concerned if Britain so carried on the war that it would be able together with the USSR to determine the conditions of the peace, complaining that Britain was not yet all-out in the war, etc.

On Feb. 8 in a speech in Bristol, he "called for an immediate 'clear enunciation of our peace aims.'" But just what he himself thought those peace aims should be, he did not say.

Cripps' first act, after Churchill appointed him to the cabinet, was to deliver "an appeal" to the German workers through the British Broadcasting Corporation. This speech can be regarded as a typical example of his (Continued on page 4)

How Stalin Greeted Red Army's 24th Anniversary

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

In the order of the day issued on the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Red Army, Stalin did not dare tell the world what the Red Army really is and what it is really fighting for. The Red Army was born under the banner of international solidarity and the struggle for socialism.

On Jan. 12, 1918 the Council of People's Commissars issued a decree concerning the "formation of the socialist army" and defined its purpose as follows: "The old army functioned as an instrument for the oppression of the workers by the bourgeoisie. With the transfer of state authority to the workers and the exploited classes there arises a need for a new army to serve as a bulwark for the Soviet regime at the present time . . . and as a basis for the socialist revolution in Europe."

This decree was not put into effect until Feb. 23, 1918 when the first formations of the Red Army were organized; and this date has been officially set as the birthday of the Red Army of Workers and Peasants.

UNION SHOP SUBSTITUTE

This "formula" substitutes for the genuine union shop a watered-down form of the "maintenance of membership" clause, proposed

(Continued on page 2)

Churchill and The Soviet Union

Churchill in 1942 (in a telegram to Stalin): "The 24th anniversary of the foundation of the Red Army is being celebrated today after eight months of a campaign which has reflected the greatest glory on its officers and men and has enshrined its deeds in history for all time."

Churchill in 1940 (in a broadcast over B.B.C.):

"The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent. They have exposed for all the world to see, the military incapacity of the Red Army and of the Red Air Force. Everyone can see how Communism rots the soul of a nation; how it makes it abject and hungry in peace, and proves it base and abominable in war."

as he voted at the time for the appointment of Leon Trotsky as Commissar of War to be entrusted with the task of organizing and (Continued on page 2)



V. R. Dunne to Speak In N. Y. And Newark

V. R. Dunne, leader of motor transport workers Local 544-CIO and one of the 18 members of the CIO and the Socialist Workers Party convicted in the Minneapolis labor trial last December, is scheduled to speak in Newark, N. J., and New York City this week under auspices of the Civil Rights Defense Committee.

The Newark affair, a luncheon to be held Sat., Feb. 28 at 2 P. M., will not only hear Dunne speak on "The Meaning of the Minneapolis Trial", but will also be addressed by outstanding local labor leaders and defenders of civil liberties.

Among these will be Mr. Irving Abramson, president of the New Jersey Industrial Union Council of the CIO, which has already protested the Minneapolis convictions; Mr. Peter Flynn, president of Local 16 of the International Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, CIO, of Kearney, N. J.; and Mr. Weber, field representative of the American Civil Liberties Union. George Novack, national secretary of the C.R.D.C., will preside.

The Newark luncheon will be held at the Cadillac Restaurant, Hill and Halsey Sts.

The New York dinner in support of the Minneapolis defendants will be held Tues., Mar. 3, 7:30 P. M. at Werdermann's Hall, 156 Third Ave. The speakers, in addition to Dunne, will be Carlo Tresca, editor of *Il Martello*, and George Novack.

Further information about V. R. Dunne's current national tour will be found on P. 2.

Is Silent About Uninterrupted Profits Of Bosses

"3 High Purposes" Would Leave Workers Helpless Against the Open-Shop Employers

Much of President Roosevelt's radio address of last Monday night was aimed at bolstering the morale of the American people, badly shaken by the Anglo-American defeats in the Far East. But the most important and most emphatic portion of his speech — and recognized as such by the leading capitalist newspapers — was the program he enunciated on domestic policies, particularly as these applied to labor.

Introducing and keynoting this program was the sharp injunction: ". . . there is one thought for us here at home to keep uppermost — the fulfillment of our special task of production — uninterrupted production. I stress that word uninterrupted."

UNINTERRUPTED PRODUCTION

The first of the "three high purposes for every American," the program which Roosevelt stressed, was:

"We shall not stop work for a single day. If any dispute arises we shall keep on working while the dispute is solved by mediation, conciliation or arbitration — until the war is won."

This is obviously directed at the workers alone. They are the only ones who are in position to "stop work".

When Roosevelt calls for "uninterrupted production", he is clearly demanding that the workers surrender their right to strike; that if they cannot gain their just demands by mediation or arbitration, they must then submit to whatever conditions the employers dictate and stand defenseless before the union-smashing offensive of the bosses. . . "until the war is won."

But "uninterrupted production" for the bosses means something very different than it does for the workers. For the owners, it means uninterrupted profits, the greater opportunity to squeeze material gain out of the war. Roosevelt, however, had nothing to say about uninterrupted profits.

His second "high purpose" was: "We shall not demand special gains or special privileges or special advantages for any group or occupation."

On the surface, this sounds very high-minded and impartial. But analyzed in the light of actual events and present circum-

stances, it is far from impartial. The bosses, right now, are not asking for anything "special". In general, the corporations are getting just about everything it is possible for them to get. Profits are pouring in at a tremendous rate. The bosses are satisfied, so far as it is possible to satisfy their insatiable lust for profit. Moreover, they are not compelled to demand anything "special". They themselves and their agents run the war production program and the government. They have written pretty much their own ticket so far as war profits are concerned. But Roosevelt, in his speech, never mentioned the war profiteers.

It is the workers who have had to raise "special" demands. Right now, the CIO is campaigning for general wage increases to meet rising living costs and for the union shop. The attention of the country is focused on the War Labor Board which has under consideration the crucial "Little Steel" case which will set the pattern for the wage and union-shop policies of the government. Obviously, then, Roosevelt's second "high purpose" can be interpreted to mean only opposition to the granting of the demands of the workers. If he did not directly specify this, it was because he did not wish to be accused of attempting to impose a partial attitude on a presumably impartial Board in the very midst of negotiations.

GIVE UP CONVENIENCES

His final "high purpose" was: "We shall give up conveniences and modify the routine of our lives if our country asks us to." Anything that a worker gives up must come out of his living necessities. The only things he has which he can sacrifice are part of his food, clothing, recreation, medical care.

But what "conveniences" will the capitalists have to give up? Most of their profits go into banks and government bonds. Rising prices and scarcity do not exhaust their huge incomes. And even if the bosses did have to give up a little, it would mean not a lowering of their living standards, but that they would have a little less to put in the bank. All such "sacrifice" would mean to them is less in their capital reserves, not less in their bellies. The most reactionary capitalist papers noted with undisguised approval the implications of this program. The *New York Sun*, a traditional fixture on the breakfast tables of the Wall Streeters, declared on Feb. 24:

BOSS PRESS APPROVAL

"In his speech last night, the President placed the emphasis definitely upon labor. . . (this) did more probably to brighten the atmosphere in Washington today than anything else he said in his speech last night."

And, the *Sun* implies, it did more to "brighten the atmosphere" (Continued on page 2)

GRACE CARLSON'S NAME TO BE PUT ON BALLOT

ST. PAUL, MINN. — Despite efforts of reactionaries, including the Stalinists, to keep Grace Holmes Carlson off the ballot in the city mayoralty race, the name of the Socialist Workers Party candidate will be listed on the ballot. That is the ruling given Harry O'Donnell, city clerk, by the assistant city corporation counsel this week.

O'Donnell said he put the question of Mrs. Carlson's candidacy to the city corporation counsel after he had received "many telephone calls from citizens who asked how she could run for public office with the (sedition) conviction against her," and "after a statement by Mrs. Carlson that

she stood for international socialism and for the principles of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky."

The city legal adviser ruled that Grace Carlson "has complied with the provisions of the charter" through filing her affidavit of candidacy and paying the filing fee, and told the city clerk, "It becomes your duty to place her name upon the ballot unless appropriate judicial proceedings otherwise direct. The Constitution or statutes of Minnesota provide no course of procedure for the ascertainment of the right of the applicant to file."

It is not difficult to guess at the identity of the "many citizens" who protested by telephone against the candidate of the SWP.

The leading boss candidates, (Continued on page 2)

Congress Throws Out The Bill To Aid Unemployed

Ways and Means Secret Session Kills Bill to Aid Priorities Unemployed

A reactionary bloc of Congressional Democrats and Republicans, backed by the employers and a gang-up of state governors, on Feb. 19 killed the Doughton bill to provide an average of \$2 weekly federal supplementary aid for the priorities unemployed. A secret session of the House Ways and Means Committee delivered the death-blow to the measure.

By this action, millions of unemployed victims of plant closures due to monopoly-induced materials shortages and delayed war conversion are condemned — in a period of rising prices — to eke out a family existence on state benefits which average only \$10 weekly.

For weeks, the Administration calmly watched this issue being tossed about in the House, where it was first stalled by a "jurisdictional" dispute between the Appropriations and the Ways and Means Committee, then delayed further by drawn-out hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and finally scuttled after the Administration made a last-minute feeble "plea" for a \$300,000,000 appropriation.

Neither President Roosevelt nor his spokesmen have done anything more than "make the record" on behalf of federal aid, taking credit for standing on the progressive side of an issue, while knowing that Congress will do the butchering and bear the onus for an attack upon labor.

NO FURTHER ACTION EXPECTED THIS TIME

Now, it appears, the Administration is quite willing to let the matter slide for the time being. This was indicated in the New York Times, Feb. 20, which reports:

"Administration leaders in the House and other sponsors said that apparently there was nothing further that Congress was doing, and that the States would be held responsible for what they termed a growing problem."

The Times further disclosed that:

"Administration leaders planned no immediate move to revive the program. They predicted that within a few months — as the displacement situation becomes more acute — the same State officials who opposed the plan would be back pleading for

pay and to block enactment of any measure which might smack at national social security legislation.

ORIGINAL MEASURE WAS INADEQUATE

This dispute over "federalization", and the refusal so far of Congress to pass any relief at all has served to obscure a vital aspect of the federal aid issue: That is the inadequacy of all the measures proposed — including the Administration's suggestion of providing unemployment insurance up to 60 per cent of a worker's average wages but not more than \$24 weekly.

Few workers would get the \$24 maximum under the Administration's proposal. The average unemployed worker would get but \$15 weekly in combined state and federal insurance from this measure.

The trade union leaders, unwilling to make a militant fight on the entire issue, have ignored this side of the question to a large extent. They have taken the lead from the Administration, pleaded for the inadequate \$300,000,000 appropriation, and overlooked the question of adequate standards.

The CIO officialdom is now begging for a \$300,000,000 fund to be distributed in direct relief handouts, a reversion from the principle of unemployment insurance back to the old concept of "charity" relief. A measure along this line has been introduced into Congress.

WHAT UNIONS MUST FIGHT FOR TODAY

Begging for crumbs will bring at best only crumbs. The organized labor movement must be mobilized for militant nationwide union action to secure an immediate federal appropriation of not less than \$1 billion to provide the unemployed with unemployment insurance equivalent to their full union wages while on the job, and for the duration of their unemployment.

A federal program of training for jobs in the war industries must be established, so that every union man may be prepared to go to work as quickly as possible. And, as has been the practice in many corporations, the workers during the training period must get full union wages.

The chief arguments raised by the reactionary opponents of federal aid is that it might force up state unemployment compensation standards and might lead to "federalization" of the unemployment insurance system. Thus, the employing class and its governmental agents view this present issue as a continuation of their fight to wipe out unemployment relief and starve jobless workers into taking jobs at any

Grace Carlson's Name To Go On St. Paul Ballot

(Continued from page 1)

Mayor McDonough and ex-Mayor Fallon, representing different factions of the Democratic Party, have no stomach for the genuine issues raised by the candidacy of Comrade Carlson. The AFL union bureaucrats who, through the "Labor Progressive Association" are backing McDonough, do not relish permitting the ranks of organized labor to express their real feelings on the important issues at the polls. Finally, the Stalinists with their nauseating "V-for-Victory" campaign, are preparing to brand the candidate who defends Leninist internationalism as an "agent of Hitler."

Despite such opposition, the Trotskyists have placed their candidate on the ballot and are carrying out plans for a spirited campaign.

Aside from Comrade Carlson's candidacy, interest in the election is at the lowest ebb in the history of St. Paul municipal politics. The nineteen filings for the six-man city council is the smallest number on record; compare it with the 75 names filed in 1914. Besides Carlson, Mayor McDonough and ex-Mayor Fallon, the only other candidate who filed for the office of mayor is H. A. Olson, a red-baiting small businessman.

Rose Tillotson, Ramsey County secretary of the Communist Party, who has filed for the city council, two years ago ran for mayor on an isolationist, pacifist program. But that was in a different Stalinist period. Today no one can wave the flag with more vigor or hypocrisy.

The daily press has not failed to give Comrade Carlson publicity, reciting the facts concerning the recent "sedition" trial, and her sentencing to 16 months' imprisonment; also the fact that in 1940 she ran for the U. S. Senate on the "Trotskyist Anti-War Party" ticket.

HEADQUARTERS OPENED

The Campaign Committee directing Comrade Carlson's campaign is already established in its headquarters at 138 East 6th St. in the St. Paul loop. A large sign in front of the headquarters advertises "ST. PAUL SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY HEADQUARTERS — GRACE CARLSON FOR MAYOR."

The headquarters are open throughout each day. An extremely popular piece of campaign literature is the pamphlet, "SOCIALISM ON TRIAL," containing the testimony of James P. Cannon in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial.

How Stalin Greeted Red Army's 24th Anniversary

(Continued from page 1)

leading the armed forces of the October revolution.

Under Lenin and Trotsky, and for many years even under Stalin, the Red Army remained under the banner of socialism. Every Red Soldier took an oath to serve not merely the Soviet Union but the proletariat of the whole world. Part of this famous "socialist oath" reads as follows:

"I pledge myself to respond to the first call of the Government of Workers and Peasants by placing myself at its disposal for the defense of the Republic of Workers and Peasants against any attack and threat from any enemy, and to spare neither my strength nor my life in the battle for the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and for the cause of socialism and the fraternization of all races."

Permeated by the spirit of internationalism, the Red Army marched to victory in the Civil War of 1918-1920. Its revolutionary propaganda disintegrated the ranks of the armies mustered against the Soviet Republic by the imperialists, at whose head stood at the time none other than Winston Churchill — the then British Minister for War.

Why was the Red Army able to defeat its enemies who possessed vastly superior resources? On December 6, 1919, Lenin said to the Seventh Congress of the Soviets:

"What is the miracle which enabled the Soviets to carry on two years of obstinate warfare, first against German imperialism then against Entente imperialism, and then to surprise the German soldiers' refusal to surrender, i. e., prefer to fight under Hitler rather than accept a new Treaty of Versailles."

EVADING THE ISSUE
In his Nov. 1941 speech Stalin predicted that Hitler's regime would shortly be overthrown. In his order of the day in Feb. 1942 he evades the issue of Hitler's overthrow. Only a socialist revolution is possible today in Germany. The German workers and soldiers will begin seriously to

military oath drafted by Trotsky but swore himself to fulfill it:

"May the scorn of all the my lot and may the hard hand of the revolutionary law punish me, if ever with evil intent I break this my solemn oath."

After Lenin's death, Stalin betrayed the cause of Socialism. He headed the Red Army, he murdered the whole generation of Lenin's closest collaborators. He abrogated the socialist oath of the Red Army.

Permeated by the spirit of internationalism, the Red Army marched to victory in the Civil War of 1918-1920. Its revolutionary propaganda disintegrated the ranks of the armies mustered against the Soviet Republic by the imperialists, at whose head stood at the time none other than Winston Churchill — the then British Minister for War.

Why was the Red Army able

On The Defense Front

More Unions Vote Money to Aid Eighteen

The Civil Rights Defense Committee, organization mobilizing public support for the 18 convicted in the Minneapolis labor trial, announced this week the following additions to the growing number of central union bodies and union locals demonstrating their support of the 18 by passing resolutions and voting to send money to the C.R.D.C. for its work in preparing the appeal of the convictions to a higher court:

The New Haven Industrial Union Council of the CIO passed a resolution similar to that passed previously by the New Jersey CIO State Council, condemning the convictions and calling on its affiliates to help the fight to free the 18 defendants and test the constitutionality of the Smith "Gag" Act under which they were convicted.

The Central N. J. Industrial Union Council of the CIO, in Trenton, likewise passed a resolution along the lines of its parent body.

The following unions made

donations to the work of the C.R.D.C.:

Lodge 2448, Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Plainfield, Conn.

Local 238, United Automobile Workers, Torrington, Conn.

Branch 13, American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Boonton, N. J.

Dyers and Finishers Local 1932, CIO Textile Workers Union, Passaic, N. J.

Local 87, Textile Workers Union, Paterson, N. J.

Local 205, United Rubber Workers, Trenton, N. J.

Local 75, Glass, Ceramic and Silica Workers, Trenton, N. J.

Local 225, Paper, Toy and Novelty Workers, Trenton, N. J.

Local 256, Textile Workers Union, Elizabeth, N. J.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee also announced that its work in support of the Minneapolis defendants had been endorsed by the Massachusetts Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at its regular February meeting.

New Haven

A meeting to hear V. R. Dunne, will be held in New Haven, March 2nd, under the auspices of the Civil Rights Defense Committee. The meeting will be held

at 8:30 p. m., at 106 Carmel Street, headquarters of the Religion and Labor Foundation.

Dr. Willard Uphams, Executive Secretary of the Religion and Labor Foundation, will serve as chairman.

Boston

The Boston Civil Rights Defense Committee has arranged for a interesting series of meetings for V. R. Dunne, when he arrives in this city on his nationwide tour.

On Feb. 26, he will speak at a luncheon at the Harvard Business School. The same evening he will speak at an open meeting sponsored by the Boston CRDC at the Unitarian Association Building.

On Feb. 27, Dunne will speak at a dinner sponsored by the Harvard Liberal Union, at Harvard University. He will also speak that evening in a radio broadcast over the Harvard Radio.

Remainder of Dunne's Tour

Following his meetings in New York City, V. R. Dunne is scheduled to speak in Philadelphia on March 10, to be followed by meetings in Allentown, Reading and Quakertown, Pa.

Thereafter his tour calls for him to be in Baltimore on Mar. 16-17; in Pittsburgh on Mar. 18-19; in St. Louis, Mo., on Mar. 21-22. The tour will then wind up in the Twin Cities, Minnesota.

Watch THE MILITANT for dates and places for the meetings in these cities.

think about overthrowing Hitler only when they see the same perspectives that were opened to them by the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviks in the last war.

At that time, when the German armies of occupation streamed homeward in 1919 to participate under the influence of Bolshevik propaganda in the November revolution in Germany and Austria-Hungary, Lenin wrote:

"The Russian proletariat will understand that the time is close at hand when it must make its greatest sacrifices on behalf of internationalism. The day is approaching when circumstances will require us to give assistance to the German nation that has freed itself from its own imperialism — to give them assistance against Anglo-French imperialism. Therefore, let us begin our preparations without delay. Let us show that the workers of Russia can work all the more energetically, fight with greater self-sacrifice, and give their lives more readily when a revolution is at stake that is not merely a Russian affair but an affair of the international workers of the world."

But Stalin cannot speak this language. The Kremlin is committed to a different program. It fraternizes with Churchill who now sends ecstatic greetings to the Red Army because he hopes to utilize it to safeguard the interests of the British empire.

The German masses, the masses of the oppressed throughout Europe and the world will rally to no summons other than that of Lenin. The Russian workers and peasants who are fighting heroically to defend the conquests of the October revolution cannot march to victory under any banner other than the true banner of the Red Army.

Such tactics as those resorted to today are consistent with the unprincipled and violent struggle that Stalin has been waging in Minneapolis since June, 1941, against 544-CIO and the drivers and warehousemen of this city.

"Local 544-CIO is calling the attention of the national labor movement to the attack on its leaders by Tobin gunmen."

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Prices

The New York School of Social Science

WEDNESDAYS
7:45 to 8:45
The Labor Movement of Russia
JOHN G. WRIGHT
9:00 to 10:00
Modern World Capitalism
C. CHARLES

FRIDAYS
7:45 to 8:45
Progress of American Culture, 1870-1940
WILLIAM F. WARDE
9:00 to 10:00
Labor in World War I
FELIX MORROW
25c Each Lecture

LABOR TEMPLE
242 East 14th Street

FDR ASKS SACRIFICES OF LABOR BUT NOT OF BOSSES

(Continued from page 1)

phere" for every monopolist, open shopper and war profiteer in America.

Thus, Roosevelt's efforts to bolster morale had a salutary effect on the bosses at any rate. So far as the American masses are concerned — aside from his personal assurance that America would win the war sometime in the future by the long process of "attrition" — Roosevelt's contribution to their morale was the demand that they assume an even heavier burden of the war.

Roosevelt's "high purposes" meet the approval of the capitalists because they fit in with and implement the current drive of the bosses to freeze wages and the open shop.

The workers, however, need their own independent program of "high purposes" to fit in with and implement their struggle to defend their interests against the war profiteers and rising prices.

The "high purposes" for which the workers must fight include:

1. The right to exercise every traditional and effective method of union resistance to boss attacks, including the right to strike.
 2. A rising scale of wages to meet rising living costs, and union security through the union shop; an end to the special gains and privileges of the handful of owners of the war industries who are running war production solely for their own profit.
 3. Placing the burden of the war on those who are profiting from the war and who can most afford to carry its costs, the Sixty Families who control most of the nation's wealth and productive facilities.
- The workers must conduct a struggle to secure the elimination of the owning-class parasites from the system of production. Let the government take over the war industries and operate them under the control and management of the workers. That would be the real way to raise the morale of the masses.

Latest Developments In Struggle Of 544-CIO

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. — Progress of the struggle between the Minneapolis drivers and the Tobin machine this week was marked by (1) the decision of Ramsey County District Judge McNally to deny the AFL-544 motion to quash Local 544-CIO's writ of certiorari seeking a review of former state labor conciliator Blair's decision to deny elections to the Minneapolis drivers; and (2) on the heels of the above, the armed attack by three gangsters on leaders of Local 544-CIO (see the union's statement on this attack, published below).

Judge McNally's decision to review the Blair decision, reached after two months' deliberation, comes as a shock to the Tobin machine. There is no question but that an unbiased review of the actions of Governor Stassen's labor conciliator will prove that the Minneapolis drivers are entitled to a democratic election.

The daily press, the police and the County Attorney are trying to play down and ridicule the at-

Treas. Kelly Postal of Local 544-CIO, on trial for the alleged "embezzlement" of \$1,000 from President Tobin of the AFL Teamsters. Such a verdict should have resulted in a quashing of the other indictments against Postal, all based on the same phoney "evidence". Now, however, County Attorney Goff announces he will try Postal again, this time for a loan of \$5,000 made by Local 544 to the Filling Station Attendants Union Local 977. Goff, in deciding to re-prosecute Postal, is acting under pressure of the Tobin machine which is interested in continuing to keep the leaders of 544-CIO on trial in the courts. In the new trial Tobin will seek to jockey the case before a judge amenable to his pressure.

The full statement of 544-CIO's Executive Board on last Friday's

attack on the union leaders follows: "At ten minutes to noon on Friday, February 20th, three men, each holding a revolver in his hand, entered the headquarters of Local 544-CIO at 827 Twelfth Avenue South. In the headquarters were Kelly Postal, Ray Rainbolt and Harry DeBoer, union leaders, who were discussing the pending review by Ramsey County District Judge McNally of the Blair decision of last fall, denying democratic elections to the Minneapolis drivers.

"The trio of gunmen were unknown to the 544-CIO organizers. They were dressed in plain dark overcoats. The largest of the three carried, in addition to a gun, a wrapped baseball bat.

"The gunmen ordered the 544-CIO leaders to 'Stick 'em up.' When Rainbolt laughed, the largest said, 'This is no laughing matter.' The gunmen searched the 544-CIO men, found no weapons, and ordered them to face the wall with their hands up.

"They asked the names of their victims. When DeBoer told his name, the largest gunman lifted the ballbat and hit DeBoer over the head, back and legs until the latter crumpled in a corner. Mr.

DeBoer has been representing Local 544-CIO in current negotiations with the Waterman-Waterbury company, where 544-CIO recently won a National Labor Relations Board election from the AFL.

"The gunmen ordered Rainbolt and Postal to stay quiet with their hands up, and left. They had been in the headquarters about three minutes.

"Local 544-CIO reported this attack to the Minneapolis chief of detectives and to County Attorney Ed Goff.

"Local 544-CIO charges that Daniel J. Tobin, president of the AFL Teamsters International, is responsible for this armed attack on Local 544-CIO leaders. Should any Local 544-CIO leader be attacked or murdered, we shall hold Tobin personally responsible.

"Such tactics as those resorted to today are consistent with the unprincipled and violent struggle that Tobin has been waging in Minneapolis since June, 1941, against 544-CIO and the drivers and warehousemen of this city.

"Local 544-CIO is calling the attention of the national labor movement to the attack on its leaders by Tobin gunmen."

Bosses Start Offensive To Block CIO's Demands

(Continued from page 1)

viding that union members may, if they wish, sign individual statements that they "will, as a condition of employment, maintain their membership in the union in good standing during the life of the contract."

This is a far cry from the union security provided under a union shop contract, where every worker is required to belong to the union as a prerequisite for continued employment.

But the unregenerate open-shoppers of Little Steel's "Big Four" — Bethlehem, Republic, Youngstown Sheet & Tube and Inland Steel — have announced they are opposed even to this so-called "voluntary maintenance of membership" plan. Last week they burst into print denouncing the idea, calling it "a cleverly camouflaged closed shop."

DAVIS BACKS DOWN
The reported sponsor of the "Field formula", WLB chairman William Davis, already appears to be backing down before the steel barons on even this weak proposal. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, Feb. 22, states that Davis "has privately denied

he ever told anyone he would sponsor this plan."

What the steel companies and the employers want is an absolute decree enforcing the open shop status quo and barring demands for any form of union security. If the WLB does not concede completely to the companies, it is likely that they will defy its decisions and attempt to throw the issue into Congress, where the bosses know they will get full cooperation.

It is reported that the SWOC leaders are prepared to accept the "Field formula" in lieu of the union shop, if they secure the union's wage demands.

HENDERSON'S MANDATE

However, the WLB has received a virtual mandate from Price Administrator Leon Henderson against granting any general wage increases. Assistant Price Administrator J. K. Galbraith has been urging the same policy. It is unlikely, therefore, that the Board will concede more than slight wage increases.

The CIO leaders are being prodded with the threat of Congressional anti-labor action to make them yield to the employ-

ers all along the line. This threat was implicit in the speech delivered last week by William M. Leiserson, member of the National Labor Relations Board, who declared that a "national policy" must be established on the wage and union shop issues and predicted that "as things look now it appears inevitable that Congress will be forced to act because the problems are too big and too crucial for the War Labor Board to solve."

CIO leaders, who have agreed to surrender the right to strike and are depending solely on the WLB to secure the CIO's demands, cannot conceal their anxiety about the effects of this barrage on the WLB. This was revealed in CIO President and SWOC Chairman Philip Murray's complaint last week to William Davis that "certain government and industry officials," namely Henderson, Galbraith, Leiserson and the Little Steel owners, are conducting a "premeditated publicity campaign" seeking to "prejudice the public mind, and, if possible, the War Labor Board" against the SWOC's demands.

Davis' reply to Murray, on Feb. 21, naturally denied that the

Board would be influenced by this pressure. But Davis' reply did contain the threat of his readiness to have the wage and union shop issues handed over to Congress. He stated that he would "have no reason to object if the laborers of the National War Labor Board were lightened by a formation of policy by some higher authority." This, of course, is also what the employers want.

Although fearful that the CIO is going to get the dirty end of the stick from the WLB, the CIO leaders are incapable of doing anything but pleading for a "break" before this same board. Opposed to militant union action, concerned primarily with demonstrating their loyalty to the Administration and aiding it in binding the unions to the war machine, the union leaders hope merely to obtain a few crumbs and "formulas" from the WLB. These will be palmed off as substantial "concessions" in an attempt to deceive the CIO workers.

Real victories, however, will come only from militant union struggles, making use of every effective bargaining weapon of labor, including the strike.

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

Street Scene In India



This scene is typical of many streets in the cities of India, where whole families live, sleep and die on the sidewalks; where men, women and children feel the pangs of hunger from one year to another; and where the spirit of revolt for national independence is growing rapidly today.

Lessons Of The Last War

By A. ROLAND

American isolationism was defeated and permanently discarded not because of Roosevelt and his policies, nor because the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. Isolationism was completely unreal in a world whose economy had been so bound together that United States capitalism was deeply affected by whatever happened in the most remote corners of the earth.

The present war — everybody recognizes the fact — is the continuation of the first world war. The basic causes must therefore be the same, the attempt at red-ivision of the world. The United States, with its highly productive technology, and conditioned by the world economic crisis, could not possibly stay out of a war whose outcome was bound to influence its entire future.

George Soule and his fellow New Republicans cannot stomach the unvarnished truth. They seize on more idealist grounds to motivate their support of the war. In his article, *Lessons Of Last Time*, in the Feb. 2 *New Republic*, Soule says: "The issues of the present war are far simpler and clearer than those of the last one."

These issues, he says, have to do with fascist brutality which threatens to destroy civilization. Soule is forced to admit that this was not seen as the menace it was from the very start. Soule skirts carefully around this historic truth. He does not wish to be led to the heart of the entire matter.

Fascist brutality was applauded and aided by the capitalists of all lands as the savior of civilization against Bolshevism. It was not Stalin, but Churchill who hailed "that great man, Mussolini," and who spoke with respect of Hitler.

So long as fascist brutality was confined to the punishment of the working class, monopoly capitalism and all its henchmen in other countries made no complaints. Only when "fascist brutality" reached beyond its own borders to threaten the interests of the others, did the "democracies" discover its menace to civilization. Soule notwithstanding, we may cross off fascist brutality as the cause of the war.

THE DEEPER CAUSES

Simple and clear as the causes of the present war would seem to be, Soule is obviously not satisfied with his own explanation. He seeks deeper causes. He is forced to trace Nazism back to the frustration of Germany resulting from the peace imposed by the victors of the first world war. This is a partial explanation, a half-truth. Soule wishes to evade the question hidden in any discussion of special problems, whether the discussion concerns the war, fascism or democracy.

Was Nazism inevitable in Germany? An honest discussion of that question would show where one stands on the main issue of our epoch. The Weimar Republic was doomed by the forces playing within German society. Those class forces (how Soule skates around issues to evade the class issue!) pitted the workers against the capitalists in the struggle for power. Let us ask a simple question. Since Soule hates fascist brutality, would he now say that looking back he would have preferred the workers to have carried "through the proletarian revolution?"

The capitalists of France answered this question for themselves in the present war. They preferred to capitulate to the brutal fascists than to have the workers of France come to power. Are the English and American capitalists different from the French? We venture to say that if they were faced with this same choice, that between defeat by Hitler and proletarian revolution, they would act no differently. Let us pursue this analysis

come to such terms with Hitler as to direct his forces against Soviet Russia. They hoped that this would so weaken both countries that the democracies would then reap all the benefit. The second world war was thus inherent in the very rise of fascism. But it developed in somewhat different fashion than was hoped for by the capitalists.

FUTURE SOCIETY

Soule states what he thinks ought to be the aims of the present war and the construction of a "New Order" of society after the war. The complete bankruptcy of his thinking is revealed here. His new order turns out to be no different from the old order. He takes for granted in his analysis that the democracies will win the war. This will mean victory for what he terms the "somewhat more gentle form of economic imperialism" of the United States and England.

What then? Why, then the soldiers who have done the fighting will never permit the same old world order to continue. They

will see to it that power will never again be given to any "new Baldwins, Chamberlains, Daladries, Hardings or Hoovers." This means precisely nothing. Are Churchill and Roosevelt fundamentally different from those named? If so, in what way? Do not expect any answer from a man who is writing to order.

And how shall we characterize this man who has the effrontery to tell us that the second world war is already a revolution, that it is being fought on two fronts? "First is the military fight against the Axis. Second is the construction of a democratic, rationally managed, fully productive world order, the military struggle cannot result in victory and without which the fruits of victory cannot be realized." Not one single word to show this balderdash means!

PLANNED CAPITALISM

The liberals have always been the proponents of the idea that capitalism can be planned. The visual evidence of the real world seems not to discourage them in

any way. Soule tells us that after this war the raw materials of world economy must never again be exploited by capitalist imperialism of the old type. International trade and finance must be reorganized. Instead of imperialism "we must" attempt to create and direct a world economy, not merely for the benefit of a few in the older economic centers, but for the benefit of all. The backward corners of the earth must be industrially developed by a pooling of capital resources, if necessary even without profit. This means a far greater regulation by government of domestic economy. The capitalists will have to "reconcile" themselves to these new arrangements.

It is easy to dismiss all of this by calling it nonsensical and Utopian. But its function is to convince the inexperienced and uninitiated that Anglo-American capitalism is different from German-Italian capitalism, that Anglo-American capitalism is more genial and kind and offers the possibility of a solution of the world's ills. This prepares the way for the acceptance of world-wide pooling by the democracies "for the benefit of all."

Who is to inaugurate the "revolutionary" changes in capitalism that Soule feels to be necessary? Roosevelt and Churchill? Not a word is said on this vital score. Precisely here one can see the importance of Soule's conscious omission of any class analysis. Only a socialist society could eliminate all forms of exploitation, could cooperate on a world scale for the real benefit of all peoples. Capitalist society is utterly incapable of accomplishing such ends. But socialism can be brought about only by the workers of all lands. If they do not usher in the socialist society, then the second world

India, 'Heart' of the Empire

Visitors Reports Conditions Of Oppressed Native People

By WILLIAM ELLIS

(The following article is by an American who returned to this country from India shortly before the outbreak of the Pacific War).

The suffering masses of India are indifferent to Britain's war. They will never willingly support it. Their chief desire is to throw the British yoke off their backs, to be free of all oppression.

This is the inescapable impression that anyone who visits India, even for a brief time, must receive. It is the impression that India stamped indelibly on my mind.

Centuries of British rule have brought indescribable physical devastation to the hundreds of millions of Indian native peoples. That devastation is the thing that struck me from the moment I arrived in India.

The first city I had the opportunity to visit was Calcutta. On the docks there I had my first chance to observe Indian work-

ers, the dock workers. They presented a picture of abject poverty. They were dressed in mere tatters, shoeless. I noticed some with feet wrapped in dirty, bloody bandages.

In contrast to the usually, well-built powerful American dock worker, they appeared pretty scrawny, and I wondered how they were able to do such heavy manual labor. Later I was to learn that these dock workers are among the best-paid, high-

est-type workers in India, the "aristocracy" of Indian labor, so to speak. Which gives an idea of what the conditions of the lower-paid mass of Indian workers are like.

A dock worker with whom I one day struck up a conversation pointed out another worker with a bandaged head passing by. He told me that the day before the injured worker had been working on a ship and had made some protest which a stool-pigeon had overheard. He was kicked off the ship and later beaten up on the dock. Any protest is met with severe reprisal from the bosses.

Still, these workers "enjoy" better conditions than most of the Indian people. That is because they have a militant union, as I later learned, which has engaged in many bloody struggles and won many improvements for them.

NATIVES' CONDITIONS

My most vivid recollections are of the first visit I made to the native quarters of an Indian city. I went with a friend who warned me in advance of what we would see and experience.

We entered some narrow, smelly, filthy streets, more like alleys, swarming with emaciated, half-naked, ragged natives. A pitiful old woman, with a huge abdominal growth, probably a tumor, approached and begged for some money.

She followed us with continuous pleas, and finally, despite my friend's warnings, I gave her a rupee. Instantly, we were surrounded by a mass of beggars, plucking at us, crying and howling. They were all deformed or diseased in some way. We had to

evolutionary" changes in capitalism that Soule feels to be necessary? Roosevelt and Churchill? Not a word is said on this vital score. Precisely here one can see the importance of Soule's conscious omission of any class analysis. Only a socialist society could eliminate all forms of exploitation, could cooperate on a world scale for the real benefit of all peoples. Capitalist society is utterly incapable of accomplishing such ends. But socialism can be brought about only by the workers of all lands. If they do not usher in the socialist society, then the second world

literally fight our way through them and run to escape.

These beggars are the hallmark of conditions in India. They are everywhere, in vast numbers. The sick, the injured, the maimed receive little or no care from the British authorities in India. All they can do is try to drag out their existence, begging in the streets until they finally drop dead.

Along the streets, wherever I went in any Indian city, I saw many blind and crippled natives. I also observed the great number of people forced to live on the streets. Whole families, men, women and children, make their homes on the streets and sidewalks. Here, amid noise and filth, they eat, sleep and die. And such is the hunger and disease that even young men and women appear aged and bent. Actually, there are few really old people, because the death rate is so appalling.

I learned, while in Calcutta, that once a week the British authorities send a truck around the streets of the city to pick up the dead. In life, the natives are treated like dirt, and, in death, like garbage.

ENSLAVED PEASANTS

The peasant masses in India are, if anything, even worse off than the natives in the cities.

I was able on one occasion to travel a short distance into the interior. In a small village of tiny, one-room thatched huts lining a railroad track, I had the good fortune to meet and talk with a leader of a peasant group from one of the interior provinces.

We sat on the floor of one of

war can only bring after it a new armed truce resulting after an appropriate period of gestation in a third world war.

LIBERALISM, SNARE FOR YOUNG INTELLECTUALS

The role played by the Soules needs constantly to be pointed out to young intellectuals. The kind of writing indulged in by these henchmen of capitalism is intended to snare young intellectuals into the capitalist fold. The use of apparently radical phraseology and "large" thoughts covers up the real core of things. Every great situation is rationalized one way or another to secure support for monopoly capitalism. The admission of social evils and the need for really radical change are just so much bait to throw young minds off the track. Nothing could illustrate this better than Soule's long-winded cover for imperialism.

The solution for imperialist war can only be an international solution. Soule says of himself that he does "not think that the United States is just another Europe, or that all human problems can be solved by merging them in an undifferentiated internationalism." He clarifies this to show that he accepts and wishes to preserve American economic predominance.

History presents us with many nations and countries at various uneven levels of development. Soule thinks that internationalism would mean the sinking of all lands to the lowest levels. But the international working class movement would raise the level of all peoples to that of the most advanced countries. And the effect of the second world war will be to lower culture and civilization everywhere. In fact, if capitalism continues to predominate after the war, there is every danger that civilization will sink into the abyss. The planning of world-wide production will become less and less possible in an impoverished world.

the huts, which was about eight feet square and in which seven people were forced to live, and he told me of the conditions of the peasants in his province.

He described to me the terrible poverty and suffering of the peasants, who are virtual slaves of the rajah who owns all the land. The little the peasants manage to get to live on, is almost all taken away in taxes. He recited one of the native proverbs current in the province: "If a man has his belly full three times a year, he is indeed fortunate."

The peasants are not permitted to leave the rajah's land. If they try to escape, they are trailed, and if they are caught, they are tortured and beaten. Besides, the peasant leader said to me, "Even if they do escape, where would they go?"

The rajah, who aids the British rulers to keep the peasants in subjection, is in turn given the full support of the British should the peasants protest or turn rebellious.

A few years previously, the peasants in this province had revolted against the tax collections and opposed the payment of the staggering taxes. The British masters promptly sent troops into the province and the peasants were mercilessly shot down.

EVERY STRUGGLE A FIGHT AGAINST BRITISH RULERS

Every struggle of the natives — even the smallest strike over the most elementary demands — is met with armed suppression. I was informed on more than one occasion that the native workers take it for granted that when they go on strike, the British rulers will send troops to attempt to terrorize them into submission.

One union leader told me of the experiences of the workers in the great oil-fields of Assam, who a few years ago organized and went out on strike. Thousands of workers were involved, and it appeared that they would win. But the British sent troops into the oil-fields and literally machine-gunned the workers back to work.

A strike in India, therefore, is always viewed by the workers as more than a struggle against an individual boss. They know it is a struggle against the British government itself, which always comes promptly to the aid of the bosses.

Most of the soldiers and police in India come from a separate, small tribe, the Sikhs, who perform the same role for the British rulers as the Cossacks in Russia did for the Czars.

In all the time I was in India, I cannot recall seeing a single native soldier who was not a Sikh, who are easily distinguishable from the rest of the population by their long, black beards. Few Indian natives are willing to join the army and fight for the British; moreover, the British do not look with favor on giving military training and arms to any but the bribed and privileged Sikhs.

This is only a sketchy picture of the conditions which have bred hatred of the British ruling class into the very bones of the Indian masses and which lie at the roots of their growing fight for national independence.

My most fortunate experience in India was to meet a number of workers belonging to unions and native political organizations, from whom I secured first-hand accounts of the struggle now developing in India.

(The conclusion of this article, describing some organizations and political tendencies in India will appear in next week's MILITANT).

New Boards To Control Seas And Shipping Now - And After War

By ALBERT PARKER

Woodrow Wilson promised that the first world war would be followed by the establishment of a world order of economic opportunity and co-operation between all nations which, by doing away with the economic causes of modern war, would usher in a period of lasting peace.

This promise was incorporated in his "Fourteen Points"; one of these points guaranteed "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas" and another promised the removal "so far as possible" of "all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace."

Everyone knows today that these promises, designed to win the support of the war-hating masses for the war, were not kept, and that instead of the period of peace promised by Wilson there was ushered in a period of intensified economic warfare that was bound sooner or later to erupt into a new world war.

"Absolute freedom of navigation" was shown to mean absolute control of navigation; "freedom of the seas" was translated to mean freedom to rule the seas. Although the German people "consented" to the peace, by overthrowing their monarch and his regime, the German merchant marine as well as the navy was taken away, and German sea power destroyed by the victorious allies.

"Economic barriers" were extended instead of removed; tariff walls were raised everywhere in Europe and the United States; raw materials were seized and withheld from other nations.

Same Promises Again

The second world war version of Wilson's "Fourteen Points" was the eight-point "Atlantic Charter" adopted by Roosevelt and Churchill last August, and since endorsed by the others of the "United Nations". Like its predecessor, the "Atlantic Charter" promises "freedom of the seas" and "trade equality" qualified with respect to the "present obligations" of the signatories.

The Marxists of the first world war predicted the outcome of Wilson's promises, but it was not until the war was over that their predictions were proved to be true. The exact outcome of the Roosevelt-Churchill promises will likewise not be revealed in full until after the war, for their outcome depends to a certain degree on the outcome of the war. But already, although this country has been in the war as a full-fight-

ing participant for such a short time and has not even fully organized its war machinery, it is possible to see the trends of the future in the very organization of that war machinery.

James B. Reston, New York Times reporter, reports some interesting developments along this line in the Feb. 8 issue of that paper.

When Churchill came to Washington two months ago, he and Roosevelt had extensive talks about the unification of British and United States resources for the conduct of the war.

Two Boards Set Up

One of the results of this conference was the establishment of a Combined Materials Board to plan the best speediest development, expansion and use of the raw material resources, under the jurisdiction or control of the two governments. This committee, says Reston, "has authority to plan what is to be done for the duration of the war with approximately seven-eighths of all the strategic raw materials in the world."

Also established was a Combined Shipping Adjustment Board to determine the use of the shipping of the "United Nations" for the duration of the war.

There is nothing unusual in the establishment of such boards for the conduct of the war; the difference between these boards and similar boards established in the first world war, lies in the use contemplated for them after the war.

Churchill, according to Reston, was reluctant to discuss this aspect of the question. In fact, he "was a little cantankerous about doing anything about the post-war world, which he dismissed as 'that unattractive jungle.'"

Roosevelt, however, felt that these boards have an important "future, not only in war but in the peace after the war."

Reston, obviously expressing the views of the Administration, declares that "it may be that the post-war operations of the raw materials and shipping committees will prove to be more important in the long run than their operations during the course of the conflict itself."

"The Atlantic Charter... clearly indicates that the anti-Axis coalition, if victorious, intends to control the distribution of raw materials so that only those nations who are prepared to cooperate in establishing and maintaining some kind of sensible new world order shall have access to the essential raw materials of the world.

To Control Shipping Too

"Similarly, high officials here who have been dealing with the post-war problem have made it clear that in their opinion it will be necessary for a considerable time after the war to control not only the raw materials but the shipping of the world for the good of those nations — and those nations alone — who are prepared in keeping the peace."

"Mr. Churchill has thus cooperated with Mr. Roosevelt in setting up machinery to control most of the strategic raw materials and shipping of the world, not only for the duration of the war but for the days after the war."

Reston concludes his article by saying this plan for "Anglo-American cooperation" after the war has not been wholly and completely worked out, but that "the higher one goes in the ranks of the Administration the more talk one finds of this war-time machinery forming the basis of some kind of solid, practical, economic collaboration for peace."

In short, it is already obvious that the promises of the Atlantic Charter are following the same path as the promises of the "Fourteen Points", only perhaps at a more accelerated pace.

When Churchill spoke to Congress, he said that five or six years ago it might still have been possible to avoid the war if the United States and Britain had insisted on disarmament and if they had made available to Germany "those materials, those raw materials, which we declared in the Atlantic Charter should not be denied to any nation, victor or vanquished."

But if the struggle over raw materials (and shipping to transport those raw materials) led to the second world war, is it not clear that the course now proposed for the "United Nations" will lead in the future along the path of renewed economic warfare that is certain to result in a third world war?

Why Churchill Is "Cantankerous"

It should not be assumed that Churchill was reluctant to discuss the post-war problem because he had a different program than Roosevelt's. He was "cantankerous", actually, because he realizes that Great Britain is fated to play a secondary role after the war, that United States capitalism will hold the upper hand in the event of a victory by the "United Nations"; he prefers to "wait and see" before committing himself.

Ray Tucker, a Washington columnist,

gave a partial indication, in his Jan. 25 article printed in the *Flint Journal* and other papers, of why Britain hesitates to commit itself on post-war questions:

"The Mikado's unforeseen eruption Dec. 7 spoiled the smartest game of international poker Uncle Sam ever hoped to play. The emperor's subsequent successes may also have robbed us of chips we had planned to use at the peace table."

"The inside story", as he calls it, "reads like fiction."

"William Yandell Elliott, an economic adviser at Office of Production Management, had framed the blue-prints for formation of an Anglo-American cartel dominated by the United States. The Elliott corporation would have obtained control of many key resources of the British, Dutch and Free French empires as well as those produced in this country — our claim to majority ownership, according to the Harvard professor's formula, to depend on the billions of lend-lease funds we are advancing to our friends. Some return was forecast for our vast investment. Our post-war supervision over this pooling of the world's gold, food, rubber, tin, oils, fats, sugar, petroleum, etc., would have provided us with some ace cards in any final dicker- ing with the Allied victors and Axis vanquished."

That this proposal was not an individual and isolated idea is shown in Tucker's statement that "it tickled the fancy of materialistic and starry-eyed fellows as close to the White House as paper on the wall."

Seed of Future Wars

Tucker concludes, "Now the deal is off because Messrs. Hirohito and Tojo occupy the lands to which we hoped to stake a claim. And the 'scorched earth' retreat from that area may make them a liability rather than an asset after the war." If the only reason that "the deal is off" is because Japan temporarily controls some of these areas, and because of a "scorched earth" policy which notoriously has scorched very little earth, then probably the deal is not off after all, and certainly not permanently.

But whatever the outcome of this particular "deal", it is obvious from the way the war is being run, and from the conflicts between the "United Nations" themselves, that as long as capitalist policies and rivalries rule the world, the seed of future wars is present and will be nourished.

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. 9 Saturday, February 28, 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: 5 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 12, 1941
at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of
March 3, 1879."

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

Labor Needs Its Own Military Policy

Walter Reuther, director of the General Motors Division of the United Auto Workers, suggested on Feb. 22 that members of labor unions be given military training "to assist the Army in the event of enemy attacks on coastal cities and defense production areas."

Leaving aside Reuther's motivations in making this proposal, there is no question but that in this period workers in civilian life require military training for the protection of their own class interests. Most workers will agree that military training is a handy thing at a time when all the important questions of the day are being decided arms in hand.

But under what conditions shall the workers in the trade unions receive military training? Who shall control the program? Shall workers receive only the training given to privates in the Army or shall some of them receive more specialized and intensive training in the military arts enabling them to become military leaders, that is, officers? What shall be the relations between the worker-soldiers and the worker-officers? How shall such a program be financed?

The answer to these problems, which are certainly as important as the recognition of the need for military training, can be found in the program, long advocated by THE MILITANT and the Socialist Workers Party, for:

"Military training of workers, financed by the government, but under the 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."

Just as the workers look to the trade unions to protect their interests on the economic field, so should they look to them to protect their interests on the military field. Far better for them to receive military instruction under the democratic control and direction of their own trade unions than under the direction of the brass hats whom they have learned through experience to suspect as hostile to the interests of the labor movement.

If the units of workers are to be effective as a trained force, they must also provide for special training of workers as officers. Such training will take more time and cannot be given in after-work hours. Special camps must be set up where selected workers can become trained as officers capable of leading their brothers in battle.

What would be more democratic than to have the worker-soldiers choose their own officers, as they do the trade union officials? Where could they find people more devoted to their interests, more trustworthy, than the same shop-stewards and union militants who lead them in their everyday struggle for better conditions?

As for finances, what proposal could be more logical than to ask Congress to appropriate the necessary money? When Congress can spend more than a hundred billion dollars in the name of a war against fascism, why shouldn't it be called on to spend a few million dollars to enable the training of a force that would be the strongest possible guarantee against the establishment of fascism in this country?

Our program for military training has been based from the beginning on the understanding that workers must learn how to use the advanced military techniques used by their enemies. Superficial critics of this program used to sneer that we needn't worry, the government would see to it that

the workers would get such training in the army; they chose to ignore the special problems created for the workers in the new situation of world militarization.

But now that the spread of the war has led to a growing realization of the need for military training of the workers in civilian life as well as of the soldiers, who can honestly deny that our program alone provides protection of the special class interests of the workers? Who now will deny that the workers would have been much better off today if the trade unions and other workers' organizations had adopted such a program long ago?

Anti-Labor Offensive

It was necessary to read a bit between the lines of President Roosevelt's speech Monday night to see that his main emphasis was directed against labor and its demands for higher wages and the union shop.

But it is not necessary to read between the lines of the statements of Roosevelt's subordinates and Congressional supporters to understand that the Administration is supporting an intensive drive against the rights and conditions of the working class.

An Associated Press dispatch on Feb. 25 reported that a "drastic 'work or fight' law may soon be sought 'by the Administration' at the behest of 'officials charged with responsibility for all-out production' — the corporation agents of the War Production Board.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson, and his assistants, have been publicly urging against any general wage increases in the face of rising prices, and Henderson has bluntly demanded that the War Labor Board deny the general wage demands of the CIO.

On the heels of Roosevelt's speech, Democratic poll-tax Representative Howard Smith on Tuesday announced in Congress that he would sponsor a measure to suspend the Wage-Hour Law for the duration of the war. And the press reports that he is receiving wide-spread Congressional support for his proposal.

All facts point to an intensive co-ordinated anti-labor drive of the corporations, capitalist press and Congressmen, to whose fire Roosevelt's speech added much fuel.

Significantly, every blow is being directed at labor. None are being struck at the monopolists and war profiteers. Under the pretext of war-time necessity, the employing class is striving to put over the union-smashing, labor-crushing program it could not realize in peace-time.

War Secrets And Civil Liberties

The Department of Justice on Feb. 16 sent to Congress a proposal for a law making it a penal offense for any one to make public, without authority, "any file, instrument, letter, memorandum, book, pamphlet, paper, document, manuscript, map, picture, plan, record or other writing" designated by any government agency as "secret" or "confidential", or even to divulge its "substance, purport, effect or meaning."

This was so obviously a measure which could be employed to censor and silence discussion of any report, document or activity of the government and any individual in the government, that even reactionary Congressmen and the entire capitalist press condemned it.

Attorney General Biddle, who had sent the bill to Congress, was called on Feb. 24 before a hearing of a Senate committee. Although he had sought to sneak the bill through in its most drastic form, Biddle yielded a bit under pressure and told the committee that if it wanted to modify the bill that was its privilege. "I am bringing this baby to your doorstep."

The Senators, of course, held no objections to the main purposes and basic contents of the bill. They sought merely certain emendations which would enable them to say what they had to say.

But these modifications would in no wise eliminate the central vicious feature of the bill, which could still be employed as an instrument to keep from the public not only military secrets but also information which might draw criticism and popular opposition.

This bill was drafted years ago, but the favorable opportunity did not arise to present it until the current war situation made it possible to introduce it in the guise of a measure to safeguard military secrets.

That this is not, however, and never was the primary intent of the bill is indicated by I. F. Stone, in the New York newspaper PM, Feb. 18, who disclosed that "a high official of the Justice Dept., whose name I cannot disclose, said this bill had nothing to do with the war effort and had been under discussion by an interdepartmental committee for several years. This official said the bill antedated the war."

Even if this bill should not be passed, the fact that Biddle and the Department of Justice have sponsored it constitutes a timely warning to the American masses of the dangerous channels in which the Administration's mind is travelling.

Available Now

BOUND VOLUMES OF
NEW INTERNATIONAL and
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for
1940 and 1941

Price \$3.00

Order now from
Business Office
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place New York City

Business Background Of Nelson, Head of WPB

Corporation He Comes From Is Connected With Powerful, Labor-Hating Monopolies

Last month the Truman Senate Investigating Committee pointed out that the dollar-a-year men in charge of the war production program "subconsciously reflect the opinions and conclusions which they formerly reached as managers of large interests" with respect to their handling of contracts, margin of profits agreed to, etc. But the only solution the Committee was able to offer for this situa-

tion was that these dollar-a-year men be obliged to resign from the corporations from which they came and to work on a straight government salary.

When Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, appeared before the Truman Committee on Jan. 28 to defend the dollar-a-year-men, he did not even try to refute the charge of "unconscious bias" to big business on the part of the dollar-a-year men; he merely contented himself with assuring the Committee that their proposal would not solve the situation because such bias would not be eliminated among men with long big business backgrounds even if they were paid by the government. Whereupon the Committee, not daring to suggest that control of the war production program be taken away from big business men altogether, meekly withdrew its proposal.

Bearing Nelson's assurance in mind, it is interesting to get some light on Nelson's own background. Nelson is best known in business circles as an executive for Sears-Roebuck. Sears-Roebuck has interlocking directorates with 8 corporations:

General Food Corporation; B. F. Goodrich Co; Continental Can Corporation; National Dairy Products Co; McKesson-Robbins; Macy's; Gimbel's; North American Utility.

These eight corporations in turn interlock with 38 other corporations. Five big banks, including the Illinois Banking and Trust Co. which had a billion dollars in assets as of 1935.

Two investment trusts. Ten utilities, including the American Telephone and Telegraph, largest in the country, and stretching from Consolidated Edison of New York to the Pacific Gas and Electric.

Nine railroads, including the New York Central and Union Pa-

cific and M. K. and T. R.R. Three insurance companies, the New York Life, Metropolitan Life and Mutual Life, with combined assets of 7.7 billions in 1935.

Two motion picture corporations, Paramount and Loew's. Seven other large corporations: Chrysler of the Big 3 in auto; Texas Oil; Union Carbide; International Harvester; Allis-Chalmers; Wilson and Co. of the Big 4 in meat; and U. S. Rubber.

ONLY PART OF STORY

Without considering the huge number of additional interlocking directorates which these 38 corporations have in turn, 1935 figures report that the 47 corporations had listed assets amounting to a total of 31½ billion dollars.

It is true that Nelson ostentatiously resigned his executive post with Sears-Roebuck when he took over the job of heading the War Production Board, but no one doubts that his old job, if not a better one, will be waiting for him as soon as he wants to go back to it.

It is true that now he is paid by the government instead of by Sears-Roebuck, but as he himself pointed out, this does not change the basic attitude of corporation executives of long standing.

Meanwhile, it is easier to understand his activities as war production chief in the light of this background.

Churchill Shuffles War Cabinet, Adds Cripps

(Continued from page 1)

policies; it shows that fundamentally his program is no different from Churchill's.

THE "RADICAL'S" APPEAL

All Cripps had to say to the German workers was that Hitler faced "certain defeat" eventually. He declared that the workers of the USSR and Britain are ready to do their utmost to achieve this, and predicted that although Britain had lost its domination of the seas in the South-western Pacific, "the Allies will regain their superiority."

In other words, he did not say a single thing that could possibly arouse the German workers to struggle for the overthrow of Hitler; he did not say a single thing that Churchill himself could not say and has not already said many times. Apparently, now that he holds a cabinet post, he is quite content to forget about an immediate clear enunciation of peace aims.

As a matter of fact, the probable effect of Cripps' speech was to throw the German workers into greater despair and passivity. They fear that a victory by England will result in another Versailles Treaty and the same kind of suffering they had to endure after the first world war.

And when the "socialist" Cripps, whom someone once called "the most dangerous revolutionary in England," has nothing more to say about what will happen to the German people after the war than Churchill or Eden, and has nothing really to tell them but that Hitler will lose the war, their fears are increased.

Thus the only people in Germany benefited by Cripps' speech were the Nazi leaders, who take advantage of such speeches to try to convince the German masses that there is no alternative to

a Hitler victory but another Versailles.

Churchill too, of course, is benefited by such a speech, because it serves to emphasize to the British workers that Cripps, the "radical," does not have any more radical program than Churchill. He is also benefited in other ways by having someone like Cripps in his cabinet.

CRIPPS' USES FOR CHURCHILL

Churchill has not changed his policy on the colonial question, and he does not intend to. It is very useful for him, at a time when that policy is under fire, to have in the cabinet a man whose promotion, as Quincy Howe points out, "should have a great moral effect throughout Asia where he is known to sympathize with the aspirations of the native population."

It is useful for Churchill at a time when India has become the biggest internal problem of the empire to have in the cabinet a man who is on friendly terms with the nationalist leaders, Gandhi and Nehru—especially a man who has already tried to sell them on support of Britain's war!

Churchill has not changed his policy on the Soviet Union — a policy aimed at utilizing for Great Britain the struggle of the USSR against Hitler, and then turning against the workers' state — and he does not intend to change this policy either.

It is useful for Churchill to have in his cabinet a man like Cripps who is regarded among the broad masses as a pro-Soviet element and who is actually a friend only of the reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy; who can be used as a cover for Churchill's policy during the period of collaboration with Stalin, and then discarded when Churchill turns against the Soviet Union if he won't go along.

And not the least of Cripps'

uses to Churchill lies in his new job as leader of the House of Commons, where his tasks will be as a "socialist" to defend Churchill's policies against criticism and opposition, especially from the left.

Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York Times, Feb. 21, says, Cripps' appointment is a striking sign "of the unchanging adaptability of a nation that can always count on a Socialist to uphold the British system and an anti-imperialist to help save the empire."

Actually, it is a sign of the unchanging treachery of petty-bourgeois reformists who can always be counted on to rally to the defense of capitalism when it is in a crisis; it is a sign that Churchill knows Cripps' number; it is a sign of the bankruptcy of the non-revolutionary opposition to Churchill and his regime; it is a sign that fundamental policies have not been changed and will not be changed with a shuffling or reshuffling of the cabinet; it is a sign that if the British workers want to get rid of Churchill's ruinous and reactionary policies, they will have to press forward to the establishment of a Workers' Government in Britain, which by recognizing the national independence of India and the other colonies will be able to effect a lasting alliance with the colonial people, powerful enough to defeat the fascists and destroy fascism everywhere.

Trotsky's Last Work
MANIFESTO OF THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
on the
IMPERIALIST WAR
and the
PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION
48 pages 5 cents per copy
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place

Prime Minister Of An Empire In State Of Decay

By M. STEIN

Churchill's Vote of Confidence

"When I was called upon, nearly two years ago, to be Prime Minister there were not many applications for the job." Thus spoke Mr. Churchill on Jan. 27 before the House of Commons when he demanded a vote of confidence.

Churchill's monopoly attitude to the post of Prime Minister would have been impossible even in the first quarter of the present century. The young, vigorous, yet untired, rising Labor Party was in the field, ready to assume leadership, and holding out the promise of Socialism to be established in a legal, parliamentary... British way.

How Times Have Changed...

And to go a step further, such an attitude was inconceivable in the decade preceding the present war. By this time, it is true, the Labor Party had had its turn at the helm of the Empire. It betrayed its Socialist promises, brought discredit on itself, was swept out of office through the faked "Zinoviev letter" which the honorable Tories, all coming from good families, of course, did not hesitate to use. The Labor Party was in addition split and beheaded by Ramsay MacDonald and his ministerial friends who went over lock, stock and barrel to the Conservatives.

Even though parliamentary life was dull in this period — between the debacle of the Labor Party and the outbreak of the war — there were plenty of candidates for the job of Prime Minister. The truth is, the qualifications for this job had been lowered considerably. The primary task of a Prime Minister was to sit tight. The work of the foreign office was carried out in routine fashion by the professional secretaries and diplomats. The other tasks were even more so a matter of administrative routine.

There were such matters as Italy's assault on Ethiopia, the Spanish Civil War, Japan's attack on China. But the British genius for compromise always found a solution — let the rival imperialists take what they want, and as long as it isn't a chunk of the British Empire, a face-saving formula will be found somehow.

If Churchill bestirred himself and made a speech in the House of Commons about the speed with which Nazi Germany was arming itself, and about the resultant danger to the British Empire, it was easy to answer him. All one had to do was to point out that Henderson, Ambassador to Germany, was Hitler's bosom friend, that he was being feasted by Goering; where this did not suffice, a whisper into the ear of those who really counted, that Hitler's war preparations were really directed against the Soviet Union, was enough to do the trick. This was the era in which a Baldwin could do equally as well as a Chamberlain or for that matter anybody else on the roster of Conservative members of Parliament who might be picked out of a hat.

Then came the blitz and the storm. Poland was overrun by the Nazi war machine. That was explainable. Poland was an inland country pretty well encircled by Germany and there was no way of reaching it with aid. At least this was a good excuse. But following the fall of Poland, Norway fell, despite British aid. It is true this too was no chunk of the Empire, but it certainly was a blow to Imperial naval prestige and a sort of harbinger of the future.

Churchill's Unique Qualifications

The early Allied defeats resulted in the rise of Churchill to the post of Prime Minister. For who was there among the politicians more eminently qualified than he?

He was the most gifted speaker in the House of Commons. One does not need great eloquence in proclaiming victories — they speak for themselves. But one needs the gift of a Churchill to explain away defeats. Churchill will go down in history as the greatest post-mortem speaker of all time. Is there anything that can compare to his famous speech about "blood, toil, tears, and sweat"? The fact is that in this speech he outdid even himself. After Dunkirk came Greece, Crete and now Singapore.

His Singapore post-mortem speech was only a pale shadow of his previous orations; but perhaps he can be forgiven for this, perhaps he felt the situation too deeply and too personally. Just try to put yourself in his position. How would you feel about the loss of one of the richest jewels of the Empire which is under your stewardship, especially when there is so little promise for a turn in fortune?

It makes good rhetoric when you stand before Parliament and point to America and its tremendous industrial resources; point to Russia and the glorious victories of the Red Army; point to China and its tenacious fight for independence. But the honorable members of Parliament know that the Red Army is not fighting for the preservation of the British Empire; that if anything, China's struggle for independence is a bad example for the oppressed masses of India; and if one heeds rumors, he might entertain a germ of a doubt as to whether Wall Street is entirely unselfish in its solicitude for the British Empire.

Who represents the greatest menace to the Empire — its enemies or its allies? This question looms bigger to the M.P.'s as times goes on. But here again Churchill and his unique position provide them with the only ray of hope they can see.

Churchill knows his indispensability and he makes the most of it. This is why he can stand up before the august body of Parliament and say: "The House would fail in its duty if it did not insist on freedom of debate and a clear, honest, blunt vote thereon." Ordinarily, these words would be merely an expression of a democratic platitude. On the lips of Mr. Churchill, they become a grim joke. He knows what all the members of Commons know, that they have no alternative but to vote for him, so what's the use of talking. And when Churchill continues, "It is because things have gone badly and worse that I demand a vote of confidence," he is sure he'll get it. And then to emphasize his obvious contempt for his parliamentary colleagues and the predicament they are in, Churchill adds: "No one should be mealy-mouthed in the debate... no one should be chicken-hearted in the division lobby."

NEW YORK DINNER in support of the 18 MINNEAPOLIS DEFENDANTS

hear

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

CARLO TRESKA, 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