

UAW Meets In Midst Of Open Shop Drive

Auto Union Can Lead The Fight For All Labor

Militant Program Will Inspire the Workers And Halt Bosses' UnionSmashing Onslaught

By JOE ANDREWS

The United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers will meet in special convention in Detroit, April 7 and 8. 1200 delegates, veterans of many battles against the auto barons, representing the advance-guard of American unionism, will gather together at a time of crisis for their union and the entire labor movement.

Big business has launched a campaign to weaken the whole edifice of unionism. Each day this anti-union offensive gains momentum, both in the plants and in the halls of Congress.

The top CIO and AFL officials are retreating under this barrage. They are surrendering one by one the most basic union principles. They have relinquished the right to strike and double-time pay; they are pushing the speed-up campaign.

The UAW-CIO convention can call a halt to this retreat by initiating a militant drive to save labor's rights and hard-won conditions. This can be done on the basis of a sound and militant union program.

1. Defend the Right to Strike

The right to strike has been given away by the union officials without consulting the rank and file.

Made bold by the union leaders' surrender of this basic weapon, the employers and their congressional agents are grasping at this chance to strike heavy blows at the trade union movement.

The bosses refuse to settle grievances in the plants because they know that the unions without the strike weapon have no power to back up their demands.

Congressional leaders are carrying out a systematic campaign of intimidation to wring more concessions from labor. The Smith Slave Labor Bill, after being passed by the House of Representatives, is being held in the Senate Labor Committee as a club to force further surrender of the basic rights of the unions.

Every key demand of labor is now being mired in the bog of arbitration. The union leadership is depending entirely on the War Labor Board to defend the interests of labor. This employer-dominated board can no more be trusted by the workers than the thoroughly discredited National Defense Mediation Board which was its predecessor.

The strike weapon is vital in the fight to defend labor's gains and halt the anti-union offensive of the bosses. It must be defended against assault by the enemies of the unions from without and the appeasers from within.

2. Retain Overtime Pay

Once the right to strike was given away, the bosses demanded elimination of overtime pay. The top CIO and AFL officials already are yielding to the demand that

labor relinquish the established wage standards for Saturday, Sunday and holiday work. This is another surrender in the face of administration threats. Donald Nelson, War Production Board head, personally served labor with a 30-day ultimatum to accept this employer demand or face compulsory legislation.

This means a wage-cut for the workers and therefore more profits for the corporations.

The auto barons already have amassed huge profits. General Motors alone netted almost half a billion dollars in 1941. Its war orders guarantee it greater profits in the future.

While the workers are ordered by Nelson and the WPB to sacrifice, President Roosevelt has declared a moratorium on anti-trust prosecutions against the monopoly war profiteers and international cartels. Monopoly violators of the law are assured immunity. But more restrictive laws are proposed against labor.

The attack on the established wage standards for week-ends and holidays is intended to pave the way for the destruction of the principle of overtime pay.

3. Fight for the 40-Hour Week

The anti-labor drive, aided by administration policy, is already viciously attacking the 40-hour week. Speaker Rayburn, a leading administration spokesman in Congress, has demanded the abolition of the 40-hour week in favor of the 48-hour week. The auto barons and other bosses speaking through the *New York Times* and their other papers are echoing this demand.

Labor fought bitterly over many decades for the 40-hour week. Hundreds of union men died to win this standard. To give up this gain is to submit to immediate reduction in the standard of living. The 40-hour week must be vigorously defended.

4. For A Living Wage

The UAW demanded a \$1 a day wage increase, and a 90-day readjustment of wages to meet increased living costs. These just demands are now in negotiations with GM.

The corporation owners, though (Continued on page 2)

CONGRESS 6% PROFITS PROPOSAL IS A FRAUD

The House of Representatives, pausing briefly in its all-out-war on labor, on March 28 passed a measure to "take the profits out of war." This was a provision to limit profits on military and naval contracts to six per cent of their face value. The measure, however, is loaded with jokers.

The evidence brought out by the Truman Senate Investigating Committee and the House Naval Affairs Committee has shown that many shipbuilding corporations, averaging between six and ten per cent profit on their government contracts, actually are raking in a volume of profit equal to 200 and 300 per cent — 800 per cent in one instance — of the value of their entire original capital investment.

James E. Barnes, Washington lobbyist for the Todd Shipbuilding Corp., testified before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on Feb. 5 that his company this year will do \$200,000,000 in government business, realizing \$20,000,000 net profits — after taxes — on a total capital investment of \$40,000,000, from contracts providing "only" ten per cent profit. "I don't care if you put it down to two or three per cent," Barnes cynically admitted, "if you give us any profit at all, with the magnitude of our business and our investment, we will be profiteers."

Just as there are many ways to skin a cat, so the corporations have many ways of concealing profits. They can, and do, pad out their costs with fictitious items, and by figuring their profits on the basis of phony costs conceal

the real amount of their profits. They can, and do, pile their profits into so-called "contingency" and "reserve" funds, which are not counted as profits. For instance, Bethlehem Steel put aside into "special" reserve funds \$25,000,000 in 1941, which enabled them to show a profit of only \$31,500,000 instead of their real profits of \$59,500,000.

IT'S A GIFT!

Actually, if the big corporations didn't make a cent on their ordinary government contracts, they would still grab billions through the gifts of new plants and equipment being given them by the government — but which are not reported as profits.

Jesse Jones, head of the government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Defense Plants Corporation, on March 21 reported that up to March 7 his agencies had authorized or made expenditures for new plants and plant expansion to the amount of \$11,194,433,962. This is an outright gift to the big corporations.

These are the facts which show on the fraud of Congressional talk about "profits limitations" on government contracts — whether six per cent, two per cent or no per cent at all.

VOL. VI—No. 14

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

STANDARD OIL-NAZI DEAL EXPOSES BOSS PATRIOTISM

India Congress Heads Reject Cripps' Plan

"Dominion Status" Offer Is Fraudulent; Would Leave British Rulers In Control

By ANTHONY MASSINI

April 1. — British imperialism's hope that its offer of dominion status for India after the war would succeed in mobilizing the Indian masses for support of Britain's war appeared to be dashed to the ground today by reports that the All-India Congress Party and other Indian groups would reject the plan presented by Sir Stafford Cripps on behalf of the British War Cabinet.

Dispatches from India indicated that the Congress Party objected chiefly to the demand in Cripps' plan for Britain to "retain control and direction of the defense of India." It may be that the Congress leaders themselves have little confidence in the kind of war that Britain would conduct. But undoubtedly their decision was influenced primarily by the unyielding attitude of the Indian masses who are so embittered by British rule that even the prospect of a change in masters has not induced them to want to fight for Britain.

The Congress leadership, which represents the interests of the Indian capitalist class, has shown by its compromises and capitulations in the past that it cannot be depended on to lead the struggle against the imperialists. In fact, the Congress leaders, while they desire the opportunity to replace the British as the dominant force in India, fear more than anything else the independent steps that the Indian masses will try to take to solve their economic and political problems once the British yoke is removed.

PRESSURE FROM MASSES

The rejection of Cripps' plan by the Congress leaders, therefore, must be viewed as the expression of tremendous pressure on them from the masses. These leaders realize that they would be thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the peasants and workers if they accepted the plan. As Jawaharlal Nehru put it in an interview with Leland Stowe (*New York Post*, March 28): "Suppose we did come to an agreement with Britain, short of independence. Various political groups (Nehru means the masses) would immediately say that the Congress was selling out."

The completely anti-democratic character of the whole British plan, symbolized by the undemocratic manner in which the proposal was discussed, is another sign of the attitude of the masses. Churchill and Cripps presented their plan to the Indian leaders, — with whom there was at least a chance of acceptance. The 400,000,000 Indian people — whose fate is at stake — were not consulted at all. But that is not surprising — British imperialism knows what their answer would be.

For the last few weeks editorials in the American press have been singing songs about how "the old type of British imperialism is forever gone," but the plan brought by Cripps — designed to frustrate independence for India — is a sign that British imperialism, while weaker than it was three years ago, is just as reactionary as ever.

ANOTHER PROMISE

The plan, so carefully concocted and so ballyhooed as the sign of a new era, turned out to be the same as the offers of the past — a promise of "dominion status" for the future, after the war. For the present, from now until after the war, it offered India nothing,

absolutely nothing. In essence, it was a repetition of the same "dominion status" promise that Britain made India in 1917 — and never kept.

This time, of course, the promise was freshened up by the addition of a few "precise and clear" details. But an analysis of these details shows that fundamentally Cripps' offer was as fraudulent as those made by Britain in the past.

The plan called for the creation after the war of "an elected body" to be "charged with the task of framing a new constitution" for a "new Indian Union" which would receive the status of a dominion in the British Empire.

On the surface, this may appear to be similar to the demand raised by the Indian masses for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly by universal suffrage. Actually, it is an evasion of that demand, twisted around by certain "provisions" to achieve not a free India, but an India so divided that whatever its formal status, it would still remain in (Continued on page 4)

St. Louis CIO Council Endorses Work Of CRDC

Calls On Affiliates To Give Support to Defendants

After a report by V. R. Dunne, outstanding northwest labor leader and one of the 18 convicted in the Minneapolis case, the St. Louis CIO Industrial Union Council voted to endorse the work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee in appealing the convictions. The Council also voted to request all affiliated locals to support the case financially.

The St. Louis CIO Council officially invited Dunne to speak at the meeting on March 25, upon the request of the Civil Rights Defense Committee. The meeting was attended by 125 delegates from affiliated CIO locals.

Speaking at the meeting in the course of his nation-wide tour sponsored by the CRDC, Dunne explained the meaning to labor of the convictions of the 18 leaders of Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party under provisions of the vicious anti-labor Smith "Gag" Law. Stressing the significance to the labor movement of the use of government agencies, at Daniel J. Tobin's request, to attack Local 544 for joining the CIO, Dunne

pointed out that such a precedent endangered labor's fundamental democratic rights.

He also spoke on the great importance of the fight to test the constitutionality of the Smith "Gag" Law, by appealing the Minneapolis convictions to the Supreme Court. The fight of the CRDC in this case, he stated, is a fight on behalf of the rights of all labor.

One of the first responses to Dunne's talk came in the form of a donation to the Civil Rights Defense Committee from the St. Louis Joint Advisory Council of the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees, CIO.

While in St. Louis, Dunne also spoke at a meeting of colored hotel workers who received his report very favorably.

From St. Louis, Dunne visited unionists in Southern Illinois and appealed for help to the Minneapolis defense. After a brief rest in the Twin Cities, he will proceed on the Western half of his tour. He will speak at Fargo, Platteville, Mont., Spokane, Tacoma, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Los Angeles. Local CRDC branches in those cities report plans have been made for Dunne to speak at open meetings, as well as before union groups.

Stalin's Policy Brings USSR Little Outside Aid

C. P. Press Silent On Lag In Allied Aid; USSR Isolated Before Nazi Spring Drive

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

With the advent of Spring the USSR confronts once again the full might of the Nazi murder machine which has been stalled since last December. What has Stalin's foreign policy accomplished in the way of providing aid to the heroic Soviet soldiers, workers and peasants in their life-and-death struggle against German imperialism? It

can now be established beyond dispute that Stalin's "allies" have failed even to provide the quantity of materials and supplies they had originally promised.

According to a recent statement by Shinnell in the House of Commons, which has remained unchallenged, not even a thousand tanks, planes or guns have been sent to Russia by Churchill. "This paltry trickle of aid — less than 170 of each of these vital instruments of war per month — is on par with the much lauded 'aid' rendered by the RAF wing in Russia which succeeded in bringing down 15 German planes in six months! In the Battle for Britain 172 planes were brought down in a single day" (*Socialist Appeal*, English Trotskyist organ, Feb. 1942).

"BAD LAG"

On March 2, the American News-weekly *Time* reported a "bad lag" in the actual movement of U. S. war material to Russia. This lag, according to *Time*, has been caused by a conflict among the ruling top in Washington. "The President, seeing the Lend-Lease clearance papers, takes it for granted that the goods have

been shipped, does not know that they have been sidetracked by the U. S. Army and Navy for other uses." In short, the brass hats in Washington have been countermarching even those shipments that might actually have been made.

This report was corroborated on March 26 by Roosevelt himself in an official letter directing "high officials of the government, including the Secretaries of War and Navy . . . to remove all barriers to the shipment of supplies to Russia" (*New York Times*, March 27, 1942). The Washington correspondent of the *Times* goes on to add that "officials evidently had to be prodded by the White House to make them release the equipment that is so urgently required by the Russians."

Yet the *Daily Worker* has not dared to complain openly about this state of affairs. Why? Because the Kremlin itself prefers to resort to devious methods of bringing pressure to bear on London and Washington.

DAILY WORKER'S SILENCE

"There have been news stories lately, originating in Berne,

Switzerland as well as here in Washington, pointing out our failure to deliver promised quantities of Lend-Lease goods to Russia, in accordance with the provisions of the protocol arranged at the time of the Harrison-Batt mission" (*Common Sense*, April 1942).

The Washington correspondents of *Common Sense* add caustically: "There is some evidence that these stories were inspired by the Soviets themselves." There has been no refutation from Moscow of the stories emanating from Switzerland and Washington.

It is not hard to understand why Stalin prefers not to broach the issue openly even in the pages of the *Daily Worker*. This would embarrass and compromise not only London and Washington whose favor the Stalinists are currying, but also Stalin himself. The Kremlin's official silence is an annihilating commentary on the bankruptcy of Stalin's "realistic" policy. It is with such aid that the Soviet Union has to meet the full brunt of the impending Nazi offensive. Stalin's policies of relying on the "democracies" have resulted only in isolating the Soviet masses from their real allies, the revolutionary workers of Europe.

It is still not too late to mobilize those real allies — in Germany, in the occupied countries — to give powerful aid to the USSR by attacking Hitler from the rear. To achieve this, however, the reactionary policies of Stalinism must be abandoned and replaced by the policies pursued by the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky.

Monopolies Put Profits Before Everything Else

Conspiracy With German Chemical Trust Led to Rubber Shortage, Crippled Production

By ART PREIS

Standard Oil's conspiracy with the German chemical trust, I. G. Farbenindustrie, to share between them world control of the chemical and petroleum industries, is a devastating indictment of American monopoly capitalism.

This conspiracy, which blocked American synthetic rubber production and seriously crippled all of American industry, proves that the American bosses place their profits and monopoly advantages before everything else, in war as in peace, and that their patriotism is a hypocritical cloak for self-interest.

Standard's conspiracy reflects practices and policies pursued by all the great trusts. It was a conspiracy known for years to the government, which did nothing about it until the rubber shortage threatened to cripple the whole war production program. And even now, the government's exposure has been served up with a liberal coating of whitewash.

The main fact of this conspiracy, as related by Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold last week to the Truman Senate Investigating Committee, is that the Rockefeller interests, by an arrangement first concluded in Nov. 1939, have agreed with I. G. Farben to give the latter exclusive world rights to the chemical processes developed by Standard, which include the cheapest and best methods for the production of synthetic rubber. In return, Standard has obtained from its German capitalist colleagues exclusive rights in "any patents or discoveries which directly concerned oil production, including synthetic gasoline," according to Arnold's report.

Additional Agreement

At the outbreak of the war in September 1939, an additional agreement was made to ensure the continuance of this arrangement throughout the war and thereafter, regardless of which group of powers won. A letter, dated October 12, 1939, from the Standard official in charge of the negotiations with I. G. Farben, states:

"They (I. G. Farben) delivered to me assignments of some 2000 foreign patents, and we did our best to work out complete plans for a modus vivendi arrangement

Rockefeller Discusses War

On the very day when Assistant Attorney-General Arnold was giving the details before the Truman Committee of the Standard Oil's conspiracy to block synthetic rubber production, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was delivering an address in New York's Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in his capacity as honorary chairman of the USO's fund campaign.

Among other beautiful thoughts expressed by the chief of Standard Oil was:

"This war is fundamentally a death struggle between the material and spiritual forces in the world. Materialism has run rampant. . . Surely, it is not for things, but for ideals that such sacrifices are made; not for the material, but for the spiritual."

for working together, which would operate through the terms of the war, whether or not the U. S. came in."

Standard's modus vivendi included aiding the German capitalists in the construction of their synthetic gasoline and high octane aviation gas industries. As late as in August 1941, Standard sought to turn over its Hungarian plants to the Nazis for \$24,000,000 gold. After the defeat of France, at the suggestion of I. G. Farben, Standard sought to make a mutually beneficial arrangement for the control of hydrogeneration patents in Occupied France.

Standard's modus vivendi operated even after Pearl Harbor and the Far East defeats. Up to last week, Standard refused government requests that it release its patents for manufacturing Butyl rubber, although it had given these patents to I. G. Farben to use for the Nazi war machine and had agreed to their use by an Italian corporation.

"Standard's activities thus frustrated the creation of an American synthetic-rubber industry," declared Arnold. The practical results of the conspiracy were to confront American industry with a crippling rubber famine, strike a damaging blow at all production and force drastic curtailment of essential consumers goods.

Why Deal Was Made

Why did Standard make such a deal with I. G. Farben?

"These arrangements were (Continued on page 3)

Stalinists Try To Suppress Union Militancy, Speed Up Workers, 'Finger' All Opponents And 'Appease' Bosses

Bridges Wants The Unions To Act As Speed-Up Agents

Blames Union for Axis Victories, Urges Workers Not to Worry About Profiteers

By PHILIP BLAKE

The strongest epithet of the Communist Party today is "appeaser." Yet there is no force in the labor movement which is more ready than the Stalinists to knife the interests of the labor movement in the back for the purpose of "appeasing" the bosses and thus securing the "national unity" to which Stalin-

ism in the United States has dedicated its efforts. No section of the labor movement spends less time than the Stalinists in attacking or criticizing the bosses who are responsible for lags in production; no group spends more time than they do in trying to speed-up the workers.

Their policy of "appeasing" the bosses has led them in recent weeks to such treacherous practices as attempts to break strikes (Western Electric plant in Kearny, N. J.); support of boss-inspired attacks on union militants who try to protect the workers' interests (Alcoa plant in Cleveland); campaigns to speed the workers up to an extent which not even the bosses dare as yet to demand (UE proposal for 15% speed-up), etc.

MURRAY COMPLAINS

The Stalinists are even more ready than the trade union bureaucrats to "appease" the bosses by giving up labor's rights. This was demonstrated at the Extraordinary Conference of the CIO in Washington last week, of which the newspaper PM reported on March 25:

"Murray and CIO left-wingers (Stalinists) clashed briefly for the first time since the Nazi-Soviet war began. The dispute arose over a speech by Harry Bridges, West Coast longshore leader who charged, it is understood, that the CIO has not fashioned an adequate war program."

"Bridges is said to have deprecated agitation over current anti-labor legislation and labor's economic status, demanding greater emphasis on production."

"Interpreting this and a couple of other speeches as excessive 'appeasement' of anti-labor forces, Murray vigorously reiterated his conviction that labor could not afford to yield all along the line during the war era. With reference to the changed attitude of the left-wingers, he said bitterly:

"I've been supporting this war for 18 months."

Bridges expresses the Stalinist trade union policy in action. The remarks he made in Washington express only the outlines of this policy; but an examination of the speech he made to the San Francisco CIO Council shortly before the Washington conference shows just exactly what the Stalinists mean by "an adequate war program." An account of the speech is made in Bridges' own paper, the Stalinist-controlled

of the working people of America...."

Since Bridges believes that production is the responsibility of the bosses and the government, and the unions must spend the majority of their time speeding up the workers, it is not surprising that he cautions the unions against devoting time to the question of boss profiteering, etc.:

"To be handled 'at the proper time and the proper place,' Bridges briefly noted such factors as exorbitant corporation profits....

"But now is not the time to worry about ultimate rewards. When our way of life is menaced by Axis enslavement it is enough to save what we have—even the present grievances."

Let us not worry about the "ultimate rewards," says Bridges; let the bosses have their profits—the workers should not worry when they can preserve "even the present grievances."

And what about those who disagree with the Bridges policy, let alone those who want to oppose it?

"Those who don't see this are not Americans—are not loyal," said Bridges. "We've got to finger them. We can't take time to explain—we've got to go around 'em or roll over 'em."

Murray "bitterly" reminded the Stalinists at the Washington conference that they were Johnny-come-latelies so far as support of the war is concerned. But it is clear that they have more than made up for lost time since last June when they were denouncing the war as imperialist—and that they have already far out-distanced even the Murrys and Greens. No trade unionist who sees the Stalinist trade union line in action can fail to understand that part of his struggle against the boss offensive to undermine union conditions must be a determined struggle against Stalinist "appeasement" of the bosses.

"If we place stress on hours and wages so that we interfere with the fighting, we're slackers and selling out our unions and country."

"When you recall that only a few months ago executive committees like this in Norway and France were saying, 'We shouldn't be doing it all; the employers should do their share,' you understand why the unions should become instruments of speed-up now."

In other words, when the bosses try to use the pretext of the war to lower wages and raise hours, the unions should not resist or they may "interfere with the fighting" and "sell out the unions."

"NOW NOT TIME TO WORRY"

Bridges is not content to accuse the trade unionists of France and Norway of responsibility for Hitler's victories. He goes on to explain to the workers that it is not their responsibility to worry about production—the government and the bosses have charge of that. All that they have to worry about increasing is the speed-up.

"The majority of the time of officers, of grievance committees, of the unions as a whole must go to winning the war."

"How? Production. I'd rather say speed-up, and I mean speed-up. The term production covers the boss, the government and so on. But speed-up covers the workers—the people who suffer from speed-up are the workers."

"To put it bluntly, I mean your unions today must become instruments of speed-up

C. P. Helps WLB Fire 4 Cleveland Union Leaders

Their Only Crime Was That They Tried to Protect Members From Alcoa Speed-Up Drive

CLEVELAND, March 30. — Acting in line with Harry Bridge's recent call for union leaders to "finger" union militants for the bosses, Stalinist officials of the CIO Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers on March 26 publicly endorsed a War Labor Board decision upholding the firing of four union shop stewards for allegedly "instigating a slow-down" in the Aluminum Corporation of America's plant here.

Before the local union membership had time to act on the case, Edward Cheyfitz, national executive secretary of the IUMMSW, and Alex Balint, Cleveland regional director, both well-known Stalinists, and Frank Grady, president of Local 55, issued a public statement which declared that they "fully supported" the WLB decision and that "the men responsible for stoppages must go."

The fired union militants, by the admission of the union officials themselves, had resisted company attempts to institute a vicious speedup and pay-cutting system in their division, Plant S, which employs mostly Negro workers. All four of the fired shop stewards were Negroes.

The most damning part of the Stalinist leaders' actions in this case is their own admission, put out in a statement in the name of the local union, that reprisal against the four militant job stewards "is the result of an investigation which was originally requested by the union" — that is, the Stalinist officials.

The stool pigeon and pro-boss role of the Stalinist union leaders has created tremendous resentment in the union rank-and-file, and particularly among the Negro workers who form one-fourth of the workers in the entire plant.

STALINIST FINGER-MEN

Another statement, issued by the president and vice-president of Local 55 and Balint and his assistant, Peter Zvara, stated that "we called upon the Federal Government to send in a special investigator to really get to the bottom of this problem. This investigator is on the job now... Let the guilty pay!"

This same statement, however,

Try To Halt Distribution Of Militant

The Communist Party's lynch campaign against Trotskyists and all other union militants who oppose the Stalinist speed-up and wage-cutting drive gained impetus on March 30, when the Stalinist-dominated leadership of the Los Angeles CIO Industrial Union Council slipped over a resolution attacking "trade unionism as usual" and calling for the prevention of the distribution of THE MILITANT in front of the local CIO meeting hall.

Other papers included in this Stalinist ban on a free press and free speech for working-class political opponents of Stalinism are Labor Action and the Socialist Party Call. These, like THE MILITANT, have attacked Stalinist treachery in the union movement.

The action was taken on one of four similar and simultaneous resolutions initiated by well-known Stalinist leaders of local unions.

Chief target of the Stalinist attack, was, of course, the Trotskyists. It is no coincidence that the Stalinists combine an attack on "trade unionism as usual," that is, militant defense of the workers' rights and standards, and an onslaught against the Trotskyists.

The Trotskyists are known to be outspoken defenders of the union workers' rights and conditions in war as in peace.

Considerable opposition was

What Stalinist Demand for 15% Speed-Up Means

The Stalinists in control of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, have shown that they are not kidding about speeding up the workers.

When they ask for a 15% increase in production by their members, they mean just that: "this increase shall be by the direct additional expenditure of energy and effort, over and above such increases as will be effected through improved methods or techniques instituted by our war production councils."

It is estimated that this 15% increase would result in a speed-up greater and more intensive than the bosses were able to put through in the old days of the industry before the workers had organized their unions.

voiced against the Stalinist resolution before it was passed by the Council. One auto worker, according to the Daily Worker, reported, called it a "violation of the Bill of Rights" and a "poor policy to follow in any democracy."

But the well-oiled Stalinist machine, combining patriotic appeals, threats and mechanical control of votes, succeeded in shoving the resolution through.

There is no doubt that the Stalinists plan to use this resolution as a cover for physical attacks on distributors of THE MILITANT and other anti-Stalinist working-class papers.

Kearny Workers Label Stalinists As Strikebreakers

KEARNY, N. J. — Since last October the Western Electric Employees Association, an independent union, had been negotiating over wages and the grading system with the management of the Western Electric Company, subsidiary of the giant monopoly American Telephone and Telegraph.

The Association is not very strong or well-organized, and it shows all the weaknesses of independent unions or one-time company unions which have escaped from the domination of the employers who inspired their creation; nevertheless last year by a strike it won some wage gains and other improvements for the workers. Unlike the AFL and CIO leaders, it has not declared its intention of giving up the right to strike.

The company, which employs 20,000 workers and supplies the vast network of the Bell Telephone System with its communication and replacement system, has become very "tough" toward the Association since it began to receive war orders and the war broke out. It offered a wholly inadequate wage offer, refused to consider the demands of the Association, stalled on all proposals and refused to arbitrate.

Finally at the end of February the Association voted to give the management a month to resume negotiations or agree to arbitration: it threatened a strike by March 28 if the company remained adamant.

STALINISTS INTERVENE

As the deadline grew closer, with the management still standing firm, the Stalinist-dominated leadership of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, which has some members in the plant, saw a chance to advance the cause of "national unity."

A day or two before the date set for the strike, the Stalinists came out with a leaflet in front of the plant and huge advertisements in the local newspapers. They denounced the Association for daring to "threaten" to strike — they did not denounce the company management in any way. They called on the workers to "disassociate" themselves from the "irresponsible threat" to strike — they did not in any way attack the bosses for refusing to negotiate further or even arbitrate.

Finally, the threat to strike compelled certification of the dispute to the War Labor Board, and the strike was called off.

WORKERS INCENSED

Reports from workers in the plant indicate that large numbers of them — including non-Association workers and CIO sympathizers — were greatly incensed by the Stalinist leaflets and articles, denouncing them as "nothing more than strikebreakers" and "stooges for the bosses."

The Stalinists may have made some headway in their drive to get Western Electric to regard them as more acceptable representatives of the workers than the Association, but their behavior in this fight has done much to antagonize the workers toward the CIO. But what do the Stalinists care? They can always attack such workers as "appeasers."

UAW Meets In The Midst Of Open Shop Offensive

(Continued from page 1)

fatter than ever with profits, have refused to grant these demands. They are stalling the negotiations. They have indicated in advance that they will finally shove these demands into the lap of the War Labor Board, where there will be more stalling, as in the case of the steel workers' demands.

With prices skyrocketing, a general wage increase and provisions for a rising scale of wages adjusted to meet price rises are immediately needed. By organizing militant union pressure, against both the corporation and the War Labor Board the UAW can win its demands. Such a policy was required before the war. It is doubly necessary now.

5. Against Piece-Work and Speed-Up

General Motors, supported by the administration, is trying to bring back the hated piece-work system and to reinstitute the dog-eat-dog conditions of competitive work and competitive pay. This is designed primarily to effect drastic reductions in wages and to begin a back-breaking speed-up in the plants.

Such a system — endorsed by Donald Nelson under the name of "incentive pay" — would pit worker against worker, undermine the solidarity of unionism and turn the clock back toward the days of the open shop in auto.

"Incentive pay" and competitive work would provide for wage classification and reclassification on the basis of company favoritism and the amount of individual production. This would wipe out seniority, a keystone of strong unionism. Every worker with an ounce of unionism in his blood will fight this plot to bring back the rule of the service men, the stoolpigeons and company flunkies.

6. No Wage Cuts In Transfer to War Work

The method employed by the companies in converting the plants, which resulted in widespread unemployment, was deliberately calculated to create an opportunity for wage-slashing. In the process of rehiring after the mass layoffs, men are being reclassified at lower rates of pay in the converted plants. Without specific contractual provision that no worker shall suffer a reduction in wages as a result of transfer to war production or in the process of reemployment after a layoff, the whole wage structure is endangered. The restoration of original wage classifications and repayment of all back wages due as a result of this wage-cut

scheme is needed to prevent deep slashes in the standard of living of the auto workers.

7. Against Jim Crow Practices In The Industry

The corporations have increased discriminatory practices against the Negro workers, attempting to pit white against colored workers and inciting race riots in the auto centers in order to disrupt the unions. The companies follow a deliberate policy of forcing the worst jobs on the Negroes, segregating them from the other workers, etc. The UAW must put up an effective and uncompromising fight against any and every form of Jim Crow.

8. Demand the Steward System

The UAW has been demanding the steward system in its current negotiations. Just as it has since 1937, General Motors has replied by proposing to cut committeemen representation in half, and thereby weaken the shop bargaining procedure.

With grievances piling up, shop problems can best be handled by the steward system. The answer to the corporations' scheme is to stand fast for the steward system, the most democratic and effective means of representation.

9. For Expropriation of All Auto Plants and Operation Under Workers' Control

The only way to insure efficient operation of the plants, secure continuity of employment, and stop profiteering and mismanagement, is to take the plants out of the hands of the duPonts, Fords and other coupon clippers, and operate them under the control of the workers.

10. Build A Labor Party

Democrats and Republicans alike are laying down an anti-union barrage in Congress. The workers have no representation in the political arena. The unions are reduced to begging favors from boss politicians. A Labor Party is more than ever a necessity for the labor movement in order to defend itself against the union wreckers in Washington.

The top officials of the UAW have already pledged themselves to give up the right to strike. They will attempt to turn this convention into a hand-raising rally for their program of surrender. According to the New York Times, March 27, CIO President Philip Murray stated that he was prepared to take disciplin-

ary measures against unions which act contrary to this program of surrender. The leaders of the UAW must not be permitted to use high-handed methods which violate the democratic rights of the local unions and members.

The UAW has the richest tradition of union democracy in the American labor movement. Those in the saddle who attempt to destroy that tradition are aiming at the very heart of the UAW.

Only by the fullest trade union democracy can the union meet the crucial problems ahead and mobilize the ranks in the coming struggles.

The UAW has reached the strongest point in its history. It now counts 600,000 loyal members in its ranks. With that enormous power fully mobilized, the UAW can erect a dam will turn back the flood of union-busting legislation and the corporation offensive.

Militant industrial unionism built the UAW. Militant industrial unionism can defend it against all attacks.

All labor looks to the auto workers to give them a lead. The UAW convention has the prestige and the power to inspire the labor movement to a militant course that will maintain the living standards, organizations and rights of the American workers.

Defeat the anti-labor drive!

Subscribe to the "Fourth International"

THE BILL OF RIGHTS IN DANGER!

The Meaning of the Minneapolis Convictions
by GEORGE E. NOVACK
foreword by JAMES T. FARRELL
Author of "Studs Lonigan," etc.

5 Cents
Order from
CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE
160 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

Two pamphlets that deal concretely with present day problems of the war, the struggle against Hitlerism, trade union democracy, etc., in a language so simple and clear every worker will immediately grasp and understand the fundamental Marxist ideas...

JUST OUT IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM

by Albert Goldman

The official court record of his final speech for the defense in the Minneapolis "Sedition" trial

100 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

ALREADY A FAVORITE SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

The official court record of his testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial, with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

116 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

Order from:

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK

Subscribe to the
Fourth International!

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

Democracy and the Army

The United States government is building a big army which is supposed to preserve and restore democracy throughout the world. Meanwhile the men who run the army (and the government) are getting into practice for this big job.

The Negro soldiers of the 25th Infantry, stationed in the state of Washington, have been barred from 20 hotels, cafes, cigar stores, pool rooms, etc., in the town of Walla Walla, according to evidence produced by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

By itself, of course, there is very little novel about such a situation. Negro soldiers and civilians find themselves barred from public places in thousands of cities in the north as well as the south; these Jim Crow practices flourish even in states where there are specific civil rights laws against this kind of discrimination; and Negroes are discouraged from entering countless establishments by slyly insulting signs saying "No shoe shine" or "No bootblack allowed."

But what is especially interesting about this particular situation in Walla Walla is that the soldiers are barred from these places "for any purpose" by their own officers!

An official army order, dated Mar. 21, declares that "upon written requests from each of the following businesses. . . each of the firms listed below are declared OFF LIMITS for all soldiers of the 25th Infantry. . ." Of course, white soldiers are not barred from these establishments.

Democracy is a wonderful thing — for some people to talk about.

The Right to Vote

It does not seem at this time that the Pepper Senate bill to abolish payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting in federal elections will be passed.

The leader of the Democratic Party, Roosevelt, has been silent about the bill, which is no wonder when we realize that it is the members of his own party who are kept in office through the poll tax. The poll-tax congressmen have been silent, but it is authoritatively reported that if the bill ever comes before the Senate, they will conduct another filibuster such as they carried on a couple of years ago to keep the anti-lynch bill from being voted on.

All opponents of the Democratic Party dictatorship in the south will of course support the bill — weak and full of loopholes as it is — and any other measure that even partially lowers the bars that keep 10,000,000 Negroes and whites from voting in the south.

But it would be an illusion to believe that the mere passage of this bill by itself would permit the Negro people of the south to vote. Something happened last week in Columbia, South Carolina, which will demonstrate this.

City officials there ruled, following a long fight, that Negroes have the right to enroll to vote in the Democratic primary, but that party qualifications for voting — as well as poll tax payment — must be met before they can vote in the primary. The courts thus far have upheld the right of party executive committees to determine voting qualifications for their primaries. (The Democratic party, at the present time is the only one that ever wins in elections; if Negroes are deprived of the right of voting in the primary, their right to vote in the regular election is little more than a mockery).

The city Democratic executive committee has decided that Negroes must meet the following qualifications: "Every Negro applying to vote in the city Democratic primary must be known to have voted the Democratic ticket continuously since 1876."

As the Pittsburgh Courier correspondent points out, "According to that, a Negro must be at least 87 years old and must have voted the Democratic ticket for the last 66 years to be eligible now."

This is clear proof that even aside from the poll tax issue, the Jim Crow parties and ruling class will still have plenty of legal ways of keeping the Negroes from voting. They have plenty of devices besides the "white primary" — and if they didn't, they would invent them.

For example, there is the "educational requirement" for voting. In the hands of the Jim Crow state governments, this can be used to disfranchise every Negro, including those who have gone through college. All kinds of abstract and complicated questions can be asked by the registration clerks, and unless they can be answered to the "satisfaction" of these clerks, Negroes can be turned down. At the same time wholly illiterate whites will be accepted into the voting booths.

Then there are property qualifications for voting which still exist in some southern states, and which can be extended to include others. Under this 98% of the Negroes would be automatically excluded from voting.

And it must not be forgotten that the ruling class in the south did not use legal means at first to take away the Negro people's right to vote. The first thing they did was use violence and terrorist bands to murder and beat up the Negroes who dared to want to vote; then, after that, they passed the discriminatory laws. The ruling class in the south would not hesitate for a moment to again resort to use of vigilante mobs, Ku Klux Klan and other such groups.

The Negro people must struggle for more than passage of the Pepper bill; in the final analysis they will secure and guarantee their right to vote only by a victorious struggle against the rule of the Jim Crow bosses and landlords and the whole system of Jim Crowism. That struggle will be just as tough as the struggle to restore democracy for the workers and minority groups in Germany.

STANDARD DEAL EXPOSES BOSSES

(Continued from page 1)
not entered into with any desire to aid or assist Germany," Arnold pointed out. "The sole motive was an attempt on the part of the Standard Oil to get a protected market and to eliminate independent competition, and finally to restrict production in world markets in order to maintain control."

Where protecting its monopoly advantages helped the Nazis, Standard did not permit considerations of patriotism to stand in its way.

Even after 1939, when Standard had received I. G. Farben's consent, in exchange for certain considerations, to enter into negotiations for licensing the Butyl process to American companies, it still "proceeded to further retard the development of synthetic rubber because of its natural monopolistic desire to keep complete domination over this industry."

Government's Attitude

The government did not undertake its exposure of Standard Oil and its suit against it with any willingness. This is indicated by the fact that Standard's conspiracy — its existence, if not all its details — has been known to leading government officials for years. Yet, until last week, the government made no move to expose or end it.

As early as 1932, the American rubber corporations, with many pipe-lines into the government, had approached Standard for its synthetic rubber patents. In 1939, representatives of the government also unsuccessfully sought information on the Butyl rubber process from Standard.

So well known were the facts of Standard's deal with I. G. Farben, that a New York newspaper, PM, on July 6, 1941 — five months before Pearl Harbor and almost nine months before the government took court action against Standard — was able to publish accurate details of the deal.

Over a year and a half ago, the threat of an impending rubber shortage was brought to the attention of Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and head of the government's Defense Plant Corporation. At that time, Jones was urged to facilitate the expansion of the synthetic rubber industry. Jones then opposed this venture — an attitude most favorable to the Rockefeller interests! — and gave out false information to the effect that there was a sufficient supply of crude rubber on hand, even with all imports cut off, to meet the country's needs for more than a year of war.

A year after the true situation had been revealed to Jones, he finally contracted, on an "experimental" basis, for production of 40,000 tons of synthetic rubber. When Singapore was about to fall, Jones told the Truman Committee that he was making plans for the production of 400,000 tons of synthetic rubber — in 1944.

As a result of the heat put on him recently for failure of the rubber program, Jones tried to protect himself by issuing a statement two weeks ago disclaiming personal responsibility for the rubber shortages. He cited the fact, since further confirmed by William Batt, Director of Materials for the War Production Board, that the "presidential concurrence in this course." That is, the policies which were so favorable to Standard Oil and the rubber monopolies had the sanction of Roosevelt himself.

If Standard Oil had been willing to make a quiet deal to pool its patents with the big rubber companies as late as March 25 — the day before the government finally instituted its anti-trust suit to secure the Butyl rubber patents — in all likelihood Standard's conspiracy with I. G. Farben would never have been exposed by the government. But Standard still refused to release its processes.

The government then had no choice but to take action against Standard Oil, because the rubber situation since the loss of Malaya and the East Indies has become so acute as to disastrously impede all war production. Only fear for the very outcome of the war finally impelled the government to challenge the mighty Standard Oil.

Not Just Standard Oil

In terms of the scope and power of Standard Oil alone, and the Rockefeller interests which control it, this conspiracy goes down to the very bedrock of American capitalism.

The Rockefellers control the greatest private family fortune in the world. Two other families with major holdings in Standard Oil, the Harkneys and Whitneys, stand fourth and seventh respectively in the list of America's Sixty Families. These three families are linked by marriage and business ties with most of the other few families which control

the major portion of the corporate wealth of the country.

Through holding companies, interlocking directorates, and other devices, the Rockefeller interests have direct control over tens of billions of dollars of corporate wealth. Rockefeller agents sit on the directing boards of hundreds of huge corporations — mines, factories, railroads, shiplines. They control the richest bank in America, the Chase National, and billion dollar companies like Mutual Life Insurance. The Rockefellers, together with the J. P. Morgan interests, constitute the two most extensive and powerful financial dynasties in world history. Thus, to speak of Standard Oil is to speak of one of the two major foundation stones of American monopoly capitalism.

Others Involved

But even within the framework of this particular conspiracy to block the production of synthetic rubber, Standard Oil did not stand alone. Other giant corporations, whose agents are even now working directly within the government war production agencies, also played a part.

Among these were the duPont interests, the notorious "Dynasty of Death" which controls America's chemical and munitions trust, and has the largest single holdings in General Motors Corporation. "For instance," Arnold was forced to report, "there is no doubt that one factor in the delay in Standard's synthetic rubber program was Standard's cartel obligations toward duPont" and "Standard and I. G. had obligated themselves not to open the field of synthetic rubber in the United States without first offering a share to duPont."

Just as Standard sought to avoid competition with I. G. Farben on the international arena, so "Standard was seeking to eliminate. . . also competition with the duPonts."

Another giant corporation involved in Standard's withholding of the Butyl rubber process was General Electric, whose chairman, Philip Reed, is head of the WPB's key Bureau of Industry Branches. Reed is now under fire in the Guthrie scandal for using his position to further the "business as usual" interests of his corporation.

Explaining why Standard "held back use of Butyl rubber, even in this time of rubber shortage," Arnold told of "the tremendous pressure which undoubtedly has been exerted upon Standard by various companies who did not wish to retard the development of synthetic rubber but nevertheless wished to make sure that they are given priority in its development."

"It may be that the pressure of such companies as General Electric to delay the release of samples of Butyl by Standard to other companies has played its part."

Nor were Standard Oil, duPont and General Electric alone in holding up synthetic rubber production. Prior to the Far East defeats, the big rubber corporations, Goodyear, Firestone, Goodyear, and the United States Rubber, also balked at the idea. They had huge investments in crude rubber plantations and in equipment for fabricating natural rubber. Their sole immediate interest in seeking to gain synthetic rubber patents was to forestall the rise of a competitive industry and to be in a position to capitalize by way of high monopoly prices on any rubber shortages.

"No Difference"

Standard's arrangements with I. G. Farben are not unique. They are typical. Arnold himself revealed that I. G. Farben right now maintains over 100 known cartel

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Prices

WHY we Defend the Soviet Union

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York City

arrangements with leading American corporations.

"There is no essential difference," Arnold stated, "between what the Standard Oil of New Jersey has done in this case and what other companies did in restricting the production of magnesium, aluminum, tungsten carbide, drugs, dyestuffs, and a variety of other critical materials vital for the war."

And Arnold's further statements indicate that the greatest impediment "to production" are those very monopoly corporations which are organizing and financing the present anti-labor drive under the pretext that it is the workers who "impede production."

"So long as such cartel agreements continue to exist, the inevitable result will be shortages in essential materials. It is impossible to accomplish the purpose of a cartel — to maintain high prices, to keep a tight control over the market, to eliminate independent competition — without restricting production."

Knowing all this, what did the government do about the situation of which the Standard Oil case is typical?

How Standard Oil Was "Punished"

On March 26 the Department of Justice finally "filed a criminal information and a complaint against the Standard Oil Co. and also entered into a consent decree with them." That is, a deal was made with the Standard officials. They marched into the federal court and pleaded nolo contendere (no contest of the case) — not a plea of guilty — with the brazen declaration that their "war work is more important than court vindication." They paid out a total of \$50,000 in fines, about one hour's average profits for Standard and its holdings. The government then withdrew its charges.

Nominally, Standard is now required to license any other company royalty-free for the duration of the war to produce Butyl rubber and to transfer full knowledge of the process to them. This, in fact, is the single "retribution" exacted of the Rockefeller interests.

The pay-off, however, is that Standard Oil has been "asked to produce a large portion of the synthetic rubber to be turned out in the next two years for our government-financed plants." (AP dispatch from Washington, March 28).

As for the basic question of Standard's cartel arrangements with I. G. Farben, Arnold sadly confessed that "the decree does not have in it a provision allowing either the Attorney General or the court to pass upon the future relations between I. G. Farben and Standard Oil. I think the committee can understand why I have been worried about the resumption or continuance of such relationship."

A Whitewash Job

When asked by one member of the Truman Committee why

Standard had been permitted to get off so easily, Arnold answered, "We felt that getting those patents loose was more important than years of litigation," and added that Standard's court settlement "was on a take it or leave it basis" and that "rightly or wrongly I took it."

But the government's treatment of Standard Oil was not merely a matter of the government's lack of power. The government did not want to press Standard any harder than it did. In fact, having obtained the Butyl rubber patents, the government is now seeking to whitewash and protect Standard's "reputation."

Arnold deliberately used no term more severe in characterizing Standard's activities than that this immensely shrewd and powerful corporation has maintained an "ambiguous position." This characterization was used continuously and exclusively throughout Arnold's testimony.

At one point, Arnold spoke of the "conduct patriotic American companies may be forced into by these cartel arrangements." In response to a question, he described Standard's relations with I. G. Farben as "commercially simple-minded," attempting to give the impression that this second most powerful financial group in the world is run by foolish, though fundamentally patriotic, gentlemen who permitted themselves to be "taken in" by the Nazis.

In his summation, Arnold made a special point of giving a boost to Standard Oil "which has paid the penalty." He said: "We need Standard Oil. . . to help us win the war. . . We may well be grateful (sic) to that company for putting its arrangements in writing and thus to furnish an object lesson of the results of international cartels." In the end, according to Arnold, Standard Oil emerges as an example of pious rectitude!

Still Holding Key Government Posts

Having "paid the penalty," Standard's agents still remain in their key government positions. There is its dollar-a-year man, Ralph Wolf, assistant director of the Synthetic Rubber Laboratory of the Standard Oil Development Co., who is assistant chief of the WPB's Synthetic Rubber Section. There is its staunch protector, Frank Carman, a dollar-a-year patriot from the Armstrong Cork Co. and chief of the Synthetic Rubber Section, who after Arnold's testimony heatedly said: "I won't be a party to the statement that the company (Standard) was not co-operating with the Government on the Butyl patent."

And there is Walter C. Teagle, chairman of the Board of Standard Oil of New Jersey, who blandly paid \$5,000 wrung from the blood and flesh of the Standard workers to get a clean bill-of-health for his part in the conspiracy, and who con-

tinues in his government post as a MEMBER OF THE WAR LABOR BOARD.

Teagle, who aided the Nazis and whose efforts on behalf of Standard's monopoly and profits helped produce the present crisis of American production, still sits on a government board with power to make decisions of tremendous importance for the welfare of American labor. And, the workers of Standard Oil still labor under completely open shop, company union conditions. Standard's seamen, compelled to work under a company union set-up, are daily facing death on flaming oil tankers, torpedoed by Nazi U-boats run by oil which Standard so helpfully provided the Nazi war machine.

In 1909, in an attempt to break up the Standard Oil trust for violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, a federal court fined the company \$25,000,000. It was never paid. In 1912, the Supreme Court decreed the "dissolution" of the trust. Today, any one of the Standard companies, like Standard Oil of New Jersey, is greater than the whole trust in 1911. And the program of Arnold and the government now, after the latest revelations about Standard Oil, indicates that Standard, and all the other huge monopolies, have nothing to fear from the Roosevelt regime.

What Future Holds

In the conclusion of his testimony, Arnold had nothing more to recommend than that the government encourage research which would be available for all to use, that there be some minor reforms made in the matter of granting patents and in the regulation of patent licensing agreements, that companies be required to register their foreign agreements, and, finally, that there should be "eternal vigilance and. . . a wide awake investigating agency to enforce the Sherman Act."

The character of that "eternal vigilance" and "wide awake" enforcement of the Sherman Act was made clear in a letter to President Roosevelt, sent March 20 and pointedly made public on March 28, one day after Arnold's testimony before the Truman Committee. This letter was signed by Attorney-General Biddle, Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox — and Arnold.

It informed Roosevelt that "some of the pending court investigations, suits and prosecutions under the Anti-Trust statutes" by the Department of Justice, if continued, will interfere with the production of war materials. . . In those cases we believe that continuing such prosecutions at this time will be contrary to the national interest and security."

To which Roosevelt replied, as of the same date, "I approve the procedure outlined in your memorandum to me. . ."

See editorial on the Standard Oil case on P. 4.

The Russian Phase Of The Pacific War

By A. ROLAND

Japanese Strategy In the Pacific

Military strategy at its best pursues long-term aims and wide objectives. The immediate tactics in a campaign are most useful when they fit into and further the main aims of the high command. Japanese success in the drive southwards has focussed most attention on the southwest Pacific. The American navy is busily engaged in protecting the far-flung island bases leading to Australia. It is following a plan that envisages the building-up of large forces on the Australian mainland, later to be used for an offensive against the Japanese from that far-off corner of the world. Once such plans are set in motion, they require prolonged effort and the maintenance of fairly strict schedules for keeping open the routes and for supplying the growing armies.

The Japanese could have wished nothing better than this. It should be noted that American strategy has been a forced strategy, not based, so to speak, on its own volition, but on that of the enemy. The Japanese pursue a vast plan, a plan that was worked out in its essentials years ago in the Tanaka memorial to the Japanese Emperor. The exact steps as first outlined in the Tanaka document had to be modified somewhat in the light of later developments. One of the first campaigns outlined by this general, was to be directed against the Soviet Union in order to enable Japanese imperialism to seize the Maritime Provinces of Siberia and as much more of the Soviet Far East as could be swallowed up. The few brushes between Japanese troops and the Red Army, intended as feelers to test the strength and fighting qualities of that army, convinced the Japanese militarists that they had a tougher nut to crack than they had bargained for. They were forced to pursue a waiting game, waiting for the inevitable war in Europe which would weaken the opponent. Meantime the Japanese went to the next imperialist order of business, expansion southwards.

Japanese Await Best Moment

But the Japanese merely postponed the part of their agenda dealing with the Russian question. They will seize on what they consider the best moment to launch their long-planned all-out attack against the Soviet Union. And that is why the Japanese must be greatly pleased by the present alignment of forces in the Pacific. If the United States can be deeply involved away off at the antipodes, in an effort from which it cannot easily extricate itself if it desires later to do so, then the Japanese will have succeeded in keeping their two major opponents separated the whole width of the earth. It can then fight a defensive struggle against the United States in the south, holding on to what it has already grabbed, and turn its major attention to Vladivostok and Siberia. The opportunity for such a blow will hardly present itself in quite the same way again, and the Japanese have been clever enough to miss no opportunity.

There are certainly signs that the Japanese may launch an overwhelming attack in the direction of Siberia to be timed with Hitler's drive against the Soviet Union this spring. The main Japanese fleet has hardly been involved in the Pacific war thus far. It is held close to its bases at home. This is not merely for purposes of defense, but it fits also into the anti-Soviet strategy. It cuts off, too, the possibility for Vladivostok to secure aid from the United States. The armies in Manchuria, built up over a period of years precisely for the move to the north, have not been weakened by many withdrawals for the southward expansion. Some seasoned troops were withdrawn from China, but if anything the Manchurian garrisons have been strengthened by new forces. The Chinese, who have the best means for getting information, report the presence in Manchuria of thirty-three divisions, or well over half a million men.

Then there is the air force. The United Nations now claim air superiority in the fight to the south. The Japanese do not seem to be pressing forward towards Australia with anything like the strength of their attacks on Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. Evidently the air strength is being held in reserve for the task that is more important immediately. Here again the Chinese report insistently that the Japanese air force is being concentrated up north, and there is no reason to doubt their word at all.

Dangerous Period for the USSR

The recent attacks in China, particularly in Shansi and Suiyuan, are very much like similar attacks made just before the Nipponese made their move southwards. These attacks were then intended to destroy Chinese concentrations and bases of resistance, so that it would take a long time for the Chinese to rebuild and regroup their forces. The Japanese then proceeded to withdraw a large section of their army from China. The present scale of attacks have a similar purpose, to weaken the Chinese sufficiently, destroying as much of their material as possible, in order to withdraw Japanese troops for another campaign.

Most significantly of all, the press reports an article on the possibility of the co-ordinated attack by Germany and Japan; in the Goering newspaper, the *Essen National Zeitung*. The paper quotes the Mikado's premier as saying: "The red shadow of the Soviet Union looms threateningly over our frontier. It must be forced back." The similarity of the change in ambassador to the USSR with the sending of Kurosu to the United States before the attack on Pearl Harbor has been widely commented on in the world press — and with justice.

The Soviet Union will thus be faced with the most trying and dangerous period of the war. The attack on two fronts which threatened for so long and was so much dreaded, is becoming rapidly inevitable. No doubt Goering mentions it in his paper to encourage the German soldiers with the idea that now not only their own might will be pitted against the Soviet Union but also that of the Japanese who have shown such phenomenal success in the Pacific.

Tobin Urges Locals To Hire Some Statisticians

His Answer to Offensive of Employers Is Counterattack -- With Convincing Figures

By JACK RANGER

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn. — President Daniel J. Tobin, dictator of the AFL Teamsters International, has proposed a brilliant substitute for such union weapons as strikes and picket lines.

"To prepare for a new era in labor relations when all strikes may be virtually outlawed," according to the March issue of the AFL Teamsters' monthly magazine, Tobin "advises every district organization of Teamsters in the country to employ a first-class statistician in order properly to present its demands before arbitration boards."

Tobin, like his fellow bureaucrats in the top leadership of the AFL and the CIO, long ago "outlawed" the strike weapon within his own organization, acting as policeman for the government and the bosses to prevent drivers from striking in defense of their wages and conditions.

A ROTTEN SUBSTITUTE

In recent months the employers have taken advantage of the rubber shortage to lay off thousands of drivers and to violate their union agreements. The ranks of the Teamsters Union are becoming restless and are demanding action against the chiseling bosses. But Tobin has handcuffed the unions by his no-strike policy.

Forced to give some answer to the membership, Tobin hands them a stone — the proposal that they hire "statisticians" to argue their demands before "arbitration boards."

To justify this proposal Tobin claims that "victory" in the recent arbitration of the over-the-road contract covering Midwest drivers "was obtained principally through the efforts of the statistical department recently created by the International."

However, the fact is that the over the road contract, which expired last Nov. 15, has not been settled yet, and is still before the War Labor Board.

There is nothing wrong with union negotiators having at their finger-tips statistical information to support their demands for wage increases, etc. But class statistics, no matter how good, are not sufficient to defend workers' rights. If statistics are enough, then workers would not require picket lines or strikes, or even unions, to enforce their demands.

Unfortunately, employers and government labor boards are not impressed with statistics. The main thing that impresses them about Tobin's unions is that Tobin has assured the government that he will lie down and roll over for them, and that he won't permit his membership to strike. The bosses and the boss-dominated war labor boards only laugh at unions who can't fight for their rights, no matter how brilliant a case a union statistician can make out for the workers' demands.

"ANTI-AIRCRAFT GUNS"

Tobin's lieutenants throughout the country are trying to sell the membership on the Tobin substitute for the strike weapon. "Employers who enter into negotiations with Iowa Teamster organizations in the not-too-distant future," threatens Ray Mills, president of the Des Moines Teamsters Joint Council (in the March 19 issue of the *Des Moines Federationist*), "may find themselves matching wits with union representatives who know as much, if not more, about their business affairs than they do themselves. . . . The statisticians are our 'anti-aircraft guns' set up to shoot down all the usual high-flying claims of the employers."

That expert statisticians do NOT provide the answer to the needs of the drivers is revealed by Tobin himself, who complains bitterly in the same issue of his magazine of "unpatriotic employers (who are) attempting to increase their personal profits through the rubber emergency," and of "certain employers (who) are conspiring to take advantage of the no-strike policy of the Teamsters' Union in order to breach contracts."

What the hell, Tobin! Call out your statisticians! Prove to the employers that they can't do that!

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 14 Saturday, April 4, 1942

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

Editor:
GEORGE BREITMAN

THE MILITANT follows the policy of permitting its contributors to present their own views in signed articles. These views therefore do not necessarily represent the policies of THE MILITANT which are expressed in its editorials.

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

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

Stalinist Drive Against Militants

To understand the lynch campaign which the Communist Party is trying to incite against the militants in the labor movement, it is necessary only to read the account on Page 2 of this paper of some of the most recent activities of the Stalinists in the trade unions.

As Harry Bridges made clear in his recent speech before the San Francisco CIO Council, the Stalinists are bent on completely perverting the character and function of the trade union movement. From independent organizations created to protect and improve the conditions of the workers, the Stalinists want to change the unions into servile adjuncts of the war machine and instruments for speeding up the workers. This is their way of repaying the American capitalists for the trickle of aid which the government has sent the Soviet Union.

The steps which the Stalinists have taken in recent weeks are only the beginning; they intend to go much further along this path. At the CIO conference in Washington last week, *PM* reports that "Bridges is said to have deprecated agitation over current anti-labor legislation and labor's economic status, demanding greater emphasis on production." The Stalinists are not satisfied with the step-by-step capitulations of the official union bureaucracy, which is still trying to make a pretense of protecting the workers' conditions; they want to speed up the process and get the union bureaucrats to go all-out all-at-once in the drive to shackle the unions.

But before the Stalinists can completely achieve these objectives, they have to dispose of the opposition to their treacherous policies.

They seek to beat down and silence the trade union militants who want to preserve the unions' gains and rights. Undoubtedly this is what the Stalinist union leaders had in mind when they publicly and demonstratively endorsed the dismissal of four union stewards at the Cleveland Alcoa plant for resisting an admittedly provocative company move to speed up the workers in violation of the agreement with the union. They hope that actions of this nature will serve as object lessons to terrorize other union militants into not fighting back against boss attacks.

Above all, the Stalinists want to suppress the Trotskyists who, although small in numbers, are the most articulate and consistent opponents of Stalinist betrayals. The Communist Party cannot answer the argument of the Trotskyists. That is why it slanders and tries to frame up and incite mob violence against them.

Read what Bridges had to say about those who oppose his program to speed up the workers and "appease" the bosses:

"Those who don't see this are not Americans — are not loyal. We've got to finger them. We can't take time to explain — we've got to go around 'em or roll over 'em."

In these three sentences, reduced to its most reactionary essentials, is contained the formula of the Stalinists for framing up their opponents. Here is the basis for their charges that the Trotskyists

are "Hitler's agents." Here is the Stalinist directive to act as "finger men" against the union militants. Don't try to "explain" what the Trotskyists stand for and why the Stalinists want them out of the way — "roll over 'em", slander them, denounce them, suppress them, slug them, frame them up, prevent the distribution of their paper, as the Stalinists tried to do in Los Angeles — and in this way, incidentally, prove how "American" and "loyal" the Stalinists are.

Workers! Trade unionists! Fight back against the Stalinist slanders, provocations, frame-ups. The Stalinist lynch campaign is part of the drive to destroy your unions and rights. Fight back against it if you want your unions to express your interests and not those of the bosses.

They Feel At Home With The Fascists

Standard Oil's conspiracy with the German I. G. Farbenindustrie shows that the leading representatives of American monopoly capitalism find nothing in the ideology of Nazism which prevents them from "doing business with Hitler." They feel perfectly at home around the international conference tables with the heads of the German trusts. The I. G. Farben representatives may be Nazis, and the Standard Oil men may be "democrats", but their way of life, their outlook, their objectives — profits and monopoly — are identical. They are class brothers.

It is no secret that the American capitalists have always found much to admire in Hitler's "internal" regime, above all, the "efficiency" with which the Nazi terror machine smashed the German workers' organizations and delivered the masses over to capitalist super-exploitation.

Today, American monopoly capitalism is having some "unpleasantness" with German capitalism. That, however, has nothing to do with ideologies. That is a business conflict. And business competitors — when they find it mutually advantageous — can always come to some "understanding", just as Standard Oil came to an "understanding" with I. G. Farben.

Standard's conspiracy proves conclusively that American big business is not interested in a war for democracy against fascism. It is interested in one thing only — profits. Tomorrow, when they think it essential to their interests, the American capitalists will tear a leaf from the notebook of German capitalism and try to establish a fascist dictatorship in America.

Yet, it is these same monopolists who run and control the war production program and whose spokesmen dominate the government war agencies. It is Standard Oil and the other big corporations which hold the economic and political power in this country today.

If Roosevelt were really concerned about waging a war to destroy fascism, his first move would be to destroy the power of America's own monopoly capitalists. He would remove the war production program from their control. He would take over the basic war industries and place them under the control and management of the workers, the only class able to run industry in the interests of the masses, and the class most truly concerned with defending democracy and destroying fascism.

The administration's treatment of Standard Oil, however, shows where Roosevelt really stands.

An ordinary espionage agent caught with the stolen plan of a new automatic pencil would be shot or given long-term imprisonment. Standard Oil gave the Nazis indispensable industrial processes worth whole armies. Standard's "patriotism" helped cripple American war production. But the Standard officials were let off with a total of \$50,000 in fines — a drop in the ocean to them — and the government withdrew its charges. Standard, and all the rest of the monopolies, are free to continue business as usual. Their agents continue to exercise just as much power as ever on the War Production Board and other government agencies.

In fact, immediately after the exposure of Standard's conspiracy, the administration hastened to assure the monopolies that anti-trust prosecutions which "interfered with war production" would be postponed until after the war.

The Standard case has shown the compatibility of the American monopolists with fascism, and the real nature of their "patriotism." But Assistant Attorney-General Arnold took pains to represent the Standard officials as merely "commercially simple-minded" but fundamentally "patriotic." His basic conclusion? "We need Standard Oil."

But we don't need the "Standard Oil" that Arnold refers to. We don't need the Rockefellers and Teagles, all of whose efforts are in the realm of financial and political manipulation to gain greater corporate wealth and profits. Without these monopolists, all that is essential to production would still remain — the plants, facilities, raw materials, technical skills, and, above all, the workers.

When the workers have control of the basic industries and can operate them in the interests of the American masses, then they will be able and eager to fight a genuine war for democracy that will never be halted until fascism and all its works are wiped from the face of the earth.

BOUND VOLUMES OF
**NEW INTERNATIONAL and
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**
for
1940 and 1941
Price \$3.00
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place New York City

Bethlehem Steel To Get \$50,000,000 Plant Gift

Far Cry From \$100,000,000 Proposed To Aid 165,000 Small Business Firms

Last week Congress made a gesture in the direction of the tens of thousands of small-business men who are being shoved to the wall by the big monopolies which have hogged most of the war orders. The Senate Banking Committee on March 25 approved an administration-sponsored measure to establish a \$100,000,000 fund to aid those small-business men lucky enough to secure war orders.

Just how "generous" this proposal actually is can be judged by comparing it with the single plant expansion contract which the government's Defense Plant Corporation secretly signed recently with the Bethlehem Steel Co., as revealed on March 19 by the New York newspaper, *P.M.*

That contract, whose terms when originally disclosed to the Truman Senate Investigating Committee were called "outrageous," would provide Bethlehem Steel with a government-financed plant costing \$50,000,000 — one-

half of the total sum being talked about for aiding some 165,000 small firms in this country.

How Bethlehem got this contract is a sufficient commentary on the extent of the government's concern about aiding small business and curbing the monopolies.

For a year and a half before the war, the big steel corporations issued reports, cited approvingly by Roosevelt himself, that they already had ample capacity to meet the steel needs in time of war. The steel barons did not wish to invest their monumental profits in plant expansion.

CONTRACT DENOUNCED BY GOV'T COUNSEL

Even when the steel shortage became very acute, they held out against expansion in order to get free plants from the government. Last summer, Bethlehem began to negotiate with the government for a \$50,000,000 plant to be built on its Sparrows Point, Maryland,

property. The contract, as drawn up by Bethlehem and approved by the OPM, gave the company a 35 year lease. The government could cancel this lease only if production during a five year period averaged less than 25 per cent capacity, and then the government had the right only to move the plant off Bethlehem's land — at government expense.

The counsel for the Defense Plant Corporation reported that "either Bethlehem did not desire to expand and has therefore submitted a proposal which it believed would be rejected, or Bethlehem was using the defense program to obtain at government expense, modern facilities which would have a material value in peace-time operations."

Signing of this contract was held up a few weeks because of the repercussions of the Truman committee disclosures. The original contract was "modified" — that is, even worse features were added — and was finally signed last month — on the quiet — by the Defense Plant Corporation. A \$50,000,000 contract with Bethlehem Steel — and it's all gravy!

India Congress Heads Reject Cripps' Plan

(Continued from page 1)
effect a colony of Britain.

MASSSES WOULD HAVE NO VOICE IN CONSTITUTION

The plan provided for the election of only part of the "constitution-making body" — but even that part was not to be elected by the masses. The masses were asked to die in the war in return for a constitution to be drawn up by a body which the masses were not to be permitted to elect.

One part of this body was to be elected by the members of the lower houses of the legislatures of the 11 provinces of British India — who themselves are elected under limited suffrage — on the basis of proportional representation for various political groupings.

The constitution-making body would thus be twice removed from the control of the voters, and in this case the voters would by no means be synonymous with the masses.

In this country United States Senators used to be elected by state legislatures; the experience always was that such Senators were far to the right of Senators elected directly, because they were further removed from the control of the voters.

STRONG REPRESENTATION FOR BRITISH PARTNERS

The second part of the constitution-making body was to be chosen to represent the Indian native states, which constitute from one-fourth to one-third of the total population of India. These representatives would not be elected — they would be appointed by the despotic native princes and feudal lords. The exploited peasant masses were to have nothing at all to say about who would represent these states. It can be taken for granted that this large section of the population would not have had its interests represented when the constitution was drawn up.

These native princes are the agents and partners of British imperialism; they remain in power only by the support of Britain and realize that without the aid of British bayonets they would be overthrown by the peasant masses. As recently as March 22, a New York Times story from Bombay reported that "The Princes fear that if the British-Indian link is broken, they will ultimately be swept away."

Thus, in the person of the princes' representatives and the representatives of reactionary minorities in some of the provinces, Britain was providing for itself a strong minority of British agents in the constitution-making body.

THE CLUB OF A WALK-OUT THREAT

This was not all. Cripps' plan contained an even stronger club to force the writing of a constitution which would be acceptable to British capitalist interests. And that was the provision that any of the provinces or native states which did not like the constitution after it was drawn up, could withdraw from the "new Indian Union" and be granted by Britain the "same full status as the Indian Union."

What would this mean? That Britain's most direct agents in the constitution-making body would be able to walk out of it if they didn't get what they wanted for themselves and for Britain.

The result would have been in

effect the establishment of a number of Indian Ulsters. Such a set-up would have placed Britain in the position where it could maintain its rule in an India divided into two or more parts; it could play one part against the other, and use the British-inspired demands of a minority to thwart the will of the majority as they do in Ireland.

The mere threat of such a step by Britain's agents in the constitution-making body would have strengthened their influence there all out of proportion to their size, and undoubtedly would have resulted in the adoption of various provisions — subservience to British capital, maintenance of feudal regimes, etc. — which British imperialism and the most reactionary elements in India would want adopted.

ALSO DEMANDED SIGNING OF TREATY

Reactionary and anti-democratic as these features of the plan were, British imperialism was not willing to stake its future on the effectiveness of them alone. It further demanded the "signing of a treaty which shall be negotiated between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making body."

This treaty would "make provisions in accordance with undertakings given by His Majesty's Government for the protection of racial and religious minorities." That is, Britain intended to use its tools who represent only a minority of a minority — the Moslem League, for example, does not represent the majority of the Moslems — to maintain its hold on India.

Through this treaty and through the provisions permitting the partition of India, Britain would have retained what amounted to veto power. In this way British imperialism expected to preserve its power to exploit India and to guarantee the continuance of the whole present economic structure of India.

The Indian masses are concerned with solving their own social, economic and political problems — not with winning the war for a Britain which refuses to grant them the democracy in whose name they are expected to fight and die. They will not be satisfied with any fraudulent plan — whether it comes from Cripps or Nehru — they will not be satisfied with anything short of the immediate convocation of a constituent assembly, directly elected by universal suffrage.

A Timely Political Document!

IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

(A Compilation — 1927-1937)

10 CENTS

By LEON TROTSKY

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK

The New York School Of Social Science

announces

a new series of lectures

WEDNESDAYS

7:45 P. M.

The History of American

Trotskyism

JAMES P. CANNON

8:55 P. M.

Modern American

Capitalism

C. CHARLES

FRIDAYS

7:45 P. M.

The Progress of American

Culture

WM. F. WARDE

8:55 P. M.

The Wave of Revolution,

1917-1923

FELIX MORROW

25c for single lectures All classes held at

LABOR TEMPLE

242 East 14th Street, New York

IS EVERYBODY HAPPY?

The Soviet Union and
Its Democratic Allies

By M. STEIN

New Attitude Toward the Red Army

The racket of cashing in on somebody else's success is a very old one. Ask any prize-fighter who had the good fortune of rising to the top. He is an unknown, trading punches with his opponents, pretty lonely while on his upward climb. While he's receiving and meting out punishment, there are very few friends rooting for him in his corner. But as soon as he is proclaimed champion, he is surrounded by all sorts of would-be friends, seeking to bask in his reflected glory. The people who had no use for him, and had no hope that he would ever amount to anything, are the very ones who become the loudest in their praise, the ones who say, "I always knew he had it in him."

The Red Army won the championship in the early winter on the longest continuous battle line in the history of warfare. Against great odds the Red Army maintained this championship throughout the winter. Not only did this heroic Red Army fight a powerful, well-equipped enemy, but it was at the same time burdened with an incompetent General Staff, which was responsible for the early and very costly defeats. This army was furthermore weakened by the policies of a corrupt regime in the country — a regime which systematically exterminated all the leaders and inspirers of the revolution who made the Red Army possible.

The Red Army's climb to championship has been a very difficult one indeed. Many were the times when it looked down-and-out, and many were the people who said it would never come up before the count of ten.

Everybody Seems Happy

How different everything is today. Everybody is a friend of the Red Army! Everybody seems happy at its successes!

Is the Conservative Mr. Churchill happy? Why, certainly. He above all! This most class conscious opponent of the Soviet Union is not averse to cashing in on the successes of the Red Army. When the storm broke loose over the inglorious defeat of Singapore, Mr. Churchill was quick to run for cover under the victorious banner of the Red Army. His words drip with honey in the message on the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Red Army, which he says "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." (New York Times, Feb. 24).

And our own President does not merely join in the sentiments of the Prime Minister at the successes of the Red Army — his is a greater mission. His is the heavier responsibility. He speaks not in his own name alone, not in the name of his country alone: "... all the United Nations salute the superb Russian Army as it celebrates the twenty-fourth anniversary of its first assembly." (New York Times, Feb. 24).

Yes, how much water has run over the dam since "its assembly." We even remember the circumstances under which it occurred. We recall the dispatch of American troops in Siberia to cooperate with the Japanese troops and to coordinate their efforts with the British troops in Archangel and the French in Odessa — all there to help in "its first assembly."

Mr. Roosevelt has the distinction of setting political style, just as the Duchess of Windsor at one time had the distinction of setting the fashion for ladies' hairdos and dresses. It is no wonder then that the President's apparent enthusiasm for the Red Army should become the fashion. The Red Army is hailed in the most unexpected circles. Everybody seems to be for the champ; businessmen, industrialists, army dignitaries, clergymen, and even the so-called labor leaders, the Greens and the Wolds.

Stalinist Business Booms

There is, of course, in addition, that gang which has been exploiting the prestige of the Soviet Union as a profession. For them business is truly booming. All the pent-houses which since the Stalin-Hitler Pact had shut their door in the face of the Stalinists, have been opened wider than ever. What a chance to rub shoulders with the elite of society and to drink toasts of oldest champagne to the Red Army soldiers and the guerrilla fighters who know of no limits in their sacrifices. After a few toasts intermingled, naturally, with toasts for the President or the Prime Minister or Sir Stafford Cripps, one gets perhaps the feeling of being a participant on the far flung Russian battle field.

In the midst of all the cheers for the Red Army, there are nevertheless some people who insist on bringing in a sour note. We refer here to none others than the Soviet Ambassadors in Washington and London. Mr. Litvinov made a speech at the Hotel Astor in New York on March 16; Mr. Maisky echoed his remarks in London on March 25th. The two ambassadors keep on harping on one thing, they ask for a diversion, such as the opening of a western front, and they want this done immediately. Says Maisky, "The decisive moment is 1942."

A reading of the text of these two speeches gives one the feeling that the Ambassadors are polemics against somebody. And then it occurs to us that Mr. Churchill after his Washington conference with the President was the one who spoke about decisive action in 1943 and not 1942. Would it be too impertinent to inquire what is the difference between the two dates? Is it merely a difference in temperament, a tendency towards restlessness and impatience on the part of the Soviet representatives? Or is it purely a question of strategy?

But here too our memory serves us in good stead. We remember an address made by Wendell Willkie, unofficial ambassador of Wall Street, who sometimes speaks out what others dare not say. Said Willkie at the Conference of Mayors (New York Times, January 14): "But democracy cannot be saved by the armies of Russia. Democracy must be saved by the democracies themselves."

So you see, while they are cheering for the champ and their hearts, yes and their purses, are with the new contender for the championship, they are now in the process of training. This is the meaning of the different dates. The question of who is to defeat Germany is to them the decisive one.