

**NEXT WEEK:
SPECIAL 8-PAGE
MAY DAY EDITION**

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 16

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1942

207

FIVE (5) CENTS

BRITAIN REJECTS INDIAN PROPOSALS India Denied Right To Control Its Own Defense

UAW Militants Oppose Yielding Labor's Rights

150 Delegates Fight Surrender of Union Standards at Auto Workers Conference

By JOE ANDREWS

DETROIT — The first powerful opposition to surrender of labor's rights since Pearl Harbor was voiced at the War Emergency Conference of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, held here on April 7-8.

A group of 150 delegates, representing no less than 100,000 auto workers, voted against giving up the established week-end and holiday wage rates and denounced the WPB management-labor committee scheme as a disguised speed-up plan.

This determined bloc of delegates refused to retreat another inch in the face of the employers' offensive and defied the appeals of the entire UAW international board and the personal plea of President Roosevelt.

The appearance of this militant group is the most significant

and encouraging development in the American labor movement since December 7, 1941. It represents the growing resistance of the rank-and-file workers to the top union leadership's policy of appeasing the open-shop employers and their government agents.

The two-day stormy debate at the conference centered around the International Executive Board's demands that the auto workers "voluntarily" take "substantial wage cuts" and accept the speedup, by surrendering double-time pay for week-ends and holidays within the regular 40-hour work week and supporting establishment of management-labor committees to increase "individual" production.

"EQUAL SACRIFICE"

Tied together with the International Board's demands on the auto workers was a ten-point program calling for a three percent limit on profits, prevention of war-time millionaires, adjustment of wages to meet rising prices, a labor voice in planning to avoid post-war depression, etc.

But this "equality of sacrifice" program did not fool the opposition delegates. One after another they took the floor and exposed these proposals as a cover-up for the union leaders' retreat.

As one delegate explained it: "We will vote here to give up overtime pay and for the speed-up. It will be an accomplished fact. But all the resolutions we may pass about limiting profits will be so much hot air. We are sacrificing our conditions, but the bosses won't give up a thing."

Unable to answer the opposition on the merits of the issue, the executive officers were forced to argue that if these demands were not accepted "voluntarily", Congress would impose them on the workers by legislation.

THE CHIEF ARGUMENT

Above all, the leaders hammered at the point that to op-

Buffalo Local Backs Stand of UAW Opposition

BUFFALO, April 15 — Bell Aircraft Local 501 of the UAW-CIO heard a report on the proceedings of the Detroit conference last Sunday and voted two to one against the conference decision to give up the regular pay rates for week-end and holiday work.

This action was taken by the membership despite the pleas and speeches of Leo Lamotte, a national official of the UAW and Regional Director Kerri-gan.

The union members also protested against the flag waving presentation of the issues at the conference by Richard T. Frankenstein, director of the union's Chrysler department.

pose this surrender was to oppose the government.

Climaxing six hours of torrid debate on the over-time pay issue, Richard Frankenstein, a moment before the vote was taken, shouted:

"Are you going to tell the President of the United States to go to hell?"

After this, and a re-reading of Roosevelt's personal appeal to the conference, 150 of the 1400 delegates courageously dared to stand on their feet and vote against the Executive Board's proposals.

In taking this militant position, the opposition reflected the sentiments of the union ranks, as even UAW President Thomas admitted when he spoke of the opposition as upholding the "popular" position. In the statements of Reuther and the other Board members were clear admissions that the leaders were opposing themselves to the genuine sentiments of the membership.

OPPOSITION STRENGTH

Although the militants numbered only 150 out of some 1400 delegates nevertheless they spoke officially for a large proportion of UAW members. Among the opposition was the entire Flint delegation, representing 45,000 workers; the delegation from the

(Continued on page 2)

"None Of Your Counterfeit!"



Congress Party Turns Down Plan Brought By Cripps

The British War Cabinet has turned down the proposal of the Indian Congress Party for Indian control of its own defense against invasion. The Congress has answered this rejection by turning down the War Cabinet's fraudulent promise of dominion status after the war with Britain to remain in full control of India between now and the next peace.

The events of the last week have made it clear — despite the attempts of the American press to confuse the issue — that Britain's primary interest in India is not to protect it from invasion, but to prevent the Indian people from taking their fate into their own hands.

The British ruling class refuses to relax its stranglehold

on India, regardless of the effects on the war or the interests of the Indian people; it is afraid, even with a Japanese invasion looming, to permit the Indian masses to assume control of their own defense.

No editorials in the American press will change the facts: If India falls to Japan because the Indian masses are not aroused and armed for resistance — and they will not be, as long as they feel that they would be fighting Japan only to insure British domination of their country — the responsibility will belong to Churchill and the British ruling class.

THE CONGRESS LEADERS

Churchill's adamant take-it-or-leave-it attitude left the leadership of the Congress Party no alternative but to reject the plan brought by Cripps. The Congress Party represents the interests of the native capitalist class, but it is important as a political force only because it has the support of large masses of peasants and workers. The acceptance by the Congress of an openly fraudulent promise such as was offered by the British War Cabinet, would have completely discredited the Congress and destroyed whatever influence it has.

Although the Congress leaders showed a willingness to prolong the conferences with Cripps and try to work out some sort of compromise which could be sold to the masses, the War Cabinet's

stand on the question of who would control the defense of India — that is who would control the armed forces and the government — made this impossible. As the Congress statement put it:

"At any time defense is a vital subject. During war-time it is all important and covers almost every sphere of life and administration."

"To take away defense from the sphere of responsibility (of an Indian government) at this stage is to reduce that responsibility to a farce and nullify and make it perfectly clear that India is not going to be free in any way . . ."

And that, apparently, was uppermost in the minds of the Congress leaders throughout all the conferences. They could not accept a proposal which made it perfectly clear to everyone in India that the Cripps' plan was only a device for gilding the chains which keep the Indian masses in enslavement.

WHY COMPROMISE FELL THROUGH

At one point newspaper dispatches announced that a compromise had practically been reached and that the Congress leaders were about to accept a plan which provided that the British viceroy would pick an executive council of 15, with an Indian member to handle all defense matters "except strategy" (Continued on page 2)

Nazi Tieup Holds Back Magnesium Output

Aluminum Trust, Getting New Plants from Government, Conspires to Further Monopoly

The Aluminum Company of America, which is receiving the lion's share of nine new government-financed aluminum plants, is still "doing business with Hitler", like Standard Oil and the other American trusts. This is part of a conspiracy to restrict production and protect ALCOA's aluminum and magnesium monopoly.

This week the government is expected to bring ALCOA before a federal court in an anti-trust hearing to force release of the company's magnesium alloy patents, which it shares exclusively with the German I. G. Farbenindustrie. The government is also

for the duration of the war — and the government will then withdraw its charges. ALCOA's (Continued on page 3)

SWP Candidate Prepares Final Campaign Plans

**Goldman and Carlson to Make Radio Talks
Giving Socialist Workers Party Platform**

ST. PAUL, Minn. — With the St. Paul election campaign drawing to its close on April 28, the Campaign Committee for Grace Carlson for Mayor announced its plans to reach the workers of St. Paul with its socialist program.

Five thousand leaflets were distributed during the week in working-class neighborhoods announcing the concluding campaign rally and radio speeches.

At the campaign rally to be held April 23 8 P.M., at the American House, 144 Rice Street, Albert Goldman, attorney for the Socialist Workers Party and one of the defendants in the recently concluded "seditious conspiracy" case, and Grace Carlson will be the speakers.

Albert Goldman will also make a 15 minute radio speech over station WMIN on April 24 at 8:45 P. M. in behalf of the Socialist Workers Party candidate. The candidate herself will speak over the same station April 27, the night before the election, at 8:45 P. M.

Ten thousand copies of a special St. Paul election edition of THE MILITANT will be distributed in St. Paul on April 25, 26 and 27 by Socialist Workers Party members and sympathizers.

In a recent press release the Carlson Campaign Committee stated: "The nomination of William Fallon and John McDonough for mayor of St. Paul in the primary election leaves St. Paul workers with no one to represent

ed at 138 E. 6th Street and election literature and information about the campaign may be obtained there."

MCDONOUGH'S RECORD

That "Labor Progressive" candidate, John McDonough does not represent the interests of labor was clearly demonstrated by the events of the past week in the campaign. William Fallon, whom the Labor Progressive Association denounces as "the candidate of reaction" exposed McDonough as having made a deal with the local power trust, Northern States Power Company. "25 days after Mayor McDonough took office," said Fallon, "an ordinance was approved extending the franchises of the Northern States Power Company for five years without any vote of the people."

In the same radio speech Fallon recalled how another "Labor" mayor, William Mahoney, used to call the Northern States Power Company "the great octopus." Even the old time reactionary William Fallon is able to make political capital of the cynical betrayal by Labor Progressive office holders of the principles of the Labor Progressive Association.

In spite of her clean-cut socialist program and the campaign against her because she had been convicted of violating the Smith "Gag Act," Grace Carlson received the vote of one out of every thirty people who went to the polls in the March 10 primary election.

Wave Of Violence Against Negro Soldiers Claims Its Fifth Victim In Two Weeks

Soldier Shot Dead In Virginia; Others Injured by Police Assault In Tuskegee

APRIL 14 — The wave of violence against Negro soldiers claimed new victims this week, as the Army officials and boards of inquiry continued to remain silent about the many attacks against Negro troops reported in last week's MILITANT.

At Camp Lee, Virginia, Private James W. Martin stepped out on to the balcony on the second floor of the prison barracks. The corporal of the guard below ordered him to step back inside. When Martin did not move, the corporal ordered a sentry to shoot. Martin died from bullet wounds in his head.

The corporal and the sentry were held and a board of commissioned officers was set up to investigate the case.

In Tuskegee, Alabama, on April 3, several Negro soldiers were injured as the result of an attack on them by city cops, according to a report received by the Pittsburgh Courier which was not able to secure all the details because "all news of the occurrence has been suppressed by Army authorities."

The fight began when city po-

with the M. P.'s in the battle had felt it necessary to provide themselves with rifle ammunition in advance of the fight and against orders.

Nor have either of the military boards set up in Arkansas issued any report on the case of Sergeant Thomas P. Foster, Negro soldier who was assaulted by white M. P.'s and then shot dead "as he lay helpless on the ground" by a white city cop because he had asked the city cops beating up a drunken Negro soldier why they didn't turn him over to the M. P.'s.

Nor has any report been published in the papers about the trial in San Antonio, Texas, being given a white soldier who had shot and killed a Negro military prisoner in a fight because he had not stopped fighting with another prisoner when the white soldier had ordered him to.

GROWING RESENTMENT

Meanwhile strong resentment over these attacks on Negro soldiers was growing among the Negro population.

New York City Councilman

Adam Clayton Powell, editor of The People's Voice, gave clear expression to this resentment in an editorial printed in the April 11 issue of that paper. Entitled "Mr. President, Just What Is It That We Are Fighting For?" Powell pointed out that "more Negro men have been killed and beaten so far this year, than in any similar period of this century," and declared:

"Mr. President, we lay the blame squarely at your feet. . . You alone have the power to deal with this correctly and you must do it and do it promptly, with firmness and exactness. . ."

"This you must do: 'Immediately command the military police to protect by force of arms all members of the United States Army. . .'

"Order the Department of Justice to arrest immediately for trial the civilian murderers of Negro troops."

"Wipe out Jim Crow in all departments of our armed forces. 'If not, then what are we fighting for?'"

Record Is Filed For Appeal In 'Sedition' Case

NEW YORK, April 15 — The Civil Rights Defense Committee, official defense agency of the 18 members of the Socialist Workers Party and the CIO who were convicted in Minneapolis last December on charges of violating the Smith "Gag Act", announced this week that the record of the "sedition" case has been filed with the clerk of the Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis, Mo.

By agreement with counsel for the government, the time for filing of the briefs for the defendants has been extended to July. The government will have until September for filing its reply briefs.

The attorneys for the 18 defendants estimate that the oral arguments on the appeal will take place before the Circuit Court sometime in October. A decision will be rendered soon after the oral argument.

C.P. Tries New Scheme To Halt Sale Of 'Militant'

Plans to Use Sound Truck, Signs, Boxes, Monitors and Pressure On CIO Members As Well As Violence Against the Distributors

The attempts of the Stalinists in the Los Angeles Industrial Union Council of the CIO to prevent the distribution of working class newspapers that defend labor's rights and oppose the treacherous policies of the Communist Party, have thus far proved unsuccessful. But the Stalinists are still determined to prevent the workers from getting a chance to read such newspapers.

Two weeks ago, late in a meeting of the Council after many of the delegates had already departed, the Stalinists introduced resolutions condemning "trade unionism as usual" and **THE MILITANT**, Labor Action and the Socialist Party's Call. The Stalinists voted to "discourage" the distribution of these papers in front of the CIO hall.

The passage of this resolution did not discourage either the distributors of the papers from appearing on the street in front of the hall, nor did it discourage the rank and file, and non-Stalinist CIO members from taking copies of the papers that were offered to them.

MEANING OF "DISCOURAGE"

Last week the Stalinists showed what they meant by the word "discourage." Organizing a band of twenty men, they attacked two girls holding **THE MILITANT** and Labor Action, took their papers away from them, tore them up and took the pieces

is anything wrong with their accepting and reading these papers.

A STRAW MAN

The Stalinist-dominated executive board brought out a new resolution; this one states that "the papers are not official organs of the CIO!" Nobody has ever pretended that they were—but the Stalinists hope that the introduction of this issue by them will confuse the question in the minds of many of the non-Stalinist delegates and thus make it easier for the Stalinists to put over their dirty moves.

It was then decided, once this issue had been raised, "that a sign will be placed at the entrance expressing the CIO's opposition to the newspapers."

"The CIO sound truck will also be used on meeting nights to inform those coming into the building that the Trotskyite papers are opposed by the council and a letter is being sent to all affiliated locals asking that they take similar action."

But the Stalinists are not going to take any chances, they are not going to depend even on this publicity campaign to achieve their purposes.

BOXES AND MONITORS

They know the non-Stalinist workers have not paid much attention to their slanders before. Consequently, as the Daily Worker reports:

"Boxes will also be placed in the corridors of the buildings and monitors will stand by them urging that all delegates deposit the unwelcome material in them."

In this way the Stalinists hope to exert greater pressure on the individual CIO members and to intimidate them — by threats to call them sympathizers of "fifth columnists" — into not accepting the paper.

Whether this Stalinist scheme to prevent workers from reading what they want, will work any better than those employed in the past, remains to be seen.

At any rate, it is already clear that the Stalinists are willing to spend as much time and energy attacking the right of free speech and free press as they are responding to prevent strikes and to speed up the workers.

Trotsky's Last Work MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

on the
IMPERIALIST WAR
and the
PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION
48 pages 5 cents per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place

UAW Militants Oppose Surrender Of Labor Rights And Standards

(Continued from page 1)

Detroit Dodge local, numbering 20,000 members; Toledo delegates representing 15,000 auto workers; and delegates speaking for thousands of members of Murray Body, Bell Aircraft, the big West Side Detroit local, and many other important sections of the union.

The Executive Board members apparently expected to push through their program without serious opposition. They had deliberately issued the call to the conference at the last minute so that most of the delegates had to be appointed and not elected. One week's notice was given, which did not permit any proper discussion of the issues in the locals. The delegates included 150 paid organizers who were told by Thomas "either go along with us or hand in your resignations."

But the response to the speech of Louis Ciccone of Local 216, Los Angeles, who struck the keynote for the opposition, indicated that the leadership was facing a real fight.

"We have a fight to win right here at home," Ciccone pointed out. "You ask us to sacrifice and promise in return to take the profiteering out of war."

On the West Coast we have declared our willingness to work for just living expenses if the management gives up profits. But they won't give up any of their profits. Step by step you are sacrificing labor's basic rights. You have given up the right to strike. You're giving up overtime pay. When will the management start sacrificing? Every time we make a sacrifice, they ask for more."

"STEP BY STEP"

John McGill, leader of the delegation from the powerful Flint Local 599, attacked the leaders for surrendering to government pressure. "Our organization is falling into the hands of someone who has no right to it, of someone besides the rank and file who built it."

Exposing the hollowness of the leadership's promises to fight for "sacrifices" by the bosses McGill said:

"The slogan of Victory Through Equality of Sacrifice sounds fine. But it's nothing but a fraud. Step by step and inch by inch the employers and Congress are getting back everything we have won. Let the members of the International Board come out and tell this conference what any single manufacturer has sacrificed . . . give it to us in facts and figures. Where is the equality of sacrifices?"

A great volley of applause greeted McGill's words:

"It's the workers who fight and die, not the employers. Isn't that sacrifice enough? Let's be clear on what we're asked to give up. Our International Board is proposing a wage cut. Should we sacrifice wages while General Motors piles up hundreds of millions in profits?" McGill declared his

support for the war, but nevertheless denied that Hitlerism could be defeated by wiping out labor's rights and gains.

In addition to Ciccone and McGill, others who made militant speeches were William Hill, president of Detroit Dodge local; Arthur Shipley, of the same local; Lloyd Jones, president of Detroit Murray Body local; Michael Manning, president, and Chester Mullins, of Detroit West Side local; Walter Reuther's home local; Arthur Case, Flint Buick Local; Neill Goff, Flint AC Spark Plug; J. P. Maturski, vice-president of Buffalo Belle Aircraft local; Paul Steffes, Milwaukee Local 75; Thomas Burke and Richard Gosser, Toledo Local 12; and John Barnes of Pontiac.

TOP LEADERS ARGUMENTS

Contrasted to the fighting words of these delegates, the speeches of the national officers were permeated with fear and defeatism.

Secretary-Treasurer George Addes, who in the past has posed as a militant, gave a typical expression of the leaders' attitude.

"You will get limitations of overtime pay whether you like it or not. Your friends in Washington have deserted you. You can't stop Congress now." He proposed nothing but to turn tail and run.

In attempting to answer the question why the workers must sacrifice now, while management will be asked to sacrifice later, Addes admitted the fraudulent motivation for the "Equality of Sacrifice" proposals.

"Why do we have to make sacrifices in advance of management? Because employers generally do not believe in democracy. Most of them would be victorious if the Axis won the war because they can function just as well under a dictatorship . . . Some, like Standard Oil, have made deals with the Axis power . . . and yet some of you delegates are asking that we wait until these business men make sacrifices."

This, in effect, was an admission that the Executive Board's policy is an attempt to "appease" fascist-minded monopolists who will nevertheless continue their war against labor.

MANAGEMENT-LABOR COMMITTEE DEBATE

The second day of the conference was spent in debate over Nelson's proposed management-labor committees.

Attempting to answer the argument that this was a disguised speedup plan, the UAW officers led by Walter Reuther, asserted that it was intended to give the workers a voice in production planning.

A delegate rose and read from the text of the union's program itself, which proved the speedup purpose of the management-labor committees. The program states: "We commit ourselves to the increase of production of all war materials . . . both by collective and

individual effort." Such a speedup was opposed by the militants as a betrayal of the over 150,000 auto workers now out of work.

Reuther's claim that the Nelson plan was the same as the Murray Council plan was exposed by several delegates who pointed out that the joint-committees under Nelson's plan have no power to enforce production decisions. It was related that in some companies where the labor-management committees are already set up, the management "permits" the workers to put ideas into a "suggestion box," which the management alone assumes the right to accept or reject. The Murray plan proposes to give the joint management-labor-government councils actual power to regulate production.

The majority of delegates finally were induced to vote for this speedup plan by the same argument used to put over the holiday pay cut. J. P. Thomas stated that it was the explicit request of Roosevelt that the plan be adopted. "Are you going to let down our Commander-in-Chief?" Thomas shouted.

The same 150 militant delegates voted against the management-labor committee speedup plan.

CONDEMN WLB'S "SHORTCOMINGS"

A most significant action of the conference was the unanimous endorsement of a resolution containing a sharp condemnation of "serious shortcomings" of the War Labor Board. The resentment felt by all union members at the run-around they are getting from the WLB compelled the union leaders themselves to introduce this resolution.

This resolution as worded by the leaders was a plea to the government and WLB to start taking some speedy action on the grievances and demands of the workers before "discontent and unrest" over-ride the leaders' no-strike pledges.

Because the WLB is delaying decisions, and is refusing to accept cases growing out of the firing of workers for union activities, the workers are "virtually being driven into strike action against their wishes," the resolution stated. It also charged that the corporations are taking advantage of the no-strike policy to undermine the unions and ignore the demands.

The specific proposals of the resolution served, however, to disguise rather than reveal the true character of the WLB. These proposals dealt entirely with fac-

tors of inadequate organization, suggesting merely extension of the board mechanism into regional boards and other methods of expediting the handling of demands and grievances. Such changes, however, would not alter the fundamentally pro-employer character of the WLB, which was purposely set up as a device to divert the workers' demands into a bottomless swamp of mediation and arbitration.

A POLITICAL ISSUE

What was brought out most clearly by the debate and decisions at this conference is that the immediate problems of the auto workers can no longer be met merely on an ordinary trade union level. The auto workers face not only the individual employer or corporation, they are confronted by the opposition of the entire governmental apparatus. Every issue is forced onto the political arena. The questions of holiday pay and speedup were posed by the International Board not on their merits, but on the basis of political support or opposition to Roosevelt.

The emergence of the opposition at this conference was the herald of a new force arising from the union ranks. The international Board, despite its long record of clique fights, lined up solidly against the militant rank-and-file. As a result, the old Board factions are losing many of their followers. The newly-forming opposition is drawn from both the Reuther and Addes caucuses and includes unionists who have long fought for an honest union program based entirely on the interests of the workers without regard for personal ambition.

The manner in which the UAW members jealously guard their democratic union rights reveals the innate vitality and militancy among the auto workers. Such a spirit must inevitably respond to the appeal of the opposition.

The coming UAW convention in Chicago next August will witness a heightening of the conflict that made its first appearance last week in Detroit.

C. P. DISCREDITED

The Communist Party, which formerly attracted many militants in search of leadership, is now thoroughly discredited in the auto union as a result of its unprincipled clique tactics and sharp shifts in policy. The few Stalinists left in any position in the UAW cling to the shirt-tails of the Executive Board. When John Anderson of Local 155, Detroit, urged the delegates not to consider their own conditions but to concentrate on "fighting the Japs," the delegates, who remembered a previous convention speech of his against British imperialism, hooted and jeered.

As the war progresses, the employers and government will demand more and more concessions from labor. The needs of the workers will come more and more

into conflict with the capitulatory policies of the union leaders.

For militant leadership, the workers are now compelled to develop new leaders out of the ranks. The first sign of this new leadership was evidenced by the opposition at the auto conference, whose stand inspired not only the auto workers but large sections of the American labor movement.

DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

The fact that this conference was called at all is proof that the auto union leadership is compelled to respect the will of the rank-and-file, if only in a formal fashion. The traditional UAW democracy prevailed at this conference, showing that the union ranks still retain the decisive voice. That means that the union members will fight to prevent the International Board from bureaucratically stifling the opposition.

Although the majority of delegates submitted to the demands of Roosevelt at this conference, they still demonstrated that they are not mere hand-raisers for the union leaders. For instance, when the Executive Board appealed for a special \$50,000 fund to campaign for their "equality of sacrifice" program, the delegates flatly turned the request down.

The manner in which the UAW members jealously guard their democratic union rights reveals the innate vitality and militancy among the auto workers. Such a spirit must inevitably respond to the appeal of the opposition.

The coming UAW convention in Chicago next August will witness a heightening of the conflict that made its first appearance last week in Detroit.

The outbreak of the war last Dec. resulted in a temporary paralysis of the union movement under the guidance of the present leadership. The events at the UAW conference preface the rebirth of a militancy which will rally the American workers to battle in their own interests and call a halt to retreats.

More Unions Give Funds to Support Defense of 18

The Civil Rights Defense Committee this week announced the receipt of further union financial contributions to aid in the appeal against the conviction of the 18 Socialist Workers Party and CIO members in the Minneapolis Smith "Gag" Act trial.

The contributing unions and the amounts of their donations are as follows:

Gas, By-Products and Coko Workers Local 12065, United Mine Workers, CIO, District 50 Edgewater, N. J.: \$50.

Bell Aircraft Local 501, United Automobile Workers, CIO, Buffalo, N. Y.: \$25.

United Rubber Workers, CIO, Local 69, Trenton, N. J.: \$10.

Amalgamated Lithographers Union, AFL, Local 1, New York City, \$10.

The CRDC, which is the organization authorized by the Minneapolis defendants to organize public support on their behalf, has national headquarters at 160 Fifth Avenue, New York City. The CRDC urges all unions and progressive groups to give the fullest financial and moral aid in this case.

Stalinist 'Reincarnated'

Pat Sullivan was a militant Canadian union organizer. He was president of the Canadian Seamen's Union. He was also a devoted Stalinist. Thus, when the war broke out in September, 1939 and Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, Pat Sullivan opposed the imperialist war. He continued to organize the workers and urge them to fight for better conditions.

For this, the Canadian government promptly clapped Sullivan into a concentration camp, where he remained for 21 months. It is not known on what precise date Sullivan finally saw the light. It is believed, however, that very shortly following the date of June 22, 1941, the day Hitler began his invasion of the Soviet Union, a sudden vision arose before Sullivan.

From that moment, he was, as it were, transfixed and transformed. Passing once more through the gates of the concentration camp, this time on his way out, Sullivan summed up the spiritual transformation which 21 months in a concentration camp and a change of party line can achieve: "Bygones are bygones. We step out, reincarnated, to do all in our power to win the war against Hitler."

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Prices

CHICAGO MASS MEETING

MAY DAY CELEBRATION

Speaker:
Albert Goldman
Attorney for the Socialist Workers Party

Sunday, May 3
2:30 P. M.

HAMILTON HOTEL
20 So. DEARBORN ST.

Auspices: SWP, Chicago
Admission 25 Cents

Cop Murders Alabama Negro In Cold Blood

A Negro steel worker was shot to death in cold blood by a city cop in Birmingham, Ala., last week.

Henry Matthews, the victim, was crossing the street when a cop, C. W. Hopkins, asked him if he was drunk. Matthews answered that he was not drunk, and the cop began to strike him.

Matthews tried to cover up, and the cop drew his gun and fired. Matthews fell wounded to

the ground and the cop, standing over him, fired four more shots at his back.

The Negro people in this country are told that there is a "war for democracy" going on, and that as a result they must forget about their struggle against Jim Crowism and for equality.

But the enemies of the Negro people will not let them forget about it — they continue to insult, suppress, discriminate, segregate, murder. In fact, these attacks on the Negro people have increased since Pearl Harbor.

They are proof that the Negro people must continue the struggle for equality and democratic rights in war time as much as in peace. Otherwise, when the war is over, they will find themselves with less rights than they had before the war.

CHICAGO

MAY FROLICS

SATURDAY, MAY 9th

DANCING:
MOVIES: an intimate film of the defendants as they lived during the trial.
ENTERTAINMENT: specialty dance and song numbers professionally presented, a magician, workers songs.
BAR, BUFFET: eat, drink and be merry.
at the

VIKING TEMPLE

3257 No. Sheffield Avenue

Sponsored by the

CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE

For the Defense of the 18 Minneapolis Defendants

Entree 8:30 P. M.

Admission 50c

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

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

New Jim Crow Plans for the Navy

After Pearl Harbor, the demand for the abolition of Jim Crow bars against Negroes in the Navy and Marines became louder and more insistent than ever. Last week Secretary of the Navy Knox announced a new plan affecting Negroes in these branches of the armed forces. An examination of this plan shows that it is not intended to do away with the much-denounced racial discrimination and segregation; all that it is intended to accomplish is to weaken and eliminate some of the criticism that has been aroused; Negroes will still be treated as "inferiors" and the "war for democracy" will still be fought by a Jim Crow armed force.

Up until now, Negroes were permitted to serve only as mess stewards and cooks in the Navy, and not at all in the Marines. After this new plan goes into effect — and it will take some time — the following changes will be made:

Negroes will be accepted as volunteers for general service in the "reserve components" of the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard.

Negro and white sailors and Marines will not be mixed. A separate Negro outfit will be set up in the Marines, under white officers. All Negro crews, under white officers, will be placed on small boats and assigned to "maritime activities around shore establishments" and "in navy yards"; those who are skilled workers will be employed in "construction crews and companies" (fancy names for labor battalions) and they may be employed in developing bases outside of the U. S. continental limits.

Negroes will be eligible for promotion as petty officers (non-commissioned), but not as commissioned officers, because, according to Knox, it takes many years to train men as commissioned officers.

If enough Negroes rush in to volunteer for this Jim Crow set-up, the Secretary of the Navy may assign some of them to serve on a destroyer or two.

The whole plan will begin as soon as the Navy can establish "a suitable training station," that is, a Jim Crow training station. Meanwhile, recruiting for service as messmen will continue without change.

Lip Service by Knox

Add this all up, and what does it equal? Knox and the administration have paid some formal recognition to the idea that Negroes should have the right to serve in all branches of the armed services. But putting some Negroes on small boats around the shores and in the navy yards or sending them as labor battalions to other countries does not at all change the fact that Negroes will still be segregated and discriminated against only because of their color!

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was quick to call Knox to order on his alibi for barring Negroes from serving as commissioned officers even in the segregated set-up because it takes "years to train officers." It pointed out that "at present the Navy is taking new off college campuses and out of civilian life daily and is giving them intensive training so that they can become commissioned officers. One such class was graduated recently from a training ship in the Hudson River."

If this can be done with whites, obviously it can be done with Negroes too. The fact that Knox does not intend to do this is proof that he doesn't want to. Knox said of his whole plan: "We are going into this in a cordial spirit of experimentation that will produce the least possible difficulties." What he meant was that he was going to pay a little lip-service to all the anti-Jim Crow agitation while at the same time making the least possible concessions to the idea of Negro and white equality.

'Progress' -- and Some History

The New York Herald-Tribune called this step an innovation and other papers hailed it as unprecedented, etc. Some groups have admitted its limitations, but say, "Well, it is not perfect, but anyhow it's a step forward." This is a completely false way of looking at the matter.

For it overlooks the fact that only 25 years ago, during the first world war, Negroes were accepted into the Navy on exactly the same basis as whites, and were not segregated. Of course, they did not have full equality even then, but at least they were allowed in the same crews as white sailors, and had the same formal right to become officers, etc. Then, 20 years ago, in 1922, after the war had been won, an order was issued barring Negroes from any service except in the messman branch.

In other words, Negroes in the middle of the second "war to save democracy" are worse off so far as discrimination in the Navy goes than their fathers were at the beginning of the first "war to save democracy."

Anybody who calls this a step forward is in the same position as the man who was earning \$30 a week, and then got cut to \$20 for doing the same work, and now is happy because he is "raised" to \$22 a week.

The only reason Knox offered this new plan was to "satisfy" the Negro people that they have something to fight for, that after the war they will secure greater rights. But it will not achieve that effect; advanced Negroes will recognize it only as an attempt to avoid giving them genuine equality in the armed forces; they will never believe that democracy can be preserved or extended by a Jim Crow armed force. They together with all class-conscious workers must continue the struggle for democratic rights in the armed forces and the abolition of all forms of military Jim Crowism.

Doing Business With Hitler

Jones Says Standard Oil Blocked Rubber Industry

Exposes Lies of Company Heads But Admits Own Agency Is Aiding Standard Monopoly

Further evidence relating to the Standard Oil-Nazi I. G. Farbenindustrie conspiracy which helped to block America's synthetic rubber industry, was given to the Truman Senate Investigating Committee last week by Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and head of the government's Defense Plants Corporation.

Jones substantiated previous government evidence when he admitted Standard Oil sought to prevent development of an American synthetic rubber industry in conformity with its patent-pooling deal with I. G. This was part of an agreement to divide between them world control of the chemical and petroleum industries and markets.

The testimony of Jones gave the lie to the statements of W. S. Farish and Frank Howard, president and vice-president respectively of the 2 billion dollar Standard Oil of N. J. who, a week before had claimed to the Truman Committee that Standard had given the government "full information" about its vital butyl rubber process and that its conspiracy with the German chemical trust was in the "interests of the United States."

Jones admitted that Standard had "not encouraged any of us in the belief that butyl rubber was a success." "Standard had refused to release its patents even after Pearl Harbor, although it gave them to the Nazis in 1938."

While blaming Standard for the rubber shortage which is crippling American war production, Jones was forced in effect to admit his own complicity. His own agency is continuing to aid Standard in retaining its monopoly on butyl rubber, acknowledged to be the "cheapest and best" form of synthetic rubber.

GOVERNMENT AIDS STANDARD'S MONOPOLY

Jones revealed that under the government's new program for expansion of the synthetic rubber industry Standard Oil is the only company which will produce butyl rubber.

Only 60,000 tons of butyl will be produced. The rest of the 700,000 tons of synthetic rubber planned for the government's program will be of the so-called buna type, inferior to butyl and costing over twice as much to produce.

Under the pressure of the rubber corporations, the government itself is restricting the production of butyl rubber. The rubber corporations don't want to engage in butyl rubber production because, despite the recent government decree against Standard, after the war the rubber companies would have to pay a stiff royalty to Standard, which would put them at a competitive disadvantage. In addition, they would have to go to Standard for the petroleum derivative which is the base of butyl rubber.

Instead, the rubber corporations have compelled the government to subsidize the production of buna rubber. This is costlier and inferior to butyl. But the government is giving the rubber corporations new plants and a guaranteed market for buna rubber.

Jones spilled the beans about Standard in an effort to cover up his own share of responsibility for the present rubber famine.

WHAT JONES COULD NOT EXPLAIN

But facts which Jones could not explain away before the Truman Committee were: 1. Why he opposed expansion of the synthetic rubber industry until after the fall of Singapore. 2. Why Standard Oil was the only company given government contracts for synthetic rubber plants prior to the present disclosures. 3. Why the Defense Plant Corporation officials had originally agreed that Standard should receive large royalties on all synthetic rubber produced by other companies under the government program. 4. Why Standard is still the only company which will produce butyl rubber in government-financed plants.

Jones admitted that he had "every imaginable difficulty" over Standard's patents. But he still insisted that he thought it was "all right" for Standard to get exclusive control of the government's butyl/rubber plants because Standard had the "know-how" on the process — the "know-how" presumably released to all companies by the government's anti-trust suit.

During Jones' testimony it was brought out that the nature of the contracts given Standard, as well as the other companies, would permit them to buy up the government-financed plants for a song after the war. Jones denied that this would lead to the large

field, including synthetic rubber. They agreed to share their patents exclusively with one another.

In October 1939, Standard and I. G. made a further arrangement providing that their cartel agreement was to continue throughout the war "whether or not the United States came in." When American entry into the war appeared imminent, Standard took over I. G. Farben's portion of their joint interests in this country, including the patents shared between them. This was done to prevent the government from taking over I. G.'s holdings and profits.

A BASIC CONTRADICTION

Standard is still maintaining its arrangement with I. G. And there are over 100 other such arrangements known to exist between American monopolies and German capitalist interests. If the government were to proceed against Standard on this score, it would also have to act against virtually the whole of American monopoly capitalism.

In this is revealed a basic contradiction of the capitalist system. American capitalism as a whole is in mortal conflict with German capitalism. Yet the individual American monopoly interests seek to do business with enemy interests when this aids them in securing monopoly control on a world scale and against their own domestic rivals.

It is this contradiction that is reflected in the *New York Times*, April 2, which seeks to whitewash Standard Oil throughout a lengthy editorial, and then ends up noting that there is "however, one deeply disturbing aspect" of Standard's dealings with the Nazis. It chides the Standard officials "with their worldwide sources of information and their experience in international affairs" who have continued their collaboration with I. G. when they "were peculiarly well placed to understand the implications for the world of the Nazi program."

The *Times* does not dare to develop to the end the implications of this fact. For it would lay bare a fundamental contradiction of the very capitalist system which the *Times* upholds.

The very monopoly corporations which are running the war program and making colossal profits out of war production, when it is to their interests continue to traffic with the enemies of their own government. In war as in peace, they defend their profits and monopoly advantages above all else. In the name of "patriotism" they try to squeeze the workers dry to pay for the war.

But their own "patriotism" is only a hypocritical cover for self-interest.

Standard's CONSPIRACY

Complete documentary evidence of Standard's conspiracy was in the files of the Department of Justice for at least a year before it was brought to light on March 26. But only after the Far East defeats, when the sources of natural rubber were cut off, did the government initiate its anti-trust suit against Standard and force the formal release of its butyl rubber patents. This action was taken at the behest of the rubber corporations, which were compelled by events to move into the synthetic rubber field and had to block the competitive advantages of Standard, which controls the best processes.

The special weapon which the rubber corporations were able to wield was Standard's link with the Nazi interests. As the documentary evidence has proved, Standard made an agreement with I. G. Farben in order "to be free from the competition of the other and also from independent competition." Standard was to have a world monopoly on petroleum products and synthetic gasoline, outside of Germany. I. G. was to control the chemical

How the "democracies" paved the way for Hitler's coming to power.

The German Revolution

ITS RISE AND FALL 1918-1923

Two Lectures by FELIX MORROW

Friday, April 17 and 24

LABOR TEMPLE 242 E. 14th Street

Auspices: NEW YORK SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Alcoa-Nazi Tie Behind Lag In Metals Output

(Continued from page 1)

cartel agreement with I. G. will continue, as well as its aluminum and magnesium monopoly.

WHY ALCOA RESTRICTS MAGNESIUM PRODUCTION

ALCOA's monopoly control of the magnesium patents has enabled it to limit production of this vital war metal to 4,000 tons a year, five percent of the war needs. Magnesium is a lighter, stronger and less expensive substitute for aluminum. Production of magnesium on any extensive scale might have forced down the monopoly price of aluminum. ALCOA didn't want that. So it conspired with I. G. Farben to permit I. G. to produce all the aluminum and magnesium it desired for Germany, if I. G. would permit ALCOA to control the aluminum and magnesium field in America and throughout the rest of the world.

One company only, Dow Chemical, was allowed to produce magnesium in America under an agreement which compelled Dow to sell only to companies designated by ALCOA. This restriction of production has held up the manufacture of thousands of military aircraft and has contributed to the metals shortage which is crippling American production.

As in the Standard Oil case, the government has known about ALCOA's conspiracy for a long time. Over a year ago, ALCOA was indicted by a federal grand jury for its conspiracy with I. G. But not until this week, over four months after Pearl Harbor — did the government dare to finally challenge the mighty ALCOA, and then only in a weak, small voice. War or no war, ALCOA refused to yield up its patents, and not until the government was faced with a crisis of war production did it reluctantly take action.

ALCOA's patent-pool with I. G. was only part of a general agreement covering the aluminum field. Assistant Attorney-General Arnold has described the manner in which this agreement came about:

HOW CONSPIRACY WORKED

"In 1931 there was a growing world surplus of aluminum which threatened to invade American markets and disturb the monopoly control and the price structure of the Aluminum Co. of America. So that company formed a Canadian affiliate, called Aluminum Ltd., thinking that in this way it could escape the anti-trust laws and could join with the aluminum monopolies of

other countries to prevent threatened world competition by eliminating this surplus."

ALCOA and its Canadian affiliate parceled off the world market with the French, British, German and Swiss interests. They formed a cartel, pooled their resources, bought up all surpluses and withheld them from the market. Then they drastically limited all world production and fixed minimum world prices.

"The plan to keep up prices by restricting world production rolled merrily along," says Arnold, "until Hitler came to power. He had no patience with any limitations on German production but he was delighted with the idea of limiting production abroad."

"And so Hitler, in return for permission to produce unlimited quantities at home, promised that he would not increase his exports and thus disturb the world prices which the cartels were trying to maintain."

BLOCKED EXPANSION OF ALUMINUM TOO

For almost a year and a half, during 1940 and 1941, ALCOA sought to protect its aluminum monopoly by blocking any government plans for expansion of the aluminum industry. The OPM officials cited ALCOA's optimism — that is, lying — figures about the adequacy of existing aluminum facilities and refused to order additional plants. Last fall, it was "discovered" that ALCOA's facilities were able to provide only 25 per cent of the war needs — if all consumer production were cut out.

The Truman committee, in its June 26, 1941 report, was forced to conclude "that ALCOA had convinced OPM of the adequacy of the supply (of aluminum) in order to avoid the possibility that anyone else would go into a field which they had for so many years successfully monopolized."

Also, the Truman committee stated that ALCOA had reasoned "that it would be favorably treated by the government in order to insure an adequate supply for defense purposes." And it has been treated favorably!

Government anti-trust suits were instituted against ALCOA in 1912, 1924, 1928 and 1930. It beat them all. In 1937, another suit was filed by Roosevelt's "New Deal" administration. Over four years later, in October 1941, the case ended when Federal Judge F. G. Caffey gave ALCOA one of the slickest judicial whitewashings on record.

THE MILITANT of Feb. 15, 1941, describing in detail the ALCOA-I. G. Farben conspiracy, wrote that "one thing we can be certain of, ALCOA is not too worried by the present indictment brought against it . . . the government will continue, as in the past, to lay cash on the line for ALCOA for every ounce of aluminum it uses in its war preparations, from field kitchen equipment to flying fortresses." That statement still goes!

'Woman's Place' --It's In The Factories Now

By LYDIA BEIDEL

The war into which the United States has entered is already displaying its "total" character with respect to women. The rapid induction of men into the armed forces has created a momentous problem for the ruling class — that of achieving a balance between the military and industrial personnel of the

country. The solution of that problem suggests itself: draw women into basic industry.

The full implication of this new and conscious involvement of great numbers of women in the vital branches of capitalist manufacture is not as yet clear either to the working class or to the capitalists. The latter, however, display a well-founded uneasiness at the prospect of having to cope with a vast new mass of "undisciplined" workers who are being taken into vital sections of American economy only to be shoved out and replaced if and when the male population is returned to its usual industrial life.

The problems of war production have called forth all sorts of institutions for hastening and organizing the induction of women into industry. The United States Department of Labor has conducted extensive investigations on the speed with which women can be trained to replace men and those firms receiving war orders have been prevailed upon to emphasize the hiring of women.

A survey of the aircraft industry indicates that 75% of the operations involved can be performed by women, and every large aircraft plant is moving toward the replacement of male by female labor. The Ford Willow Run bomber plant, for instance, has already hired at least 15,000 women and reports an ultimate 100,000 jobs for female labor in this plant alone. The government looks to England as a standard in this industry, where 40-50% of

aircraft workers are now women. In another of the vital war industries, small arms manufacture, American industry looks to Wales as a model; there, 80% of the working force is female.

Diligent researchers have discovered that there is almost no field of industry into which women cannot be drawn, while maintaining the regular rate and quality of production, and that the replacement of men can extend from the least skilled operations of the mass production industries to the most highly skilled techniques — blue-print reading, shop mathematics, speeds and

proletariat—unskilled, poorly-paid, insecure.

The change in the composition of the working class of the United States as a result of this process holds plenty of headaches for those sections of the capitalist class endowed with the power to see one step ahead of today's profits. The fear that the drawing of women into vital industry — in other words, the proletarianization of women — is a move which cannot be unmade, and which will create a new kind of female, gnaws at the subconscious mind of those up above.

Great slabs of propaganda are being handed out to put women in the right frame of mind. Women, according to this line of flattery, have moved "from the second line of defense workers to the front line." Women are being admonished to remember that their first duty is to "cease reacting emotionally" (read, "cease making demands for a better living") and to assume seriously the task of "guarding the advantages of our democratic system of society." In this connection it is interesting to note that the women of England who make demands for improved conditions are soundly abused for "not taking seriously the responsibilities as well as the advantages of democracy."

There is no better guarantee for the maintenance of real democracy than the development of a class-conscious female section of the proletariat. This war, itself a symptom of the dying past, will be an instrument for breaking the bonds of social oppression which have kept the masses of women prisoners in the narrow limits of the kitchen.

The Dilemma Of The Capitalist Class Of India

By A. ROLAND

A Blow to British Cabinet

The British have suffered a heavy blow in the refusal of the Indian Congress Party to accept the British War Cabinet plan. The extent of the blow may be judged by the fact that not even the "left socialist" lawyer Cripps, that professional "friend of India," could sell the Churchill gold brick. Even the Hindu bourgeoisie was compelled to reject an obvious fraud.

The Indian Congress Party is careful not to burn all its bridges, however. That party represents the capitalist class of India, who know very well that they dare not set the Hindu masses in motion against British imperialism. The oppressed masses would act in their own interests and would attempt to throw off their backs not only the foreign but the native exploiters as well. The Nehrus and Azads would like to see the end of the rule of the totalitarian Indian princes who are kept in the saddle in their many small states by the British Raj. But the Indian Congress leaders depend on the English rulers only to a lesser degree than the princes. For these leaders are the direct spokesmen for the native factory owners and the native shareholders of British finance.

The Fear of Being Discredited

The British miscalculated the requirements of so critical a moment as the present one. They offered the Indian bourgeoisie entirely too little for so much. They were asking the Hindu leaders to sell the war to the Indian masses. That is no mean task, as anyone knows who has the faintest idea of the conditions imposed on those many-millioned lowly sons and daughters of India. Actually what the English desired was some gesture on the part of the Hindu and Moslem upper class that would tend to render the masses at least passive for the duration, and not actively hostile. Certainly the Nehrus, who have themselves seen the inside of the English jails, do have some idea of Indian conditions and of the smoldering hatred of the English deeply embedded in the hearts of their downtrodden countrymen.

That is why the Congress Party rejected the proposals. It was not that they looked the gift horse in the mouth and saw its ugly teeth. It was due rather to the knowledge that acceptance would have discredited them completely among the masses. The fraud was so palpable and obvious that the masses might well have constituted a new and independent movement directed against both the English and their native allies. The risk they might thus take, and the imminent danger to the English rule over India, warranted a much higher price. The English, of course, fear the higher price — native rule — as much as they fear the Japanese invasion.

We mentioned that the Indian Congress did not burn all its bridges. It was most friendly and polite to the English overlord. It tried to be as helpful as possible, short of giving in completely. It offered to cooperate with the English in the defense of India. Its resolution speaks of its desire to line up with the progressive forces of the world, but as a free India. By a free India the Congress meant a capitalist India. The stress of further events may yet force the English to make a much better offer.

Jinnah, leader of the Moslem party, got pretty much what he wanted in the Churchill plan. He was to be allowed to constitute a separate state, if the Moslems so desired. But this open tool of British imperialism was forced to wait for his cue from the Congress Party. How could he accept a plan, in reality his own plan, which was yet rejected by the others? That would have labeled him too obviously as the tool that he is. Had Congress accepted the plan, Jinnah would, also have accepted, particularly since his master would have demanded it in that case.

Protection of Minorities

The English brazenly make the claim that they, the masters, are anxious to preserve the rights of the Moslem minority, to protect this minority from oppression by the majority. The Indian Congress properly rejects this claim as an attempt to create disunity and to set up Irish Ulsters in India. But why couldn't Congress make these guarantees directly in its own name to the Moslems in such a way that its sincerity would be unquestioned? Lenin always stood for the self-determination of national minorities even to the point of complete secession. He was thus able to build the powerful Federation of Soviet States.

But that would mean the activating of the masses themselves. It would mean the widest extension of democracy and universal suffrage. The Indian Congress feels rightly that it would tread here on ground much too dangerous for its own safety. Class rule can never tolerate complete democracy, particularly not in this epoch.

Meantime the problem of the war remains. The Japanese must also take into account the political situation in India. The Mikado would undoubtedly like to march into India. But what will that invasion bring? If it brings the Hindu masses to their feet and tends to set the teeming millions in motion, the Japanese armies may again experience the same thing they did in China. The Japanese navy might seize some part of the coast, but what about the interior? The Hindus would hardly welcome them as liberators. The Japanese would face the danger of being swallowed up by the outbursts of an agrarian revolution. The war is approaching a stage where the colonial peoples may have something to say for themselves against both imperialist camps.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 16 Saturday, April 18, 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. Single copies: 5 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.

How To Get Friends In Washington

No one at the United Automobile Workers conference last week dared to defend on its merits the demand that the workers surrender the established wage scale for week-end and holiday work. No one upheld Roosevelt's statement that such a surrender is needed in order to facilitate production.

Instead, the union leaders argued only that if the workers did not surrender this right, Congress would take it away by anti-labor legislation. According to the union officialdom, the only choice for the workers lay between the devil and the deep blue sea.

"You will get limitation of overtime pay whether you like it or not," said one UAW executive. "Your friends in Washington have deserted you. You can't stop Congress now." And another leading officer pleaded for the acceptance of Roosevelt's demands on the grounds that the workers should not antagonize the "only friend" they possess in the Capitol.

These words from the mouths of the union leaders are a confession of their own bankruptcy. It is a confession that the politicians, for whose election the union leaders went around campaigning, have turned out to be not friends, but enemies of labor.

But the union leaders do not admit that their political policies have been wrong. They still cling to the same concepts. Their complaint is only that those who were always the agents of the employing class have "deserted" labor.

The workers find themselves undefended and friendless in Congress today because the union leaders, by opposing independent labor political action, have barred the way to election of genuine spokesmen for the workers.

The result is that the union movement, the most powerful organized force in America, confronts a vicious Congressional anti-labor drive and has not a single voice — not one — to defend its interests in Congress.

Surely this is conclusive proof of the complete falsity of the political policies of the union leaders. And surely it is proof as well that the workers will have a voice in Congress only after they establish their own political party and elect to office representatives directly from the ranks of organized labor.

More than ever, the workers need their own independent labor party, based on the trade unions, which will carry their struggles into the political arena. The policy of dependence upon employing-class politicians must be repudiated. The workers must send to Washington tried and true union fighters responsible to the union ranks. That means that the labor movement must begin at once to forge the weapon of an independent labor party.

The Fall Of Bataan

In the final analysis, Bataan fell for the same reason that Malaya and the Dutch East Indies fell: The failure to mobilize and arm the millions of native people to fight against the Japanese invaders.

The Philippine Islands have 16,356,000 native inhabitants. They have been under American rule

for over 40 years. During these years, the United States government had been planning for just such an attack as has been made by Japan. The defense of Bataan was conducted, in fact, along lines planned 40 years ago.

From the more than 16,000,000 people in the Philippines, a force of at least one million could have been mobilized, trained and armed to fight an invasion.

Why was this not done? Why was there only a relative handful of specially-picked native troops available for the defense of Bataan? For the same reason that the imperialist rulers of the Dutch East Indies, of Malaya and Burma, would not train and arm the native peoples. They feared the subject peoples as much, if not more, than they feared the rival imperialists.

For no subject colonial people loves and supports its foreign rulers; no foreign rulers ever trust their subject people.

That, and that alone, is the reason why the Filipinos were not armed.

The Filipinos, like all other subject peoples, do not want to be the servants of any foreign masters. They have always fought to rule their own destinies. The American capitalist press may boast that the Filipinos have been better treated than the Malaysians, Burmese and Koreans. But the Filipinos themselves by and large have shown no eagerness to fight and die for the difference between the old and new masters.

The Philippine people stand fundamentally in the same relationship with their new rulers as with the old.

Up to now, the Japanese imperialists have had a temporary advantage over the ruling imperialists in Malaya, Burma, the East Indies and Philippines. That is because all subject peoples tend to hate their immediate oppressors more than they fear the threat of new masters. But now Japanese imperialism is becoming the immediate oppressor in the conquered colonies. It will receive the hatred and resistance which up to now have been directed primarily at the old rulers.

In order to win real freedom, the Philippine people face the following basic tasks: 1. They must conduct an uncompromising struggle for national independence against the Japanese and all other foreign oppressors; 2. In this struggle, they must unite with all other subject colonial peoples; 3. They must form an alliance with the working people of the advanced countries in a joint struggle for international socialism; for without the aid of the workers in the developed countries, the Philippine people cannot be assured of permanent emancipation.

When these tasks have been accomplished, Bataan will fall again — to the Filipinos, to the people to whom Bataan belongs. And no foreign ruling class — not Japanese, nor American, nor any other — will be able to take it away from them again.

Money For Union Wages For Soldiers

The Senate bill to raise the soldiers' base pay from \$30 a month to \$42 does not settle the soldiers' pay issue by a long shot.

Certainly no one can rightly claim that \$42 a month, or double that amount, is adequate pay for men who are going out to face misery and death, particularly since many of these soldiers are forced to send money home to help their dependents.

The pay increases advocated in Congress will total an estimated \$255,000,000 a year. The war profits of any one of several big monopoly corporations last year would meet this bill.

General Motors alone raked in enough profits — after all taxes — to foot the entire cost of these pay increases.

The profits of Standard Oil, which has been conspiring with the Nazis while American boys are dying, made enough profits last year to cover the whole amount of the proposed pay increases.

Yet there are corporation and fascist-minded elements, in and outside of Congress, who are trying to stir up the soldiers against the workers by the lie that the workers are living off the fat of the land. Their reactionary agitation seeks to turn the soldiers' justified resentment against the low level of their pay into hostility toward the labor movement, and thus to enforce low wage standards for both the workers and soldiers.

The one answer which the unions can give to such vicious propaganda is to demand that the soldiers receive pay equivalent to that obtained by union workers — trade union wages.

Let no one argue that the money is not available to provide decent wages for the soldiers. The hundreds of millions of dollars a year in war profits being carried by the big corporations show that the money is there. Let those who are really concerned about the interests of the soldiers demand the abolition of war profiteering and the use of the money that would be saved by such a step to pay trade union wages to the soldiers!

BOUND VOLUMES OF

NEW INTERNATIONAL and
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1940 and 1941

Price \$3.00

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place New York City

A Stalinist Discusses Situation In Germany

Denounces German Workers; Sees Hope In
Generals, Priests, Foreign Imperialists

By LARISSA REED

The contempt, hatred and fear of the Stalinist bureaucracy for the masses is sharply reflected in an article in the March, 1942 *World Survey*, written by K. Erwin, "a functionary of the Communist Party of Germany." Entitled "From the Intoxication of Victory to Bitter Sobering," Erwin boasts that "by attacking the Soviet Union, Hitler has signed his own death warrant," while in the next breath he

viciously attacks the German workers and soldiers for being the chief obstacle in the path of realizing Hitler's defeat.

Erwin pretends concern for the German people and sheds a few crocodile tears at their misery produced by the war. He deplores the "terrible losses... of wounded and crippled.... Never have I seen my people so poorly clad... there is no soap either for washing or laundry use... no vegetables.... The Berlin markets present a sad picture of long queues of women waiting for food.... Everyone knows that war is hell. The German masses, like the masses all over the world, are crying out for a program by which they can end the whole insane slaughter — including the war on the German-Soviet front.

But Erwin, the German lackey of the Kremlin, has no program for the masses; he is concerned only with saving the reputation of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Lashing out against the German workers and soldiers whom he both needs and fears, he condemns their apathy and submission to the Nazi war against the Soviet Union. "Attempts by our comrades to hold mass (protest) meetings near factories met with no success," he complains, and adds venomously: "We trusted the wisdom and class consciousness of the Berlin worker. But subsequent events show that we miscalculated; the... cowardly... philistine... capitulating... Berlin worker would not budge."

STALINIST RESPONSIBILITY
Why did the Berlin workers refuse to budge? Erwin, himself, admits that they accepted the war "reluctantly, like an ox being led to slaughter." He cannot explain why, because his party is in large part responsible for their present submission and apathy. The succession of Stalinist betrayals, climaxed by the Stalin-Hitler Pact, helped harness the German people to Hitler's war machine.

During the brief period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact, when the Stalinists basked in the sun of Hitler's toleration, they shouted that

widening the breach between the workers and soldiers of both countries.

The reason is that the Stalinists fear, above everything else, an independent and coordinated struggle of the European working masses against all the imperialist contenders for the enslavement of the masses. For they know that this would be the doom of the Stalinist bureaucracy as well as of the fascists.

STALINISTS LOOK FOR ALLIES

In line with this policy, Erwin reaches out toward possible Stalinist allies against both the Nazis and the equally dreaded revolutionary masses. He declares hopefully, that "a substantial section of the General and officer corps regard Hitler's war against Russia as a mistake.... These sharpening contradictions... are but a reflection of the maturing conflict between Hitler and certain sections of the bourgeoisie.... Hitler's relations with the Catholics, too, are becoming more strained.... But his ace in the hole is Anglo-American imperialism. "By making war on America, he (Hitler) is only accelerating the collapse of the Nazi regime," he boasts. What will replace the Nazi regime? Not a German workers' state, but — with Erwin's aid — a new gang of native generals, capitalists and religious, in alliance with the Anglo-American capitalists!

Erwin brazenly proposes this betrayal of the masses in the name of the Russian revolution. He declares: "These people forgot that had the Russian workers taken this line (of submission) they would never have overthrown Czarism and abolished the rule of the landlords and capitalists." But the Russian workers and peasants, under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky abolished the rule of the landlords and capitalists by following a course exactly opposite to the one Erwin here proposes. They won their victory through their own independent struggle; thru the power of their own Soviets and under the banner of international socialism. They did not rely upon foreign imperialists or the native capitalists.

The German people will rise against Hitler only when that same road is opened to them as was opened to the Russian people by the Bolsheviks in 1917. The German workers and soldiers can overthrow Hitlerism and end the war by joining with the only allies they have — the masses of Europe — and together creating a Socialist United States of Europe.

QUESTION OF SABOTAGE

He exposes this trap, however, when he calls for sabotage as he means by which to overthrow Hitler. Denouncing "the petty-bourgeois prejudice among our own working class on the question of sabotage," Erwin urges the German people to cut themselves to pieces, as well as their soldier brothers at the front by depending on acts of sabotage and terror alone. Sabotage is only a supplementary weapon for aiding the struggle of the Red Army against the fascist war machine; it cannot be a substitute for a revolutionary socialist program which will arouse the German people to throw off the Hitler yoke.

Sabotage at the rear must have as its essential political program at the front — fraternization between the Russian and German soldiers. The Stalinists, however, aid Hitler by opposing fraternization and conducting the war along nationalist lines, thereby inflaming national hatreds and

British Cabinet Rejects India Congress Proposals

(Continued from page 1)

and tactics" which would be controlled by the British General Wavell. The *New York Times* story, April 10, declared:

"It was reported that the Congress preoccupation with the new formula was due to the concern of members of its working committee for a close examination of its details in view of the eventual necessity of informing the large membership of the party."

The compromise formula was rejected in the end because the Congress leaders could not work out any satisfactory way of informing their followers why they should accept it. As Nehru remarked after Cripps had left for England, "The fundamental factor (in India) today is dislike of the British Government. It is not pro-Japanese, it is anti-British sentiment." Nehru knows very well that the Indian people are not going to fight to protect Britain's interests, and he knows too that any group in India today which is compromised on this question is done for.

ANOTHER REASON
Another reason which undoubtedly motivated the Congress leaders in their decision was the complete lack of faith among the masses of Britain's ability to conduct a successful defense of India. The course of the war thus far has shown that where Britain is in control of colonies, it is not only unable to inspire the masses but it fears to arm them. The results of British control speak for themselves in the Far East, where the native peoples did not lift a finger to help their British oppressors. On this point the Congress statement said:

"What is most wanted is an enthusiastic response of the people which cannot be evoked without the fullest trust in them and the devotion of responsibility on them in the matter of defense. It is only thus that even in this

grave eleventh hour it may be possible to galvanize the people of India to rise to the height of the occasion.

"It is manifest that the present (British) government of India, as well as its provincial agencies, are lacking in competence and are incapable of shouldering the burden of India's defense...."

That the Indian people do not intend to stand by and meekly await the fate which Britain's policy will bring upon them, was reflected in the significant statement made by Nehru on April 12, recognizing that the problem before the Indian people now is how "to organize our war effort on our own basis of a free and independent India."

Discussing the question further, Nehru said: "I wanted 100,000,000 Indians in the army. It was not a conception of just an army functioning, but of every man and woman doing something, making it a popular war, of our carrying on defense even if the trained armies in the field failed."

ARM THE MASSES!
If this policy were carried out, then India could escape the fate of Malaya, Singapore, Hong Kong, Burma. But this policy is completely contrary to the strategy and aims of the Churchill govern-

ment, and it can be successfully carried out only by a struggle against the British ruling class. The British rejection of the Congress' counter-proposals is proof of that.

The Indian people, however, must be guided in their struggle not by what Churchill desires, but by what the present situation and the protection of their own interests demand.

The Indian people must take their fate into their own hands. They must organize military training of the whole population, in preparation for a struggle against all oppressors. And they must sweep aside all those who prevent them from following out the only policy that can save them from imperialist bondage.

Let them do this, and the workers in Britain and the United States — who have no interest whatsoever in helping Churchill to hamstring India's struggle — will gladly send them arms, military services of technicians and military specialists, and every other assistance possible. In this way alone — by arming themselves and preparing for a determined struggle — will the Indian masses achieve and secure their independence from all who would oppress them.

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 Homeward Journey

Sir Stafford's Mission to India
And the 'New Masses'

By M. STEIN

The Cruel Treatment of Sir Stafford

Even though a certain individual may not count for very much on the historical scale, he is nevertheless made of flesh and blood, he's got feelings and one shouldn't be deliberately abusive towards him. We refer here to Sir Stafford Cripps.

If someone with a diabolical twist of mind had sat up nights trying to figure out methods of abuse of an individual who is being groomed for the office of Prime Minister of His Majesty's Government, he could not have devised anything more cruel than Sir Stafford's mission to India.

The cruelty does not lie so much in the mission itself, which was doomed to failure from the start. After all, what is one failure more or less in the life of a British politician? We have seen Mr. Churchill even thriving on failures and making a career of defeats. The cruelty lies in the manner in which the Right Honorable Sir Stafford was raised up high and then higher and then still higher, until he reached the very pinnacle, and there on the very top, observed by the entire world, he was told to perform the sleight-of-hand trick of giving and not giving — of giving India its independence and at the same time making it even more dependent on the British empire — of arousing India's enthusiasm in a holy war for democracy, at a time when none of this democracy is offered to the masses of India.

The performance was scheduled to last for a week. It was extended for another week, and then another. But this only extended the agony. It only postponed the inevitable — the inevitable need of facing the cheering squad with a confession of failure. The sweet memories of the glorious send-off at the time he left his native land, when life was so full of promise and hope — those memories only emphasize the failure of the mission, make the return home more bitter and cruel. This poor groom courting the post of Prime Minister is now homeward bound empty-handed, coming from the land where many of his predecessors as well as contemporaries have accumulated fortune and fame.

Stalinist Concern About the Mission

But it would be wrong to dwell entirely on the personal tragedy of Sir Stafford Cripps. Cruel as his fate is, one must nevertheless remember that there are others besides him to whom the mission to India meant a lot. Take the Stalinists, for example.

The *New Masses* features on the cover page of the March 24 issue a banner headline announcing an article entitled "Behind Cripps' India Mission." The article was written by Claude Cockburn and sent from London by cable. All of the circumstances therefore suggest that this is an important article and that it represents the "line." It was obviously written prior to the announcement of the plan which Cripps carried with him in such strict secrecy across the seas.

Mr. Claude Cockburn shows very great concern for the political future of Mr. Cripps. He enlightens us as follows: "There are those who imagine that, first, Cripps will have a crashing failure in India, and that, secondly, this failure will have a serious effect upon his position here."

Without keeping you in suspense on this score, we will proceed to quote further from the mouth of the oracle:

"The first premise, of course, depends on just what is in the secret government plan — assuming that there really is a plan and that its whole development is not still dependent on what Cripps turns up." But this is not exactly what interests us. We know now that "those who imagine that... Cripps will have a crashing failure in India..." — that those people were correct. The only point that matters now, is the answer to the second question, which is our concern for the moment. We remind you again that our concern is based on purely humanitarian grounds. The Stalinist Cockburn is fortunately very reassuring even while weighing the possibility of a failure.

"But one must not assume that Cripps' political position here would necessarily collapse as a result of such a failure. On the morning of Cripps' decision to leave for India, a close friend of his pointed out to me with a certain acumen that, 'Whether he fails in India or not, it is likely that in the meantime a situation can arise here in which people may once again feel that the best thing to do would be to recall Cripps. It may be felt that if only Cripps had not been absent in India at the moment, he would have prevented the rest of the War Cabinet doing what it has done.'"

Sir Stafford Was Not Recalled

After we got over the shock of learning that Cripps and the Stalinist Cockburn have mutual friends, we are faced with the greater shock that people who presumably are all very patriotic, speculate "with a certain acumen" on the development of a political crisis within the country so that they may advance their own political fortunes.

Well, the political crisis in the country did not mature and Sir Stafford Cripps was not exactly recalled to come and lead the country out of the wilderness.

But the Stalinist Cockburn has still another word of reassurance. He seems determined to give Cripps the Prime Minister's post despite all odds. Says he: "And there are plenty of important and realistic people in the Conservative Party who conceive that since, without question, Cripps is today a greater figure than Churchill in the eyes of the mass of the people of the country, it might after all be possible for the moderate conservatives to come to some sort of 'arrangement' with Cripps."

But we are very much afraid that even though Cripps proved on his mission to India that he can be trusted to safeguard the interests of the Empire, Churchill as yet has the greater hold on the Conservative Party. And while Cripps wasted his time in India, Churchill utilized his mending his fences in the Conservative Party.