

FOR A RISING SCALE
OF WAGES TO MEET
INCREASED PRICES!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 2

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

WLB SETS CEILING ON WAGE RAISES

Steel Workers Establish International Union

Opposition to Surrender of Overtime Pay Is Voiced On First Day of Convention

By ART PREIS

CLEVELAND, Ohio, May 19 (By Wire).—The six years' aspiration of the organized steel workers in this country was realized this morning at the opening session of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee's first constitutional convention. Seventeen hundred cheering delegates, representing an estimated membership of over 600,000 steel unionists, adopted the first article of their new constitution establishing a full-fledged international union, the United Steel Workers of America, CIO.

All the key issues still remain to be discussed and voted upon during the next three days before the scheduled adjournment, including wage policies, union security, and the provisions of the constitution.

Chairman Philip Murray spoke four times and laid the basis for policies which will most likely be adopted by the convention.

The highlight of the day's deliberations, however, was an unexpected opposition which arose over the issue of surrender of the established week-end and holiday pay rates. Although not organized, the opposition was sufficiently disturbing to force Murray to take the floor twice, appealing directly in the name of "our commander-in-chief, President Roosevelt."

Murray's keynote address this morning indicated the main concern of the leadership at the convention. The primary emphasis was that the steel workers must become "missionaries of good will and national unity." He added a reaffirmation of his loyalty to Roosevelt, stating, "I am supporting my country and I am supporting its president."

Murray dwelt at length on Roosevelt's war labor policies reaffirming his commitments to a no-strike policy and the settlement of all disputes through the War Labor Board, and gave support to the management-labor speed-up plan.

MURRAY ON DEMOCRACY

A significant section of Murray's keynote address was a pointed reference to his intention to establish a "democratic union" and a "democratic constitution." It was apparent that these words were addressed to allay the widespread uncertainty of dissatisfaction among the rank and file with the past undemocratic conduct of the union by the appointed leaders. How-

ever, he did not indicate what specific democratic safeguards the handpicked constitution committee would place in the constitution.

At the same time, Murray issued an emphatic warning: "I shall fight any attempt that is made to have little backroom caucuses while this convention is going on. So if any of the boys are thinking right now of midnight sessions in strange places in the city of Cleveland, just begin to forget about it right now."

Murray made plain that he would try to eliminate any group which exercised its democratic exercising its democratic right to get together and formulate a program and seek to win support for it in opposition to Murray.

Murray's own machine operates in the guise of the official union administration.

There was nothing in the keynote speech about the decisive question of the dollar-a-day wage increase in Little Steel, or the fight for union security. However, during the report of the committee on officers' reports, Murray did discuss in detail the progress of the War Labor Board cases, seeking to allay the growing disquiet due to the long delay.

He outlined the involved steps taken by the union leaders on the issue. His words suggested impatience and concern about the WLB attitude. He reaffirmed his support to the dollar-a-day demand, but failed to offer a program to win the increase other than continued dependence on the WLB and Roosevelt.

Murray strongly attacked wage freezing, and declared that it "would definitely discourage membership in unions. Its ultimate

result would lead to the destruction of the unions, particularly the newer organizations." He failed, however, to point out that Roosevelt's "wage stabilization" with its expressed opposition to general wage increases, itself lays the foundation stone for future wage freezing.

DEBATE ON OVERTIME PAY

The flare-up on the week-end and holiday pay issue came suddenly during the reading of the committee on officers' report's statement approving a recommendation to surrender standard overtime pay when week-ends and holidays fall within the 40-hour week. At least 10 delegates, one after the other, took the microphone to express opposition in the name of their local unions.

Murray spoke twice after the applause showed wide sympathy with the opposition views. He admitted that the only reason he urged surrender of the right was because "the President of the United States asked the CIO to vote on it favorably." He argued further that all other CIO unions had approved the policy which the steel workers should follow. He stated that the recent UAW con-

(Continued on page 4)

"EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE"



NEWS ITEMS: Office of Price Administration reveals that government is going to pay corporations 35 billion dollars to compensate them for past price rises. War Labor Board tells unions they must not expect wage increases to compensate them for past price rises.

Canadian Wage Freezing Plan Also Being Adopted By Govt.

New Board to Work Out U. S. Version of Plan Which Freezes Wages Over \$25 a Wk.

Washington set a ceiling on wage raises this week and thus moved to prevent the workers from securing increases to compensate them for cuts in their living standards due to price rises. It is also working out a program, similar to the "Canadian plan," to freeze the wages of all workers earning \$25 a week or more.

These moves, in line with Roosevelt's "wage stabilization" program, were announced at a press conference held on May 19 by William H. Davis, chairman of the War Labor Board.

Davis revealed that any wage increases that may be granted by the Board will be limited to not more than 50 per cent of the increased cost of living since wage scales were last fixed. He also announced that all such increases will be given in the form of war bonds rather than cash.

Davis thus indicated that the War Labor Board policy on wage increases would, for the time being at least, follow the pattern of the Chicago shipyard wage negotiation conference. The Chicago conference, acting under pressure from President Roosevelt, voted to accept only a 7 per cent wage increase, although their

contracts signed under government supervision a year ago provided for pay increases ranging from 13 to 16 per cent.

Davis declared that the Chicago formula would be considered "the ceiling," which means that the War Labor Board will deny the workers increases to bring their living standards up to the levels of a year ago, even in violation of present union contracts.

Davis' remarks, however, made it clear that the government regards even this reactionary program as temporary. For it has set up a special board, composed of Price Administrator Henderson, War Man Power Board Commissioner McNutt and Labor Secretary Perkins, to work out and present to Roosevelt a United States version of the "Canadian plan" which freezes wages for workers making \$25 a week or more.

This would affect most of the workers in the country, and practically all the workers engaged in the important industries producing material for the war.

Davis declined to state at what figure the board would propose to begin the freezing of wages. He said that he thought the figure should not be below \$25 a week, which is interpreted to mean that he does not think it should be much above that figure, if any.

(According to the government's Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$50 a week is the minimum figure for a decent standard of living on the basis of the low 1932 prices.)

Davis also revealed that this new board would also seek to extend the government's jurisdiction over wages to cover all of industry. Up to now the government has had jurisdiction through the War Labor Board over only about 5 per cent of the demands for wage increases, the other 95 per cent being settled by voluntary agreements between the unions and the bosses.

Under this proposed provision, employers would be forbidden to grant wage increases to workers making \$25 a week or more, even in cases where the unions were powerful enough to persuade the employers to grant their demands.

Davis explained that it would then be possible for the government agencies to tell the employers, "You can't raise wages of workers now receiving \$25, or whatever the standard might be, without government review."

This open pronouncement by the head of the War Labor Board, indicating what the government plans for the near future, is obviously a broad hint to the employers to stall on coming to agreement with the unions on wage questions — a hint that they will be only too eager to accept.

The workers have been told by their union leaders that the administration was their "friend" and would protect their conditions and rights during the war if they would only follow its advice. Today the strongest offensive against the workers' standards is coming from the administration itself. The trade unions must now repudiate the "turtle policy" advanced by the union leaders and advance their own program, if their standards are to be protected. Above all, that means a struggle at the present time under the slogan:

A rising scale of wages to meet increases in the cost of living, both past and future!

Shipyard Union Offered Half Of Wage Raises Due

Chicago Conference Decides Not to Grant Pay Increases Called for In Contracts

After more than three weeks of discussion, the national shipyard wage negotiations conference representing labor, employers and the War Production Board, came to an agreement on May 17 which denies 600,000 workers in the private shipyards approximately half the wage increases to which they are entitled by the contracts negotiated last year under government supervision.

This formula may be adopted by the War Labor Board in its campaign to keep the unions from getting wage raises to compensate for price rises. It was conceded at the conference that under the existing contracts the shipyard workers were entitled to a 13 per cent wage increase on the Pacific coast and a 16 per cent increase in the Gulf zone, because price rises in the year ending April 1 have reduced the workers' real wages and living standards

to that extent. But under the agreement now signed, there will be an average increase of only about 7 per cent, or 8 cents an hour, with the increases to be paid in war bonds.

Thus government and employer pressure have resulted in a substantial cut in the real wages of shipyard labor. Roosevelt himself intervened at the beginning of the conference on May 2 to warn the unions that they could not have the full wage increases provided for in their contracts.

The government is also expected to exert pressure on the respective unions involved to effect ratification of the Chicago decisions. Previously it was reported that sentiment among the workers in the shipyards is strongly opposed to making any big concessions.

Early reports last week that the final "compromise" would provide a six cent an hour increase "are said to have aroused wide-spread dismay within the ship unions," according to

P.M.'s labor reporter, James A. Wechsler, on May 15.

It is easy to understand why the shipyard workers were opposed to giving up the increases their contracts called for.

When they signed these contracts pegging their wages to rises in the cost of living, they gave up the right to strike, their strongest bargaining weapon, which left them at the mercy of the employers and the government's war agencies. Now they can see that although they abided by their end of the contract, it is being broken by the very same agencies that persuaded them to sign it.

Furthermore, Roosevelt and his agents in Chicago demanded that the unions forego the wage increases on the ground that it would interfere with the 7-point "equality of sacrifice" program.

But everyone knows that the shipyard employers are not being asked to make any sacrifices. On the contrary, they are going to keep on making tremendous profits on the same cost-plus fixed fee system that has been in operation all along.

This means that the bosses will continue to be compensated in full for all price rises—while the shipyard workers will be denied such compensation. Some "equality of sacrifice!"

WHY BURMA FELL

War Correspondents Reveal That British Failed to Arm Native People and Were Afraid to Use Available Chinese Troops

By GEORGE BREITMAN

Previously withheld information about the war in Burma has now been released by war correspondents arriving in India.

This information from Burma confirms what was demonstrated by the Cripps negotiations in India — Britain's colonial policy remains what it always was.

The story of Burma was the story of Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaya all over again. The British were more afraid of independent action by the colonial people than they were of the prospect of defeat at the hands of their imperialist rivals. The British proved incapable of winning the support or confidence of the colonial slaves they have so long oppressed.

The AP's staff correspondent on May 15 summed up the case with which the Japanese had seized Burma as follows:

"By the maximum use of an army authoritatively estimated not to exceed four divisions (about 72,000 men) and an air force of probably not over 450 planes, Japan drove a massive wedge from the Bay of Bengal nearly to the borders of Tibet in an amazing four-month campaign that practically separated India and China and virtually cut off the latter from her anti-Japanese allies.

"What the Japanese won in four months would be cheap at almost any price, but they actually got it at small cost."

"No Attempt to Win Burmese Support"

How did this campaign prove so ridiculously easy, when Burma has a population of more than 15 million, and when China with its tremendous resources of trained manpower was in a position to intervene?

In the first place, as the UP correspondent reported on May 15: "There was no attempt to win Burmese support (Continued on page 2)

OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS OF THE MINNESOTA FARMER-LABOR PARTY

From the Socialist Workers Party of Minnesota

Here in Minnesota, as everywhere, the people are grappling with two great problems. We are striving to maintain the social gains won over decades of struggle through the trade unions and farm organizations. And we are seeking a solution to war, fascism and all the social evils which a decaying and outlived profit system inflicts upon us.

Efforts to solve these pressing problems will be effective only if based upon a sound working-class program.

In past years Minnesota has set a progressive example by building a Farmer-Labor Party and placing it in power. Today the need for the workers and poor farmers to unite on a correct program and to build an independent party representing the masses is stronger than ever. Rank and file Farmer-Laborites throughout the state are hoping that now they can create a political movement divorced from

the old Republican and Democratic Parties, based upon a program that will represent their true interests.

The Socialist Workers Party shares this hope. We believe that in the last analysis only a fundamental social and economic change and the building of socialism can cure the basic ills of society. Nevertheless, we support every progressive step taken by the workers, both in their economic struggles and in their political action. It is in that spirit that we address this open letter to you.

THE TWO FARMER-LABOR CONVENTIONS

There are two Farmer-Labor conventions appealing to the people for support. A convention of the Stalinist dominated Farmer-Labor Association has been called for June 27-28 in Minneapolis. A convention of the Farmer-Labor Party, called by trade union and farm leaders as well as old-time Farmer-Laborites will be held May 28 in St. Paul. Because the May 28 convention will be more representative of the organized work-

ers and farmers it should offer a more favorable opportunity for progressive action.

It is more than possible that the June convention announced by the Stalinists may be called off, and that the Stalinist elements will attempt to take over the May 28 convention of the Farmer-Labor Party. Should the Farmer-Labor Association hold the June convention, it is certain that nothing constructive will come of it. The Stalinists, who led the Association to its crushing defeat in the 1938 elections, today have even less in common with the needs and interests of the people.

If unity and a progressive program is to be achieved this year, it can only be done at the May 28 convention.

Unfortunately, the leaders of May convention have a program which is as reactionary as that of the Stalinists. Their chief ambition, like the Stalinists, is to effect a deal with the old Republican and Democratic Parties. Only by defeating this treacherous plan, by insisting (Continued on page 4)

DuPonts Also Do Business With Hitler

Add another to the list of powerful American trusts which are reaping hundreds of millions in profits from the "war against fascism" and are still doing business on the side with Hitler.

The latest of America's Sixty Families to be linked in a government indictment for a monopoly conspiracy with the Nazi corporations is the du Ponts — the famous "Dynasty of Death."

E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, America's chemical and munitions trust, has been indicted along with seven other companies by the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice. The indictment, handed down by a federal grand jury in Trenton, N. J., charges the du Ponts and the other companies with a world wide conspiracy to suppress competition and establish a complete monopoly on dyestuffs, including those used in the processing of munitions.

The agreement, made between the du Pont corporation and the Nazi I. G. Farbenindustrie, British Imperial Chemical Industries, Mitsui of Japan and the

Establishments Kuhlmann of France, was first concluded in 1929. It was extended from time to time and was to be operative throughout the war.

It was an agreement which gave the Nazis unrestricted use of American patents in return for not competing in America or the international markets with du Pont.

According to the indictment, based on detailed documentary evidence from the files of the companies, du Pont and its associates conspired to eliminate all competition in the manufacture and sale of dyestuffs in this country; restricted all exports and imports; extorted fantastic

prices from American consumers of dyestuffs and derivative products; fixed arbitrarily high monopoly prices; and through a patents monopoly, prevented any other manufacturers from engaging in dyestuffs production.

PROFITS AND PATRIOTISM The effect of the conspiracy was described last week by Assistant Attorney-General Arnold, who stated:

"The practices charged by the indictment are another example of the influence of carte's on American industry. This cartel not only resulted in high prices to the American consumer but has also restricted the full development of the chemical industry which is essential to our war effort.

"The effects of these illegal restrictions on production have not been confined to dyestuffs

alone. One of the principal means of conspiracy has been restricting the production of the chemical intermediates from which dyestuffs are made and from which important munitions, particularly explosives and plastics, could equally well be made."

Although du Pont and the others have been indicted, it is questionable that they will actually be brought to trial. A recent agreement made between the War, Navy and Justice Departments gives the War and Navy Departments power to halt any anti-trust suit which in their opinion "interferes with the war effort," unless President Roosevelt directs immediate prosecution on appeal from the Attorney-General. The General Electric-Nazi tungsten carbide conspiracy suit was recently halted by action of the War and Navy Departments.

Browder Release Proves He Was Jailed For His 'Views'

Roosevelt's Explanation On Why Stalinist Leader Was Arrested Is Sheer Hypocrisy

By PHILIP BLAKE

Acting shortly before Earl Browder became eligible for parole, President Roosevelt on May 16 commuted Browder's four year prison sentence to the term already served, almost 16 months, and thus set him free.

In this way Roosevelt gave open recognition to the fact that the Communist Party, following the German attack on the Soviet Union and the subsequent shift in Stalin's policy last summer, has become the nation's most ardent and unrelenting supporter of the Roosevelt administration and its war program.

The White House statement announcing the commutation of sentence attempted, however, to cloak the real reason for the original prosecution of Browder. It stated, without explaining why, that "The sentence imposed upon him was longer than the usual sentence imposed for offenses involving the fraudulent obtaining and use of passports." It then continued:

"The President believes that the principle of obedience to law has been sufficiently vindicated by the punishment already suffered by Browder and that the commutation of his sentence which brings about his release at this time, just shortly before he will become eligible for parole, will have a tendency to promote national unity and allay any feeling which may exist in some minds that the unusually long sentence in Browder's case was by way of penalty imposed upon him because of his political views."

PLAIN HYPOCRISY

Actually, as everyone knows, the only reason Browder received such a severe sentence in 1940 for a trifling technical irregularity in connection with his passport — the only reason he was brought to trial at all for something which happened many years before — was precisely because of his "political views." The four year sentence, so severe that even Roosevelt now admits it was "unusually long," was not handed down by accident — it was made after Roosevelt's district attorney had demanded A FIVE YEAR SENTENCE.

Roosevelt's hypocritical at-

tempt to deny that the discriminatory sentence Browder received was because of his political views, does not stand up. Browder did get a four year sentence because of his political views in 1940. Today his political views, dictated from the Kremlin, have changed. That is the only reason Roosevelt commuted the sentence. There is no politically conscious person in this country who honestly believes that Roosevelt would have commuted the sentence if Browder's political views had remained the same that they were in 1940. If not for Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union, Browder would have remained in jail for the full four years.

The Stalinists, and Browder, will be the last people in the world to expose Roosevelt's hypocrisy. For since their political line changed almost a year ago, they have been helping the administration to suppress the truth about the Browder case and the reason for the government's prosecution.

1940 EXPLANATION OF C. P.

But the Stalinists have not been able to suppress or burn every pamphlet they printed in those days. On Jan. 22, 1940, the night he was convicted, Browder spoke at a Madison Square Garden meeting in New York, and said: "We must warn the people that this verdict of this case is only one incident in the drive of the American ruling class toward war. . . . The motive of this prosecution lies in the general campaign of our ruling class to prepare our country for war. . . . And the Stalinist Defense Committee for Civil Rights for Communists said: 'It is the first step in the drive of Wall Street and the Roosevelt Administration to outlaw the Communist Party — the most determined fighter

These "political views" Roosevelt, of course, has no interest in persecuting. On the contrary he sees the opportunity to utilize the Stalinists and the prestige of the Soviet Union to sell his program to the workers and to help him in the suppression of genuine revolutionary socialists. The freeing of Browder thus assumes the character of a political action, just as the prosecution of Browder was a political action.

Browder's first statement on being released demonstrated that he was prepared to repay Roosevelt: "I hope that everyone who is interested in my release will make it the occasion, as I will, to weld unbreakable national unity under the Commander-in-Chief for victory in the war."

It is expected that Browder will soon begin a national tour urging intensified support of the administration's war program.

WLB Is Setting Dangerous Precedents

Board Opinion Opens Way To Govt. Intervention In Unions

While considerable publicity has been given the general decisions made by the War Labor Board in recent cases, little attention has been paid to certain apparently minor formulas and secondary opinions buried within the lengthy texts of the WLB rulings.

It is precisely these seemingly incidental opinions, however, which are beginning to build up into an imposing body of precedents that may prove more significant in the long run than the primary issues which the Board has been deciding. As Louis Stark, labor commentator, observed in the May 10 New York Times:

"Decisions by the NWLB . . . have already begun to form a discernible pattern. Concessions against which organized labor fought stoutly for years on the legislative field are now apparently being conceded 'for the duration.'"

This "discernible pattern" is being developed in two important spheres. One is the degree of government intervention and control over the internal affairs of the unions. The other is the basis for future decisions respecting wages, contracts, union security, etc.

Here are a number of important examples of how the WLB has been gradually encroaching on the independence of the unions.

THE INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER DECISION

The WLB assumed authority in the International Harvester Company case to over-ride the right of the union to determine by its own procedure whether to accept the Board's ruling granting the union a maintenance of membership clause. The Board directed that the government shall conduct a secret referendum of the union workers to determine whether or not they wished to accept the Board's policy.

On the basis of this precedent, the WLB might eventually usurp entirely the right of the unions to decide questions independently of government control and intervention. The labor members of the Board protested this feature of the ruling, but went along with it, stating that in peace time it would be "an unjustifiable government encroachment upon internal union affairs," but that they would accept it for the sake of harmony during the war.

WALKER-TURNER CASE

Another instance of government intervention in internal union affairs was the decision in the New Jersey Walker-Turner Company case. The Board not only insisted on reviewing the union constitution, thus assuming the prerogative of passing judgment on union constitutions, but it also fixed the amount of dues which the local union might charge its members. The Board ordered the local union not to charge more than \$1 a month dues and \$2 initiation fee. It is easy to see that the extension of this precedent can lead to government usurpation of the policy-making powers of the union members and government dictation of union constitutions. The national leaders of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers accepted the decision while protesting "certain portions of the formula worked out which invade the internal affairs of unions to an unnecessary extent."

The policies of the WLB on the matter of wages, contracts and union security are taking shape in opinions buried in the text of its rulings.

The Stalinist leadership of the NMU has, from the first, tried to scuttle labor's fight against the repressive measures urged by the government. The united front forged by the other unionized unions isolated the NMU and thereby reduced its power to sabotage the fight. The NMU leaders have, however, succeeded in selling out their own membership.

WAGE POLICY

In the International Harvester case, the opinion stated that "real wage levels which have been previously arrived at through the channels of collective bargaining and which do not impede maximum production of war materials shall be reasonably protected. This does not mean that labor can expect to receive throughout the war upward changes in its wage structure which will enable it to keep pace with the upward changes in the cost of living."

Two vital opinions are here involved. The government assumes the right to abrogate wage rates established by union contract which it might claim to be impeding war production. This opinion would also permit the government to cancel any union contract provisions under the pretext that these "impede maximum production of war materials."

Further, this opinion rules out price rises as a justifiable basis for wage increases. Even if prices go up, states this WLB ruling, the workers cannot hope to get wage increases "which will enable it to keep pace with upward changes in the cost of living." This opinion is of extreme importance in the light of the administration's "wage stabilization" policy. It shows that the administration's justification for "wage stabilization" on the basis of "price control" is a fraud. For the WLB has no intention of raising wages even if the "anti-infla-

U. S. Steel Uses Decision In New Attack On Union

After successfully defying a government order for ten months, U. S. Steel on May 8 finally agreed to comply with a War Labor Board ruling directing the steel corporation's subsidiary, the Federal Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., to grant a "maintenance of membership" clause to the Industrial Union of Marine Shipbuilding Workers, CIO, at the Kearny, New Jersey, plant.

But the corporation did not give up its efforts to destroy the

workers and the unions is this gradual development of a body of WLB precedents and opinions nibbling away bit by bit at the rights of the unions, extending the hand of the government into the union affairs and laying the basis for future decisions against justified union demands for wage increases and the union shop.

union. In fact, it immediately sought to make capital out of the WLB order itself.

Through a letter to the WLB and a public statement and notice in the plant, L. H. Korndorff, Federal Shipbuilding's president, by pointedly directing the attention of the workers to two specific clauses of the ruling, initiated a campaign to persuade union members to quit, and non-union workers not to join, the union.

One clause states that any member of the union who gives notice prior to the signing of the contract that he is dropping his membership, will not be penalized by loss of his job. The other states that non-members of the union are not required to join as a condition of employment.

The public statement specifically advised union men that they could quit the union without penalty "before the new labor contract is signed, which will not be earlier than ten days from now." The company was clearly trying to utilize the WLB order to undermine the union.

The company's tactics drew a sharp letter of protest from CIO President Philip Murray, who on

May 12 wrote the WLB denouncing the company's actions as an attempt, in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, to influence the workers with respect to joining a union. A decision as to whether the company is violating the NLRA would have to come from the National Labor Relations Board, which will not make any decision until after the 10 day period is up.

WHAT COMPANY CONCEDED

Even if the company complies in good faith with WLB order, what it actually concedes to the union is very little indeed. A maintenance of membership clause does not grant genuine union security. All it provides is that the individual members who agree to stay in the union after the contract is signed, or who join thereafter, must continue to pay dues for the life of the contract, not more than one year. This is not the union or closed shop. As the WLB ruling points out, it "does not require any old employee, any new employee or any employee whatever to join the union at any time." It does not prevent the company from attempting to discourage membership in the union.

At best, such a maintenance of membership clause can operate only to permit the union to retain the membership it has at the time the contract is signed. In the Kearny shipyard only about half the workers are union members, according to the union's own admission.

WHAT THE COMPANY EXPECTS IN RETURN

Undoubtedly, the reason for the company's formal acceptance of the Board's ruling was to keep the Board's authority intact. In this way, both the Board and the bosses intend to place the unions in a position where they in turn will feel obliged to comply with any future WLB rulings, no matter how unfavorable to the workers. This is a strategic move anticipating a WLB ruling against the workers in such vital issues as the demand of the steel workers for a general dollar-a-day wage increase.

Should the Board rule against the wage increase — which is a great likelihood — it will point to the example of U. S. Steel as an argument for compelling the unions to accept whatever the Board offers. By conceding a very little to the workers in the matter of the maintenance of membership clause, U. S. Steel and the other corporations are anticipating decisive concessions from the WLB in the future.

Lynch Campaign Proves A Flop In Flint Union

Workers Show Resentment at Attempts To Link Union Militants With Fascism

FLINT, Mich., May 15 — Election of delegates to the Michigan CIO Convention from Chevrolet Local 659 of the United Auto Workers was marked by a vicious slander campaign against those union militants who offered a program to defend the workers' interests against the anti-labor offensive of the employers and Congress.

This campaign, initiated by the leaders of the local and their supporters, and supported by the Stalinists, was directed against an independent slate of 2 union candidates, charging them with being "National Socialists and Trotskyites" and trying to create an amalgam between fascism and union militancy.

In a typically underhanded manner, an unsigned lynch campaign leaflet was issued in front of the plant gates. But responsibility for the leaflet, despite the attempt to conceal it, can easily be placed where it belongs. For it was distributed by the same high-paid union officials and organizers who were rounded up from various jobs in the city to campaign for

a few dozen votes of being elected.

MILITANT PROGRAM

The program of the two-man slate was the following four-point program:

1. For the preservation of the gains made by the UAW.
2. Opposed to wage cuts. Opposed to any program, no matter by whom proposed, which sacrifices any gains made by the membership. We have yet to see the first sacrifice made by any manufacturer. It's the workers who fight and die, not the employers. Isn't that sacrifice enough? Should we sacrifice wages while the corporations pile up billions in profits? And what about the fellow-workers in the armed forces? Shall we be able to face them later and answer what we did with the conditions they fought for, only to have us give them away behind their backs?
3. For a rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living.
4. Improve conditions through improvement of working conditions and putting unemployed to work on idle machinery.

WHY BURMA FELL

(Continued from page 1)

by the British Imperialists, so that many Burmese joined the Japanese or remained passive."

Furthermore: "Burmese civilian morale was weak from the start. . . . There was lack of confidence in Burmese civil government."

The Burmese natives distrusted not only the British, but also the native puppets of the British. Only last winter the British authorities had arrested and interned U Saw, Burmese prime minister, without trial and without any evidence of their charge that he was negotiating with the Japanese government. The Burmese natives remember only that just prior to his arrest, U Saw had given public expression to their intense desire to achieve national independence. It is no wonder they distrusted the Burmese native government, handpicked by the British after U Saw's arrest.

Another important factor in the fall of Burma was the failure to utilize the Chinese veteran troops, offering to fight the Japanese.

The UP correspondent says: "All the time (that the Japanese were advancing with ease) thousands of Chinese soldiers waited, for nearly two months, before in March they were permitted to march in and take over part of the front."

"Chinese officers have insisted to me that they would have been able to hold the Japanese behind the Sittang River had permission been given earlier for them to join the Imperialists."

And the AP correspondent says that this factor "decided the campaign." "Enthusiasts envisioned at that time huge Chinese armies streaming into Burma immediately. But they did not arrive."

Why? The AP correspondent tries to explain the situation as follows: "Native Burmese ministers protested against possible entrance of the Chinese." But this is only another way of saying that the British protested, for the Burmese ministers were the puppets of the British and did what they were told. The British only used them because they themselves feared the presence of the Chinese soldiers.

Why did the British reject the offer that might have stopped the Japanese advance?

Because they feared that the Burmese people would rise up and take advantage of the opportunity to gain their independence, — revolts were already taking place against the British authorities in many villages — and they feared that the Chinese soldiers could not be depended on to aid the British in suppressing the native people. They feared that the Chinese soldiers who themselves were fighting valiantly for independence from imperialist domination, would sympathize with and perhaps aid the Burmese in securing their independence. That was why they rejected the offer for almost two months.

An April 22 dispatch from a New York Times correspondent in China shows that the fears of the British on this score were well founded. The Times' correspondent reveals that the natives were at first suspicious of the reason for the Chinese troops' entry on Burmese soil. The Chinese had liaison interpreters between the natives and Chinese troops, who at first were unable to understand Burmese mistrust and hostility.

"The Chinese troops in Burma are conscious of the tremendous responsibilities, national and international, on their shoulders. When

a Chinese reporter asked half a dozen soldiers how they liked fighting in Burma all replied: 'All we want is to fight the Japanese.'"

That is, the Chinese soldiers were not in Burma to defend British imperialist rule, but to defend China. True, they had crossed the border. But the British knew that the mere crossing of a border did not change the character of China's war, nor of the attitude of the Chinese soldiers. For the Chinese were merely acting in accord with an obvious military tactic, they wanted to stop the Japanese BEFORE the Burma Road.

In a desperate attempt to save the "white man's" face, the British then put pressure on behind the scenes to secure the appointment of the American General Stilwell as head of the Chinese expeditionary force, so that the Asiatic peoples would not see Chinese-led troops possibly achieving in Burma what the British had miserably failed to do.

But the British understood that even the appointment of Stilwell would not change the situation, because he was essentially a front, a top official with a Chinese general staff and Chinese officers throughout the troops; and they feared that any achievements of these troops would be considered Chinese and that once these fighters for independence were tightly lodged in Burma, they would not willingly give way to the restoration of British imperialist control.

That is why the British would not admit Chinese troops, even with Stilwell in command, until the war was almost over, and that is why even then they admitted only "one Chinese army, equivalent in numbers to one Japanese division."

There is one other interesting aspect to the reports which sheds a good deal of light on the aims of the Burmese natives who refused to support Britain and who were therefore accused of being "pro-Japan." The UP report says:

"Throughout the advance of the Japanese in Burma they interfered as little as possible with the local governments set up by the Burmese as each town fell, apparently letting the natives form independent islands of administration until the entire country was conquered when taking over the disunited colony would be simple."

In other words, these natives were concerned primarily with setting up their own government. They attempted to do this behind the Japanese lines, as well as behind the British lines. If there were less manifestations of hostility to the Japanese than to the British, it was because the Japanese shrewdly took advantage of the native's sentiments and pretended to be in favor of their independence, while the hide-bound conservative British openly showed themselves to everyone to be opposed to Burmese independence.

Of course the Japanese are no more interested in permitting independence for the Burmese than the British. Undoubtedly they will soon begin to try to bring Burma under their complete domination. But the Burmese showed by their actions that what they were fighting for was national independence, and they will certainly fight back against the Japanese imperialists with the same determination and vigor that marked their struggle for independence from Britain.

Wages Not Frozen In Seamen's Agreement

The freezing of maritime labor's wages for the duration of the war, a provision originally contained in the agreement signed two weeks ago by the unlicensed seamen's unions and the War Shipping Administration, has been eliminated and wage increases can be obtained through the regular channels provided in the union contracts.

The May 14 issue of Seafarers Log, official organ of the Atlantic & Gulf District of the Seafarers International Union, AFL, reports:

"While wages were frozen in the first draft of the agreement, it was subject to further negotiations and has since been eliminated. Wages are not frozen except insofar as union minimums will be safeguarded throughout the war. Higher wages to meet any increased cost of living can be negotiated through the regular bargaining machinery."

This does not mean, of course, that the seamen will automatically receive any pay raises to meet spiraling prices — they still have to fight for such increases. But at least they are not bound by a signed compact not to even ask for them.

Last week the Stalinist-led National Maritime Union, the only union of unlicensed men not in

the united front that signed the original pact with the WSA, signed an agreement with the government on contracts and conditions for the duration of the war which was even worse than the original united front agreement that the Stalinists had so loudly condemned.

The NMU agreement closely paralleled that which was signed a week earlier by the Seafarers International Union, Sailors Union of the Pacific, Marine Cooks & Stewards and the Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers Association. It differed, however, in one important respect! It left a loophole through which the shipowners could launch an offensive on any clause in the collective bargaining contracts.

Whereas the other unions have an iron bound clause guaranteeing the observance by the shipowners and government of all contracts and working conditions

for the duration of the war, the NMU agreement reads "as follows:

"It is hereby agreed that the provisions of the existing collective bargaining agreements be continued and observed for the duration of the war unless changed by mutual agreement between the War Shipping Administration and the unions, or in case of a deadlock by decision of the Maritime War Emergency Board."

In short, the shipowners or the government can throw any phase of labor relations with the NMU directly under the jurisdiction of the Maritime War Emergency Board. This Board is headed by Captain Macaulay of the Maritime Commission who has a record of anti-labor activities.

The Stalinist leadership of the NMU has, from the first, tried to scuttle labor's fight against the repressive measures urged by the government. The united front forged by the other unionized unions isolated the NMU and thereby reduced its power to sabotage the fight. The NMU leaders have, however, succeeded in selling out their own membership.

TWO UE LOCALS VOTE AGAINST SURRENDER OF OVERTIME RATES

At least two important locals in the Stalinist-dominated District 4 of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, have voted overwhelmingly to reject the proposal of their General Officers to surrender the established overtime pay rates for holiday and week-end work.

The two locals which took this action were the Ford Instrument Local 425 in New York and the National Union Local 445 in Newark, N. J. Their action has not been reported in the union's official paper, UE News.

The vote to reject the General Officers' proposal was made at the initiative of the executive board in Local 425. The vote of the four shifts of the union, which represents 3,000 members, in favor of the executive board

motion, was almost unanimous, with only five members voting against.

The members expressed themselves against the General Officers' proposals on the grounds that it constituted a voluntary wage-cut which would lower their living standards at a time when rising prices have already drastically raised the cost of living. As some workers pointed out, the union had recently won a pay raise, and the surrender of the established overtime pay rates would have the effect of wiping out the gains which even the management had conceded the workers were entitled to get.

The members of Local 445 voiced opposition to the surrender of their overtime wage standards on the grounds that it was false that labor or labor's pay was in any way responsible for

holding up production. Members took the floor to show that production would not be increased by appeasing the bosses on this question, and to answer the UE organizer's argument about "equal sacrifice" by pointing out that labor is already making all the sacrifices and the bosses are making none.

The local is at present engaged in trying to secure wage increases to counteract price rises in the last year, and it was obvious to everyone how contradictory it would be to go to the boss and point out the need for a wage increase and at the same time voluntarily accept a wage cut which the boss had not even sought in this particular plant.

Less than 10 workers in this union of 1500 voted in favor of the General Officers' appeasement proposal.

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

The Negro press was so jubilant last week about Roosevelt's granting the Navy Cross to Dorie Miller, Negro hero of Pearl Harbor, that they all overlooked a very ironic twist to the affair. In granting the award, Roosevelt cited: "His distinguished devotion to duty, extraordinary courage and disregard for his own personal safety during the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor." Miller's extraordinary courage that day is well known to everyone — but doesn't a citation about his "devotion to duty" ring a little funny? According to the Navy's Jim Crow regulations, it was Miller's duty to wash the dishes and serve the food — and NOT to touch any of the guns. If he had carried out the functions to which he was assigned, Miller would not have received the Navy Cross last week. . . According to the Navy Department, Miller will be awarded the Cross on board the ship where he is now stationed. That should also present an ironic spectacle. When the ceremony is completed, Miller will be sent back to the kitchen again to devote himself to the duty of washing dishes. For according to the new Navy ruling, by which Negroes in a special Jim Crow division will be assigned to posts outside of the mess department, Negroes who are on ships where there are white sailors will still be permitted to serve only in the mess department.

Some things change, and some things seem to go on in the same old way. Now they're going to have women in the army. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed a bill authorizing the establishment of a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, under control of regular army, and the president has issued an executive order establishing the auxiliary. Under this set-up 150,000 women will soon be in the army. That certainly is a far cry from the attitude toward women prevailing during the first world war. But while things like this may change, Jim Crow conducts business as usual. An amendment to the Senate bill to prevent racial discrimination in the auxiliary was withdrawn in response to pressure from anti-Negro elements.

A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL, and the one who was responsible for calling off the March on Washington a year ago, has made many speeches and written many articles during the last two years in which he asserted that this is a "war for democracy." The Negro people, he said long before Pearl Harbor, must give unconditional support to the war because only by a victory for the "democratic" nations would they be in a position to secure the democratic rights which they are denied in this country. Last week Randolph made a speech at a mass meeting in San Antonio, Texas, in which he emphasized the need for the Negro people to struggle for the abolition of the poll tax and the white primary system. "Randolph," according to the May 16 Pittsburgh Courier, "stated that Negroes must realize the necessity of winning the right to vote in the South before the war ends, while world opinion is watching the profession and practice of the democratic process everywhere. After the war it may be too late, he concluded." Would it be impertinent of us to ask Randolph to publicly explain what kind of "war for democracy" it is that he thinks may end with the Negro people being in a worse position to gain equality than they are in now?

John Wesley Jones of Greenville, South Carolina, was found guilty of breaking the law two weeks ago. Judge James M. Richardson ordered him to pay a fine of \$20 or serve 30 days in jail. The crime with which he was charged was "resisting arrest" because he sat down beside a white man on a trolley car when there were no more seats in the "colored section" of the car. Said the judge: "Somebody has been talking to you and you are getting ideas in your head, and when you get ideas trouble is bound to result. You can't fight back. The law requires segregation of the races, and whether it is a good law or not, it must be carried out." That's the trouble with the John Wesley Joneses in this country — they hear all this talk about a "war for democracy" and equality and all this condemnation of Hitler's discrimination against the Jewish people, and they start getting ideas in their heads and the next thing you know they're acting just like regular criminals and outlaws, daring to sit down beside a white man no less! It's enough to make a cracker sick at the stomach.

CONTENTS OF THE MAY ISSUE OF "FOURTH INTERNATIONAL"

Labor's Fight Against Inflation, editorial comment.
Washington in Latin America by Terence Phean.
The Murder of Bob Harte by Walter Rourke.
The Crisis in Agriculture by C. Charles.
Roosevelt and the Negroes by Albert Parker.
On the War Fronts by Joseph Hansen.
The Program for Peace by Leon Trotsky.
The Role of Burnham and the Apology of Schachtman by F. M.
Underground Austria and the Soviet Union.
Single copies of this issue cost 20 cents. A year's subscription may be secured for \$2.00. For either, write Business Manager, Fourth International, 116 University Place, New York.

Bob Harte Was A GPU Victim

Secretary of Trotsky Was Assassinated by Stalin Agents Two Years Ago

By JOSEPH HANSEN

Shortly before dawn on May 24, 1940 some 25 men penetrated the walls surrounding the home of Leon and Natalia Trotsky in Coyoacan, Mexico, kidnapped the secretary-guard on duty, Robert Sheldon Harte, riddled the bedroom of the aged revolutionists with machine gun slugs, hurled incendiary bombs, and fled, believing they had succeeded in assassinating the most prominent leader of the world socialist revolution.

An "accident of war," as Trotsky termed it, had enabled him and Natalia to live a few more months before Stalin, leader of world reaction in the working class, would make a second and more desperate attempt.

Harte was carried to a lonely cabin in the mountains a few miles away, one bullet sent crashing into the back of his head, another in his temple, and his body thrown into a grave which had been laid with lime in preparation for the bodies of Trotsky and Natalia.

Slander As Well As Assassination

In order to divert attention from Stalin's GPU who had perpetrated this crime, the Stalinist press intensified their hue and cry against Trotsky. They denied any connection whatever with the murder of Harte and the attempted murder of Trotsky and his wife. They accused Trotsky of having organized a "self-assault," of carrying on "an international blackmail," of acting as "an instrument in the Yankee war of nerves against Mexico." Previously they had accused him of being in the "service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) of the United States," of having "links . . . with Wall Street." This was in the days of the pact between Stalin and Hitler; having himself become an agent of Hitler, it was necessary for Stalin to convert the old slander about Trotsky's being a "Gestapo agent" into the new slander of being a "Wall Street Agent."

On June 18, however, the Mexico City police department announced that with the arrest of 27 members of the Communist Party the case had been solved. David Alfaro Siqueiros, prominent in Stalinist circles, was named as the actual leader of the murderers, a role he later confessed when apprehended by the police. Luis Arenal, well known contributor to the New Masses and Futuro, magazine of Stalin's Mexican representative, Lombardo Toledano, together with his brother Leopoldo Arenal, were named as the two who shot Harte. They have not yet been apprehended by the police. Two others of those who fired the machine guns were contributors to Toledano's Futuro, Felix Guerrero Mejia and Nestor Sanchez Hernandez, author of an article attacking Trotsky.

Other Murder Agents of the GPU

The police established that David Serrano, member of the Political Bureau of the Mexican Communist Party, had organized a network of spies surrounding Trotsky's home in Coyoacan. Among these spies were Serrano's former wife, Julio Barradas de Serrano, and another female member of the Communist Party who attempted to worm their way into the confidence of the police detail in preparation for the machine gun assault.

The Communist Party assigned a lawyer member of its Central Committee, Pavon Flores, to represent the prisoners Serrano and Martinez.

The police further established that it was Central Committee member Serrano who obtained the police uniforms which were used as disguises by the assailants.

Trotsky estimated that the GPU had spent at least \$10,000 in merely the physical preparations for the murder, not counting arrangements of false passports, bribes, etc.

The higher-ups in the organization of the plot were never uncovered by the police. Oumansky, the old GPU agent who had been sent to Washington by Stalin, ostensibly as Ambassador although he was nothing but a professional organizer of GPU plots, moved in complete immunity until he was recalled to Moscow by Stalin. Since then he has dropped from public view.

Role of Trotsky's Murderer

Jacson, who later succeeded in murdering Trotsky, undoubtedly played a leading part in the May 24 assault. The Stalinist prisoners reported that one of their leaders, besides Siqueiros, was a "French Jew" whose name they did not know — a mysterious person who spoke Spanish with a decided accent. Jacson may already have become known to Harte and was undoubtedly the one who succeeded in inveigling Harte into opening the barred doors for the Stalinists disguised in police uniforms.

On June 25, the Mexican police, working on the clues furnished by the Stalinist assassins whom they had arrested, discovered the body of Harte. Because of the dryness of the ground or for some other reason, the lime had not destroyed the corpse. Early in the morning the police brought locks of his hair and pieces of his underwear for identification by Trotsky's household. Bob's red kinky hair was unmistakable. We had known him well in the Downtown Branch of the New York Local of the Socialist Workers Party where he had proved himself a devoted, hard working comrade ready to carry out any assignment within his capacities.

None of us can ever forget the grave stern face

of the Old Man after the news had been broken to him, and the tears that came down his cheeks. "Poor Bob, poor slandered Bob." For the Stalinists who murdered him had then turned around and accused him in their press of being "implicated" in the plot — no doubt a move calculated to cover up and divert attention from Jacson. Bob was the eighth of Trotsky's secretaries to die at the hands of Stalin in his desperate efforts to halt the growth of the Fourth International. Before him, the following heroes of the working class fell: Glasman, Butow, Blumkin, Sermus, Poznansky, Klement, Wolfe, and Trotsky's own son, Leon Sedov.

The guilt of the Stalinists was recognized by everyone — but the participants went practically scot-free. Stalinist pressure and corruption succeeded in eliminating the charges of murder and attempted murder, use of firearms, usurpation of official functions (of police officers) and criminal association. In the end Siqueiros faced only the charges of housebreaking, unlawful use of uniforms, robbery of two cars, and damaging another's property (with machine gun volleys!)

Nor did he pay any penalty for even these charges. He applied for bail, was granted the application, and less than a month later, skipped bail and fled to Chile. At the present time he is living in Chile, working on some murals for a school the Mexican government is constructing there.

Salute to Bob Harte

Bob was young — only 25. He had everything to live for. His family was well to do. Had he wished, he could have pursued a life of comfort and ease like the majority of the class he came from. But that life seemed inadequate. The stagnation and decay of the capitalist class repelled him. He could not endure the stultifying atmosphere of the business world. Despite the dangers and hardships of the revolutionary's way of life, he found his way to Trotskyism. The only place where he could find a cause worth completely devoting his life to, was in the movement to end the ignorance, misery, poverty, and war of the imperialist epoch by organizing the means of production along rational planned lines and thereby ushering in the universal brotherhood of man. Bob found that cause great enough to make his life worthwhile, short though his years were. In the great future society of socialism, Robert Sheldon Harte will be remembered as one of those who made the glorious new life possible.

Many times when we sang The Internationale at meetings we raised our fists together with Bob in token of our irreconcilable struggle against the horror and anarchy of capitalism. Today, Bob, we salute you in memory of your sacrifice. Your spirit along with that of our other martyrs marches in our ranks.

tolerable plight of his fellow-workers by means of union organization. Both they and my informant had been members of the old Norwegian Seamen's Union. Realizing that the phony union they now have is a boss organization, they resolved to work for the establishment of a real union. Arriving more than a year ago at New York, they quit their ship, intending to remain ashore and sign Norwegian seamen into an independent union of their own as the ships came in.

They had been ashore and active only a couple of weeks when FBI agents got on their trail. The pair were arrested, accused of being "fifth columnists," and without even a pretense of a trial they were shanghaied on board a British freighter which took them to a Canadian concentration camp.

It is easy to understand, then, why Norwegian seamen, including the deck and engine-room officers, have developed a feeling of sympathy for Chinese sailors. The war, while developing and fanning race prejudices in some quarters, is breaking them down in others and creating a sentiment of international working class solidarity.

TASK FOR THE AMERICAN UNIONS

The maritime unions in America can do much to promote and solidify this thoroughly progressive tendency among the seamen of the various nations, all of whom are suffering from tremendous disabilities. They can, and should, take up the grievances of Chinese and Scandinavian seamen, fight for them and protect them against the vicious persecution which is their lot in American ports.

This would not merely be a fine display of international labor solidarity; it would also serve the cause of American seamen. A successful fight for the rights of Chinese and Scandinavian seamen would take the wind out of the sails of America's bosses in their assaults on American maritime labor.

Next week THE MILITANT will print an article by Gordon Bailey on governmental discrimination against Japanese-Americans on the Pacific Coast.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

U. S. Ports Discriminate Against Chinese Seamen

Citizens of America's 'Brave Ally' Are Not Even Permitted to Leave Their Ships

By a Correspondent

One recent day a Norwegian freighter entered the port of New Orleans. As the vessel was coming alongside, a group of burly, grey-uniformed Pinkerton guards appeared on the wharf. Two took up stations on the port side while the others took up positions at the gangways. Their job was to see that no member of the 37-man Chinese crew

paid to raise several million dollars for refugee relief in China. It is one thing to talk about the hardships of Chinese in China — quite another to mention, much less demand the ending of, vile injustices done to Chinese in America. America is in this war to assure freedom for all peoples? Let the American imperialists begin by giving freedom to Chinese seamen. Let them proclaim the end of the unequal treaties with China, which it is also entirely within their power to do. It's a safe bet they will do neither unless they are forced.

Today, when Japan is locked in mortal combat with its American imperialist rival, and when Washington could be successfully pressed to make vital concessions in the interest of maintaining the United Nations' front in the Far East, China could compel Washington to abrogate that section of the Immigration Act which discriminates against Chinese seamen and others on racial grounds. It could at least try to force Washington to declare an end to the unequal treaties. But Chungking and its diplomatic representatives in this country remain as silent as the grave, content to take whatever crumbs the Washington imperialists choose to let fall from their table, and nothing more.

TALK AND ACTION

The fact that Washington, despite its tireless eulogies of the "brave Chinese nation," continues to treat Chinese and other Orientals as coolies, is an indication of what is in store for the Asiatic people if, failing to win and hold their independence, they fall under the heel of dollar imperialism.

While the Chinese sailors were being made prisoners on their ship at New Orleans, the press, the radio and official spokesmen of Washington were whooping it up for China United Relief cam-

mit to the status of inferiority which the imperialists thrust upon them. In New York harbor on April 11 twelve members of the Chinese crew of a British merchantman entered the captain's quarters and demanded shore leave. According to press reports, the captain ordered them to leave and see him about the matter later. The leader of the crewmen reportedly swung at the British skipper with a marlin spike and the skipper shot him dead. Police were summoned and the remaining 11 were arrested.

BOND OF SYMPATHY

The British master of the ship where the above "mutiny" took place showed no sympathy with his Chinese crewmen. On the ship aboard which I girdled the globe it was quite different. There existed a close bond of sympathy between the Norwegian officers and the Chinese crew. They helped the Chinese crew get a big pay raise in Australia and an additional war bonus in South Africa. And the captain tried his best, though unsuccessfully, to induce American immigration authorities at New Orleans to permit one of the seamen to go ashore to locate his brother's grave. This Chinese seaman's brother had been killed, ironically enough, when a British ship was torpedoed off the east coast. But the authorities were adamant in refusing him permission to spend time ashore.

Norwegian maritime workers are sympathetic to the Chinese because they are in a somewhat like situation. They have few rights and are virtually prisoners to their ships. The Nazi occupation of Norway meant the end of the powerful Norwegian Seamen's Union. In its place has come a phony company union which represents, not the men, but the shipping bosses organized in the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission. The latter is a creation of the Norwegian government-in-exile.

Norwegian seamen, and that includes officers and skippers, are permitted to remain ashore in Allied ports only for the briefest time. They must sail with the ship they came in on, get another within a few weeks — or suffer imprisonment.

In a port remote from this country I ran into a ship's engineer who told me his story. He had traveled in the war zones

for two years, arriving in Cape-town, decided he would take a rest ashore for a few months. He had been twice torpedoed and his nerves were in bad shape. From his pay he had saved sufficient money to insure that he would not become a public charge. But no — the British immigration authorities insisted that he stay with his ship, or else!

The captain of the ship I was on was hoping for a rest when he arrived in America after piloting his vessel through dangerous waters for some 20,000 miles on a single voyage. This hope was shortlived, for he was told on arrival that he had been assigned to a tanker which he was to sail to England ten days hence. "Suppose you refuse — tell them you're not in shape for such an undertaking?" I inquired. He smiled back at me wearily. "Would you like to be sent to a concentration camp in Canada?" he asked.

DEEPLY DISCONTENTED

Denied any real freedom, and given reading rooms ashore instead of badly needed improvements in wages and working conditions, Scandinavian seafaring men have become deeply discontented. Men without a country, they are forced without respite to sail the hazardous seas in a cause which more and more of them are coming to feel is not their own. They hate the Nazis, but find themselves victims of a system of virtual slavery which matches the plight of their countrymen in the Nazi-occupied countries. If the Norwegian factory worker goes on strike, he may be jailed or even executed by the Nazis. If the Norwegian seaman becomes dissatisfied, grumbles out loud and says something uncomplimentary about Churchill or Roosevelt, or even if he is only just tired and quits his ship, he is headed straight for jail or a "democratic" concentration camp.

These sailors have told me, and I have seen for myself, how spies and stool-pigeons frequent the bars in various ports. They listen in to the sailors' talk, ears cocked for "disloyal" remarks. Or they draw the men into conversation and get them to betray their real feelings about the war. Hundreds of discontented Norwegian and Danish sailors trapped thus are now languishing in British and perhaps American concentration camps. Most of these "fifth columnists" — that's what the imperialists call them — are in concentration camps in Canada, some having been shipped there from the United States.

A Norwegian seaman confided to me the story of what happened to two of his seafaring friends who sought to mitigate the in-

The Writings Of Karl Max On India In 1853

By A. ROLAND

The letters written by Marx (with the aid of Engels) for the New York Daily Tribune in 1853 read as freshly as though written but yesterday. The letters that dealt with India were later collected into a pamphlet called "The British Rule in India." The occasion for writing on this subject was the introduction of a bill in Parliament by a lame-duck Whig government which was attempting to perpetuate the direct rule of monopoly capitalism in view of the end of the overlordship of the East India Company. The words of Marx are worth quoting here.

"How came it that English supremacy was established in India? The paramount power of the Great Moghul was broken by the Moghul viceroys. The power of the viceroys was broken by the Maharrattas. The power of the Maharrattas was broken by the Afghans, and while all were struggling against all, the Briton rushed in and was enabled to subdue them all. A country not only divided between Mohammedan and Hindu, but between tribe and tribe, between caste and caste, a society whose framework was based on a sort of equilibrium resulting from a general repulsion and constitutional exclusiveness between all its members. Such a country and such a society, were they not the predestined prey of conquest?"

The story of British rule in India is the story of the fostering of these divisions. Race against race, tribe against tribe, one kind of state against another kind, one religion against another. Meantime the shameless hypocrisy of deploring the lack of progress as being due not to British sabotage, but to something innate in the Indian peoples. Churchill, through the "honest" Cripps, plays once again on this old tune, using Mohammedan against Hindu. Marx quotes from the speech of Sir Charles Wood, the Cripps of his day: "In India you have a race of people slow of change, bound up by religious prejudices, and antiquated customs. These are, in fact, all obstacles to rapid progress." The same song!

But Marx showed the tremendous impact of British capitalism on Hindu civilization. England first of all exploited the hand skill of the Hindu cotton spinners and weavers by becoming the middleman to carry this goods from India to Europe. Then England applied machinery to the manufacture of the new textiles. The trade was then turned right around and England could actually sell cotton goods more cheaply to India than it could be made by the coolie labor of the Indian peasant. The result was the complete undermining of Indian life and society. Marx says of this:

"All the civil wars, invasions, revolutions, conquests, famines, strangely complex, rapid, and destructive as the successive action in Hindustan may appear, did not go deeper than its surface. England has broken down the whole framework of Indian society, without any symptoms of reconstruction yet appearing. This loss of his old world, with no gain of a new one, imparts a particular kind of melancholy to the present misery of the Hindus, and separates Hindustan, ruled by Britain, from all its ancient traditions, and from the whole of its past history."

The founder of scientific socialism does not regret the breaking up of the stagnancy of Asiatic despotic civilization. Marx sees the process of a deep-going change in all Asia, all the East, beginning in India. The solution to the painful upheaval of Oriental life is not the restoration of the old, outworn system with its idiotic customs. It does not lie in the resumption by tens of millions of Indian peasants of their toil at the hand spinning machines and the hand looms. That is the Utopian program of Gandhi, a reactionary program. It lies rather in the completion of the new integration of social life on the new plane. That completion can come only with socialism. The liberation of India depends on the action of the united masses of India, throwing off the yoke of the imperialist oppressor, and on the English working class lending its helping hand against the common oppressor.

Meantime Marx, in passing, throws light on the present situation in India. He writes: "The native army, organized and trained by the British Drill Sergeant, was the sine qua non of Indian self-emancipation, and of India ceasing to be the prey of the first foreign intruder."

The policy of pacifism, adopted as the official policy of the Indian Congress Party, must be utterly condemned by every Hindu who sincerely wants the emancipation of his country. The Indian toiler must understand the enormous difference between the force used by the conqueror to whip into submission those whom he would enslave, and the force used by the oppressed to cast off the shameful yoke of slavery. The Indian people must place no reliance whatsoever on the British to defeat the imperialist aim of Japan in seizing India. Japan can be defeated by the independently organized resistance of the Hindus and the Mohammedans of town and countryside, united against the would-be invader. India has a unique opportunity to strike a blow for its liberation from all imperialism. The Hindu people, far from resorting to passive resistance, must learn the use of arms to defend themselves and to cast out all imperialist oppressors, British or Japanese.

The actions of the leaders of the Indian Congress Party, whether it be Gandhi or Nehru, make plain that the struggle for liberation must be fought not only against the foreign oppressor, but against the native one as well. It is only fear of the masses that dictates the cowardly policies of these misleaders. Their aim is not emancipation for India but a deal, a bargain, with one conqueror or the other.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 22 Saturday, May 23, 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: 1 cent per copy in the United States; 4 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

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

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

Why Stalin Doesn't Trust His Allies

As the Red Army of the workers' state locks in decisive combat with the fascist foe, the American press once more reports the remarkable fact that the American and British "allies" remain in the dark concerning Soviet strategy, Soviet strength in manpower and material, Soviet war production.

"U. S. military opinion," reports *Time* magazine on May 11, "is that neither Britain nor the U. S. has any accurate knowledge of Russia's military strength. Stalin plays his cards close to his chest, trusts no man, not even his new partners, with what is in his hand." Again: "The U. S. high command has seen little of Russian armaments, and nothing of the front." The *New York Times* military expert, Hanson Baldwin, reports May 17 that the Russians "have not allowed our observers at the front, and such basic factors as number of German prisoners in Russian hands and number of Russian divisions available are not known in this country."

Why does Stalin refuse to let his allies know what capitalist allies ordinarily know about each other's forces? Whether the Red Army is weak or strong, in either case the motivation of the Kremlin, logically, is the same: it does not trust its allies. Maybe, if the British and American governments knew certain facts, the Kremlin fears, it would receive less arms from its allies. Or it may be that the Kremlin has the perspective that, at the next stage of the war after Hitler is weakened, the "democracies" would use its military information about the Soviet Union in an assault on it.

Whatever the specific motivation, the fundamental fact is clear: Stalin utterly distrusts his allies to the point of refusing them any information about the situation of the Red Army.

In this fact is reflected the fundamental antagonism between the workers' state and the capitalist world. That antagonism may appear at times to be subordinated by a given capitalist power which makes an alliance with the Soviet Union against another capitalist power. But the fundamental antagonism always remains, for capitalism and the workers' state are irreconcilable. Only the weaknesses and contradictions of imperialism have thus far saved the Soviet Union from an all-out assault of the combined capitalist world.

Essentially Stalin is doing now what he did during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Then, while publicly boasting about the safety that the pact assured the Soviet Union, at the same time he sought, in the seizures of the Finnish, Polish and Baltic territories, to find additional strategic means for defending the Soviet Union.

But in both cases Stalin deceived the workers of the world. The masses were told by the Communist parties during the Stalin-Hitler pact that the pact was a blow for world peace, that it safeguarded the Soviet Union, that the "democracies" were the principal warmongers, etc. — the masses were left completely unprepared for the assault on the Soviet Union.

Likewise now the masses are told by the Stalinist parties that the "democracies" are fighting for a progressive world order, that they are true allies

of the USSR, that the masses should put all their trust in Roosevelt and Churchill, etc. Stalin and his minions lied to the masses during the Stalin-Hitler pact; they lie now too. To the extent that Stalinism influences the masses, they are left completely unprepared for future unfriendly acts by the "democracies" against the Soviet Union.

To sum up: The Stalinist bureaucracy defends the Soviet Union by its typical bureaucratic methods: behind-the-scenes deals and operations, without any regard for the sentiments and interests of the great masses of the USSR and the whole world.

But the only real defense of the Soviet Union, in the last analysis, is the defense of which the international proletariat is capable. That is the extension of the October Revolution to the rest of the world. Only Workers' and Farmers' Governments, only the Socialist United States of Europe and America, can assure the safety of the Soviet Union.

Thus Stalin's bureaucratic methods work against the real defense of the Soviet Union. His private distrust of the capitalist powers is more than outweighed by the unlimited public credit he grants them through the Communist parties. By delivering the masses to Roosevelt and Churchill, he is hamstringing the defense of the Soviet Union. When Stalin sold the Comintern to Hitler, many people understood the terrible damage that Stalin was dealing to the Soviet Union. Equally damaging is his re-sale of the Comintern to the "democracies." The proof of this is Stalin's utter (but private) distrust of his capitalist "allies."

Canada YCL Disbands

We have received from Canada a copy of an official press statement issued April 17 by the Young Communist League of Canada. It says in part:

"On Sunday, April 17, a special national conference of the YCL convened in Toronto. After exhaustive discussion the conference unanimously voted that the YCL be disbanded as of April 17, 1942."

"It is to be regretted that the illegality of the YCL, which was imposed as a result of basic differences on the Munich policy, was continued (by the government) in the present totally different historic setting."

"The national conference of the YCL is confident that all young people who belong to the YCL will work even more strenuously for unity and for victory in 1942 to win the war."

In short, the good name of Canadian "democracy," compromised by its outlawry of the YCL, is to be saved by dissolving the YCL!

The Stalinist press in this country has failed to publish the facts about the situation of the outlawed Canadian Stalinists, as it has likewise failed to publish the recent news of the outlawry of the Stalinist party in Ceylon, the continued illegality of the Stalinists in India and other British colonies, the fact that Churchill himself has refused to reverse the outlawry of the *Daily Worker* in Britain, etc. This spectacle of being kicked in the face by their "allies" is too, too embarrassing.

Hillman: Used Up

If Hillman is a typical guinea pig, a period of about two years is the length of prime usefulness to a capitalist government of a trade union bureaucrat openly functioning as a complete agent of the government.

How he strutted when he was made co-director of the OPM in the Spring of 1940! With what arrogance he laid down the law to the delegates at the CIO national convention in the fall of 1940, speaking, he said, "in the name of President Roosevelt," as well as vice-president of the CIO. For most of the past two years he was cock of the walk.

But the White House circle, for their own reactionary reasons, are extremely sensitive to the reactions of the labor movement. They know that Hillman's star has been descending since his complicity in sending troops to smash the North American Aviation strike. With a sound class instinct, the workers demand from labor leaders entirely different standards than those of capitalist politicians. Having as yet no perspective of an alternative to the Roosevelt administration, the masses passively accept its anti-labor actions; but when a trade union leader is associated with those actions, they look upon him as a traitor to the working class — which he is. And after two years of such treason, Hillman ceases to be useful to the White House.

So all Hillman's desperate attempts to get himself appointed Chairman of the Manpower Commission were futile, and the job went to a capitalist politician, Paul V. McNutt. Then — a long step down from the co-directorship of the OPM — Hillman moved heaven and earth to become chairman of the Labor Division of the WPB, but that went to an unknown social worker named Lund.

Hillman is badly damaged goods. And his fate is the handwriting on the wall for all trade union officials who openly become agents of the government. They'll all be used up, as the war unfolds and they follow out the iron logic of their traitorous position and betray the workers on every crucial question.

A Timely Political Document!

IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

By LEON TROTSKY

(A Compilation — 1927-1937)

10 CENTS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK

Open Letter To Members Of Farmer-Labor Party

(Continued from page 1)

that the Farmer-Labor movement break with the old boss-controlled parties can the delegates to the May convention assure the progressive growth and success of the Farmer-Labor Party. This movement was defeated in 1939 primarily because it did not break with the old capitalist parties.

Benson and the Stalinists who dominated his administration, did not fight for a program in the interests of the workers and farmers. They proposed no basic solution to the problem confronting the people. Their program was based always upon the interests of the Stalin bureaucracy in the Soviet Union.

SWP WARNED FLP

IN 1938

In an open letter to Governor Benson, issued by the Socialist Workers Party before the November 1938 elections, we predicted and tried to prevent the defeat of the Farmer-Labor Party. We said then:

"The truth is that the Farmer-Labor Party is in mortal danger of a defeat at the hands of reaction, unless the workers and farmers can be armed with a program which will spur them to the utmost efforts to achieve victory."

"Twelve concrete proposals — for housing, farm prices, unemployment relief, public works, etc., were presented by the Socialist Workers Party as a basis for such a program. But, we warned, 'The above program cannot be carried out without a sharp break with the Democratic national machine, neither can it be carried out until the Farmer-Labor Party makes a clear ideological break with Roosevelt's most vociferous supporters, the most determined pro-war group in the country today, namely the Communist Party.'"

Unfortunately for the workers and farmers of Minnesota, this program and these proposals were ignored.

This year, as in 1938, if the Farmer-Labor Party does not break with the old boss parties, it will fail to inspire the workers and farmers or secure their support.

Rank and file Farmer-Laborites, trade unions and farm organizations cannot depend on either the Stalinists or the conservative right-wingers to supply the program and the leadership which will solve the burning problems confronting the people of Minnesota today. Both groups are even now making behind-the-scenes overtures to representatives of the old-line capitalist parties. A company-union alliance of the Farmer-Labor movement with Democrats and Republicans won't solve a single problem for the workers.

Only Independent working class political action can solve these problems.

A PROGRAM FOR THE FARMER-LABOR MOVEMENT

The employing class is trying to place the full burden of the war upon the masses, and to wipe out the social gains of labor. The Farmer-Labor movement must demand that the hard-won social gains of labor should not only be maintained, but extended.

1. Confiscate War Profits.

Higher relief standards, higher pensions for the aged, increased aid for the dependent children, a more extensive public health and housing program should be provided. To finance these necessary measures, legislation must be passed to confiscate the huge war profits of Big Business.

2. For a Rising Scale of Wages.

Roosevelt's 7-point "stabilization" plan to prevent inflation is ineffectual because it will not solve the problem of the ever-widening gap between the demands of the people for goods and services and the decreasing supply of these consumer goods. Roosevelt's plan would in fact freeze wages, and increase the suffering of the workers. The Farmer-Labor movement must demand that labor be given a rising scale of wages to meet rises in the cost of living.

3. Expropriate all War Industry and Operate It Under Workers Control.

Big Business and its political agents claim to be fighting a war against fascism. But the Rockefeller Standard Oil, duPont's chemical trust and General Motors, General Electric and Mellon's aluminum trust are still doing business with the Nazis behind the backs of the American people. The greatest enemy of the workers and farmers today is fascism, whether at home or abroad, but fascism will never

be smashed if we entrust the fight to the bosses.

Moreover, these same monopolists are waging a war against labor under cover of patriotism. The Farmer-Labor movement must demand that the factories be taken out of the hands of these monopolists and their dollar-a-year agents, and operated by the government under workers control.

4. Preserve Civil Liberties.

Civil liberties are gravely endangered during this war. The conviction of 18 members of the Socialist Workers Party and of Local 544-CIO in Minneapolis last December, is a danger to all. The Farmer-Labor movement must take a stand to defend the Bill of Rights. In wartime as in peacetime all civil liberties must be observed.

5. For Democratic Rights In the Armed Forces.

Both the unions and the Farmer-Labor Party must take up the cudgels on behalf of the workers-soldiers.

The Farmer-Labor Party must become known as the champion of the men in the armed forces. If this is not done, the reactionary forces will succeed in carrying out their program of using the soldiers and sailors against the labor and progressive movement during and after the war.

6. Cancel All Farm Debts.

Minnesota farmers are fighting a losing battle against a huge burden of debt. The Farmer-Labor movement must advance the demand that all farm debts, farm mortgages, and seed loans be cancelled. The Farmer-Labor movement must fight to defend the farmers from the encroachment of the banks, and unite workers and farmers against their common enemies.

7. Equal Rights for the Negro People.

Shameful discrimination by Minnesota industry against Negro workers still prevails. Even more revolting is the discrimination which exists against the Negroes in government service.

both military and civil. The Negro people must have full social, economic and political equality.

8. For a Workers' and Farmers' Government.

Even the most elementary problems facing the workers and farmers today are political problems. Only by vigorously defending the unions and by uniting the workers' ranks on the political field can we overcome the attempts by employers and government to crush labor, and put a stop to the cowardly retreats of the trade union leaders. If the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party raises the banner of independent working class political action, it will give an inspiring example to the people throughout the nation.

Together the masses could march towards the establishment of a Workers' and Farmers' Government in the United States, and the replacement of the worn-out capitalist system by a socialist economy.

9. Defend the Soviet Union.

The heroic resistance of the Russian workers against Hitler's war machine has demonstrated that the people will fight to the death for industries and land which have been taken away from the capitalists and landlords.

The Socialist Workers Party has this heroic defense of the Soviet Union by the brave Russian workers and peasants. We defend the Soviet Union unconditionally, despite the crimes of Stalin, because the Soviet Union remains a Workers State.

★ ★ ★

We of the Socialist Workers Party carry on the tradition of Eugene V. Debs, who raised the slogan of international working class solidarity in the first World War. Like Debs we have been persecuted by the government for our devotion to the interests of the workers. We have earned the right to speak to you, to urge you to adopt a program of independent political action on a state scale, and on a national and international scale.

This is the only road to lasting peace, and to freedom and plenty for all.

CRDC Dance Frolic In New York Nets \$143 For Defense

NEW YORK, May 19 — More than 200 friends and sympathizers of the Civil Rights Defense Committee were present at the successful Spring Dance Frolic held here last Saturday evening.

A total of \$143 net was raised at this affair, arranged to raise funds for the defense of the 18 members of the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO.

Who were convicted in Minneapolis last December of violating the 1940 Smith "Gag Act."

The funds were raised through the sale of tickets and refreshments, plus a book auction.

An important part of the contributions was the money sent in by four local unions to pay for blocks of tickets to the affair. These were two locals of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL Local 66 and Millinery Workers Local 24; and two locals of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO: Local 169 and Journeymen Tailors Local 1.

The success of this affair is comparable to that held by the Chicago Branch of the CRDC at its May Frolic, which was reported in last week's MILITANT. In Chicago a total of \$115 was raised to help the work of the Committee.

STEEL WORKERS ESTABLISH UNION

(Continued from page 1)

ference adopted it unanimously. (Actually over 150 delegates representing 100,000 auto workers had staunchly opposed this step.)

It was significant that when the vote was taken, 50 to 60 delegates openly voted in opposition, while many others abstained.

However, it appeared that Murray would have everything his own way at the convention, which is packed with paid organizers and functionaries. But there is a healthy undercurrent of rank and

file militancy revealed at the sessions. With a correct program, this militant group can go far in developing sentiment after the convention for an effective fighting policy that meets the needs of the steel workers and defends their rights.

Next Week's Issue will feature a complete report on the decisions, discussion and highlights of the steel workers' convention, written by Art Preis, MILITANT staff correspondent now in Cleveland.

BUILD YOUR MARXIST LIBRARY NOW!

A LOW-PRICED SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

FASCISM AND BIG BUSINESS, by Daniel Guerin,	337 pages, paper	\$1.00
REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN, by Felix Morrow,	202 pages, paper ..	.50
TOTAL LIST PRICE		\$1.50

Special Combination Price \$.75

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York City

Stalin Blames The Red Army Ranks For Early Defeats

By M. STEIN

There is a general impression that the Stalinists have no firm principles; that consistency of doctrine is not one of their virtues; that the High-Priests of the Stalinist movement have never succeeded in elaborating a theoretical system to guide their policies. This impression can be attributed to the constantly changing line of the Stalinists. Just when they are about ready to put the finishing touches to the structure of arguments justifying the line of the moment, a new line sweeps in with the speed of a tornado and with just as much devastation it demolishes the preceding line.

We insist, however, that the Stalinists should not be misjudged. There are some immutable tenets governing the conduct of this movement. Chief among them is the concept of the infallibility of Stalin as the leader. While we have been glorying in the heroic struggle of the Red Army against Hitler's armies, a struggle which is closest to our heart because we Trotskyists alone have remained true to the October Revolution which is at stake in this struggle, we have neglected somewhat to occupy ourselves with the question of Stalin's infallibility. But Stalin, overcoming for the moment his shyness and modesty, raised the question himself in his Order of the Day to the Red Army and Soviet people on May Day. What prompted him to raise it?

There has been quite a bit of talk that the early successes of the Nazi war machine against the Red Army were due to the element of surprise. Stalin took his pact with Hitler so seriously that it served to lull the Soviet Union to a feeling of false security. The belief that the pact with the Nazis would keep the Soviet Union out of the war was so strong that when Hitler attacked on June 22, 1941, it caught Stalin and his general staff unawares and resulted in severe defeats of the Red Army forces. The losses of this period were very heavy. On the anniversary of the Red Army, Stalin issued an Order of the Day in which he admitted as much:

"The first months of the war, as a result of the unexpectedness and suddenness of the German fascist attack, the Red Army was forced to retreat and evacuate part of our territory." (*New York Times*, February 26, 1942.)

"Unexpectedness" on whose part? Who was responsible for it? What sort of a leader is Stalin if he could not foresee the inevitability of the Nazi assault? What sort of policy was pursued by him which created this "unexpectedness?"

Stalin goes further in his May 1 Order of the Day: "This circumstance should be noted: No sooner had the German arsenal lost the weapon of suddenness than the German Army was confronted with catastrophe."

If this is true, if the element of unexpectedness played such an overwhelming role, and we have no reason to doubt it, how much more does this emphasize the crime of Stalin! On his own admission, he and his policies stand condemned for the costly defeats of the Red Army in the early period of the war.

And what becomes of Stalin's infallibility? Stalin never makes mistakes. You don't believe it? Ask any Stalinist you meet on the street. Or, look through the files of the *Daily Worker* and convince yourself. There have been mistakes made, but never by Stalin. As a matter of fact, Stalin was always the one to liquidate those who had the misfortune to make "mistakes." Didn't he liquidate the Trotskyists, the Zinovievists, the Bucharinites? They made the "mistake" of opposing Stalin. But he went further than that. Every time he changed his policy, he liquidated the very people in his apparatus who made the "mistake" of being associated too prominently with yesterday's policy. All these countless victims had to be killed or removed so that the myth of Stalin's infallibility could live.

Stalin had so much hope in the durability of the pact with Hitler, that he assumed personal responsibility for it by assuming the post of Premier of the Soviet Union, by lavishly entertaining Hitler's envoy von Ribbentrop, by the prominent display in the press of his photographs at the side of von Ribbentrop, by attaching his signature to the official pacts and agreements, by the statements he issued avowing friendship for Nazi Germany on the one hand and by his bitter denunciations of British imperialism on the other.

Who was there in the ranks of the bureaucracy who could be the scapegoat? It took Stalin a long time to figure out a new angle. He wasn't quite accustomed to his new position. He was no longer "merely" the secretary of the party pointing an accusing finger at some figure-head in the apparatus of the government. He himself was the head of the government not only in fact, but in name as well. But the myth of infallibility must be maintained at all costs. Somebody, somehow, must be made accountable for the catastrophe of the early months of the war.

Stalin utilized his May Day Order of the Day to spring the new angle he had figured out. Speaking about the changed situation at the front, he said: "A turn has also taken place in the rank and file of the Red Army. Complacency and frivolousness which was observed among Red Army men in the first months of the patriotic war have disappeared." (*Daily Worker*, May 3, 1942.)

Thus you have a new version for the early defeats. It is not "the unexpectedness" and the "suddenness" of the Nazi attack that was responsible. Such an admission brings the leadership and its policy into question. Such an admission brings Stalin's infallibility into question. Stalin now lays the responsibility for the early defeats at the doorstep of the rank and file of the Red Army. It is hard to conceive of a more cowardly, more despicable act. This criminal in the Kremlin whose policy led the Red Army into the trap of "unexpectedness" points the accusing finger at the rank and file of the Red Army — the workers and peasants who fought like heroes and laid down their lives like heroes. "Complacency and frivolousness" are the traits of case-hardened bureaucrats but not of workers and peasants dying for a cause.