

## THE CRISIS IN JAPAN'S ECONOMY

- See Page 3 -

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 24

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

## The Murray-Lewis Conflict

By Farrell Dobbs

The Lewis-Murray fight is now on in earnest with Murray charging that Lewis is "hell bent on creating national confusion and national disunity." Reverting to his pre-CIO form, Lewis contends in reply that "the issue at hand is United Mine Workers of America versus Communism."

The CIO executive board accuses Lewis of using his post in the miners' union to hamper the war effort, adding that District 50 of the UMW has stirred up jurisdictional disputes with a dozen CIO unions. The campaign to organize the dairy farmers is termed "disruptive."

The miners' policy committee, in turn, has demanded that Murray remove all "Communists" from the CIO payroll, declaring that his failure to do so shall be "full and complete admission upon his part as accepting the principles of Communism, to wit, the overthrow of this government by force." Murray responded to this by stating that every man on the CIO payroll was put there by Lewis and had worked for him six years.

Events have moved rapidly since Lewis on May 28 removed Murray from office as vice-president of the UMW. Martin Wagner, one-time president of District 50, has resigned from the international executive board and is leading the opposition to Lewis in District 50. The Stalinists are eagerly pushing this movement. A National Council of Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers has been set up as an independent union seeking a CIO charter. Wagner claims the support of 55 percent of the District 50 membership of about 50,000.

### UMW'S Demands On CIO

The miners' policy committee has made three formal demands upon the CIO: 1. enter unity conferences with the AFL; 2. acknowledge the debt of \$1,665,000 which the UMW claims is owed to it by the CIO; 3. cease the attacks on the UMW, its leaders and its organizational efforts.

Until these demands are met, the policy committee declared, the miners will withhold payment of per capita taxes to the CIO, such taxes to be deducted from the monies due them on the above mentioned debt which is now in dispute.

The UMW claims to have advanced over five and one-half million dollars in services and cash to the CIO between December 1, 1935 and May 1, 1942, plus almost one and three-quarter million dollars in per capita taxes. The CIO executive board, contending that all funds were put into the CIO without any strings attached, denies that it owes the above sum to the miners and has now formally declared the UMW "delinquent." The miners have made no cash per capita tax payments to the CIO since February.

### On the Question of CIO-AFL Unity

The policy committee supplemented its demand for unity negotiations with the AFL by declaring that "President Lewis is chairman of the standing peace committee of the CIO." The miners, they added, would not be bound by the actions of any peace conference between the AFL and CIO "in which the UMW is without precise and adequate representation." A short time before the AFL had proposed to the CIO that unity negotiations be resumed. Murray charges that Lewis has been conducting individual negotiations with William L. Hutchinson, AFL carpenters' head, since last September.

The CIO executive board has countered by suggesting the establishment of a United Labor Council to be created by joint sessions of the AFL executive and CIO executive board. This is supplemented by a CIO proposal for a national conference to be called by Roosevelt's six-man "labor victory committee."

The internal fight in the CIO, long smoldering, broke into the open when Murray strongly opposed Lewis' surprise move last January proposing that AFL-CIO peace negotiations be resumed. Murray blocked Lewis at that time with Roosevelt's aid. Thereafter the rift continued to widen.

Lewis launched into the campaign to organize the dairy farmers and by the middle of March reported 30,000 members recruited in New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan and North Dakota. In April Lewis men began to resign from their posts in the CIO. Included among them were CIO regional directors and presidents and board members of state CIO councils. It was charged that Murray had failed to invite several of them to the CIO policy conference on March 23. A sharp controversy followed.

(Continued on page 2)

## Negro March Group Calls Rallies To Protest Jim Crow

### Negro Militants Are Waiting for Randolph To Offer His Program to Achieve Equality

By ALBERT PARKER

The June 16 Madison Square Garden meeting to be held under the auspices of the New York Division of the March-on-Washington movement promises to be one of the greatest demonstrations against Jim Crowism in the entire history of this city. Plans are underway for similar monster rallies for the near future in the Chicago Coliseum and the Washington, D. C. Ball Park, to be followed by others in smaller communities.

Announcement was also made last week by A. Philip Randolph, director of the March-on-Washington movement and president of the AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, that the committee sponsoring the meeting was asking for a complete, voluntary blackout in Harlem on the night of June 16 as an expression of the Negro people's determination to win equality. Randolph urged that every busi-

ness and church in Harlem be closed down during the meeting, that every social and recreational activity in Harlem be discontinued, that the window shades in every home be pulled down.

### DEMANDS

The demands which will be raised at the Garden rally will include the following:

Full enforcing power for the Fair Employment Practices Committee, so that it can really compel employers to cease their practices.

(Continued on page 3)

# SOLDIERS' FAMILIES TO GET STARVATION ALLOWANCES

## Supreme Court Again Refuses To Act On Odell Waller Case

### Mass Protest Is Needed to Prevent June 19 Execution

When the high priests demanded the crucifixion of Jesus, Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor sitting in judgment, "took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man." And he let Jesus be turned over to the executioners.

Nine modern Pontius Pilates of the U. S. Supreme Court on June 1, for the second time within a month, washed their hands of the impending execution of Odell Waller, a poor Virginia Negro sharecropper condemned to die on June 19 for the self-defense slaying of his white landlord.

The Supreme Court judges refused to review the case without even saying why.

But if Waller dies, his blood will be upon those nine august justices, as much as on the Jim-Crow Virginia judge and the all-white planters jury who convicted Waller, and the southern courts which upheld the conviction.

For Waller never had a fair trial, and the Supreme Court knows it. He did not have a hearing before a jury of his peers. In Virginia, as in seven other southern states, the poll tax has served to disfranchise the vast majority of citizens, the impoverished whites and Negroes. They cannot vote; they cannot serve on juries.

If the Supreme Court had ruled, as it should have, that Waller had not been tried by a jury of his peers, a great blow would have been struck at the poll-tax system. That is the system which permits a handful of ruling southern whites, the most reactionary scum in the country, to perpetuate themselves in political office.

But the Democratic Party's strongest base is that very southern ruling class which demands the death of Waller. That is why Roosevelt's Supreme Court would not even express an opinion on the case.

The original Pontius Pilate could seek to evade responsibility by claiming that the "multitude" — incited, of course, by the high priests and Pharisees — had demanded the death of Jesus. The Supreme Court's refusal to review the Waller case satisfies only the demands of a tiny minority, the southern ruling class.

But it does not satisfy the "multitude" of 1942, the millions of Negro and white workers and progressives who are demanding that Waller's life be saved. The CIO and AFL general counsels, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Negro March-On-Washington Movement, and a host of other organizations, are demanding that Waller go free.

Waller can yet be saved. Despite the Supreme Court's failure to act, one narrow gate remains open. Waller's counsel can appeal to the Federal District Court of Eastern Virginia for a writ of habeas corpus. If rejected there, he can appeal to the Circuit Court, and then, once more, to the U. S. Supreme Court. Meanwhile, Waller is already within



## Senate Bill Prohibits Anti-Trust Prosecutions

### Monopolies Given Free Rein Under Measure Advocated By Administration's Spokesmen

By WALTER FREEMAN

At the behest of Big Business, the Roosevelt administration and Congress are pushing through legislation guaranteeing the war production monopolies immunity from anti-trust prosecutions.

The Senate last week quietly approved a rider, attached to the House bill setting up the government's small war plants corporation, which gives WPB chairman Donald Nelson power to suspend the requirements of the anti-trust laws and the Federal Trade Commission in connection with government war contracts.

This would permit the monopolies to violate the anti-trust laws with the authority and approval of the government itself.

The measure approved by Congress is similar to that proposed two weeks ago to the Senate Judiciary Committee by Attorney-General Biddle. Undersecretary of War Patterson also advocated the measure, asserting, according to the N. Y. Times, May 29, "that he strongly favored such legislation in order to give business men specific assurance against anti-trust suits and to enlist them wholeheartedly in the war production drive."

Under the Senate-approved measure, Nelson will be able to give the trusts the right to engage in such monopoly practices as pooling, price-fixing, sales agreements, etc. In this way, the war program is to be used to strengthen the monopolies now and help them to further entrench their rule over the economic and political life of the country for the period after the war.

Several months ago the materials shortage and production lag compelled the government to start anti-trust prosecutions for the release of joint American-Nazi patents. The corporations then began a terrific campaign to force the government to suspend the anti-trust laws. The immediate results of the

campaign were the issuance of consent decrees on the corporations' terms in the anti-trust trials of Standard Oil and Aluminum Company of America.

A request from the War, Navy and Justice departments heads was sent to Roosevelt recommending that anti-trust prosecutions pending or in process should be suspended for the "duration" in cases where these might "interfere with war production."

Roosevelt made public this letter and his reply, approving this policy. He issued an executive order giving the War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission power to halt anti-trust prosecutions, except where the President orders the contrary.

As a result of this order, the War and Navy Departments were able to secure the suspension of the federal anti-trust trial of General Electric for blocking the production of tungsten carbide in conformity with its patents-pool deal with Krupp, the German steel trust.

Because the corporations were afraid that the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice, headed now by Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold, might try to push prosecutions at some future stage of the war or even after the war, the corporations sought specific legislation granting them outright immunity.

## House Votes Dependents Aid Lower Than Relief Standard

### New Bill Would Give Draft Boards Excuse To Cancel All Deferments for Dependency

Paving the way for drafting millions of men with dependent families into the armed forces, the House of Representatives last Monday passed a bill providing barest subsistence allowances for the wives and children of soldiers and sailors. The House bill is a slightly modified version of the one originally passed by the Senate.

This starvation allowance will give local draft boards an excuse for denying deferments on the grounds of dependency. The voracious demands of the war on a world-wide front already have virtually exhausted the supply of young unmarried men without dependents.

The House bill would provide families of fighting men with allowance even lower than the relief granted by many

municipal agencies. It would provide, in this period of high prices, only \$48 per month for a wife; \$62 for a mother and child; and \$10 for each additional child. This is less than the relief allowance of \$77.80 a month provided for a mother and two children by the New York City Welfare Department.

Furthermore, \$22 of this dependents' allowance would be paid not by the government, but out of the wages of the soldiers themselves, thus reducing their meagre pay by almost half!

Dependents other than wives and children, such as parents, brothers and sisters, are to fare even worse. These "secondary" dependents, as they are classed in the bill, are to receive \$5 from the service man's pay, plus the government allowance of \$15 for one parent, \$25 for both parents, and \$5 each for any other dependents, up to a total of \$50 for all dependents.

Thus, the men in the armed forces who are now facing death or preparing for the battle lines are getting an intimation of how a "grateful" capitalist Congress intends to protect their loved ones, and the kind of treatment they themselves can expect to receive when they return home jobless after the war.

At the same time as the House voted on the family allowance measure, the Senate was passing the soldiers and sailors pay increase bill, raising the minimum monthly wages from \$21 and \$30 to the still inadequate \$50 and \$54. Congress passed this measure only after long wrangling and haggling. But it is adding the supremely brazen touch of taking away most of the increases by forcing the service men themselves to foot a large portion of the family allowance bill.

Congress' clear intent in passing the family allowance measure was revealed when the House struck from the Senate version of the bill a clause permitting the President to classify men for deferment on the grounds of occupation, disability and dependency. This is to make certain that the local draft boards will have the power to deny deferment for reasons of dependency.

It is generally recognized that many Congressmen who voted for the family allowances and pay increases might, have opposed even these gestures had this not been an important election year, with most of Congress running for re-election. The trade unions, which have tens of thousands of members in the armed forces, have a responsibility to defend the soldiers' and sailors' interests at home. It is the elementary duty of organized labor to protect the welfare of the families of the men in the armed forces, by demanding that Congress provide these families with allowances sufficient, to enable them to live in health and decency.

Employer resistance to wage increase demands will be a by-product of Washington talk about stabilizing pay scales.

"Official line is hard to follow, industrialists say; there's been no clear anti-wage boost policy laid down. But an employer who wants to put up a fight against increasing wages has at least a left-handed encouragement. It's only a short step to 'unpatriotic' wage increases."

## Bosses Receive Encouragement To Fight Unions

The bosses may criticize the administration for not having gone "far enough" with its "wage stabilization" program, but they are deeply grateful to it just the same.

For as the authoritative Wall Street Journal of May 28 makes clear, it has become one of their chief weapons in opposing the demands of the workers for wage increases to meet price rises of the last year.

Employer resistance to wage increase demands will be a by-product of Washington talk about stabilizing pay scales.

"Official line is hard to follow, industrialists say; there's been no clear anti-wage boost policy laid down. But an employer who wants to put up a fight against increasing wages has at least a left-handed encouragement. It's only a short step to 'unpatriotic' wage increases."



# British Shoot Strikers At U.S. Base In Bahamas

## Natives Killed and Jailed for Trying to Win An Increase In Their 80c-A-Day Wages

A militant strike and sweeping demonstrations by native workers employed on a huge construction project at the American base in the British Bahamas was suppressed last week by British troops after they killed two strikers and wounded scores. More than forty workers were arrested.

The demonstrations started after a reported 1500 native workers struck in protest at the 4 shillings (80 cents) a day wage they are receiving for work on which imported American workers are receiving more than a \$1 an hour.

The killings occurred when the strikers attempted to hold a protest march. This brutal action aroused the strikers and thousands of native sympathizers, who stormed the streets of Nassau in the fashionable ruling class districts, smashing windows and even setting fire to a police station.

British garrison troops were fiercely resisted. About thirty

vailing starvation wages of a few cents an hour maintained by the British rulers. The native workers, however, resented the fact that they were receiving 80 cents a day for work paying American workers more than \$1 an hour.

Since the arrival of the American workers, merchants have jacked up prices sky-high. The native workers, already living at the lowest subsistence level, find their living standards reduced beyond endurance by rising prices.

The wage agreement made by the American government at the insistence of the British, is intended to keep the native workers in the conditions of misery and servitude long imposed by British imperialism. Most of the work on the islands is on the British plantations whose owners fear that if native workers get a taste of the wage scales paid American union workers, they will no longer be willing to slave for a few cents a day.

# Shipyard Local 9 Against Giving Up Overtime Pay Rate

By JAMES DALL

SAN PEDRO, Calif., June 5. — Local 9 of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, CIO, voted almost unanimously last week to reject one of the important proposals made by the Chicago shipyard wage stabilization conference last month and to insist on maintenance of the established overtime pay rates for week-end work.

Delegates to the Chicago conference had returned to Local 9, the only CIO shipyard workers local on the west coast, with proposals that overtime be paid only for the sixth and seventh days of work, and that Saturdays and Sundays when they fall within the 40 hour week be treated the same as week days. The chief supporters for this position were the Stalinists who were booted off the floor after making some super-patriotic speeches.

Many workers stood up to insist that this was the beginning of an attempt to eliminate overtime pay altogether, to point out that the established overtime rates in no way held up production, and to voice the principle of the 40 hour week, for which labor has fought so many bloody battles.

Both the day and night shifts voted with virtual unanimity in favor of the following motion: "The work week shall begin Monday morning at 8 A. M. and shall end Saturday morning at 8 A. M. Work on Saturday shall be paid for at time and a half and on Sunday at the rate of double time."

## REALLY A WAGE CUT

On the chief decision of the Chicago conference — that the union accept an 8% increase in wages when their contract called for a 13% increase to make up for price rises during the last year — a good deal of dissatisfaction was voiced by the members, but no motion was introduced against the conference position.

At both the day and night shift meetings workers took the floor to explain that what they were getting was a real cut in wages, not an increase. Rises in the cost of living had lowered real wages, they pointed out, and the Chicago conference was "stabilizing" their living standards at a lower level than they had last year. There were a number of demands for the retention of the clause in the contract which stipulates further compensation for future rises in the cost of living.

The workers also asked insistently about the Chicago conference decision to "pay the additional 8% of wages in the form of war bonds. Since many workers are dependent on this small sum to meet the pressing needs of the families, this was an important point. But the local delegates hastened to assure them that there was nothing compulsory about it, that it would be a personal matter to be decided voluntarily by each worker.

The members of the AFL boiler makers union, which holds a back-door contract with Califorma Ship, are also greatly discontented with the decision reached at Chicago. The AFL wage scale is not being paid in the shipyards; machinists making \$1.25 or more elsewhere can get only the prevailing shipyard scale of \$1.12. Others crafts such as boiler makers, layout men, electricians, etc., are reduced to the same low level, and there is a general feeling that the union leaders at the Chicago conference "sold out too cheaply."

# Cannon Ends Lectures On History Of Trotskyism

## Plan to Publish the Series In Book Form

James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, last week concluded his series of twelve lectures for the New York School of Social Science on the history and development of the American Trotskyist movement.

As a pioneer Communist and as the recognized outstanding living authority on Trotskyism, Comrade Cannon's lectures aroused great interest and a large attendance.

He traced the early stages of the Trotskyist movement when, as the Communist League of America, it was devoted to propaganda for the Trotskyist position in the Communist International. After Hitler's rise to power in 1933, the Trotskyists began their campaign for a new revolutionary party and international to replace the corrupted and discredited Communist International.

The lectures then described the unification of the Communist League with the leftward moving centrist American Workers Party into the Workers Party; the entry of the Workers Party into the Socialist Party as a crystallizing force for the revolutionary left-wing tendencies in the SP; the expulsion of the revolutionary socialists from the SP and their formation of the present Socialist Workers Party in January 1938.

Because of his personal participation in the activities and events he described, Comrade Cannon was able to enhance his lectures with intimate descriptions of the life of the movement. He analyzed its various phases, the building of its cadres, breaking out of its early position of isolation and its increasing participation in the trade unions and mass organizations of the workers. He gave many searching portrayals of the various personalities which have crossed the path of Trotskyism in the past.

The lectures were recorded verbatim by stenographers. It is planned to publish them in printed form in the near future.



JAMES P. CANNON

tion in the activities and events he described. Comrade Cannon was able to enhance his lectures with intimate descriptions of the life of the movement. He analyzed its various phases, the building of its cadres, breaking out of its early position of isolation and its increasing participation in the trade unions and mass organizations of the workers. He gave many searching portrayals of the various personalities which have crossed the path of Trotskyism in the past.

The lectures were recorded verbatim by stenographers. It is planned to publish them in printed form in the near future.

# New Union Drive Begun At Douglas Plane Plant

LOS ANGELES — With a drive that bids fair to make Los Angeles really a union town, the Aviation Division of the UAW-CIO has opened a sweeping organization campaign at the far-flung plants of the Douglas Aircraft Company. Under a renovated and militant organizing committee, workers at the three local plants are demonstrating their disgust for the company's long-established policies of grand and petty chiselling by flocking into the CIO union.

The drive was launched by the UAW International on the frank recognition that the sub-scale wages of Pacific coast aircraft are having an unhealthy effect on wages at the big midwest plants — like Ford — where a large part of the union's membership is now involved in aircraft production. In charge of the campaign is William Taylor, one of the leaders of the Ford drive last year.

With its machinery geared for action, the union has already begun its assault. Opening shots include the publication of a union paper, *Plane Facts*, which is printed and distributed by tens of thousands and which seems to be well received. In addition, most of the other local CIO unions are being drawn into the drive through a committee of "voluntary organizers," which consists of members of other CIO unions who are talking up the drive and helping sign up Douglas workers.

**COMPANY TACTICS**

The company has answered this opening volley with a couple of peashooter shots that raise doubts about the fabulous anti-union invincibility of Douglas.

First, the company fired the union president, who thereupon started devoting all of his time to organizing the place. Then Douglas issued a statement saying it has asked President Roosevelt for permission to raise wages in its plants.

No statement, however, was issued in connection with the costly Douglas lobby working day and night in Washington, D.

# No-Strike Pledge Debated at Mich. CIO Convention

MUSKEGON, Mich., May 29. — One of the most significant discussions at the Michigan CIO's fifth annual convention, which concluded its three-day of deliberations here yesterday, developed around the union leadership's no-strike policy.

A number of Detroit local union delegates, principally auto union members, openly opposed that section of the leadership's "Michigan CIO Victory Program" which reaffirmed the surrender of labor's most powerful bargaining weapon, the strike. In the end the no-strike position was endorsed by the convention.

## CLIQUE FIGHT

Most of the convention controversies involved a clique fight for control of the state CIO. August Scholle, backed by the national leadership of the auto union and the Stalinists, sought re-election to the state presidency against Andrew Leiper, a Detroit UAW of ficial. Leiper, who had the backing of many militants and dissatisfied elements, polled a vote of 1,132 against Scholle's 2,611. However, Leiper had no basic program different from Scholle's.

The Stalinist delegates, coming mostly from small paper-membership unions, backed Scholle. But since they were excluded from the Scholle slate for vice-presidents, they managed to get some of their people on the Leiper slate, instructing their delegates not to vote for any other candidates. Their unprincipled maneuver to squeeze onto the state executive board was unsuccessful.

## PROTEST JOB JIM CROW

A hot discussion broke out in the convention on the issue of Negro discrimination. Negro delegates took the floor to charge certain leaders with paying mere lip-service to the CIO policy of opposing discrimination in the plants, particularly in the matter of giving Negro workers the right to production jobs.

This seat of the convention, Muskegon, was lambasted because of the Jim Crow policies pursued in the plants here, delegates citing particularly conditions at the Continental Motor plant. A group of Negro delegates dramatized the situation by parading through the convention hall with signs bearing slogans against discriminatory practices.

The issue was greatly clarified when a Negro delegate from a Detroit UAW local pointed out that the employers are responsible for inciting race hatred as a means of dividing the workers.

Despite their program of unconditional support of the administration's war policies the union leaders were compelled to express opposition to the government's job-freezing program. Scholle declared it might tend "toward regimentation" and R. J. Thomas, UAW president, declared the War Manpower Commission's order would permit manufacturers to force workers to remain on low-paying, non-union jobs.

The convention was poorly organized, there being time to vote on only four of the 40 resolutions submitted by the resolutions committee. There were 904 voting delegates, representing 600,000 Michigan CIO members, mainly auto workers.

# Rochester Railroad Council Approves Fight to Free 18

Local 544-CIO of Minneapolis announced last month that support for the 18 leaders of Local 544 and the Socialist Workers Party convicted under the Smith "Gag Act" has been pledged by the powerful Rochester Railroad Council, a delegated council from the 21 railroad unions in the Rochester, N. Y., area.

The Rochester council is one of the many AFL and CIO bodies supporting the 18 defendants. Following is the resolution sent to Local 544 together with a donation for the work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee:

"WHEREAS, the Smith Gag Law, passed in 1940 by Congress, is a direct attack on freedom of speech, the press and labor in general; and

"WHEREAS, 18 leaders of Local 544-CIO of Minneapolis and the Socialist Workers Party have been victims of a vicious frame-up as a result of this law; and

"WHEREAS, these workers are carrying this case to the United States Supreme Court to test the constitutionality of such an anti-labor law; and

"WHEREAS, we recognize this as a general attack on labor and therefore a fight that all labor must rally to;

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Rochester Railroad Council goes on record condemning these convictions of workers under this law, and pledges its aid in helping to fight the case to the Supreme Court."

# For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Living Costs

# Murray-Lewis Conflict

(Continued from page 1)

lowed over charges that Thomas and Reuther of the United Auto Workers had slandered Lewis and the UMW.

Then Michael Quill, Stalinist president of the Transport Workers Union, raided the District 50 offices in New York City with a big squad of henchmen, looking for "dual-unionists." Quill smashed a picture of John L. Lewis for the benefit of press photographers and held a press conference in which he charged Lewis with being "part and parcel of an isolationist plot." (Quill himself, like all Stalinists, was a rabid isolationist during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact.) The Stalinist-controlled New York Industrial Union Council followed up in kind. In every instance the UMW demanded that Murray act to defend Lewis and the miners' union.

On May 9 Murray spoke before the Pennsylvania state CIO convention and complained bitterly about Lewis' activities. Then in a meeting of his own local union of the miners at Cokesburg, Pa. he made a plea for support against attempts to "sabotage me from within and destroy the CIO." Saying that he hoped anyone who started a mess in the miners' union would be driven out of office, Murray added, "I'm going to be president as long as I am elected."

William Mitch, district president of the Alabama UMW, told the miners' district convention: "Some heads of CIO unions are supporting a smear campaign against the UMW and John L. Lewis. For the most part these individuals only became patriotic since Russia was attacked. The campaign is carried on in large measure in the *Daily Worker*. . . There never would have been a CIO except for the UMW and Lewis."

Meantime the Stalinists were busy pouring more oil on the fire. Quill filed formal charges against District 50. Action against Murray was by now under way in the UMW policy committee. A protest was sent in from District 50 locals in Buffalo. Seven more locals in Cleveland followed suit and raised the demand for a new CIO charter in the field covered by District 50.

Lewis suddenly decided to abandon the procedure of formal charges against Murray and summarily removed him from office in the UMW "on constitutional grounds." Murray was in conference with Roosevelt at the time, discussing this among other questions. Martin Wagner cast the lone vote against the approval of Murray's removal.

Lewis had invoked a clause in the UMW constitution which gives the president arbitrary powers, a clause very similar to the provisions Murray had incorporated into the constitution of the steel union a week earlier. Knowing this, it is much easier to understand why Murray said, "I cannot question the authority of the international executive board in these matters."

Van A. Bittner and Patrick Fagan, UMW district presidents in the West Virginia and Pittsburgh areas, failed to sign the resolution summarizing Lewis' views and policies which was adopted by the policy committee. The CIO News declared editorially on June 1: "Officers of the United Mine Workers have found nothing better to do than to stage a lynching bee against the President of the Congress of Industrial Organizations."

**Recalls Lewis' Experience With Green**

This is the second bad experience for Lewis with a man he helped to put into the highest union office.

In June, 1924, Samuel Gompers, the founder of the AFL, was a pall bearer for Terrence V. Powderly, leader of the old Knights of Labor. Gompers was thus symbolically putting the seal on the tomb of this amorphous industrial union which he had helped to crush. Six months later he uttered his last words — reactionary as always — and followed Powderly to the grave. Gompers' mantle was to fall upon the shoulders of William Green, then secretary of the UMW.

Green hesitated to take the post, just as Murray hesitated to replace Lewis as head of the CIO. But in both cases Lewis insisted upon it and personally placed their names in nomination. Both men turned against him. Green broke on the issue of industrial unionism. Lewis had him read out of the miners' union. The whirlpool of events since Lewis broke with Roosevelt has relentlessly drawn Murray into opposition to him. Murray, too, is being "disciplined" by Lewis.

The rise of the industrial union movement brought in its wake a growing demand for independent working class political action. Lewis channeled this sentiment into Labor's Non-Partisan League. Then he put the tendency in reverse by using the LNPL to support Roosevelt in the 1936 election. Lewis at that time called Roosevelt the "greatest humanitarian ever elected to the presidency of the United States." But this beautiful friendship was doomed to be ruptured.

It is said in informed union circles that early in 1940 a conference was held between Lewis, Sidney Hillman, David Dubinsky and Daniel Tobin. At this meeting it was decided to send Lewis over to the White House to take up the question of the coming presidential election. Lewis was to get Roosevelt's promise to veto any anti-labor legislation Congress might pass. In return he was to be supported for a third term.

Roosevelt asked a little time to think it over. He at once called in Hillman, Tobin and Dubinsky. It is said that this was done without Lewis' knowledge, and that thereafter it became increasingly difficult for him to get an appointment at the White House.

**Roosevelt and Labor In War**

Whatever the actual circumstances were, it is certain that Roosevelt was no longer thinking along the lines of the earlier labor policy of the New Deal. War had broken out in Europe. Roosevelt was already preparing for American participation in the unfolding world conflict. He knew that in order to prosecute a war under the capitalist system it was necessary to reduce the standard of living of the masses and to move toward the general regimentation of labor.

Roosevelt considered it imperative that he completely dominate the trade union officialdom. He had to break up any combination of union leaders which might make trouble for him. A first step in this direction was the move to reduce Lewis to a less influential position.

Tobin soon became a member of the White House staff, and for a short time functioned in that capacity as a sort of "trouble-shooter." He is now working overtime trying to keep his union membership employed in the face of the stiff rationing of rubber and gasoline. His income from per capita tax is threatened.

Hillman got a post in the OPM, but after about two years of hatchet-work against the unions his use value to Roosevelt had been virtually exhausted. Hillman's Washington career flamed with less brilliance than the sputter of a wet match, and left a similar odor.

Dubinsky crawled miserably back into the AFL where he can now salve his ego only by continuing to act the petty autocrat over the workers in the ILGWU.

**Lewis and the 1940 Elections**

Lewis decided to fight Roosevelt. But he kept his back turned to the road of independent working class political action. On the eve of the election he came out in support of the Republican candidate, Willkie. This act provoked much bitterness among the pro-Roosevelt workers who had idolized Lewis. It also offended those workers who were more advanced politically, and who had hoped he would call for the formation of a labor party. His stock fell sharply among them as well.

Lewis took a desperate gamble in an all-out attempt to defeat Roosevelt. He said he would consider it a repudiation of his leadership if Willkie was defeated and would therefore resign as president of the CIO. He made good his promise at the 1940 CIO convention. Murray replaced him in office.

Lewis had probably calculated in advance on the use of his trusted lieutenant, Murray, if he lost the bet. He no doubt expected to continue more or less as the actual head of the CIO, with the prospect of an early return to the presidency.

However, events have shown that Lewis' abdication was to put the CIO under the full domination of Roosevelt. Murray is little more than the titular head of the CIO, just as Lewis had planned. But it is Roosevelt, not Lewis, who is the real leader.

The anti-Lewis pressure on Murray began as soon as he took office. Murray was already strongly pro-Roosevelt, which put one strike on Lewis at the outset. The Hillmanites started at once to drive a wedge between Murray and Lewis. The imminence of United States entry into the war helped the process along.

On June 22, 1941 Hitler invaded the Soviet Union and another blow was struck at Lewis. Overnight the Stalinists became rabidly pro-war and pro-Roosevelt. They turned violently upon Lewis, whom they had supported up to that time. From then on they worked day and night to effect a complete break between Lewis and Murray.

Lewis undertook to clean the Stalinists out of such union posts as they held in the UMW. He revoked some local union charters in District 50. One of these actions has just been overruled by a New York court.

Before long Murray began to think about the need to prepare a new base for himself in the CIO. His relations with Lewis were becoming strained. He proceeded to establish his complete dominance over the steel workers union.

However Lewis still held sufficient influence over Murray to secure his resignation from the National Defense Mediation Board during the captive mine strike in the fall of 1941. This act, which blew up that strike-breaking agency, was soon to be nullified by Murray, with Lewis' assistance, when the War Labor Board was created.

Although Lewis had worked hard for months to line up support at the 1941 CIO convention, the miners' delegation was completely isolated at that gathering. Lewis did not attend in person.

Then came Pearl Harbor and the declaration of war. Murray now went all the way over against Lewis. Roosevelt intervened openly to help Murray spike the Lewis unity proposal in January, and from then on the fight was out in the open.

**Political Line of Lewis**

While Lewis has loomed large for the past decade on the trade union scene, there is no evidence to show that he has been or is now following a consistent political line. Lewis, as his whole record shows, is a political adventurer. His method is always to maneuver, and he trusts more to the power of a bureaucratic machine than to any political line.

He transferred the idea of machine control from the UMW into the CIO during its formative stage. Even his closest associates are bound to him only by the ties of personal loyalty and job patronage set in the weak cement of a purely class-collaborationist trade union perspective. There is no firm seal of common belief in great principles to bind them solidly together.

With these loosely organized forces Lewis has essayed many a zig-zag in policy. At every turn of the road he has had defections in his ranks. Lewis has yet to show that he has learned the meaning of these experiences. He just banishes the sinners from the house of their father as an object lesson to the others and proceeds on his way, whatever the direction of travel may be at the moment.

On the political field Lewis attempts to apply the same general idea, shifting his support from one capitalist politician to another as the troubled winds blow him about. He has never found the understanding or the courage to place full confidence in the working class. His current attack on "Communism," although aimed primarily at the Stalinists, has a deeper meaning. It reflects his utter distaste for any form of independent working class political action.

**Policies On the War**

There are some who think that Lewis is motivated in his present conduct by a fundamental opposition to the war. This confusion arises mainly from the fact that his opponents try to make it appear so.

Lewis broke only with Roosevelt in 1940. He did not break with the capitalist system.

He subscribed to a statement criticizing Roosevelt's foreign policy written by the Republican isolationists in August, 1941, which he signed along with Hoover, Landon and a dozen others. The statement called for defense of the Western Hemisphere and aid to Britain, but it opposed aid to the Soviet Union, characterizing the workers' state as "not a democracy."

Lewis is now energetically attempting to assure every one that he supports the war. We will let him state his position for himself as he presented it to the miners' policy committee on June 3:

"In the war labor conference in Washington in December last, I was one of those representatives of labor who voted to accept that contract between the government, industry, and labor which called for the elimination of work stoppages throughout the country, on the basis of the government setting up an agency which would give judicial determination to the ills and grievances of the workers of this country. I was glad to do so. I was glad to make that personal contribution as an official representative of our membership. I like to believe that my presence in that meeting was helpful.

"There is, of course, a question as to what degree the contract has been carried out and to what degree labor has had its grievances judicially determined by that agency. But that question does not affect the principle of cooperation which is involved and does not affect the obligation of every American and every mine worker to try as he can to make the maximum degree of contribution." (Our emphasis.)

**Union Leaders Push Blindly to Split**

As matters now stand the miners are behind in cash per capita tax payments to the CIO and have been declared "delinquent." They may withdraw or be suspended from the CIO. Under the constitution, however, the convention of the CIO is the only body that can suspend or expel an affiliate. The UMW convention will be held in October, about a month before the CIO gathering. It is idle to attempt to predict what will happen before or at these sessions.

John L. Lewis played an important role in the building of the CIO. The miners' union was the main bulwark of this movement during its early struggles for existence. It would be a crime for the miners to be separated now from the CIO.

This could be the beginning of a devastating process of disintegration in the most militant and progressive section of the labor movement. Murray, the Stalinists, Lewis and Hillman, contrary to the general interests of the movement, are all blindly pushing in the direction of this split. The rank and file workers have no interest in supporting it.



## The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

### Union Stands Firm For Negro Rights

The most heartening news in many weeks was the firm stand taken by the United Automobile Workers, CIO, on behalf of the Negro workers in the Dodge Truck plant of the Chrysler Corporation in Detroit.

Twenty Negroes employed in the plant were entitled by the seniority provisions of the contract between the union and the corporation to receive jobs on production work, and at the insistence of the union, they were transferred to production work from the janitor tasks to which the corporation had confined them for so many years.

When these Negro union men went to work on June 2, about 350 white workers raised a protest and started a fight. The plant was shut down for a day.

But to the credit of the union, it stood fast and refused to be intimidated by this group representing only about 10 percent of the workers. Morris Field, assistant director of the union's Chrysler department, said that the Negro workers would have to be accepted. "The UAW and CIO policy calls for equal treatment of all races, and so does the American constitution. The union will abide by that policy."

It is difficult to tell whether these 350 men were acting on their own — that is, acting in line with the vicious racial prejudices they received from capitalist propaganda sources — or whether they were acting in line with a plan worked out by the corporation seeking a pretext not to transfer the Negro workers to production work.

In either case, they were acting against the interests of the working class as a whole and aiding the enemies of working class unity against boss exploitation. In either case, a halt has been put to their scissorbill game by the intelligent stand of the union.

### Let's Not Have Any Illusions

The New Jersey State Legislature has set up a Negro Welfare Commission to investigate acts of discrimination against Negroes. The commission's chairman said last week that the "discrimination of many firms could be attributed to their lack of knowledge of the unlimited number of competent

Negro workers available."

And he added: "The commission hopes to serve as a mediating body, bringing to the attention of employers the vast number of colored men and women who are asking for an opportunity to earn a livelihood." We cite these remarks to show the attitude of these government bodies, many of which seem as much concerned in whitewashing the employers as in securing new jobs for the victims of Jim Crow. Isn't it clear that this commission — which is going to use "reason" and "information" and "mediation" — is not really going to crack down on the employers who practice deliberate discrimination?

A few weeks ago when Governor Edison of New Jersey signed an anti-discrimination bill, this column reminded its readers that Edison, who was making all kinds of flowery speeches at the time he signed the bill, was himself as Secretary of the Navy a few years ago guilty of the kind of discrimination he now professes to deplore.

One reader wrote in to ask us if that was any reason for objecting to the bill itself. We answered him to this effect:

We do not object to these bills. On the contrary, if we had members in the legislature, we would have campaigned and spoken and voted for the bill which embodies an idea which we have always advocated. What we object to is the idea that these bills will solve the problem of the Negro people and that therefore the Negro masses should halt their efforts to organize for the destruction of Jim Crowism. That after all is the motive of most of the boss politicians in passing these bills — they are interested primarily in calming the Negroes and getting them to cease their agitation and struggle. And secondly we object to the hypocritical claims of the politicians when they pass these bills and set up these commissions.

The Negro workers may get some additional thousands of jobs from the passage of this bill — just as it is conceivable that they may get some jobs as the result of this new commission. But the minute they stop fighting for their rights, they'll get nothing and they'll lose what little they may have gained in recent years.

# Economic Crisis Lays Basis For Revolution In Japan

## 'Eight Years of Democracy' Witnessed Radicalization of Masses

By A. ROLAND

The world economic crisis of 1929 struck Japan just one year after the Emperor had graciously permitted all males over twenty-five years of age to vote. Thus the vote was used for the first time just when unemployment hit the Japanese workers as never before in history. The industrial shut-downs added misery on top of what had already become an agrarian catastrophe of tremendous magnitude. It is not difficult to summarize the situation of the peasants in terms of general statistics.

Japan was the last of the great powers to abolish feudalism. Ten years after Russia had decreed the end of serfdom, the Mikado followed suit in 1871. The process of abolition was pretty much the same in both cases. The nobility retained most of the land — the best parts, of course — and gave up a part for government distribution among the freed serfs. Just as in Russia, the landowners were paid enormously inflated sums for the land they had "voluntarily" given up.

Japanese statistics are not very reliable. But they show that today slightly more than half the population still live on farms. The rest of the people work in industry or foreign trade, but in reality some of the industries are very close to agriculture, so that the percentage dependent on agriculture is greater than the figure given. Only (15-17%) land of the area of the Empire proper (the islands of Japan) is arable.

What that means is that a population half that of the United States must obtain its livelihood from a land area half the size of California. No wonder the average size of holding in Japan is under one and a quarter acres. But even this small acreage is not owned by the peasants. In 1929 70% of the peasants were for all practical purposes landless. Of these 30% lived as tenants or sharecroppers. Only 1% of the peasant population owned 25 acres or more. The peasants as a class are sunk in debt to the bankers.

It is clear that in the very best of times, the Japanese peasantry existed not at the subsistence level, but well below that level. The impact of the economic crisis on the agricultural workers and peasants defies the imagination. Millions were reduced to an animal level. The peasants were forced to use up all their reserves, all the seed to be used for the next harvest.

Obviously an agriculture based on the size of holdings of the

Japanese must be a very backward one. Yet nowhere in the world is there so relatively advanced a technology in industry, based on so backward an agrarian economy as in Nippon. This is not to ignore the lack of raw materials for basic industries. But brief as has been the development of Japanese economy, it has reached the stage of monopoly capitalism. In France one speaks of the two hundred families. In the United States we have our sixty families. But in Japan there are the five or six families — the Mitsus, the Mitsubishi, the Sumitomo, the Yasudas and the Okuras. These few families own no less than 60% of the entire national wealth of the country.

### HOW RULERS SEEK TO SOLVE THE CRISIS

Japan came so late upon the scene of capitalist world economy that her development was telescoped. The sicknesses of capitalism in decay were present right at the birth. Fundamentally it is this that produced the explosive violence of Japanese imperialism. Like all imperialism, that of the Rising Sun seeks convulsively to heal its internal wounds abroad.

The dizzy pace of Japan's capitalist-imperialist development may be judged by the history of its Golden Age, the age of bourgeois democracy. Of course a military dictatorship, left over directly from the feudal regime, has existed in Japan ever since the Restoration of 1868. Yet this dictatorship screened itself behind a constitution of sorts. This constitution provided for the gradual spread of democracy, a bourgeois kind of democracy which could never be used against the regime. So in 1928 proletarians voted for the first time. The period of economic crisis had the inevitable consequence of driving the workers and peasants to the left. A Proletarian Party grew up quickly and showed considerable strength, electing some 33 members to the Diet in the last democratic elections permitted.

The whole internal situation became highly charged. It was feared by the ruling military bureaucracy that an explosion might come at any moment. As a matter of fact if an experienced revolutionary party of the working class had existed, the result of the situation would not have been in any doubt. The generals could not have placed any reliance in an army recruited from the peasants for the most part. These peasant soldiers knew conditions at home and were ready to revolt. The Manchurian adventure of 1931 was intended to give the military clique the opportunity to tighten their grip at home as much as abroad. It was to secure "national unity" by the introduction of wartime conditions. Between 1928 and 1936, by the Government's own figures, some 60,000 people were thrown into prison for "dangerous thoughts." The volume of arrests grew after 1936, but no figures have been forthcoming.

### PROMISES TO PEASANTS

The Manchurian adventure was pictured to the peasants as the cure for their landlessness. The rewards of conquest were promised first of all to them. In the absence of any proletarian guidance, the peasantry thought imperialism might really be the way out. But this did not last very long. It did not take many years for the peasants to have visual proof that the only ones to bene-

fit were the capitalists and the war-lords. The speech of one of the petty officers to a crowd on the streets of Tokyo during the revolt of 1936 shows this clearly.

The revolt occurred as a regiment was about to be entrained for service in Manchuria. The soldiers barricaded themselves and attacked various points. The petty officer, one of the leaders, said: "Why should we fight in Manchuria to protect the interests of the capitalists — the Mitsus, the Kawasakis, the Morimuras and the others?" Then he added: "Manchuria was all right in the beginning but now it is the hunting ground of the capitalists who are exploiting it for their own profit."

The revolt has been pictured as a fascist revolt against democracy. But whenever any uprising takes place which has no clear goal because it is leaderless and without any defined program, its result is speedy reaction. The army used the revolt, fomented in part by reactionary "younger officers," to put an end to all democracy. Thus democracy lasted in Japan just eight years! The military dictatorship threw off the screen of parliamentary pre-

fit were the capitalists and the war-lords. The speech of one of the petty officers to a crowd on the streets of Tokyo during the revolt of 1936 shows this clearly.

The revolt occurred as a regiment was about to be entrained for service in Manchuria. The soldiers barricaded themselves and attacked various points. The petty officer, one of the leaders, said: "Why should we fight in Manchuria to protect the interests of the capitalists — the Mitsus, the Kawasakis, the Morimuras and the others?" Then he added: "Manchuria was all right in the beginning but now it is the hunting ground of the capitalists who are exploiting it for their own profit."

### 8 YEARS OF DEMOCRACY

The revolt has been pictured as a fascist revolt against democracy. But whenever any uprising takes place which has no clear goal because it is leaderless and without any defined program, its result is speedy reaction. The army used the revolt, fomented in part by reactionary "younger officers," to put an end to all democracy. Thus democracy lasted in Japan just eight years! The military dictatorship threw off the screen of parliamentary pre-

tense and took direct power. This was a preventive measure to head off revolution. It does not resemble fascism in the Italian or German sense, in the sense in which the middle class helps to establish a fascist regime for capitalism after the failure or defeat of a proletarian revolution.

The military dictatorship naturally solved nothing in the crisis of Japanese economy. If anything, it aggravated the situation in the extreme, since the standards of living of the masses were still further lowered. The only "solution" for the military minds was a new act of desperation in the second World War. The generals gambled on an Axis victory. The likelihood is that the gamble will fail. If so, the world will see the final collapse of semi-feudal Japan. Japan today resembles nothing so much as the Russia of the Czars. Defeat in the war would lead inevitably to the same situation as Russia in 1917. The Japanese proletariat will then have the opportunity to take power and solve the problems of Japanese economy in the only possible manner — by giving the peasants the land, and by leading the way towards socialism.

## Labor Freezing Program Threatens Regimentation

### McNutt's Order Forbids Workers to Change Jobs Without Sanction of the Government

Regimentation of the workers and forced labor are clearly foreshadowed in the War Manpower Commission's proposed order last week dealing with the freezing of war industry workers to their present jobs.

The order was implemented by a "work or fight" mandate, issued by Commission chairman Paul McNutt, who declared

that workers who refuse to accept jobs offered them by the United States Employment Service will be reported to the Selective Service "for consideration in connection with any request for deferment on occupational grounds" and will be drafted into the army if found physically fit.

Pretext for the order, which has aroused opposition in the ranks of organized labor, is that employers are "pirating" workers from each other with offers of higher pay.

The effect of the order will be to compel workers to continue on low pay and non-union jobs, so that open shop manufacturers will be able to get and keep a labor supply without paying union wage scales or maintaining union conditions.

The job freezing order requires that workers "will be expected to secure any new job requiring a critical skill through the United States Employment Service or in accordance with methods approved by it."

The "work or fight" order will be applied to workers who refuse to accept "suitable employment in a war industry without reasonable cause." This will enable the government to force workers to accept jobs in non-union low-pay plants, or to shift workers from union to non-union jobs.

### PROTESTS

An indication of the anger that has been aroused in labor's ranks by this threatening move toward regimentation, is the strong condemnation of it issued last week by the Washington Press Bureau of the American Federation of Labor.

This declared that "a storm of criticism is brewing in trade union circles against arbitrary and confusing rulings by the War Manpower Commission and other Federal Agencies issued without prior consultation of organized labor."

The "work or fight" ruling, declares the AFL news release, "is equivalent to saying that if a worker doesn't submit to complete regimentation, he will be drafted for armed service."

"Mr. McNutt hastened to remark that this 'pressure' from the Government wouldn't affect the right to strike, but his assurance appeared empty and meaningless."

The great concern caused by the freeze order, even among the union leaders who have been most willing to give up labor's rights, was shown at last week's Michigan State CIO convention. National leaders of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, were among those who charged that the order was a move in the direction of "regimentation."

The choice of McNutt for head of the War Manpower Commission was made with the agree-

## Why U.S. Corporations Do Business With The Nazis

By M. MORRISON

The airing in public of the fact that the heads of some of the most important corporations of this country have had close business and friendly relationships with the heads of the big Nazi firms, up to the very beginning of United States participation in the war and even afterwards, is evidence of the correctness of those who contend that the war is not one for democracy against fascism and certainly presents us with a golden opportunity to press our slogan of expropriation of the big industries and their operation under workers' control.

### ARE THEY TRAITORS TO THEIR CLASS?

At the same time we are presented with this question: How does it happen that persons who are at the head of some of the most powerful industries and are members of the upper rank of the class in whose interest this war is being fought should pursue policies which are obviously advantageous to the rival German capitalist group? A mechanical approach to this question would lead one to conclude that these industrial barons are traitors to their class in the sense that they prefer a victory of Hitler and German imperialism rather than a victory of their own national capitalist group. That conclusion is incredible and therefore unacceptable.

The business dealings between Standard Oil of New Jersey, duPont and other American firms with Nazi business organizations do of course show that the big business people have nothing against the fascists as such and proves, at the very least, that as a class the big capitalists are not supporting this war because they believe that it is a war against fascism. The chiefs of Standard Oil and of Alcoa are the same type of people as the chiefs of Farbenindustrie. In general they have the same ideas and the same social outlook. All of them want a world where they rule and exploit labor. They will go the limit to help one another against any attempt by workers anywhere to rid themselves of exploitation.

### THE BASIC MOTIVE

But it must be taken for granted, that although not interested in defeating fascism, the American capitalists, including those who have been working with the German capitalists, are interested in defeating expanding German imperialism constituting a serious danger to the interests of the American capitalists. The explanation for the willingness of some American capitalists to do business with the Nazi industrialists lies in the fact that every capitalist is primarily interested in his own profits. His profits and not the abstract general interests of his class constitute the motive force of all his actions and dealings.

In general those sections of the capitalist class who had profitable connections with German industry or who were least endangered by the actual or potential competition of German business firms were most lukewarm for war; while the big eastern banking interests and the capitalists who felt German competition in Latin America or else-

where were the most ardent supporters of Roosevelt's foreign policy. There may be individual exceptions here and there but in general the sections of the capitalist class who stood to lose most in the immediate future, if German imperialism were victorious, were and are the most belligerent.

There is far more unanimity among the American capitalists in the struggle against Japanese imperialism because on the surface the Japanese capitalists, determined to expand in Asia and the Southwestern Pacific, appear more dangerous than the German capitalists.

### WHY THEY SOLD SCRAP IRON TO JAPAN

In spite of the fact, however, that a war between Japan and the United States was considered inevitable by almost every important and influential commentator and political figure, the American capitalists kept on selling scrap iron and oil to Japan, thus enabling it to prepare more adequately for the inevitable conflict. The profits derived from such sales was too tempting for these capitalists to consider the future interests of the capitalist class as a whole.

Only the government, representing the interests of the capitalist class as a whole, will act, when necessary, in the general interests of the class even though the immediate interests of some individual capitalists may suffer thereby. But even the government acts only as a last resort. The pressure exerted on it by groups who stand to lose their profits interferes with necessary decisive action until the time arrives when postponing such action threatens the vital interests of the capitalist class as a whole.

### ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

It was only after Pearl Harbor that the Roosevelt administration began seriously to convert the automobile industry to production of armament material. The rubber barons were unwilling to permit large quantities of rubber to be accumulated in the United States lest such an accumulation interfere with the price structure and consequently with their profits. Every capitalist looks out for his own interests and the government delays action because of the resistance of those capitalists whose immediate interests have to suffer.

Naturally all those who are defending the interests of the present social order try to make masses believe that some defect in the character of a particular capitalist is to be blamed for his opposition or indifference to the needs of the war program. Our task is to show that the capitalist acts as he does because he is interested in his profits and he will forego profits even during a war fought for his class interests only when compelled to do so.

No matter what a worker thinks about this war, it is necessary that he join in the struggle to take away the important industries from the capitalists and operate them under workers' control. From any and all viewpoints such a step would aid tremendously in the struggle against fascism.

## March-on-Washington Group Calls Anti-Jim Crow Rallies

(Continued from page 1)

tices of racial discrimination in employment. Absolute equality for Negroes in all branches and in all offices of the armed forces and federal departments — an end to the practices of segregation which are based on racial discrimination.

An end to the brutal shooting and killing of Negroes in the armed forces by M. P.'s and civilian police.

The discontinuation of Negro blood segregation by the Red Cross.

The elimination of all discriminatory practices in jobs, housing, politics, government boards, etc.

The freedom of Odell Waller, Negro sharecropper who is sentenced to die on June 19 for the self-defense slaying of his landlord, and who was denied trial by a jury of his peers because of the Virginia poll tax which not only keeps Negroes and poor whites from voting but also denies them the right to serve on juries.

### PACK THE GARDEN!

The Negro people of New York will turn out in great numbers on June 16 because these demands are their demands, because these demands express the aspirations of all who suffer from Jim Crowism. Every militant Negro will do all in his power to pack the Garden and fill the streets outside for blocks around — for here is an opportunity to give mass expression to the indignation of the Negro people at the discriminatory policies which continue full blast in the midst of a war loudly dedicated to democracy.

But class-conscious Negro workers, who went through the experience of the March-on-Washington movement a year ago, are not going to suffer from the illusion that merely a large turnout at the Garden is going to solve their problems. They want to demonstrate against Jim Crowism, and they are in the fore-

front of the fight to organize such demonstrations — but they know that expressions of indignation alone are not enough, they know that while such expressions of indignation may win a few small concessions, a real fight against the Jim Crow employers and government officials is necessary if genuine equality for the Negro people is to be achieved.

### WILL LISTEN CAREFULLY

That is why the militant Negroes who are helping to build up this June 16 demonstration are going to listen very carefully to the speech A. Philip Randolph will make that night. They are going to listen carefully for two reasons:

1. They have not forgotten Randolph's behavior last year

### A NEW PAMPHLET

## THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON - One Year After

by ALBERT PARKER

An attractive 16 page pamphlet of the Fourth International article of which George S. Schuyler, noted Negro columnist, said in the May 30 Pittsburgh Courier: "Best critique of Randolph's March-on-Washington movement . . . The caustic comments of the author, Albert Parker, and his sound logic should provoke considerable thought in colored America about the eminent labor leader and Spingarn Medalist."

Price: 3 cents per copy; 2 cents per copy plus cost of postage for bundles of 5 or more.

Order from:

Pioneer Publishers  
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE  
NEW YORK

when he succumbed to government pressure and called off the March-on-Washington without consulting the rank and file of the movement and against their wishes.

2. They have learned that the Negro struggle needs more than a list of demands to be successful, that it requires A PROGRAM.

Randolph raises correct demands and makes militant speeches — in fact, he sounds like a radical when you compare his statements with those of the Stalinist-controlled National Negro Congress — but in none of his statements does he indicate a program for achieving the demands he raises.

Last year when Randolph was starting the March-on-Washington movement, he warned that the Negro people could no longer make any advances by gab-fests with government officials. "Evidently," he said then, "the regular, normal and respectable method of conferences and petitions, while proper and ought to be continued as conditions warrant, certainly don't work. They don't do the job." And: "Power and pressure do not reside in the few, the intelligentsia, they lie in and flow from the masses." That was why it was necessary, he said, to organize the March-on-Washington movement to get the masses together for the kind of militant action which would make the Jim Crow forces quake in their boots.

A whole year has passed, and Randolph himself admits that the conditions of the Negro people have not improved materially. What does he propose now? Mass meetings for one thing. Mass meetings are necessary, but not even Randolph will dare to pretend they are sufficient. Besides the holding of meetings, Randolph has advocated only one thing: the necessity for "free, independent and courageous Negro leaders to have a frank, candid and plain talk with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt about

## WORKERS' FORUM

### "Nothing Short of Right Is Right"

Editor:

The condition of the native Negro residents of this unit of a large and holy arsenal of Democracy, San Diego, which maintains loudly — as others of its sister units of said arsenal — high sounding ideals about spreading freedom throughout the rest of the world, remains virtually the same as of yore.

We who have resided in this fair and moral city, sharing its burdensome taxes, are in spite of the all-out effort toward spreading light and cheer throughout the world via the bayonet (perhaps gas) left out in the cold.

Of all the jobs dished out in the Consolidated Aircraft Company, ours are strictly menial. Indeed it was only recently that we were admitted within its sacred portals at all. This villainous behavior is brazenly carried out beneath a huge-painted slogan which reads: "Nothing short of right is right." This slogan covers more than a block. In all

other industries the conditions are substantially the same.

The above description is typical of the entire nation despite the insincere speeches of the great white father in Washington, made only when seeking votes or to stop a march on the capital.

The Negro press has not been silent to these abuses, however, hence it is being subjected to criticism by the bosses, through that father of all reactionaries, Westbrook Pegler. In my opinion, this is only the spearhead of a coming all-out attack, soon to come, to crush all Negro papers into silence. But I am certain it will fail in its purpose to crush the growing wrath and militancy of the Negroes, rather it will increase it.

A BLACK BOLSHEVIST,  
San Diego, Calif.

Join the Socialist  
Workers Party

### A CORRECTION

One writer in last week's issue of THE MILITANT mistakenly referred to the Workers International League of England as an affiliate of the Fourth International. This is not the case, although the WIL and its newspaper, "Socialist Appeal", are supporters of the program of the Fourth International.

### Trotsky's Last Work

MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL on the IMPERIALIST WAR and the PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

48 pages 5 cents per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
116 University Place  
New York City



## THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the  
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 24 Saturday, June 13, 1942

Published Weekly by  
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8647

Editor:  
GEORGE BREITMAN

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

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

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

### JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

## The Budd Strike And The Government

The administration claims it is anxious to prevent strikes.

How the government is going about "preventing" strikes is shown in the case of the Philadelphia Budd plant strike.

The Budd workers have been subjected to unendurable conditions. Their wages are the lowest in the industry. They have no seniority rights, and no grievance machinery. The Budd management maintains a company union in defiance of a ruling by the NLRB.

The Budd workers were finally driven to strike by the provocations of the company, whose thugs violently ejected from the plant and locked out a group of welders who dared to protest a 25 cent an hour wage cut.

This strike could have been settled in a minute by the government. The workers only wanted the company to abide by the federal labor laws. But the government did not enforce its own laws.

Instead, in the very midst of the strike and while the company was using every vicious device to break the strike, the Navy Department ostentatiously announced that it was granting Budd a contract for 900 cargo planes to be built in a new government-financed \$12,000,000 plant.

This is how the administration upholds the labor laws and treats corporation violators of those laws. This is how the government prevents strikes.

## Louder Than Words

The liberal press has been loud in its praises of the "radical" Vice-President Henry Wallace and the conservative Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles for speeches they made last month on the war aims of the United Nations.

But despite the furore the liberals are trying to raise in behalf of these speeches, neither the real masters nor the working masses of the United Nations have become very much excited about these speeches in which Wallace said that "The object of this war is to make sure that everybody in the world has the privilege of drinking a quart of milk a day" and in which Welles declared that "Discrimination based on race, color or creed must be abolished."

The ruling classes of the United States and Great Britain don't mind speeches of this kind once in a while because they help to inspire some people to greater support of the war and because they are useful as window dressing in covering up the real intentions of the powers-that-be. A liberal speech now and then doesn't bother the reactionary ruling classes because they know that they—not liberal speeches—will determine the policies of the world after the war.

As for the oppressed masses, they didn't have time to digest the generalities of the speeches before certain events took place which speak louder than words.

Before Wallace's speech had even been printed in full, the Dutch police fired on May 25 into a peaceful demonstration of Chinese sailors employed on Royal Dutch Shell tankers in the Netherlands West Indies, killed 18 and wounded 54. The

Chinese sailors were demonstrating for war-risk insurance and wage increases that would enable them to drink a little of that quart of milk of which Wallace spoke.

A few days later, on June 1, British troops fired into a demonstration of native workers employed in constructing a United States base in the British West Indies, killed two, wounded scores, arrested 40 and smashed the strike. All that the Negro strikers and their sympathizers were asking was raises from the 80 cent a day wages that prevent them from purchasing sufficient bread to exist on, let alone milk.

And three days after this, a steamship company guard shot and seriously wounded two Chinese seamen and with the aid of a police emergency squad drove 23 other members of a freighter crew back to their ship at Pouch Terminal, Staten Island, New York. The "crime" of these Chinese sailors was that they wanted to go ashore and stretch their legs on land between their dangerous trips asea—a violation of the United States Exclusion Act of 1924. Their "crime" was that they thought Welles' talk about abolishing racial discrimination was a good idea.

In other words, if the masses don't get excited about such speeches, it is because bullets speak louder than words.

## Lord Halifax Helps Hitler

Lord Halifax, British ambassador to the United States, declared in a speech at Syracuse University last Monday that the peace terms to be imposed on a defeated Germany after this war will be harsher than those of the Versailles Treaty.

What were the conditions imposed on Germany by the Versailles Treaty?

They included the post-war blockade which starved and stunted a whole generation of the German people.

They included the Franco-Belgian military occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. The terrorism and brutality that accompanied that invasion, the shooting of hostages, the raping and looting, have left their scars on the minds of the German people to this day. And they have not forgotten how that occupation paralyzed the whole of German economic life.

Versailles meant robbing the milk from the German children, and the bread from their parents. It meant nurturing the weeds of national hatreds which have spread and poisoned the peace of the world.

The Versailles Treaty meant the Balkanization of Europe, the dismemberment of Austria and Hungary, and the new oppression of national minorities. It prevented a customs union between Austria, Hungary and Germany, thereby maintaining barriers to trade which wrought economic ruin.

And Versailles recalls the threats of the Allied Supreme Council to cut off all food supplies from Germany if the masses attempted to abolish capitalism and unite with the Soviet Union for the socialist reconstruction of Europe.

In short, the Versailles Treaty strengthened the conditions in Germany and Europe which enabled Hitler to rise to power and which guaranteed the second world war.

The new and harsher Versailles peace promised by Halifax can only lead to another world war after this, and still another, until all civilization is reduced to dust and ashes.

Such threats of a harsher Versailles only strengthen the hand of Hitler. His chief weapon is the masses' fear of another Versailles. It is the major theme of Goebbels' propaganda. Halifax's threat of another Versailles helps only to drive the German masses closer to Hitler for it appears to them that a German defeat means another Versailles and that a German victory is the only way to avoid another Versailles.

Halifax's statement is worth 20 divisions to Hitler. It confirms Hitler's claims and Goebbels' propaganda in the eyes of the German people. It delays the revolutionary overthrow of Hitler and the Nazi system. It serves Hitler's interests, not the interests of a genuine struggle to destroy fascism.

## Farish's Oath

W. S. Farish, president of Standard Oil of New Jersey, sought last week to defend his connections with the Standard-Nazi I. G. Farbenindustrie cartel agreement, by declaring: "I swear under oath that I have never received any compensation or recompense from any outside source whatsoever, including the Germans."

Let's see. Farish gets his rake-off from Standard Oil, including an annual six-figure salary, huge bonuses and large blocks of shares.

But where does Standard get its money from? Part of it, at any rate, has come from the Nazi deals, which helped to strengthen Standard's world monopoly and increase its monumental profits.

Thus, even if I. G. Farben didn't slip Farish a bank-roll under a table, he did receive compensation and recompense out of the profits made from the Nazi deals by Standard Oil.

## 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

# Favoritism And Caste Dominate Armed Forces

## Restrictions Ban Democratic Relations Between Officers And Ranks; Congressmen Grumble About 'National Scandal'

By DAVID WARNER

Every soldier and sailor is thoroughly aware of the undemocratic character of the army and navy, the rigid caste system under which the rank and file are treated not only as inferiors on the military plane, but also on the social.

In former years, it was sufficient that the enlisted man learn this hard fact and not think of himself as an equal to his officer. Today however, with the

tremendously enlarged army playing a far more important role in the life of the country than ever before, any socially ambitious society hostess must also learn that the army does not have the common democratic standards that are supposed to prevail in civilian life.

Barbara Wright, society editor for the *Detroit News*, devoted her entire column of Feb. 15, 1942, to tipping off her readers on the proper procedure when entertaining army men. The column is entitled, "Tips To Officer's Bride on Army Social Code."

Miss Wright starts right off by warning those of her readers who may still think that the army is a democratic institution that the "first and strictest rule of army etiquette—it has no exceptions—is the ban against inviting commissioned officers and enlisted men to the same gathering. They never meet socially, either at an army camp or in civilian life when home on leave. Neither do their wives."

### A SERIOUS FAUX PAS

Fearing perhaps that she did not make the point strong enough, Miss Wright elaborated a bit: "So you would be committing a serious faux pas if you invited, say a young captain and a corporal of your acquaintance to the same dinner party. It would prove intensely embarrassing to both men, as the captain would feel obligated to leave or violate military discipline if the corporal was in the house when he arrived and the same would go for the corporal."

### SELECTION OF OFFICERS

The whole procedure of selecting the officer caste is one which makes it almost impossible for a worker to become an officer. Special precautions are taken, as we will show, to insure that no militant trade unionist ever receives a commission or training for a commission.

The simplest method for the army bureaucracy is that of arbitrarily handing out officer's commissions to those citizens whose "achievement and abilities" in civilian life "qualify"

them for "leadership."

The only trouble with this method is that at times it becomes a little too raw for the public to stomach. Protests against rampant "favoritism and discrimination"—to use the very mildest terms—have become so widespread that even Congressmen have been forced to register their objection.

### "NATIONAL SCANDAL"

The *N. Y. World-Telegram* of May 2 reported in its nationally syndicated column, "Heard in Washington":

"If the army and navy—or their Commander-in-Chief—don't stop the commissioning of new officers with no military training, Congress may."

"Private House and Senate disapproval goes far beyond published remarks. Members mutter about 'national scandal.'"

"They say: That sons of wealthy and prominent families find it easier to get bars and epaulettes than others do."

We can only guess at the actual number of scandals that have occurred. What drives the Washington politicians to mutter their objections is more than anything else the fear that some of these scandals may see the light of day and cause a real outburst of public protest.

Nevertheless, this classic method of recruiting officers remains in force today and insures that large numbers of the officers will continue to come from the ranks of the anti-labor employers and reactionary sections of the population generally.

Next week, we will discuss the officer's training schools, the most important medium for selecting officers, and see how candidates are chosen for these schools.

# British Government To Control Coal Industry

## But Labor Protests Because Mines Would Still Be Run In Interests of the Bosses

In an effort to halt the wide-spread strike wave throughout the coal mining areas of England, Scotland and Wales, the Churchill government has announced a plan for the operation of the mines and allocation of coal supplies under the control of the government.

The plan, contained in a so-called White Paper, has been called "nationalization" by the government and the capitalist press. It has the universal endorsement of the mine operators and the conservatives; but is heartily condemned by the coal miners, mine union leaders and almost all sections of the trade union and socialist movements in England.

A new Ministry of Fuel, Light and Power has been set up, headed by the conservative Major Gwilym Lloyd George, son of the reactionary prime minister of the last war. Operation of the mines will be under the control of this ministry, aided by a National Coal Board, composed of mine managers, technicians, coal distributors, mine owners, government officials, and a small minority representing the mine workers.

### BOSSSES PROTECTED

According to David Anderson's London dispatch to the *N. Y. Times*, June 3, the "management will be left in the hands of the present pit managers who will continue to serve the owners though they now are subject to removal by the government. There will be no fundamental alteration of the financial structure of the mining industry."

The full ownership of the mines will remain in the hands of the private mine operators who will receive £66,450,000 (\$267,800,000) from the government as compensation for the use of the mines. The arrangement will last only during the war, after which the mines will once more be operated under private control.

Significantly, the new Board will have no power to determine wages and working conditions, it has been announced by the government. No formal set-up has yet been announced to deal with the issue of the scandalously low mine wages which are chiefly responsible for the continuing strikes. 15,000 miners were conservatively estimated to be out last week at the time of the announcement of the "nationalization" plan. Britain's 700,000 miners have long been demanding a minimum wage of 4 pounds, five shillings (\$17) a week, a meagre

increase of approximately a dollar a week. One strike after another has hit the coal mining areas of Britain in the past months. Miners have left the pits by the thousands, either to join the armed forces or get better paying jobs in other war industries. This has contributed to an extreme coal shortage in Britain, which the government is trying to overcome by taking over control of the mine operations, including control and regulation of the labor supply.

A contributing factor to the intense dissatisfaction and unrest among the miners, is that some 36,000 of them are workers who during the past six months have been transferred to the mines from other industries at a great loss in wages.

The immediate reaction to the plan is reported in a special London dispatch to the *N. Y. Times*, June 5. "The nationalization plan, however, is meeting much criticism. The Socialists wanted outright nationalization and the Liberals seemed to want a plan nearer socialism than that the government formulated. The Conservatives are pleased."

So long as the ownership of the mines remains in the hands of the private operators, the miners realize that genuine nationalization has not been achieved. They are demanding a system of common ownership.

And so long as the control of the mines remains in the hands of government officials representing the interests of the mine owners, the grievances of the mine workers will remain as acute as ever.

The solution of the mine workers' problems lies now, as before, in a struggle for governmental expropriation of the mines and their operation by committees democratically elected by the workers.

## Spills Beans On Profits

The May issue of *Associated News* features an article, "We Came, We Saw and We Did Not Concur," a report of hearings before the three-member panel of the War Labor Board on the demands of the Western Electric Employees Association, an independent union of the workers in the Kearny, N. J., Western Electric Company.

One interesting aspect of the hearings was the presentation by the union of two letters written by a former president of Western Electric. The first letter read: "The Western Electric Company is making too much money, and at the present time it would be enormously harmful to that company and to our general interests if it were known what its profits were. I trust that there will be no information given

until matters are in better shape. I think it well for you to destroy this letter."

And the other letter, to a Western Electric stockholder:

"There are various reasons why it is advisable for the Company to make this change. One is that the taxation situation in Illinois is getting to be almost impossible. The laws are not clear and the application of them takes the form of legalized blackmail, particularly on the larger taxpayers. This law in the State of New York under which we propose to incorporate seems to be admirably suited for our purpose. We have waited for some time to capitalize our surplus but have wanted to avoid the publicity of 'melon cutting.' For obvious reasons, we want as little publicity to this proposition as possible, either before or after the event."

## ROOSEVELT'S METHODS, BROWDER AND BRIDGES

By M. STEIN

The President's action in releasing Browder and Biddle's action in ordering the deportation of Bridges, which came twelve days later, are not a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. Quite the contrary, both these actions are part of one pattern, part of a political method which has become identified with Roosevelt ever since he became President, and which, one must admit, he has used very skillfully. Let us try to trace this method in the sequence of the two events.

Browder was released from the federal penitentiary at Atlanta on May 16, when the President commuted his sentence to the time already served. The White House statement on the commutation released the same day expressed the President's belief that it "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."

Could anyone conceive of a more generous act? Here you have the President, who is engaged up to his ears in the conduct of the war for "survival" of the nation which pays his salary, and who gives what's left of his free time to the "United Nations," nevertheless finding time to take cognizance of Browder and to right a wrong done him.

Is it any wonder that the Stalinists were jubilant? The Stalinists were jubilant not only because they got Browder back, but because the President's statement took them into account as a factor in the "national unity." If you go all-out to serve and please a master, as the Stalinists have done, a word of recognition from the master goes further sometimes than a tip.

The liberals too were jubilant. They like to paint the President in their own image and to endow him with their own ideals of pure democracy where justice is truly even handed. When the facts of life argue against them, they either ignore them or absolve the President of responsibility by pointing an accusing finger at a Biddle or a Hull or whatever departmental head may serve as the most convenient scapegoat at the moment. But when Roosevelt smiles in the direction of the liberals, when he throws a bone to the left, that's something to talk about, that vindicates their loyalty to him, their worship of him.

This is what we mean by the Roosevelt political method, or at least this is part of it—the smile in the liberal direction, the throwing of the bone to the left, not too often of course, but often enough to give the liberals and now the Stalinists above all something to feel happy about so that they can go around and whisper about how Roosevelt is really their man, how he is putting it over on the capitalist class.

The capitalist press which, "national unity" or no "national unity," guards the interests of the ruling class like a vicious watchdog, came out barking and howling against the release of Browder. They didn't really expect that Browder would be put back in jail and they didn't care. They did not propose it. But the opposition of the capitalist press even to the slightest bow that the President makes in a left direction, is something he knows about in advance, counts on and uses to serve his purposes.

The opposition of the capitalist press increases the President's popularity with workers. The labor bureaucrats, the liberals, the Stalinists cover before the bark of the press and the howl of the congressmen, they turn pleading eyes in the direction of the President in a sort of mute appeal. This is generally the psychological moment when Congress will pass some vicious anti-labor legislation, or when the President will impose some "voluntary" sacrifice on the workers, or when a Biddle will come forth with a deportation order.

The order to deport Bridges came May 28, twelve days after the release of Browder. Biddle might say it was a mere coincidence, just as he said that the "sedition" indictment of Minneapolis Local 544 and Socialist Workers Party leaders, at a time when Tobin unleashed a program against Local 544, was a mere coincidence. We cannot help but see the Roosevelt pattern in the case of Bridges, as we saw it in the Minneapolis case.

It is immaterial whether the decision to deport Bridges was held in abeyance until Browder was released in order to soften the subsequent blow, or whether the order for the deportation of Bridges was intended to take the scare off those sections of the ruling class who could still be scared by the Browder release.

The important thing is that in the so-called concession in the release of Browder, Roosevelt was not giving away anything that came off the capitalist hide. The White House statement emphasized this point when it said: "The President believes that the principle of obedience to law has been sufficiently vindicated by the punishment already suffered by Browder. . . . In the case of Bridges, however, despite the part he is playing in speeding up the workers and in stifling union militancy, the working class was dealt a severe blow. The capitalist class, on the other hand, was given an added weapon, a new club with which to smash away at those who dare to stand up and fight for the interests of labor."

The release of Browder did not violate the "principle of obedience to law"; the Biddle ruling extended this "principle" further and covered new ground in it.

The Roosevelt method therefore gives the impression of conceding something to the working class without giving anything in reality. While the toasts are drunk to the graciousness of the President in liberal and Stalinist circles, while the press and ultra-reactionary Congressmen bark at the generosity of the President, that's the time to deliver a vicious blow at labor, that's the perfect setting for a Biddle deportation order or for a Smith Gag Law.

### Against Governmental Moves

### To Freeze Wages!