

TAX BILL SOAKS MASSES, SPARES RICH

British Defeats In North Africa

By Art Preis

The fall of Tobruk and the rapid Nazi advance into Egypt have aggravated Britain's chronic political crisis. Churchill has returned in haste to England, forced once more to personally defend his leadership and to explain away the latest British defeats.

As usual, there will be talk of transport and supply difficulties, the problem of holding vast areas with small forces, the errors of the military command.

All these factors have played their part in the latest, as in the preceding defeats. If this war has proved anything at all, it is the ineptness of the Old School Tie military leaders of Britain. From the fall of Hong Kong, to the debacles in Malaya, Singapore and Burma, the British imperial leaders have demonstrated incompetence and stupidity in the technical arts of war.

But their excuses, as well as their self-criticisms and recrimination, ignore a decisive fact about the British defeats — the utter inability of the British ruling class to mobilize the subject peoples of its own colonies to fight on behalf of Britain, and the resistance on the part of the British rulers themselves to permitting arms and the means of self-defense to the colonial peoples.

The truth is — as all the world now knows — the crimes of British imperialism are coming home to roost. That is the case in Egypt and the Middle East, as it is in India, and as it was in Malaya and Burma.

Natives Play "A Minor Role"

"Again the British — and the United Nations — find themselves as foreigners defending a foreign land against foreign invaders. And again the native populations — as in the Battle of Malaya and the battle for the Dutch Indies — are playing a minor role in what primarily should have been their battle," writes Victor Bernstein in the June 26 PM.

In Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Palestine and Transjordan there are some 50,000,000 people. An army of millions would spring from them, if they felt they had anything to fight for on the side of British imperialism. Instead, the small British forces find themselves swimming in a sea of hate. To the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of the Middle East, the armies of British rule are not saviors and defenders of the "four freedoms," but the military whip of an accursed oppressor.

Thus, with concern and trepidation, PM admits that General Auchinleck, the British Commander in the Middle East, "has no real friends behind him except a few mercenaries and the small island of Palestine Jews — 550,000 — who almost alone, in all the land between the Egyptian border and Damascus and beyond are all-out against the Axis."

True to its traditional policy, the British ruling class hesitates to arm even its "ally," the Palestinian Jews. Though faced with wholesale massacre should the Nazis breach the Suez barrier, the Jewish settlers are denied the right to arm themselves. They can only join the regular British forces, where they are subject to being sent to India or elsewhere to uphold British rule among other colonial peoples. Even if the British rulers do not fear in itself the arming of the Jewish people, they prohibit it because to give one group of colonial subjects the right to bear arms, while denying this right to all others, would create a tremendous furore throughout Britain's colonies.

They Dare Not Call On the Natives

There are 16,500,000 people in Egypt, but they have no part in fighting the Nazis. "Britishers, South Africans, Indians and Jews are defending Egypt, but not Egyptians. The British have announced they will not call for help from King Farouk's Army," PM reports sadly.

What a commentary on British imperialism's war for "democracy"! Egypt, a formally independent and sovereign country faced with Nazi enslavement, can defend itself only at the gracious will of a "foreigner defending a foreign land."

And why does the hard-pressed British military command deem it unwise to "call for help" from the armed forces of Egypt? Because it looks upon the Egyptian people, on all the semi-colonial and colonial peoples, as mortal enemies, to be feared no less than the Nazi tanks, guns and planes.

This is the decisive fact in the conflict in the Middle and Far East. The British ruling class, which speaks so glibly of defending the "four freedoms," faces with horror the prospect of the colonial peoples fighting for their own freedom with arms in hand. The British fear an armed native populace.

For decades and centuries these oppressed peoples have endured the insolence, indignities, brutality and exploitation of British rule. They have no desire to suffer subjection under the Nazis, Japanese or any other foreign invaders, but they will not lift a finger to aid their present masters. On the contrary, they will use every opportunity and advantage afforded by the difficulties of their British rulers to achieve their own freedom.

And rightly so! The subject peoples of the world cannot expect that they will be granted freedom by their present imperialist masters whose main interest in the war is guaranteeing their control over the colonies. To secure their freedom, they will have to seize it, to protect themselves against Axis invasion, they will have to arm themselves — despite and against their present rulers. And we can be sure that once they have entered on that road of struggle, they will not lay down their arms until all imperialist oppressors — fascist and "democratic" — have been driven from their soil.

NOTE:

For a brief summary of the history of British rule in Egypt which will thoroughly explain the reasons why the Egyptians do not show much concern over the British defeats, see article on Page 4.

Gov't Forces Alien Seamen to Man Death-Ships

Union Men Seized, Made to Sail Rotten Ships at Scab Wages

Seamen who come from the Nazi-occupied European countries with "governments-in-exile" are being compelled to ship aboard old, unsanitary "rustbuckets" at criminally low wages.

U. S. Immigration officials are rounding up such seamen, holding them incommunicado, denying them the right of counsel and appeal, and deporting them to England.

A number of the seamen so deported have wives in this country, but have been virtually shanghaied aboard these dangerous rotting vessels without being permitted to communicate with their families.

The pretext for the acts against these seamen is that there is a shortage of seamen, that they are in this country illegally, and that the only place they can be sent is England, on the grounds that England is the seat of the "governments-in-exile."

Actually, the move is an attempt, by agreement between the American authorities and the various "governments-in-exile," to round up crews at low pay on the flimsy, decrepit tubs out of which the "governments-in-exile" are trying to make profits.

As is well-known, there is no scarcity of seamen — including non-citizens — willing to man seafaring, sanitary ships at decent union wages. But the non-citizens, most of whom were staunch union men back in the countries of their origin, do not want to risk their lives and health on death-ships — and for slave-wages to boot.

Many of these seamen, particularly those from the Scandinavian countries, were sent here originally to man vessels built and commissioned in this country.

Little Steel Can Pay \$1 More, Says WLB Panel

But Does Not Make Recommendation to Grant Wage Increase

A three-man fact-finding panel of the War Labor Board reported on June 29 that the four "Little Steel" companies — Bethlehem, Republic, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, and Inland — "are able to pay the requested wage increase of one dollar a day" which the CIO United Steel Workers have been demanding since last February.

This statement of fact, however, is not a recommendation to the War Labor Board to grant the steel workers' full demands. The final decision of the Board is not dependent on the findings of the panel.

Recent decisions in other wage cases, as well as the opposition of the administration to any general wage increases, indicate that the Board may grant smaller increases than the findings of the government panel itself justify.

The panel, by a two-to-one opinion with the employer member dissenting, also approved the idea of granting the union some form of union security clause. Arthur Meyer, the so-called public representative on the panel, supported the idea of maintenance of membership.

They were stranded here, after they had joined unions and had been replaced by scab crews sent over from their native countries.

The worse case of such deportations happened two weeks ago, when 100 Norwegian, Dutch and Greek seamen were rounded up under armed guard and forced aboard a British ship in New York harbor. Some of them, who had been held at Rikers Island, and had been in touch with a lawyer, were denied the right to speak to him. They had no clothes, no money. Letters they wrote were held until two days after they were at sea.

CRDC TO SUPPORT POSTAL DEFENSE

Will Also Aid Other 544-CIO Leaders Now Under Attack by State and Tobin Forces

NEW YORK, June 30. — The Civil Rights Defense Committee announced this week that it had received a special appeal from Minneapolis Teamsters Local 544-CIO, requesting aid in the defense of executive Board members of the local facing district court charges of embezzlement.

The Executive Board of the CRDC National Committee voted to render every possible aid in the defense of the 544-CIO leaders against the trumped-up state charges.

The most pressing need of the defense, the CRDC stated, was the raising of funds to meet the bail bonds of Kelly Postal, Miles Dunne, Moe Hork and Carl Skoglund, all executive board members of Local 544-CIO. It is also necessary to finance the court costs and legal expenses of the appeal of the conviction of Kelly Postal, 544 Secretary-Treasurer who has been convicted on the embezzlement charges and faces one to five years in prison.

Postal's conviction came after a previous trial had ended in a directed verdict of not guilty. The prosecutors brought Postal to trial on a second charge, almost identical to the first, and based on the same evidence. The judge in the second case practically charged the jury to find Postal guilty.

All the embezzlement charges grew out of the fight of Local 544 for a democratic industrial union, in which the local disaffiliated from the Teamster's International

of Daniel J. Tobin, and joined the CIO. The cases involve the right of a local union leadership, after a vote of the membership, to use its treasury for necessary expenses of the union, and to transfer local union funds to new affiliation.

The piling up of state as well as federal charges, a familiar strategy used to break unions and to intimidate militant leaders, has made it difficult for Local 544-CIO to carry on its fight. The CRDC decision to aid the appeal of the Postal case, and in the defense of other 544 executive Board members, will assure that the fight against these labor frame-ups will be carried to the highest courts.

The district court cases against the Minneapolis teamsters leaders and the conviction of Kelly Postal are a continuation of the government prosecution against 29 leaders of Local 544 and of the Socialist Workers Party, in which 18 militant workers were sentenced to 12 and 16 month prison terms under provisions of the Smith "Gag" Law. The CRDC, organized as the official defense committee of the Minneapolis defendants, is now appealing these convictions to the U. S. Supreme Court.

A minimum of \$1500 is needed to defray the costs of the Postal case and the other state cases against 544. The CRDC has requested all labor and liberal organizations as well as individual friends of labor's rights and civil liberties, to send contributions to the Committee's national office, at 160 Fifth Ave., New York City.

ance of membership, and stated that USWA President Philip Murray has indicated his willingness to accept such a substitute for the genuine union shop. Richard Frankenstein, Labor member of the panel stated in the report his support for a full union shop in Little Steel.

Maintenance of membership is a far cry from the union shop. It does not make membership in the union a condition of employment. It merely requires those who individually express their desire to remain in the union at the time of the signing of the contract to continue in good dues standing with the union for the life of the contract.

The report showed that from the time of the last steel pay increase in April 1941 to March 1942 the cost of living in the steel towns had increased 13.3%. At the same time average weekly earnings had declined "a fraction of 1 per cent."

On the other hand, the profits of Bethlehem in 1942 are expected to be six times more than its yearly average between 1930-1940; Inland, three times more; Republic, 13 times more; and Youngstown, 20 times more.

Henderson Admits Quality Chiselers Boost Real Prices

"Price Control Alone Has Failed to Protect Consumer," He Says

Price Administrator Leon Henderson, in a statement issued June 25, admitted that price control under the General Maximum Price Regulations "will not be fully effective without quality control."

Citing the experiences in Canada, where the price ceiling system has been in effect for some time, Henderson declared that the price regulations are systematically evaded by the manufacturers and merchants because variety and quality in goods and services "are being ruthlessly sacrificed."

"In addition," he stated, "many of the substitutions are hidden and have not been made public. Thus price control alone has failed to protect the consumer interest."

Henderson sought to give assurance that price control would operate differently in the United States. "In this country, however, the consumer has one distinct advantage over the Canadian housewife. Every merchant will have to mark his merchandise with its ceiling price so that she will at least know that the price is not higher than in March."

Henderson had to add, however, "but she still does not know whether the quality of the item is the same."

Actually, the housewife in most instances does not have even the flimsy protection of the posted price ceilings. As David Ginsburg, OPA general counsel, admitted last week, a government survey has disclosed that two-thirds of the merchants are not posting their price lists, and half of the remaining third are posting them improperly.

Moreover, the price control program is toothless, since the administration is depending on the "honesty and patriotism" of the merchants and manufacturers themselves rather than on any enforcement machinery to see to it that the bosses live up to the price regulations. The OPA plans to have only about 3,300 "inspectors" for the whole country — approximately one to a county — to keep tabs on the millions of daily transactions in this country.

Price control will have meaning only when the masses themselves, through committees of their own organizations, determine and regulate prices, police the markets, and establish the standards of goods and services.

WALLER MUST DIE, SAYS VA. GOVERNOR

Negro Leaders Make A Last Appeal for Action by Roosevelt

NEW YORK, July 1. — Governor Darden of Virginia refused last night to halt the execution of Odell Waller, Negro sharecropper who is scheduled to die on the morning of July 2 for having killed his white landlord in self-defense almost two years ago. Darden thus rejected all the appeals for commutation of sentence and executive clemency which have poured into his office from Negro and labor organizations throughout the country.

The poll-tax governor approvingly cited the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals' opinion that Waller had received a "fair and impartial trial." The fact that the sharecropper was a non-poll-tax payer, and that non-poll-tax-payers were barred from the jury that tried him — which meant Waller was denied trial by a jury of his peers — was completely ignored by Darden.

The Workers Defense League, official Waller defense agency, announced that a delegation of prominent Negro leaders were going to Washington today to ask Roosevelt to appoint a Presidential Commission of Inquiry into the Waller case, such as was set up by Wilson in the Mooney and Joe Hill cases. Appointment of such a commission would have the almost automatic effect of postponing the execution until the case could be studied.

On June 27, Waller's counsel appealed to four individual U. S. Supreme Court Justices to issue a stay of execution to enable the case to be brought before the Court when it meets again in October. Each of the justices, including the New Deal appointees, Black, Jackson and Frankfurter, refused. The Court as a body has twice refused to review the case.

The completely different attitude of the labor movement was expressed in strong statements to Darden issued last week by CIO President Philip Murray and AFL President William Green.

(See editorial on Waller case on Page 4.)

Congress Trying To Unload War Costs On The Workers

House Committee Completes Draft of Plan To Take Billions From Low-Income Earners

The House Ways and Means Committee last week completed the draft of a new huge federal war tax measure to throw the overwhelming burden of war costs on the low-income earners. The proposed bill, openly slices the "equal" off the "equal sacrifice" promises of Roosevelt, and guarantees the corporations and the individual capitalists greater profits and incomes than in peace-time.

Here, in brief, is what the bill would do to the workers, poor farmers and lower middle class:

1. It would impose direct income taxes on single individuals earning as low as \$500 a year, \$9.60 a week, and on married couples making only \$1,200 yearly. The present exemptions are \$750 for single persons and \$1500 for married people, already drastically reduced from the \$1500 and \$2500 exemptions of two years ago.

2. Those in the present lowest taxable brackets, starting from the \$2000 down to the \$750 level, will have to pay tax increases ranging from 200% to close to 1000%.

3. An additional amount of approximately one billion dollars is to be lifted from the pockets of the wage-earners in the form of excise and service taxes — hidden sales taxes.

In order to make certain of collecting the income taxes, the Treasury is advocating some form of withholding tax — regular pay-roll deductions — of anywhere from 5% to 10% of weekly pay checks.

Although the House Ways and Means Committee did not approve a threatened general sales tax, it is generally believed that this unpopular measure has been shelved only temporarily, until after the fall elections. The Committee's present plan falls \$3,250,000,000 short of the \$8,300,000,000 revenue measure demanded by the Treasury Department, and once the elections are over Congress is virtually certain to attempt to make up the difference by pushing through a steep general sales tax.

The difference — \$3,250,000,000 — amounts almost exactly to the total of taxes included in the original Treasury measure which would have come from increased corporation profits, high income, estate and gift taxes and from closing the present loopholes that enable the bosses to evade

payment of present tax obligations.

WHAT THE BOSSES WILL BE ASKED TO PAY

Here is what the House Ways and Means Committee has done for the bosses:

1. It kicked out the Treasury Department's proposed mild schedule of income tax rate increases for the highest income brackets and substituted a schedule which would permit those in the \$75,000 to \$5,000,000 personal income groups to retain anywhere from \$27,000 to \$750,000 clear a year. The Committee indignantly threw out a proposal — based on Roosevelt's 7-point program of several months ago — for limiting personal incomes to \$25,000 a year after taxes.

2. The Committee adopted a corporation profits tax schedule which will bring in some \$650,000,000 less than even the inadequate Treasury proposal. The Committee rejected the Treasury plan for a 55% tax on the "normal" corporation profits — the average of the high profits between 1936 and 1939 — and fixed the tax at only 40%, which is scarcely higher than the present rates.

3. The Committee established a maximum 94% "excess" profits tax — which would enable the corporations to retain not merely the approximate "normal" peace-time profits, but 6% of all "excess" profits over these amounts.

In addition the Committee voted to allow a post-war credit of 14% on all "excess" profits. This means that the corporations will get government bonds equal to 14% of their "excess" profits which will be redeemed after the war. This will provide a tax rebate to the corporations of approximately 14% of their "excess" profits.

(Continued on page 2)

Talk Of A 'Long Armistice' --And What Is Behind It

By C. CHARLES

After the war, what?

Although most of the military strategists claim that this will be a long war, many capitalist statesmen are even now trying to answer that question which everyone is asking.

One thing is clear and that is that to keep the capitalist system alive after the war will require all the wisdom of the capitalist statesmen. The top-notch American capitalist statesmen are working on this problem.

In an address on post-war problems, Under-Secretary of State Welles said on June 17: "Millions of the world's people will be homeless; in Europe and Asia transportation systems will be ruined, production facilities destroyed, farms laid waste, cities devastated. . ."

It is clear to anyone who thinks that the masses, suffering first the bloodshed, bereavement and hardships of the war, and then facing conditions as described above, will probably attempt to wreak vengeance upon the social system that within the span of one generation has brought upon the world two wars, a decade-long economic depression and fascism. Mr. Welles falls into the category of people that think. He is thinking hard. And he has a plan. It consists in part of what is called the "long armistice."

Worried About Mass Revolts

The "long armistice" is a scheme not to sign any final peace treaty, to maintain the condition of armed domination until the Allies, and above all the United States, are assured that there is

no more danger of a revolt of the masses — anywhere.

Contrary to what happened after the last war, when the peace was signed at Versailles a few months after the armistice, this time victorious capitalism intends to continue its open armed domination of the world for a much longer time. After all, capitalism remembers that out of the battlefields of the last war came the Russian Revolution, that following the last war the fate of world capitalism hung by a hair as the German masses moved in a series of social revolutions that were only defeated through the treachery of the leaders of the Social-Democracy. Capitalism is determined to avoid a repetition of the experiences that followed the last war. In the words of Mr. Welles:

"The final terms of the peace should wait until the immediate tasks of the transition period after the defeat of the Axis powers has been completed by the United Nations, and until the final judgments can be coolly and rationally rendered."

And what are the "tasks of the transition period?" According to the speech Welles made on Decoration Day they are, above all else, to maintain an "international police power" until a permanent system of general security is established.

Real Meaning Is Clear

Although the police power is presented from the point of view of guaranteeing against "aggression" by the present Axis powers, its real (Continued on page 2)

Murray Charges Steel Bosses Impede Output

Blames Shortages On Corporation 'Greed' And 'Almost Criminal' WPB Steel Policy

"Corporate greed" and the "almost criminal" failure of the government to build scrap steel stockpiles are responsible for existing steel shortages and a possible reduction in steel output to 80% below capacity by next winter, charges a report issued by CIO United Steel Workers President Philip Murray to Wendell Lund, head of the WYB's Labor Production Division.

The report, made public on June 24, directly accuses the "giant steel corporations" of deliberately hampering steel production and curtailing output. As examples of how the monopoly policies and profit motives of the corporations have blocked production, Murray's report stated:

"1. All plants now engaged in heat-treating and fabricating of homogeneous armor plate would have to be closed ten days each month for a year to do as much damage to the Army tank program as is now being done by failure of one giant steel corporation to utilize fully its existing facilities and those of small steel firms throughout a program of subcontracting.

"2. All plants engaged in rolling steel plates would have to be shut down seven days each month for the duration of the war to do as much harm to the shipbuilding program as is now being done by failure of several giant steel corporations to go all-out in the conversion of strip mills to steel plates and to allow the full use of existing facilities of small steel firms.

"3. The entire steel industry would have to be shut down one month to begin to equal the damage to the whole war production program as will be done this winter unless the current failure to accumulate adequate scrap stockpile is speedily corrected."

Murray blamed the scrap steel shortage partially on the policies of the iron and steel scrap sections of the WPB, the Office of Price Administration and the Bureau of Industrial Conservation. These are the policies determined by the big steel corporations, according to last week's report of the Truman Senate Investigating Committee, which contained charges similar to the Murray report and declared that "dollar-a-year men from the big steel firms absolutely control the steel policy of the WPB."

While the big steel companies claim they are operating at capacity, the Murray report discloses that some of their plants are either shut down or facing

shut-downs shortly, either because of scrap shortage or the unwillingness of the companies to convert them or subcontract certain portions of the work to smaller companies, 1000 workers at the Shenango Works of U. S. Steel in New Castle, Pa., lost their jobs on June 13; 1000 are being laid off at the Vandergrift Works, Vandergrift, Pa.; and a threatened shut-down faces 2000 at U. S. Steel's Canonsburg, Pa., plant.

Present scrap shortages, one of the chief causes of the present steel "bottleneck," are due in large measure to the fact that the steel companies almost up to

the moment of the outbreak of war with Japan continued to ship much of the country's scrap supply to Japan, while the OPM and administration issued assuring reports that there was no danger of a shortage.

Murray proposes to relieve the situation by having the government call a conference of the small and big steel firms and the steel workers union and drafting a plan to utilize all the existing plant capacity. But his proposal does not take into consideration the facts of the monopoly system, the death-grip control exercised by the giant corporations and their government agents over the production system.

The monopoly capitalists control the industrial system of the country and will permit nothing to infringe on their control and their profits. The one step which will free the productive forces from the monopoly stranglehold is the governmental expropriation of the war industries and their operation under workers' control.

New Tax Bill Soaks Masses, Spares Rich

(Continued from page 1)

proximately one billion dollars a year after the war.

4. The Committee rejected every proposal for plugging present loop-holes in the tax laws. Among these are the total exemptions on incomes derived from state and local securities, through which the rich investors now escape some \$300,000,000 a year in taxes, and the steep exemptions for so-called "depletion" and "depreciation" of oil and mineral developments which save the big oil and mining corporations up to \$300,000,000 yearly.

WHAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS PROPOSED

Because it made a gesture several months ago, by way of a Treasury Department tax proposal for increasing taxes on the corporations, the Roosevelt administration is trying to take credit for defending the interests of the masses. The Treasury proposals on taxing the lowest incomes, however, were even worse than those of the House Committee.

Having made its gesture, the administration sat back and let the

House Committee slice to pieces everything in the bill which would have hurt the interests of the rich. It is unlikely that when the bill comes up for debate before Congress, the administration will make any kind of serious fight to re-insert those measures which the House Committee eliminated.

As the tax situation stands now, the average wage earner is going to have to turn over about seven weeks' pay by Mar. 15, 1943. That's just for 1942 income taxes and an advance payment on 1943. In addition, the workers will shell out billions in hidden and probably in direct sales taxes.

That's the picture for the two-thirds of the population which gets only 30% of the national income. Meanwhile the wealthy are going to keep piling up more wealth out of the war itself.

That's the picture, unless organized labor, the small farmer and lower middle class organizations turn powerful mass pressure on Congress and the administration and force the adoption of a program to tax the rich, to pay for the war from which they alone profit.

Minnesota Farm-Labor Ass'n Moves To Right

Stalinists Ready to Support Old Party Candidates If They Lose In F-L Primary

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., June 29. — Completely dominated by the Stalinist machine, the Farmer-Labor Association, which concluded its two-day convention here last night, tossed aside all possibilities of achieving unity in Farmer-Labor ranks in the forthcoming elections.

Paul A. Rasmussen was chosen the convention's nominee for governor, and enters the primary fight against his long time friend and political associate, Hjalmer Petersen, who had previously announced his intention

to file as a candidate for governor on the Farmer-Labor ticket. At one time an active Farmer-Laborite and the State Budget Commissioner during the Benson regime, Rasmussen has been a paid representative of the Democratic National Committee in Minnesota in the recent period. One of his most important assignments was to deliver the Farmer-Labor Party into the hands of Roosevelt and the Democratic machine.

Stalinist opposition to the convention to Petersen, Railroad and Warehouse Commissioner and the Farmer-Labor candidate for governor in 1940, was based on the charge that he is an "appeaser." Petersen's isolationist opposition to America's entry into the war and his open hostility towards the Stalinist clique, in control of the machinery of the Farmer-Labor Party, drew the fury of the Stalinists and their followers before and during the convention, although during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact no one was more rabidly isolationist than the Communist Party.

Howard Y. Williams, closely identified with Stalinist maneuverings in the Farmer-Labor Party in the past several years, was their first choice candidate for governor. Early in the nomination fight speaker after speaker took the floor to support Williams and attack Rasmussen.

William Mauseth, Stalinist floor leader, characterized Rasmussen too as an "appeaser" by virtue of his friendship with Petersen, whom he called "Enemy No. 1."

STALINIST "COMPROMISE"

Fearing an actual split in the convention and a walkout by many AFL officials who were strongly supporting Rasmussen, the Stalinist machine agreed to a compromise proposal with Rasmussen as candidate for governor and Williams as candidate for lieutenant-governor. Rasmussen was pledged to an all-out fight on Petersen in the Farmer-Labor primary and declared in his acceptance speech that "there will be no compromise on appeasers and America Firsters."

The compromise proposal put forth by the Stalinists also required Rasmussen to pledge himself to abide by the Farmer-Labor Executive Committee's decision in case Petersen is victorious in the primary election. In other words, Rasmussen cannot support the Farmer-Labor candi-

Talk Of A 'Long Armistice' --And What Is Behind It

(Continued from page 1)

meaning is clear. The Axis, according to the plan, will have been defeated and rendered prostrate and incapable of the least threat against any nation. The "international police power" will be used against any action of the masses against capitalism anywhere in the world.

In his speech on Decoration Day Mr. Welles stated that the United States alone "will have the strength and the resources to lead the way toward a world order in which there can be freedom from want." We can dismiss the phrase about freedom from want with the observation: if Welles and the class he represents could not bring freedom from want to the United States, how will he succeed in doing it for the entire world? What is decisive in the statement quoted is the opening part where Welles notifies the world that after the war the United States will dominate the world.

United States imperialism is taking on the job of executioner-in-chief of the inevitable socialist movements everywhere. It will be the Iron Heel attempting to crush the masses who, they are sure, will rise against capitalism.

Thus speaks Sumner Welles for the governing Democratic Party. In the camp of the opposition, the Republican Party, isolationism is dead. Of the two leaders of the party, Willkie long ago lined up with Roosevelt, while Herbert Hoover also agrees with the Welles plan. In a book that appeared a few days ago, *The Problems of the Lasting Peace*, Hoover as co-author even suggests the wide use of air power as the cheapest and most effective technical means for carrying out the policing of the world.

Stalinist Endorsement

The Stalinists endorse and echo the plans of the imperialists. In the recent pacts with Great Britain, and the United States, Stalin agrees not to "negotiate or conclude, except by mutual consent, any armistice or peace treaty with Germany." In other words, while British and American imperialism feels any uneasiness about the 'erman masses, while they are not assured about the social conditions there, while they are "policing" Germany against workers revolt, Stalin will continue also in a state of war against Germany. He too is lined up with the "long armistice."

The American Daily Worker of June 12, 1942

states that the British-United States-U. S. S. R. agreements, which are saturated with the counter-revolutionary anti-socialist "long armistice" concept, open "a new epoch in world history. They open the doors for the 'century of the common man'."

Decaying capitalism, which in the last years has given us depressions, fascism and war, is according to the blood-soaked scoundrels, given a full one hundred years more to live. No less! And in order to make sure that it lives the hundred years, the Stalinists first dress up the hideous monstrosity with the lie addressed to the workers that this system represents the "common man." And if their lying propaganda does not succeed, the Stalinists are prepared to repeat their counter-revolutionary performance as in Spain, France and China. They too will be among the policemen.

Role of American Workers

The long armistice is merely a proposed method of putting down the mass uprising which will result from the war. It is a method of securing the continued existence of capitalism and the domination of world capitalism by American imperialism. These are the war aims and the peace aims of American imperialism. Anyone who expects any other outcome from the leadership of the capitalist class is doomed to disappointment. Briar bushes never bear figs. Capitalist wars can only end in capitalist peace terms.

However, what the capitalist class proposes and what the masses succeed in doing are two different and often opposite things. The war is a great teacher. The masses will learn in it. Resolved to end the system, they will move toward socialism. And the police power will prove impotent as the masses learn that capitalism is an outlived system, that all it is capable of producing is another cycle of fascism, depression and war.

In their plans for a "long armistice" and the policing of the world, Welles, Hoover and Browder all assume that the American workers will do their police work for them against the workers of the world. Is this assumption well-grounded? We think not. We hold that the American workers, far from being policemen for capitalism, will prove to be the best fighters for socialism.

15,000 Negroes Protest Jim Crow In Chicago Rally

CHICAGO, Ill., June 27 —

15,000 Negroes were present at last night's March-on-Washington meeting in the Coliseum to cheer demands for a fight to achieve democracy at home now.

This demonstration, coming ten days after the New York Madison Square Garden rally sponsored by the same movement, is a sign of a new fighting spirit among the Negro masses and of their determination to abolish discrimination in industry, the armed forces and everywhere else.

The spirit of the audience was shown in their applause for all statements of the speakers that mentioned militancy and gave some hint of action, and for an inspiring dramatic presentation named, "The Watchword Is Forward."

But the principal speakers of the meeting, as at the meeting in New York, failed to give the clear call and program for action that the masses are awaiting.

A. Philip Randolph, national director of the movement, appealed to President Roosevelt for a conference: "The Negro people's representatives wish to talk over with you the problems of discrimination in the army, air corps, marines, defense industry and the government, that trouble us."

But he gave no indication of what course he would recommend for the movement when and if Roosevelt refused, as he so often has, to meet the justified demands of the Negro people.

The next in the series of mass meetings against racial discrimination which are being held in many important cities by the March-on-Washington movement, is scheduled to be held in Washington, D. C., the capital of Jim Crow, despite obstacles for securing a meeting place which have been raised by certain administration officials.

meeting to consider this question." The meeting adjourned.

The workers are still waiting for the eight cents raise and the long drawn out stalling tactics are exhausting the patience of many workers. They know that if a majority of shipyard locals vote to accept the contract, Local 9 will have to abide by it — but so far they have not given up the fight to maintain the sliding scale of wages, overtime rates and regular shifts. The Chicago agreement may be forced upon them, but no one will make them like it.

Mass Action Wins Gains At St. Louis Arms Plant

How to win democratic rights at home was vividly illustrated at the June 26 Chicago Coliseum mass rally, in a report given by D. M. Grant of the St. Louis March-on-Washington Committee.

Grant pointed out that the United States Cartridge Company, which leases and operates a plant built and owned by the federal government, and the largest of its kind in the world for the production of small arms and munitions, employs 21,000 workers of whom only 600 are Negroes and all of these are employed as porters and common laborers. Of the 9,000 women employed, there is not a single Negro woman in the plant.

On May 20 the St. Louis March-on-Washington unit was organized and adopted a militant program of action. The initial action of the committee was to organize a march on the plant of the Cartridge Company. On June 20, over 500 Negroes marched around the plant which covers nearly two square miles, carrying banners condemning and denouncing discrimination in employment because of race. The daily press took pictures and ran stories about the march. Washington sent in mediators.

On the day of the march the company re-announced plans for the immediate induction of Negroes into production. Two days after the march, the wages of

Negro porters was raised 10c per hour. Four days following the march 72 Negro women were hired.

In addition to these results, other St. Louis war plants, heeding these actions, are taking steps to include Negroes in their plant wide employment program. No Negroes however as yet are on the production lines at the U. S. Cartridge Company plant. The position of the St. Louis March-on-Washington unit relative to all St. Louis war plants was stated in the telegram they sent to the management of the U. S. Cartridge Company after the march:

"Today's demonstration before your plant was a mere token of what the Negro people think of, and how they resent discriminatory policies and anti-democratic attitudes of the U. S. Cartridge Company, all of which flagrantly violate the declared policy of the American people as expressed in President Roosevelt's Executive Order number 8802. Your discriminatory practices forced us to take this issue into the streets. We propose to keep it in the streets until it is settled and settled right. We are preparing to return to your plant and will return with constantly increasing numbers until President Roosevelt's Order 8802 has been complied with in good faith, adequately, and without any deceptive avoidance of its true spirit and import."

PORTRAIT HEAD NOW ON SALE



A portrait head of Leon Trotsky, sculptured by the well-known American artist, Duncan Ferguson.

Hard plaster, colored to resemble bronze. Will last indefinitely indoors if given reasonable care. Weighs about 40 pounds when boxed for shipment.

Price is \$25, boxed for shipment from New York. Purchaser must pay freight charges.

ORDER FROM:

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 University Pl., New York

Shipyard Workers Object To Overtime Surrender

SAN PEDRO, Calif. — Step by step the shipyard workers employed by the Los Angeles Drydock and Shipbuilding Company and Bethlehem Steel in San Pedro, are offering stubborn resistance to the "iron hand in the velvet glove" policy of the government as embodied in the recent agreement drawn up by the Shipyard Stabilization Conference.

Despite frantic flag-waving by Stalinists who were imported into the local for this purpose, despite the thinly disguised threats of administration officials to freeze wages and regulate hours by legislation, and despite the stand of "impartiality" taken by the local union officials who do not want to take responsibility for the agreement, the members of Local 9 of the CIO shipyard workers union continue to reject the eight-point settlement.

Previous meetings of both shifts have consistently voted to maintain the regular shift arrangement, providing time and a half for Saturday and double time for Sunday. When the offer of an eight cents an hour increase was reported by the officials, the workers voted to accept the raise although recognizing that eight cents was in reality a cut — not a raise — over last year's standards.

That raise has not come through because of a clever trick which was hidden by all responsible officials until now. It appears that the Chicago agreement contained eight points and a stipulation that the 8 points had to be accepted as a whole. The workers voted to accept the eight cents but not the other seven points.

At the last regular meeting of

Local 9 this trick became clear to the membership despite the "discreet" silence of the local officials. When the agreement was read it revealed that included with the "raise" in wages the workers would have to accept the staggered shift and frozen wage scale.

Worker after worker took the floor to demand clarification on the agreement and one after another the workers voiced their opinion in decided fashion. The men were ready to accept the eight cents but not at the expense of losing the regular work week and present overtime provisions.

STALINIST TREACHERY

A Stalinist took the floor and attempted to blast the membership for its "lack of patriotism" by references to "our boys at Bataan and Corregidor," etc. However he, along with the other Stalinists present, did not move to accept the contract, thus demonstrating that the prevailing sentiments of the workers made them afraid to present their full program of union strangulation.

The speaker following the Stalinist pointed out that the proposed top INCOME FOR BOSSES of \$25,000 per year had been discarded as "impractical," that the sky was the limit for profits, and that there would be money to provide union wages for the men in the armed forces if the bosses would get the union scale too; when he suggested that the Stalinist make his speech on patriotism to the bosses who were still doing business with Hitler, the membership applauded vigorously. However, before the next speaker could finish his remarks, the chairman asked for a motion to adjourn because "it is very late and many men have gone home—besides we ought to have a special

Build Your Marxist Library NOW!

A Low-Priced Special Combination Offer

FASCISM AND BIG BUSINESS, by Daniel Guerin, 337 pages, paper — List Price \$1.00

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN, by Felix Morrow, 202 pages, paper, List Price50

TOTAL LIST \$1.50

Special Combination Price - \$.75

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK CITY

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

What Now?

In an editorial entitled "What Now?" the Pittsburgh Courier (June 27) has in its own way posed the problems facing the March-on-Washington movement.

"It was an impressive gathering," says the editorial, of the movement's June 16 Madison Square Garden rally against Jim Crow "with but a single thought: i.e., the ending of discrimination against Negroes in the war effort."

"The meeting has become history, the newspaper clippings have been collected, the assorted orators and singers have departed to their respective homes, and the lengthy resolutions have been sent to high officials who are now aware (not for the first time!) that Negroes are dissatisfied with a Jim Crow status."

"Well, what now? Eighteen thousand Negroes have cheered the obvious, but what are they going to do about it? What have the leaders of the movement told them to do about it? We do not know and we doubt that anybody else knows."

"No definite move or series of moves have been suggested or advocated."

"All we have so far are ear-splitting generalities and blow-by-blow platitudes. We do not have a program. Nor does there exist any machinery for carrying out a program if there were one."

"It is one thing to get a mass of people together and steam them up to go places, but it is quite another thing to organize them effectively to execute a prescribed program."

"We believe that much can be accomplished by organizing the masses of American Negroes IF the organizers possess vision, courage and especially administrative ability."

The editorial then declares that "The nearest approach we have had to an intelligently administered mass movement is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People with its 70,000 dues-paying members, its well-written propaganda, its trained staff and its army of volunteer local officers."

True, the editorial admits, there is "tremendous room for improvement in the program, tactics and administration" of the NAACP. But the March-on-Washington, it claims, seems to be "covering the same ground no less ineptly" and is "consequently unnecessary." Then it concludes as follows:

"And so, having staged another mass meeting, what now? Is there going to be any new action? If so, what kind, where and when?"

DIFFERENT APPROACHES

Many of the points raised in the Courier editorial are similar to those raised in THE MILITANT. But it should be clearly understood that the basic approach of the Courier and THE MILITANT toward the March-on-Washington movement are entirely different.

The Courier from the very beginning has criticized the movement as "unnecessary." Last year it was one of the few Negro papers to condemn and oppose the proposed March on Washington. Acting as though it had a monopoly on the Negro struggle, and expressing dissatisfaction because it had not been consulted about the creation and aims of the movement, it sided with the forces that were trying to call off the March. The Courier's executive editor, P. L. Prattis, complained only a few weeks ago that Randolph was building a movement that might get out of hand and implied that it might be a good thing if the movement were not revived.

The Courier editorial last week, despite its militant phrases and some of its timely questions, must therefore be regarded as only another effort to discourage the building of a movement of mass action which the Negro people want and need.

THE MILITANT, on the other hand, has championed the movement against its conservative and reactionary critics ever since the idea for a March-on-Washington was raised. It has urged the masses to support the movement and build it as an instrument for mass struggle. We too have of course criticized the leadership of the movement, but from a different direction and for a different reason. Our aim was and is to show the mistakes and shortcomings of the leadership of the movement, so that the rank and file would be better able to correct them and to build a stronger and more effective organization. Our approach has been positive and constructive, the Courier's has been negative.

For example, after raising pertinent questions, the Courier does not answer them. To its own question, "What Now?", the editorial has no answer — unless it be that the NAACP should be strengthened and improved. The movement has no program for achieving its just demands, the editorial remarks. Obviously, without the right program the demands will not be achieved. But the Courier does not itself say what the right program is. If the March-on-Washington movement is only doing what the NAACP is doing, then vice versa the NAACP is only doing what the movement is doing. Then why does the Courier imply that the solution of the Negro people's problems lies in building the NAACP alone — which by implication also does not have the necessary program?

It is not exactly correct to say that Randolph and his colleagues don't have any program. They do have a program of sorts. Randolph's program, as expressed at the Madison Square Garden rally, is for him and a few others probably including the NAACP secretary, Walter White, to go to Washington and have a "frank, candid and plain talk" with Roosevelt. What he proposes to do when Roosevelt rejects most of the demands of the movement, he does not now say, but his failure to say anything is not a hopeful indication.

Now what does the Courier think about that for a program? It does not say, but from the character of most of its own proposals, its readers will agree that it cannot criticize this "program" because it is the Courier's own program, it is all that the Courier itself has ever proposed!

WRONG ESTIMATE

The trouble with the Courier on this question, and the reason for its negative approach, is that it has failed to correctly and fully estimate the change in the thinking of the mass of Negroes that has become apparent especially since Pearl Harbor. Courier editorials have often commented on this change, but evidently the writers of these editorials don't really appreciate the extent to which this change has already taken place.

Summed up briefly, the Negro masses are ready to FIGHT for their rights NOW, and they want to build a movement that will organize and lead this fight. The reason they rallied to the March-on-Washington movement last year was because Randolph assured them that "the regular, normal and respectable method of conferences and petitions, while proper and ought to be continued as conditions warrant, certainly don't work" and because he told them that what is needed now is a movement of mass action and mass pressure. They are rallying to it again today because they still think it is the kind of movement Randolph promised last year or because they think it can be made into such a movement.

And that, precisely, is the reason why in their new mood they do not consider the NAACP to be the organization they need. We do not wish to enter into a criticism of the NAACP now. It has done very good work in its field, and it should be supported in that work. This work has been carried on primarily in legal action, court cases; the NAACP also deserves praise for some very effective propaganda and publicity work. But it is not a movement of mass action. It has never seriously tried to organize mass actions. It has a large membership, no doubt, of "70,000 dues-paying members;" but these members do little more than pay dues and most of them never do anything else for the NAACP. Furthermore its membership and leadership is for the most part not of the working class, but professionals and white collar workers. It is for this reason too that the working masses don't look to the NAACP for leadership in the arena of mass struggle, although they still respect it for the work it has carried on in its own field.

Before the criticisms of the Courier editorial writers can help to advance the Negro struggle, they must first become aware of the change that is taking place and they must seriously consider the need for working out an effective and constructive program able to accomplish the things that the programs of the past and the present have not been able to.

Next week this column will give its own answer to the question, what now?

How Stalin Menaces The Foundations Of The USSR

His Concessions to the 'Democracies' May Undermine the Monopoly of Foreign Trade

By A. ROLAND

One of the fundamental ideas hammered home by Leon Trotsky was that even a victory for the USSR in the second imperialist war would not by itself assure the continuance and further development of its socialized economy. The fate of the October Revolution rests finally with the working class of Europe and of the entire world.

It is necessary to examine every phase of the gigantic struggle in which the nations are engaged with this view in mind. What is the war doing to Soviet economy? What course is Stalin pursuing in his present alliance with the democracies? What concessions is he making in payment for the aid he receives? The Soviet war is being waged under the leadership of Stalin. That means it is being waged at present by a bureaucracy that has always been ready to sacrifice the interests of the Russian masses and the October Revolution in order to maintain its own power and privilege.

The democratic allies may have agreed to open a second front in Europe in 1942. But it would be naive to think that only military policies were discussed. War is the continuation of politics by means of force. The politics of the United Nations with regard to the Soviet Union have been voiced on many occasions. Churchill, Roosevelt, Welles, all at one time or another have expressed the keen desire to see Russia drawn into the comity of the Western nations. Russia must not remain isolated, it must be drawn into world currents. Or in plain language, Russia must find its way back to capitalist "civilization."

THE TWO BARRIERS

There are just two barriers between Soviet Russia and world capitalism: the socialized economy and the monopoly of foreign trade maintained by the Soviet state. This must be remembered when the Allied statesmen tell us with so much satisfaction that agreement was achieved all around and that Stalin had gladly signed the document, enshrining the "four freedoms." One of these freedoms — Welles never fails to stress it — is that of free trade intercourse across the frontiers. Just what does this mean when applied to Soviet Russia — after the war? We need not expect any public amplification at this time. But it most certainly sounds like a threat to one of the bases of socialized economy, the monopoly of foreign trade.

EFFECTS OF WAR ON SOVIET ECONOMY

Our complete support of the Soviet Union in the death struggle with fascist Germany does not blind us to the effects on Soviet economy of the totalitarian war. It is true that the existence of socialized economy has proved a tower of strength to Russia. But the destruction of the great Dnieper dam is but a symbol of the terrible price being exacted from the first workers' state by the imperialist war. Russia is bearing the brunt of the struggle against Hitler's hordes. The marvelous recuperative powers of socialized economy, the wholesale transfer of factories beyond the Urals to unoccupied territory, need not blind us to the terrible blight on industry that the war has inevitably brought to a country still backward in comparison with advanced capitalism.

The capitalist leaders take it for granted that Russia will necessarily have to turn for aid of all kinds to the democracies after their "joint" victory. Welles in his Memorial Day speech made this clear indirectly (though di-

rectly enough for the understanding of the capitalist class) when he stated as one point that the United States alone "will have the strength and the resources to lead the way toward a world order in which there can be freedom from want." Russia was purposely not excepted from this characteristic statement.

If Stalin is now admitted so highly by the English and American capitalists (the "man of steel" finds his way to the very front covers of the magazines!), it is not merely that he is fighting the common foe, but also because the capitalists expect tremendous changes in post-war Russia. Stalin has himself laid the groundwork for this expectation in a number of ways. The capitalist class did not need the analysis of Trotsky to understand that if the Russian Revolution continued to stand alone, then it was bound to degenerate and come to terms with the capitalist world. Stalin has made it meticulously clear that not only will he not appeal for revolutionary aid to the workers of Europe (not even to those of Germany), but that on the contrary he will aid the Allies to suppress any attempt at working class revolution.

DAVIES' MISSION

Davies, Stalin's Ambassador to the United States, has informed

his class that Stalin appeals only to Russian patriotism inside Russia. Davies' Mission to America came at the psychological moment to rouse the enthusiasm of finance capital. He assures his colleagues that Stalin, while still using the phrases of the Revolution (indeed even the phrases have disappeared) is taking Russia rapidly to the right. Through Davies Stalin appeals for support to the capitalists to help him complete his mission. That mission can only be the burial of the October Revolution and the restoration of a modified form of capitalism in Russia.

Even the theoretical background has been sketched in for later expansion. It is no accident that Stalin resurrects from the dust-bins of history the names of long-forgotten Russian "heroes" who date back to feudal times and particularly to the period of the change from feudalism to capitalism. Stalin thus places on a par the struggles of Nevsky, Suworov, Kutuzov and himself in the struggle against "feudalistic reaction," as he always refers to Hitler and fascism.

It is easy to see the possibilities of this line of "theory": The second world war has created a new situation. It has thrown Europe back into so profound a period of reaction that capitalist civilization is threatened with repression into feudalism. Just as Stalin projected the Popular Front thesis that this was no time for proletarian revolution but for the fight to preserve democratic capitalism, so now this same theme will find expansion on a world scale. Better to fight for democratic capitalism than to see the world crumble into feudal anarchy. The Russian Revolution came too soon. The working

class of the world failed to come to the support of the Russian Bolsheviks and the failure of the Revolution must be laid at their door. The bureaucracy will introduce a new NEP so as to start once again within the Russian national boundaries to lay the foundations of an economy that will one day permit working towards communism — in a single country!

CANNOT ALTER TREND

It is this trend of Stalinism that aids capitalist world reaction (not feudal but capitalist reaction) in its attempt to undermine the Soviet Union even while "aiding" Russia. A second front might give the Red Army a breathing spell, but it cannot alter the trend of future development. That trend is fraught with the greatest menace to the workers of the world. It places them at the complete mercy of the master class, by teaching that, the fight against fascism means the support of capitalism, when it is in fact capitalism that gives birth to fascism in all its forms.

The thought of Trotsky on the war becomes more and more clear with the progress of events. The fate of the October Revolution, the fate of all civilization is in the hands of the working class. Only that class leading the great masses can finally defeat fascism and direct economy into a new and higher channel. The capitalist statesmen use the propaganda of building a new society which will be free from want. Such a society is utterly impossible while capitalists own the means of production and use them for their own profit. Socialism alone can save the world from misery and want. Socialism alone can end all imperialist war and usher in the new civilization.

GRIEVANCES EXIST IN ARMY--BUT THE SOLDIERS CAN'T VOICE THEM

Harsh Discipline Deprives the Soldiers Of All Democratic Rights In The U. S. Army

By DAVID WARNER

The disciplinary system of the American army is a subject of great interest to most people. This is entirely natural, since almost every family now has a son, relative or friend in the armed forces. Nevertheless, the daily papers have carefully refrained from writing about the disciplinary methods in use in the army.

Almost every other phase of army life receives great reams of publicity every day in the week. But never a word about discipline, grievances, court-martials and punishments.

This of course is no accident. For to truly describe the disciplinary system would expose the army as a reactionary institution whose methods are completely alien to the accepted American tradition of democratic rights.

It is true enough that one cannot furnish many specific examples of the autocratic disciplinary methods used by the officer caste against the rank and file. This is not because of the lack of such cases — far from it — but because of the tight censorship imposed by the army and the wholehearted cooperation of the capitalist press in suppressing such news.

No one can object to discipline as an absolute military necessity for an army. The disciplinary methods of the American army, however, are not designed primarily to strengthen its military efficiency on the field of battle, but to maintain and bolster the domination of the reactionary officer caste against the real grievances and demands of the rank

and file soldiers.

All orders of the officer caste are not only to be obeyed immediately, but without any question. It is a common occurrence for rank and file soldiers who have showed any tendency toward independence of thought to be given a repetition of completely senseless orders — solely for the purpose of breaking the will of the men and making them completely subservient to the officer caste.

PRISON DISCIPLINE

An article in the Journal of the Military Service written by Major Chester makes this clear. In describing the methods used in Sing Sing Prison, Major Chester wrote: "The man with a rebellious spirit was easily recognized and selected for drill. The drill was simple enough. The commands were 'open your mouth,' 'Shut it.' 'Open your mouth,' 'Shut it.' . . . ad infinitum. Of course the rebellious spirit, after dozens of repetitions of the absurd command, failed to obey, and punishment followed. So many minutes in the shower bath, after which the drill was resum-

ed and prosecuted to a second disobedience and punishment. Then the drill would be varied by making the prisoner open and shut his eyes at command, or raise and lower his arms, or anything, the absurder the better. The study of penitentiary methods opened my eyes to the true value of much in the military service. The manual of arms, and ordinary barrack-yard drill, after the men are able to execute them perfectly, are the military counter-parts of the discipline drills of our penitentiaries."

Soldiers who feel themselves unduly punished or persecuted by their superior officers have no recourse. The "democratic" trial of the soldier — the court-martial — is a star chamber affair where the rank and file soldier, although formally enjoying the right to choose his counsel, in practice always finds his attorney to be whatever officer happens to be available at the time. The defendant's counsel may not ask questions, or even address the court or interfere in any way with the proceedings. The presiding officer of the court-martial, the Judge-Advocate, functions not only as judge and prosecutor, but also can reserve the right of defense counsel for himself.

A REVEALING CASE

The only appeal allowed from the decision of a court-martial is that of submission of the case to the Judge Advocate General. Brigadier-General T. S. Ansell, who functioned as the Judge Advocate General in 1918, revealed

at a Senate hearing on the court-martial system how meaningless this procedure was. Ansell told of a court martial in a training camp in southern Texas while he was Acting Judge Advocate General. Eleven Negroes were accused of rape and sentenced to death. Ansell heard of the case and determined to read the trial minutes thoroughly when they reached him for re-

view. When he received the transcript, he found that the trial had been of the most summary character and that simple justice demanded a new trial. Upon ordering this, he discovered that the men had been executed before the case had been submitted to the Judge Advocate General's office.*

Above everything else, the average worker and trade unionist, upon his induction into the army, is shocked to find that he has no means whatsoever to express his grievances. Coming from the factory and the trade union movement, where the right of grievance committees to present the demands of the workers is fundamental, the worker in the army is completely defenseless against persecution and unjust punishments. His punishments go unquestioned and his grievances remain unspoken.

Just as the formation of grievance committees in the shops and factories is a tremendous step forward for the workers and represents the attainment of the elementary right of protest and expression, so the formation of soldiers' grievance committees would represent a tremendous advancement in the struggle for

democratic rights in the army. No "liberal" officer or politician will make any serious attempt to alter the army's system of discipline, because it represents the heart of the army as an instrument of the class rule of the capitalists. Only the labor movement, by raising the demand for soldier's grievance committees, can take the first step to win democratic rights in the army.

For an account of this and many other revealing cases, see Michael Cort's article in the March 1941 Fourth International, "The Court Martial System in the U. S. Army."

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

Notes On The Soviet-U. S.-British Pacts

By M. MORRISON

Recent events have shown that the least important thing about an agreement between two sovereign states is whether or not the parties to the agreement will observe its provisions. In the very nature of things no performance of an agreement is to be expected unless the conditions prevailing at the time the agreement was entered into continue to exist and in this period of rapid and unexpected changes that is hardly likely.

The "non-aggression" pact which Stalin and Hitler entered into with such fanfare in August 1939 lasted less than two years. Only people who were far removed from the fundamental principles of Marxism took that pact to mean an alliance between Stalin and Hitler to conquer and divide the world. (Is it possible that people who interpreted the Hitler-Stalin pact in such a manner have the gall to continue writing and interpreting events of the day? Alas, it is not only possible but they are actually doing so. A great many mistakes are permissible even for Marxists, but not one like that. The self-imposed punishment for such a mistake should be ceasing to write for at least five years and reading all of the Marxist classics.)

But just as the Stalin-Hitler pact had tremendous significance even though its life was extremely short, so the pacts recently consummated between the Soviet Union and Great Britain and the Soviet Union and the United States are important though they may be just as short-lived. It is not the assurance that certain provisions in these pacts will be observed that lends them significance, although that possibility is not excluded. The fact of their insertion is the really significant thing.

It is necessary in the first instance to repeat some well-known propositions which people who are not thoroughly acquainted with our literature may not be aware of.

No one can have anything against those sections of the pacts signed by Molotov in London and in Washington, which provide for military and economic aid to the Soviet Union. A military and economic arrangement between the Soviet Union and one imperialist nation against another imperialist nation is perfectly proper. Nor is there an obligation on the part of the representatives of the Soviet Union to insert, in such a treaty, any revolutionary formulations. The Soviet Union is the guardian of the revolutionary internationalism, as to what is permissible from a Marxist point of view. With those Stalinist followers who believe that Stalinism is interested in the welfare of the working masses it may still be necessary to argue from the point of view of Marxism, but in general it is only necessary to evaluate the significance and possible effects of all Stalinist measures upon the fate of the Soviet Union.

Unfortunately, whatever measures Stalin takes to defend the bureaucratic regime has its direct effect upon the Soviet Union and that is why the advanced workers interested in the defense and preservation of the Soviet Union carefully follow everything of importance that Stalin or his henchmen say and do.

The dangerous implications in some of the provisions of the treaties will be discussed next week.

no common ground between Marxists and representatives of the capitalist order on these fundamental questions.

But what if the governments of the United States and Great Britain refuse to furnish military and economic aid unless the Soviet Union is committed to certain provisions which are objectionable from a revolutionary point of view?

At the present moment it is certain that the Soviet Union can get all the help England and the United States can possibly give for the simple reason that it is to the interest of the latter countries to furnish such help. Even most of the die-hard reactionaries agree that the Red Army must be given all the support possible in order to exhaust Hitler's forces. The Soviet Union needs the military and economic aid that the United States and Great Britain can give but it needs it less than the United States and Great Britain need the continued struggle of the Red Army. The relationship of forces is such that the Soviet Union could demand and obtain aid from the capitalist allies without tying itself up to formulas which at best confuse the masses into believing that permanent peace is possible under the capitalist system.

Even if the Soviet Union were much weaker than it is and were to need the help of Great Britain and the United States more than the latter countries need its help, it would be impermissible for its representatives to permit the insertion of clauses in a treaty with a capitalist country, such as those found in the treaties signed by Molotov at the orders of his boss in the Kremlin. The Soviet Union was in a far more precarious position in the first years of its existence when Lenin and Trotsky were willing to accept military aid from the United States, England and France against the Germany of the Kaiser. But a member of the Bolshevik Party suggesting that an agreement be reached with the capitalist countries as to war aims and the organization of peace would have been looked upon as insane.

But it is useless at this time to consider what is proper or improper for representatives of the Soviet government to do from a revolutionary viewpoint. Interested only in the preservation of the Soviet bureaucracy, Stalinist treaties must be considered in the same light as all other activities of the Stalinist regime. There is no use arguing with people who have long ago forsaken the last vestiges of loyalty to revolutionary internationalism, as to what is permissible from a Marxist point of view. With those Stalinist followers who believe that Stalinism is interested in the welfare of the working masses it may still be necessary to argue from the point of view of Marxism, but in general it is only necessary to evaluate the significance and possible effects of all Stalinist measures upon the fate of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union wants to defeat Hitler; so do the British and American governments. They can agree upon measures, military and economic, to achieve that purpose. Revolutionaries would not agree with capitalist representatives to formulations about the causes for the war and the measures to be taken to guarantee peace after the war is ended. For there is

view. When he received the transcript, he found that the trial had been of the most summary character and that simple justice demanded a new trial. Upon ordering this, he discovered that the men had been executed before the case had been submitted to the Judge Advocate General's office.*

Above everything else, the average worker and trade unionist, upon his induction into the army, is shocked to find that he has no means whatsoever to express his grievances. Coming from the factory and the trade union movement, where the right of grievance committees to present the demands of the workers is fundamental, the worker in the army is completely defenseless against persecution and unjust punishments. His punishments go unquestioned and his grievances remain unspoken.

Just as the formation of grievance committees in the shops and factories is a tremendous step forward for the workers and represents the attainment of the elementary right of protest and expression, so the formation of soldiers' grievance committees would represent a tremendous advancement in the struggle for

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI.—No. 27 Saturday, July 4, 1942

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 118 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Editor:
GEORGE BREITMAN

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

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year; \$1.50 for six months. Single copies: 5 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

"Entered as second class matter February 13, 1941 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1917."

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.

Darden's Decision

No commutation of sentence! No executive clemency! Waller must die! That was how Governor Darden of Virginia answered the thousands of appeals for Odell Waller from labor, Negro and liberal organizations and leaders.

There were two aspects of the case which Darden must have considered in coming to his decision.

One was the facts of the case: denial of right to trial by a jury of Waller's peers because of the poll-tax laws; the insubstantial and conflicting evidence submitted at the trial; the lynch spirit surrounding the trial. Darden knew that in another atmosphere, where racial prejudice was not so strong, Waller's plea of self-defense would probably have resulted in an outright acquittal or a light sentence.

The other aspect Darden must have considered—and at much greater length—was the probable effect of his decision. He knew that in the eyes of the masses Waller's case has become a symbol for all the oppressed Negro and white people in the south. He knew that his decision was bound to have an important effect on what some Washington officials call "Negro morale." The Negro masses have not shown much enthusiasm for a "war for democracy" which is conducted on a Jim Crow basis. Darden was well aware that the execution of Waller would only strengthen their conviction that a Negro has no greater chance for justice in the south than a Jew has in Germany.

Nevertheless, Darden felt constrained to ignore the facts and risk the consequences and he ordered Waller to die. Everyone who is seriously concerned about ending Jim Crowism must understand the reasons for Darden's decision.

On June 29, the day the hearing on Waller's case was held in Richmond, "several unnamed sources" were quoted as saying that a wave of violence would follow any commutation of sentence and that from now on Negroes would get lynchings instead of trials in Pittsylvania County.

These were the voices to which Darden listened and whose commands he obeys—the voices of the reactionary minority which rules the south and is ready to fight to the death against any concessions to the masses. This Bourbon ruling class wants Waller's blood because it wants a docile labor supply, because it doesn't want the Negro and white masses getting any ideas into their heads about questioning the decisions of landlords and employers or raising their arms in even self-defense against their oppressors. In that sense, Waller's case has become a symbol for the ruling class too—and it is ready to lynch a thousand other sharecroppers to show that it means business.

We shall not forget this, we shall always remember that behind the order to execute Waller was the whole rotten system of exploitation and oppression which we have pledged ourselves to destroy. And we do not think that the southern masses will forget it either.

The Fourth Of July

This Fourth of July, the holiday commemorating the signing of the Declaration of Independence, will have its usual quota of reactionary windbags bragging about what the American colonists did to King George the Third back in 1776. Of course, this year their remarks will be diplomatically tempered out of consideration for existing political and military alliances with another British monarch.

The American revolutionists of the eighteenth century fought and died for national independence from an imperialist oppressor. That principle for which they struggled still holds good today—only in a greater and more urgent sense than in 1776.

"All Men Are Created Equal"

It is 166 years since the American revolutionists proclaimed that "all men are created equal" and that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness) it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

Today, 166 years after the proclamation of these words, three-quarters of the people of the earth still do not have the right to govern themselves, still exist under the rule of foreign invaders or are compelled to fight to the death to keep from suffering that rule.

There is the example of India, for instance, where 400,000,000 people are deprived of the elementary right of governing themselves and determining their own destiny. The struggle of the people of India for their national independence from British imperialism differs in no basic sense from the battle of the American colonists to free themselves from the earlier tyranny of the British ruling class.

They Talk of National Independence

The ruling class orators will talk much about the struggle for national independence on this Fourth of July—they will certainly point at length to the struggles of the people in the occupied lands of Europe against Hitler, and of the people in China against Japan, as proof of the progressive character of the war being conducted by the United States and British governments.

But their hypocrisy will be exposed by their failure to support the struggle for national liberation in India and the other colonies oppressed by the United Nations. For now the wealthy descendants, or alleged descendants, of the revolutionary opponents of George the Third are now in an amicable embrace with George the Sixth, whose government is doing far viler things to the Indian masses than his royal ancestor ever thought of doing to the American colonists.

We are for honoring the revolutions of the past by upholding the progressive principles their makers died to defend. We think the American colonists had two ideas in particular that are worthy of complete endorsement today. They believed in the right of national independence. They believed in fighting arms in hand for that right.

We can think of no more fitting occasion than the Fourth of July to express our solidarity with the fighters for freedom in India, China, Burma and all the other colonies and semi-colonies of capitalist imperialism, and to urge them to emulate the American revolutionists in a fight to the death for their national liberation.

FDR's Bedfellows

President Roosevelt has nominated Thomas F. Meaney for Federal District Judge in New Jersey. As is well known, Meaney is a tool of the notorious Hague machine, whose outrages against the democratic rights of the workers of Jersey City have been a stench in the nostrils of all decent people in this country.

Mayor Hague has long symbolized the crudest kind of political corruption. His police and hired gangs turned Jersey City into a nightmare for organized labor. All civil rights were blacked-out in a fascist-like terror reign. And while years of nation-wide protest and pressure have compelled Hague to conceal, for the time being, the more glaring evils of his political regime, the regime remains, as viciously corrupt and anti-labor as ever.

A few Senators, primarily Republicans who are anxious to use the occasion for taking a slap at Roosevelt, have expressed opposition to Meaney's appointment. But it is expected that after a little heat is applied by Roosevelt, the Senate is going to approve the appointment.

Principles Versus Practice

Roosevelt's "democratic" principles stop short of offending the Hague machine. That machine has been very successful in lining up the votes for the "New Deal" in the past—with the aid of some funny stuff at the ballot boxes, by terrorizing and framing political opposition, and, in general, by running the gamut from bribery to mayhem, and worse.

Roosevelt's continued political alliance with the Hague machine, his dependence upon it for the maintenance of his party control in New Jersey, shows him in a strange light for one who insists he is fighting a "war for democracy." Boss Hague, the reactionary Southern Democratic poll-taxers, the Kelley-Nash machine in Chicago—these are the political bed-fellows of Roosevelt.

Can any administration which even tolerates such elements—let alone invites their political support and extends them political favors—be truly concerned about spreading democracy throughout the world?

A July 4th Celebration In Vladivostok, 1918

Some Russian Workers Still Had Illusions About the Real Nature of U. S. 'Democracy'

On July 4, 1918, 24 years ago, occurred the strangest Independence Day celebration in history. In far-off Vladivostok, Siberia, 17,000 workers at a mass funeral to honor their comrades killed in the defeat of their local Soviet, turned on Independence Day with hope for fraternal aid to the American forces in the harbor. These forces had been sent along with British, Japanese and French ships to help the Russian capitalists and nobility destroy the Bolshevik revolution.

This unforgettable event has been recorded by an American eye-witness, Albert Rhys Williams. In his book, "Through the Russian Revolution," published in this country in 1921, Williams described one of the most interesting and least publicized events of modern history.

The following is quoted from the text of "Through the Russian Revolution":

It was the Fourth of July. I was standing on the Kitaiskaya looking down upon the holiday flags on the Brooklyn, the American battleship in Vladivostok bay. Suddenly I heard a faraway sound. Listening, I caught the strain of the Revolutionary Hymn:

"With hearts heavy and sad
we bring our dead,
Who shed their blood in the
fight for freedom."

Looking up, I saw on the crest of the hill the first lines of some vast procession. It was the funeral of the gruzhiki (longshoremen) killed four days before in the siege of the Red Staff Building.

Today the people rising out of their grief and terror, were coming forth to bury these defenders of the fallen Soviet. Out of the workmen's quarters they streamed jamming the street, not from curb to curb, but from wall to wall. They came billowing over the hilltop by thousands until the whole long slope was choked with the dense, slow-moving throng, keeping time to the funeral march of the revolutionists.

Up thru the gray and black mass of men and women ran two lines of white-bloused sailors of the Bolshevik fleet. Above their heads tossed a cloud of crimson standards with silvered cords and tassels. In the vanguard four men carried a huge banner with the words: "Long Live the Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies! Hail to the International Brotherhood of the Toilers!"

A sailor striding down the hilltop pushed through the

crowd and climbed upon the platform. "Comrades!" he cried joyously, "we are not alone. I ask you to look away to the flags flying over there on the American battleships. You cannot see them down there where you stand. But they are there. No, comrades, we are not alone today in our grief. The Americans understand and they are with us!"

It was a mistake, of course. This was July the Fourth. Those flags had been hung out in celebration of our Day of Independence. But the crowd did not know that. To them it was like the sudden touch of a friend's hand upon a lonely traveler in a foreign land.

With enthusiasm they caught up the cry of the sailor: "The Americans are with us!" And the vast conclave of workers lifting up their coffins, wreaths, and banners were once more in motion. They were going to the cemetery, but not directly. Tired as they were from long standing in the sun, they made a wide detour to reach the street that runs up the steep hill to the American Consulate. Then straight up the sharp slope they toiled in a cloud of dust, still singing as they marched, until they came before the Stars and Stripes floating from the flagstaff. And there they stopped and laid the coffins of their dead beneath the flag of America.

They stretched out their hands, crying, "Speak to us a word!" They sent delegates within to implore that word. On the day the great Republic of the West cele-

brated its independence, the poor and disinherited of Russia came asking sympathy and understanding in the struggle for their independence.

Afterwards, I heard a Bolshevik leader bitterly resentful at this "compromise with revolutionary honor and integrity."

"How stupid of them," he said. "How insane of them! Have we not told them that all countries are alike—all imperialists? Was this not repeated to them over and over again by their leaders?"

Truly it had been. But with this demonstration of the Fourth of July the leaders had little to do. They were in prison. The affair was in the hands of the people themselves. And, however cynical many leaders were about the professions of America, the people were not so. In the hour of their affliction, these simple trusting folk, makers of the new Social Democracy of the East, came stretching forth their hands to the old Political Democracy of the West.

They knew that President Wilson had given his assurance of help and loyalty to the "people of Russia." They reasoned: "We, the workers and peasants, the great majority here in Vladivostok, are we not the people? To-day in our trouble, we come to claim the promised help. Our enemies have taken away our Soviet. They have killed our comrades. We are alone and in distress and you alone of all the nations of the earth can understand."

No finer tribute could they offer than to come thus, bringing their dead, with the faith that out of America would come compassion and understanding. America, their only friend and refuge.

But America did not understand. The American people did not even hear a word about it. These Russian folk do not know that the American people never heard about it. All they know is that a few weeks after that appeal came the landing of the American troops. They united with Japanese troops, marching into Siberia, shooting down peasants and workers.

And now these Russian folk may say to one another: "How stupid we were to stand there in the heat and the dust stretching out our hands like beggars!"

The Parasitic Worm And The Parasitic System

Southern 'Laziness' Is Not Inherent Trait But the Product of Economic Conditions

By GRACE CARLSON
"Blessings on thee, little man,
Barefoot boy, with cheek of tan!"

In his well-known poem, *The Barefoot Boy*, Whittier drew a charming picture of a happy, active, abundantly healthy American boy. But the barefoot boys of the southern states do not fit this picture, for in that region thousands of barefoot boys and girls, as well as their fathers and mothers, are victims of hookworm disease.

The soil of most of the states, lying in the Southern Coastal Plain, is known to be infested with the larvae of the hookworm parasite. Because of the terribly low economic and cultural level of the people of those states, there is no adequate sewage disposal system. This factor, combined with the mild climate and moist, sandy soil of the region causes the hookworm parasites to thrive and infest not only the soil but the people who walk barefooted across the soil.

Dr. W. H. Pickett, State Health Officer of Florida, where hookworm disease is a great menace, wrote recently, "The simple procedure of adequate disposal of sewage or the wearing of shoes by the entire population will suffice to control hookworm infestation. The procedure is simple, the practical application appears most difficult."

But the "practical application" of effective hookworm disease control does not seem so difficult to the Marxist who understands that it is the heavy hand of capitalism which holds back progressive measures in this field. In the richest country in the world, one third of the population is "ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed."

Shoes for all and comfortable homes with adequate sanitation facilities for every family will be available to the downtrodden Negro and white sharecroppers and workers of the south only when the control of the production system is taken out of the hands of America's Sixty Families.

IMPORTANT DISCOVERIES

Sometimes representatives of the Sixty Families grow uncomfortable under the weight of their ill-gotten wealth and decide to restore some of it to the masses from whom it was stolen. Such is the story behind the establish-

ing through the skin of the foot or ankle, the worm finds its way into the small intestine of its victim where it attaches itself by means of hooks to the lining of the intestine and sucks blood. If hundreds of such worms are present in the intestines, they cause such a loss of blood in their victim that a serious case of anemia develops.

MILLIONS AFFECTED

A vivid characterization of the havoc wrought by hookworm disease in the south has been given by Dr. Heiser in his autobiography:

"Any people who have to feed a collection of intestinal worms as well as themselves are bound to lose the race against those not so handicapped. By dwarfing their bodies, inhibiting the development of their minds, and rendering them more susceptible to other diseases, directly and indirectly, the hookworm has caused incalculable damage. It has slaughtered members of the human family by the thousands and rendered them ill by the millions."

Much good work was done by the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission and by its successor, the Rockefeller Foundation, in the field of prevention and control of hookworm disease. But after more than three decades of work, hookworm disease is still a serious problem in the south, although medical science has the knowledge which could wipe it out completely.

True preventive medicine lies in abolishing poverty, with its accompanying degradation and disease. The parasitic hookworms which prey on the workers of the south can be brought under control only after the control of the equally parasitic Rockefellers, Morgans and duPonts is broken forever.

For a Rising Scale of

Wages to Meet

Rising Living Costs

Record Of British Rule In Egypt

By HOWARD ALLEN

Considerable fear that Marshal Erwin Rommel's comparatively tiny forces may take Egypt has been evinced by British and American strategists. A review of the history of British rule in the land of the Pharaohs will make clear one of the paramount reasons for this fear.

The fact that some 100,000 German troops can seriously threaten a British controlled land of 16,500,000 people with the greatest population density in the world in itself indicates the answer. British imperialism is reaping the reward for its 60 years of plunder and oppression of the Egyptian people.

With the construction of the Suez Canal by De Lesseps in 1869, Egypt became the center of increasing attention by both French and British imperialists. The imperialists were not satisfied with the "capitulations" they had extracted from Turkey, then suzerain over Egypt, which provided them immunity from (1) taxation, (2) jurisdiction by Egyptian courts, (3) entrance of their domiciles by native police.

When in 1881, Arabi, leader of the Egyptian Nationalist Party effected a coup d'etat, forcing the native monarch to grant a constitution, the monarch sought British and French help. On July 11, 1882, Sir Beauchamp Seymour bombarded Alexandria.

According to Wilfred S. Blunt (*Atrocities of Justice Under British Rule in Egypt*, London, 1906), "England was at peace with Egypt and the pretext put forward was that the British fleet was in danger from the Alexandrian forts."

"On the 13th, English sailors were landed... civilian natives found in the streets were shot down and run through almost indiscriminately." Britain knocked on Egypt's door with cannon and torch, almost burning Alexandria to the ground.

With the consummate hypocrisy of an imperialist diplomat, Lord Granville, British foreign secretary under the Gladstone government, said on January 3, 1883, "Although for the present a British force remains in Egypt for the preservation of public tranquility, Her Majesty's Government are desirous of withdrawing it as soon as the state of the country and the organization of the proper means for the maintenance of the Khedive's authority will admit of it." Sixty years later, the state of the country still does not permit the withdrawal of British troops!

How Valuable Is Egypt?

What did the British seek in Egypt? This country, exclusive of the desert wastes, is a narrow strip along the Nile of some of the richest cultivation in the world, 600 miles long and seldom more than 5 miles wide, broadening to a delta for the last 100 miles before the sea is reached.

Her half billion dollar cotton crop makes up 80% of Egypt's exports. Under British domination, agriculture has been restricted to the point where almost no foodstuffs are grown for the natives. England must have cotton!

Industries which have been developed in Egypt are under English domination and follow the pattern of England's economy rather than the needs of the native population. The bulk of Egyptian exports goes to England and the bulk of her imports comes from there.

Untold millions of dollars have been mulcted from a subjected and starving native population by swarming hosts of British officials. Even in 1936, when Britain ostensibly granted independence to Egypt, there were still 1,228 British officials at an average \$5,000 annual salary, while those dismissed were granted a compensation of \$60,000,000.

The British-owned Land Bank of Egypt with a net capital of \$5,000,000 had during 1923-32 an annual net profit of \$1,000,000. During World War I, Britain monopolized the entire cotton crop at a fixed price below the world market. British shipping extracted a cool \$15,000,000 annually.

In 1937, according to Sidney Pasha, (Spoils of Empire, Albert Vinton, Asia, Sept. 1938) "the average annual native per capita income was \$60."

44% of Egyptian agriculture is owned by 13,000 persons. Two million fellahs (farmers) of the 4,380,000 total own no land at all. Of 5 million proletarians (2 million in various industries) 3,683,243 workers earn less than 12 English pounds a year.

"White Man's Burden"

But didn't England bring civilization to the benighted Mohammedan population in the "Cradle of Civilization?" According to Arthur Settel, writing in *Living Age*, Sept. 1940, only 10% of the population is literate.

The U. S. Monthly Labor Review of July 1940 quotes the Director of the Cooperative Section of the (Egyptian) Ministry as saying that Egypt's national economy suffers considerably from "the extremely poor health of the fellahen (peasants) and the undernourishment of the vast majority of the workers in both town and country..."

Disease, starvation, superstition, oppression are rampant in Egypt under British domination. In spite of the nominal "independence" of Egypt, the British continue to rule through an alliance (based on their armed forces) with the Egyptian upper class, composed of newly formed industrial capitalists and big landowners.

The Axis strategists are not unaware of the situation in Egypt. Their hopes for capitalizing on existing dissatisfaction in order to further their own reactionary interests are revealed in an article in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, quoted in *Living Age*, Sept. 1940: "Furthermore the already great social antagonism between the rich—and, therefore, generally Anglophile—upper crust and the masses of the people will increase still more when it is revealed how the English have corrupted the Egyptian upper classes." The Axis counted on more than tanks and planes in their war against Britain—they knew that British crimes in Egypt have repelled the Egyptian masses and made it impossible for British imperialism to secure the support of Egypt's manpower and resources!

(This is the first of two articles on British rule in Egypt.)