

Trotsky Memorial Issue

AUTO MILITANTS PRESERVE
UNION DEMOCRACY

See page 2

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 33

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, AUGUST 15, 1942



FIVE (5) CENTS

INDIAN MASSES FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Mass Actions Spread Despite British Terror

Leon Trotsky Defender of The USSR

By GEORGE COLLINS

The indomitable courage and heroism of the Red Army and of the Soviet workers and peasants in their resistance to the Nazi invaders is the greatest living testimony that only the body of Leon Trotsky was destroyed when Stalin's hired assassin drove a pickaxe into his skull on August 21, 1940. Trotsky's achievements are imperishable.

The peerless morale of the Red soldiers fighting against overwhelming odds and the great sacrifices stoically endured by the Soviet population at large arise primarily from the fact that they are fighting for the conquests of the October Revolution. The October Revolution gave the Russian masses something to fight for: for the great Russian land seized from an absentee landlord class, for the factories, mines, mills and railroads taken out of the hands of a clique of bankers and industrialists, for the right to determine their own destiny as a free people.

The October Revolution owes its success to the great genius of Lenin and Trotsky, who prepared for it in the long years of Czarist reaction, who organized the forces that could and did take advantage of the war crisis, established the Soviet power and protected and defended it against the combined power of the White Armies and all the imperialists.

Trotsky participated in this unprecedented social transformation as one of the greatest revolutionary leaders in history. As commander-in-chief Trotsky organized and trained an army out of a mass of hungry and poorly-armed remnants of Czarist troops and Red Guards. That army fought its way to victory and laid the basis for the present Soviet Army. The Red soldiers today, because of Stalin's systematic falsification of history, may not understand the role Trotsky played in the organization of their army and the creation of its general staff. But they do know that this army arose from the October Revolution and was built to defend that revolution and its achievements. That alone is a tremendous tribute to Trotsky; it is for his achievements they are dying by the millions on the blood-soaked battlefield of the vast Soviet territory.

The Soviet masses are fighting valiantly for these conquests of the October Revolution but they have been fighting a losing battle because they fight under the leadership and the policies of Stalin, the betrayer of October and the instigator of Trotsky's assassination. That assassination was a high-water mark in a long series of terrible blows by which Stalin undermined the foundations of the October Revolution and which are now culminating in mortal peril for the very existence of the Soviet Union.

Stalin had smashed most of the gains of the revolution of 1917 by the time his agent murdered Leon Trotsky. Seizing the helm of the Bolshevik Party after Lenin's death, Stalin slashed away at its structure until nothing was left of this democratic revolutionary organization but a bureaucratic husk — an instrument for the protection of special privileges and a weapon against the masses. Without their party the masses are leaderless in the present crisis.

To preserve his nationalist "utopia" and above all the privileges of the bureaucracy, Stalin turned his back on the world proletariat and entrusted the fate of the Soviet Union to alliances with the imperialist powers. In Germany, France, Spain and China the revolutionary workers were betrayed again and again by the Stalin regime until their organizations were crushed to the earth. Trotsky called Hitler "super-Wrangel of the world bourgeoisie" and urged the mobilization of the Red Army against him in 1933. Stalin jeered. But eight years later Hitler could invade an unprepared Soviet Union without fear of a working class revolution in Germany or in Europe.

Stalin transformed the Bolshevik Party into a happy hunting ground for job-seekers, robbed the Soviets of their function as the democratic governing organs of the masses, turned the trade unions into helpless tools of the bureaucracy. But he could not rest easy until he had physically annihilated the leading participants of the October Revolution — the Bolshevik Old Guard and the general staff of the Red Army trained by Trotsky. Anticipating a revolution of the masses against him Stalin sought to behead it in advance by the frame-up Moscow Trials and the firing squad. Above all he had to murder Leon Trotsky whose voice and message would have been a herald to the workers of the Soviet Union and the world in the present war. The name of a living Trotsky, though thousands of miles away, would have been a battle-cry of the Red legions not only against the Nazis but against Stalin's treacherous and incompetent bureaucracy as well.

The banner of Trotsky is held aloft today by only a few hands. Tomorrow it will fly at the head of the insurgent masses of India!

As in 1917 the program of Trotsky will be the beacon-light for the masses of the Soviet Union and the whole world illuminating the road to peace and socialism!

TROTSKY'S WORKS LIVE ON IN HEROIC RED ARMY



INDIANS FOLLOW ADVICE CRIPPS GAVE AFRICANS

Sir Stafford Cripps, who tried to negotiate the Indian people out of their demands for independence from British imperialism, spoke differently to the Africans in 1937. In an introduction to "Africa and World Peace" by George Padmore, he wrote:

"Imperialism, whether in its national form or in its League of Nations form, is equally inimical to the interests of the Africans and is equally certain to produce conditions similar to those of 1914 and the war which followed them. The one safety for the common people of this or any other nation is to destroy imperialism and that they cannot do if they take part, on any side, in imperialist wars. Whether Fascist or Democratic Imperialism emerges victorious from such wars, the problem will remain and the lot of Africans will be much as it is today."

Trotsky is dead but his ideas live on and it is only his ideas and his program which can prevent Stalin from dragging the Soviet Union down into the inevitable doom that awaits him and his bureaucracy.

Trotsky's program was the banner of victory in 1917 and later against the counter-revolutionary armies and the intervention. Trotsky's program can once more be the banner of victory!

That program will cement the alliance between Russian workers and the revolutionary workers of all lands, above all, the German workers, by extending the October Revolution to western Europe, America and Asia.

BUT ORGANIZED STRUGGLE REQUIRED FOR VICTORY

Congress Party Program Cannot Mobilize
Workers Who Must Play Decisive Part

By FELIX MORROW

Under the slogans "Freedom or Death," "Do or Die," the masses of India are fighting and dying for Indian independence as British imperialism attempts to drown the movement in blood.

The All-India Congress party general committee, yielding to the nation-wide demand for immediate action to win independence, endorsed on Saturday, August 8, a resolution for a "civil disobedience" campaign, placing its direction and the date for the beginning of the campaign in the hands of Gandhi. The latter announced that he would first seek further negotiations with the British authorities on the demand for independence.

At dawn the next day Gandhi, Nehru and other Congress leaders were arrested and the Congress was declared outlawed, precipitating the immediate launching of the independence campaign.

No sooner were the first crowds on the streets than British police and troops fired into their midst, while airplanes spewed tear-gas.

With the same police mentality which has characterized all regimes faced by revolution, the British think a blood-bath and arrests of "agitators" will crush the movement. British "democracy" is as blind, facing the doom of its rule, as Czar Nicholas in 1917 or Louis XVI in 1789.

The Congress "agitators" whom it has arrested are in reality being propelled into the struggle by the pressure of the masses. Ever since Britain, without consulting any section of the population, declared India in the war in September, 1940, the tide of colonial revolution has been rising. The masses of India do not want to fight and die in this war in order to maintain British rule in India.

When the war broke out the Congress party was at the head of the provincial governments in eight out of eleven of the British India provinces, collaborating with the British. Widespread protest against India's being involved in the war without its consent forced the Congress ministries to resign.

British Gave Nothing in Negotiations

Since then there have been interminable negotiations with the British, ending with Cripps' "mission" in April of this year. All attempts of the Congress to come to an amicable agreement with the British failed.

Meanwhile the defeats in Malaya, Singapore, the East Indies and Burma had destroyed British prestige in the Far East and had brought to unprecedented heights the national self-confidence of the Indian masses. Cripps had been in India only a year earlier, and had been in close communion with Nehru and other Congress leaders; he came back in April 1942 apparently sure of getting them to accept ministries in a government under control of the Viceroy and the India Office. But that was no longer possible after the collapse of British power in the Far East. No party that sought to keep the support of the masses of India could by then accept the Cripps formula.

In the face of the British refusal to turn the powers of the Viceroy and the India Office over to an Indian government, the least the Congress could do was to launch the "civil disobedience" campaign.

Congress Leaders Merely Seek "Deadlock"

So far as the Congress leaders were concerned, this campaign does not mean the irrevocable launching of a fight to the end for independence. The Congress campaign does not have a plan for actually winning independence by mass seizure of the government buildings and arsenals, arming of the Indian masses, establishment of a provisional government, etc. Neither the pacifist wing of Gandhi nor the Nehru wing think in terms of such methods. Both are united in seeking what they term "a complete deadlock" — sufficient paralysis of governmental and economic activity to dictate to the British a resolution of the "deadlock" by reopening negotiations on the basis of the demand for independence.

That the Congress plan is so narrowly limited — not to speak of the fact that four times previously since 1920 it has launched it only to drop it — is not understood by the great majority of its followers. They look upon the present struggle as a revolutionary fight for independence and in that spirit they are meeting the British police and troops. There is a germ of truth in the British complaint that Gandhi's followers do not emulate his pacifism! They translate it in their own plebeian way into militant mass combat.

Peasant Rebellion Will Soon Start

We can predict with assurance — the same thing happened in the previous "civil disobedience" campaigns — that the events of the first days are no index to the gigantic scope of the mass movement. This time, even more than previously, advance preparations of the Congress leaders appear to have been extremely poor. With the arrests of the leaders the movement gives the

FOR INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

Statement of Nat'l Committee of Socialist Workers Party

EDITORIAL NOTE

The following statement of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party was received by The Militant and is hereby reprinted for the information of our readers.

The struggle of the Indian people for freedom from British imperialism is now unfolding with full force. Throughout India, millions of workers and peasants are moving into action to smash the shackles of century-old British domination. Through strikes and mass demonstrations and clashes with Imperial police and troops, the workers and peasants are already breaking out of the bounds of the suicidal program of "passive resistance" into which Gandhi hoped to confine this great movement. The people of India are utilizing the war and the crisis it has engendered for British imperialism to strike a powerful blow for their national independence.

For The Right Of Self-Determination!

The Socialist Workers Party supports the struggle of the Indian masses because as a revolutionary socialist party it stands four-square for the rights of all peoples to self-determination. The Socialist Workers Party supports the Indian people because

revolutionary action and victory in India will not only inspire the movement of colonial liberation from Japan in Asia and from Britain in Africa, but by weakening world imperialism it will impel the movement for liberation and socialism by the workers of Europe and America. The capitalist rulers of the world, "democratic" and fascist alike, dread the revolutionary awakening in India. Given the slightest opportunity they would forget their present differences and unite in an attempt to crush it.

Unconditional Support for Independence!

The Socialist Workers Party unconditionally supports the movement for Indian independence even though for the present it is led by the Indian bourgeoisie at the helm of the Congress Party, Gandhi, Nehru and the Executive Committee of the Congress Party have been forced to initiate the present movement by tremendous pressure from India's millions. Forced by this profound sentiment from below, the Congress leaders were obliged for the time to abandon further conciliatory moves with Britain at the risk of being pushed to the sidelines by the popular demand for immediate and unconditional independence.

To avoid the tragic fate of the

Chinese Revolution of 1925-27, the Socialist Workers Party urges upon the Indian workers that while supporting and participating in the present movement under its present leadership, they do not trust their fate to Gandhi and Co. They must organize independently and set up their own organs of struggle. Only under the leadership of the Indian proletariat in alliance with the Indian peasantry can the struggle against imperialism be carried through to victory.

Stop Repressions Against India!

The British imperialists have already thrown off the mask of conciliation which they donned when Cripps tried to drive a hard bargain with the Congress leaders. The very first open action on the part of the Indian masses has brought down upon them the heavy hand of British repression. The Congress party has been outlawed and its leaders thrown into prison. Demonstrating crowds have been fired upon by British police. Large bodies of troops are being brought into action against the masses.

On its first anniversary the "Atlantic Charter" stands exposed as a threadbare curtain behind which the British Empire

hides its tyrannical rule over the colonial masses. The Indian masses are getting their first taste of the "four freedoms" of Churchill-Roosevelt in the form of tear gas and bullets. We demand that the terror and violence against the Indian people be halted immediately!

The self-styled "democrats" who yesterday pleaded with the rulers of Britain that some small concession be thrown to the Indian masses today are denouncing the movement and justifying repressions against it in the name of the war of "democracy against fascism." They merely expose their so-called slogan as counterfeit and themselves as prostituted tools of imperialism.

Stalinists Work for British Imperialism

The Stalinists, who pretend that they favor Indian independence, denounce the actions of the Congress party and of the Indian masses for embarking on action to secure that independence. Instead they plead with Roosevelt-Churchill to stem the movement by offering a "concession." Once again they simply display the fact that Stalin has sold the services of his lackeys to British imperialism.

So-called liberals and labor

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued on Editorial column, page 4)

Auto Militants Preserve Union Democracy

Convention Delegates Protest Against Union Retreats But Unable to Develop Independent Policy

By ART PREIS

CHICAGO, August 9—The CIO United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers, largest, most militant and democratic union in the nation, this afternoon ended its tumultuous Seventh Annual Convention, which has been in session here since last Monday in the hot, crowded ball-room of the Hotel Sherman.

For seven days—two more than originally scheduled—an aroused rank and file body of delegates stormily demonstrated their dissatisfaction with and distrust of the do-nothing Thomas-Addes-Reuther-Frankensteen leadership. This leadership had come into the convention determined to strengthen its hold upon the union, limit the powers of the membership, curb the militancy of the rank and file and hog-tie the union more securely to the government machine.

Ranks Jealous of Democracy

Jealously guarding their organizational rights and democratic traditions, the delegates beat back the attempts of the leadership to grab additional powers for themselves. In unmistakable terms, the vast majority of the delegates recorded the rising resentment of the auto workers against the leadership's policies of retreat and capitulation before the anti-labor offensive of the employers and government.

The rank and file militants were unorganized and lacked any clear-cut independent program around which their opposition to the leadership could be crystallized. The majority of the delegates, while hostile to the policies of the leaders on intra-union questions and protesting against the union retreats, still followed the political policies of the leaders, supporting the capitalist program of the Roosevelt administration. Thus, in the end, they were compelled reluctantly and with many misgivings to go along with the program of sacrifice for the war and the no-strike policy, which leaves them as helpless as ever before the attacks of the employers and government. And for this same reason, they could see no alternative but to place the fate of the union once more in the hands of the old, distrusted leadership.

Officials Appeal for "Unity"

This leadership was able to capitalize upon the pro-administration political position of the delegates. By hammering away on demagogic appeals for "unity," by playing upon the anti-fascist sentiments of the delegates and confusing the issues at every turn, the leadership succeeded partly in channelizing the militant tendencies and stormy protests of the delegates and in clinging to their shaky posts. Throughout the convention, the Stalinists, who are today thoroughly discredited in the UAW, were used by the union administration to do its dirty work.

Where the issues were clearest to the delegates on the questions of democratic organizational policies within the union,

they fought down the line and rejected or limited most of the proposals of the leadership. They overwhelmingly voted down proposals to hold the next convention in 1944 instead of 1943, to cut down the representation at the next convention, to increase the dues. They turned down one schedule of steep salary increases for the officers and only agreed, by a narrow margin of seven to six on a roll-call vote, to grant a compromise schedule of increases.

Delegates Fail to Carry Through

But where a political line was decisive, on questions bearing upon their economic interests and the policies of the administration—the sacrifice of week-end and holiday premium pay, the surrender of the right to strike, the dependence upon government agencies to protect their interests—the delegates, after demonstrating their resentment against the consequences of these policies, drew back from taking a definite stand against them.

Nevertheless, in order to prevent the surging rank and file discontent and militancy from taking a decisive direction against the whole policy of retreat and surrender by the leadership, the leadership was compelled to go along a certain distance with the sentiments of the delegates. In three instances, the delegates compelled the leaders to withdraw weak resolutions—on the sacrifice of week-end and holiday overtime pay, discrimination against Negroes, and the anti-labor role of the War Labor Board—and demanded resolutions with "more teeth" in them.

"Second Front" Diversion in UAW

It had been the intent of the leadership to steam up patriotic sentiment among the delegates as a cover for putting over their policies. The first important resolution which came before the convention on Tuesday morning was on the "Second Front." The Stalinists had been attempting to make this the big, key issue of the convention, and the Thomas-Addes leadership had seized upon it as a demagogic device to keep the delegates in line.

The delegates, who were anxious to get on with their own problems, showed no particular interest in the subject of the "Second Front." There had been a reported split in the Resolutions Committee, headed by Victor Reuther, over this question. The Stalinists had wanted a "Second Front Now" resolution, but the committee came out with one simply endorsing the idea of a "Second Front" and leaving the question of when and where up to the government and military authorities.

The Stalinists are so discredited they did not dare to get up and press for a "Second Front Now." The committee's resolution was read and passed mechanically without discussion. From then on the question of the "Second Front" ceased to interest the delegates in any way.

The Struggle Over Overtime Pay

On Tuesday afternoon, came the sharpest conflict of the convention. This arose over the resolution on overtime pay for Saturday, Sunday and holidays. The resolution was introduced by the union's War Policy Committee, headed by Secretary-Treasurer George Addes, and the International Executive Board members, Walter Reuther and Richard Frankensteen.

This resolution was, first of all, a re-endorsement of the principle of sacrificing week-end and holiday overtime pay, put over by the leaders in the UAW emergency conference last April. But the resolution was also a complaint that the policy was being carried out in a "discriminatory" manner, because the AFL unions, particularly the International Association of Machinists, were "refusing to make such sacrifices" and had "solicited the support of unorganized workers in the aircraft industry throughout the country on the ground that the UAW-CIO has sacrificed premium pay for Saturday, Sundays and holidays, while the I.A.M. has refused to make such sacrifice and would obtain such premium pay for the workers who joined that union."

The resolution went on to complain that "so-called 'independent' unions and company unions . . . have likewise refused to accept such policy" and that "many large employers . . . have successfully used this device to prevail upon their employees not to affiliate with the UAW-CIO."

The resolution ended up threatening that unless the government enforces the sacrifice of week-end overtime pay "universally" "within the next thirty days, the UAW-CIO shall deem itself released from its commitment."

After both Addes and Reuther gave lengthy talks in support of this resolution, which in effect calls upon the government to pass anti-labor legislation, the delegates began hitting the floor in opposition.

Workers Against Resolution

Emil Mazey, of Local 212, Detroit, was the first opposition speaker. He pointed out that the leaders had sold the program of sacrifice to the UAW last April on the

universally applied within the next thirty days, you are going to withdraw it? What about in the next thirty days having a ceiling on profits? What about in the next thirty days having a ceiling on prices? What about in the next thirty days, an increase in pay equal to the increase in cost of living since 1939?"

Another delegate, Silvers of Local 351, made an impassioned plea against the whole policy of retreats and sacrifices. "By taking away the right to strike, by God, you are taking away grievance procedure in every small plant that is under contract with the UAW." This statement brought a volley of applause.

The leadership could get virtually no backing from the floor for the resolution, except by Stalinist elements. Nat Ganley, Detroit Local 155, notorious Stalinist whip, tried to step into the breach by bringing in the question of the "Second Front," arguing wildly against "a general strike wave in the United States at this time," appealing in the name of the "CIO members in uniform" and launching a personal attack upon the Mazey brothers, for which he was roundly booed.

President Thomas attempted to swing

'No Strike' Policy Criticised

The Wednesday morning session began with the announcement that Murray was to address the convention that morning. The early deliberations took place in an atmosphere of great confusion because of the preparations for Murray's reception. All this together with Murray's speech, was planned to counteract the militancy of the delegates. The first question was the introduction by the War Policy Committee of a resolution on the War Labor Board. This resolution was submitted as a substitute for a completely weasel-worded one originally put forth by the Resolutions Committee, but which the leadership wisely withdrew in view of the sentiments of the delegates expressed the day previously.

This resolution admitted that the employers, taking advantage of the no-strike policy, are engaged in a "sit-down on the adjustment and disposition of all legitimate grievances" and are receiving "aid and comfort from the knowledge that the National War Labor Board, as it now functions, does not give speedy relief in the multitude of situations which arise throughout the country."

After resolving that "this convention condemn the War Labor Board" for its red tape delaying policies, the resolution ended lamely by appealing to the President and the WLB to set up regional labor boards throughout the country.

William Mazey took the floor to speak against the resolution, stating the resolution "does nothing to guarantee we are going to be able to settle our grievances. . . when these boards don't take proper action." He continued, "I think we should send this resolution back and let them come out and tell the officials in Washington that if our grievances are not settled we intend to take our right to strike back and shut down every plant where the employers are trying to smash our union."

THE MILITANT Is Attacked

At this time, Lindahl, of Detroit Packard Local 190, took the floor to argue that the "policy of relying on government agencies I think is the safest." Then he opened an attack on the militants by shouting: "Is it coincidental, my friends, that the arguments used to strike down the resolution yesterday on the 'Victory Through Equality of Sacrifice Program,' is it coincidental the arguments were contained in a Trotskyite sheet (THE MILITANT) passed out at the gates of the hall?"

He argued further that "yesterday the press of this country stated that the UAW, representing seven hundred thousand workers, echoed the subversive sentiments of the Trotskyites." When he sought to continue by attacking individual delegates as "strictly subversive," the delegates halted him with boos and there was a big clamor.

But the union officialdom had been working diligently in an attempt to bring the delegates into line, and had been spreading the slander that the militants were being led by elements who want to "sabotage the convention." The resolution was passed with little further debate.

New Resolution on Overtime Pay

Then the War Policy Committee introduced its "revised" version of the controversial overtime pay resolution. This contained the same motivation as the rejected one, strengthened only by the inclusion of a clause instructing the union's Secretary-Treasurer to "notify all employers upon the adjournment of this convention" of the 30 day limit placed upon the continued recognition of the overtime pay surrender commitment as prepared in the original resolution.

In the subsequent discussion, Frankensteen and others sought to make it appear that the whole discussion revolved about the question of giving the employers 30 days notice or repudiating the commitment at once, although the resolution was really an endorsement of the policy and a call for enforcement by the government. In this

the tide by giving the floor to Frankensteen. Immediately, there was an enormous clamor. The debate had been going on for two hours, and the delegates wanted to vote. For twenty minutes, they booed and stamped their feet and refused to listen to Frankensteen, who has an unsavory reputation among the auto workers, particularly for his strike-breaking role in the North American Aviation Company strike.

Frankenstein Boomed

Frankenstein was finally permitted to speak, but his words, intended to mislead the delegates on the real issue, had no effect. And he was again booed for his efforts.

The vote was taken three times, first by show of hands, and twice by rising. Although the resolution was clearly voted down, Thomas insisted he was "in doubt." A chorus of boos greeted his statements and there was a cry for a roll-call vote. Rather than permit a roll-call, Thomas announced that the committee "will withdraw the resolution and bring back resolutions on the War Labor Board and also on our strike problem, and so forth, with an amended resolution."

way, the issue was greatly confused.

But two delegates were able to secure the floor and speak strongly against the resolution. Hill, of Local 3, pointed out that "many of our members are in the armed forces fighting for our country and our democracy. But after the war is over and they come back and have to go to work under these conditions, they will say, 'What have you people been doing in our absence? What have we been fighting for? You fellows have given up everything we helped to fight for.'"

Delegate McGill of Flint Local 599, an outstanding militant, stated: "I am not going to support any program that will serve as a spring-board to take from the workers' pay envelopes money which is their livelihood."

But before a full-blown debate could again develop, Murray made his entrance and with this distraction the vote was taken. This time, with the issue completely confused, the majority voted to support the resolution, although about a hundred delegates rose in opposition, while several hundred simply abstained from voting.

Fight Occurs on Negro Resolution

The only other significant conflict on policy occurred over the resolution introduced on the question of discrimination against Negroes in industry and the armed forces.

This resolution, while condemning discrimination, merely appealed to Pres. Roosevelt to enforce the decisions of his Fair Employment Practice Committee, called for a single standard of seniority right and qualifications to be applied without discrimination and for "special attention to an educational program" to promote better inter-racial understanding.

Delegates, both white and Negro, took the floor and objected to the resolution on the grounds that it had no "real teeth" in it. One delegate declared, "We have already written into our constitution what we are going to do to those people who undermine our union by going over to the ranks of the company. I think it is also necessary that we write into our constitution a mandate from this convention what we are going to do to those people who undermine our union by carrying out this discrimination."

Negro Delegate Gets Ovation

One of the most stirring pleas, which received a tremendous ovation, was made by Sheffield, a Negro delegate from the huge Ford Local 600. He called for a firm stand on the question of discrimination, stating:

"In all previous conventions we have passed these beautiful resolutions stating we are opposed to discrimination against the Negro race. However, we have now reached a juncture in American life where Negroes are no longer going to receive membership only in a union but in the American way of life. We want full integration into this union. We want to be your brothers and carry on the fight for industrial unionism as our forerunners have, and we can only do this by not allowing our white brothers to play into the hands of the company."

When the committee's weak resolution was once more read to the convention before the vote, the cry rose, "Vote it down!" And it was overwhelmingly rejected and sent back to committee for stronger wording.

The discussion on this resolution brought out the increasingly significant role being played by the militant Negro workers in the UAW. There were between 60 and 70 Negro delegates at the convention.

A stronger resolution on the discrimination issue was later reported out, which was finally adopted after the deletion of a section praising improvements allegedly made by the administration in its war production policies and in the armed forces.

It was on the proposed constitutional

amendments, devised by the international officers to limit and restrict the rights of the members, that the delegates asserted themselves most sharply against the leadership.

The first big debate came over the proposal to hold the next convention in May 1944. As soon as this proposal was read off, there was a storm of "No's!" from all over the hall.

Lindahl, chairman of the Constitution Committee sought to justify extending the time between conventions on the grounds of increasing transportation difficulties, and, argued that by holding a convention during the war it might "take from the arsenals of the nation close to 200,000 skilled workmen for a week of discussion."

The Stalinist Ganley urged the acceptance of the amendment "in compliance with the earnest request of the President of the United States and his administration, to the effect that wherever possible conventions should not be held during the period of the war."

But the majority of delegates, sensing that this was an attempt to restrict their powers over the officers, refused to be budged by all the specious arguments raised by the Stalinists and the Executive Board members. Delegate Stachiw, of Local 3, opposed extending the time between conventions because "never before have we needed gatherings of the Automobile Workers as we need them today. Because it is a trying period, times are changing and policies are changing, and I for one do not agree to have anybody set my destiny from a swivel chair of any office, rather than a convention."

Officials Beaten on Conventions

Such was the resentment of the delegates to the amendment, that Addes had considerable difficulty in getting the attention of the delegates when he sought to persuade them to adopt the resolution. Thomas had to make several appeals for order every time someone spoke in favor of the amendment. When it was finally put to a vote, it was voted down solidly.

Another sharp debate arose over the proposal to cut down the number of delegates to the next convention by doubling the required number of members of a local union in order to get one delegate to the convention.

Although, there was little debate from the ranks, when the motion was finally put to adopt the amendment it was voted down overwhelmingly. The feeling of the delegates was one of distrust of any proposal to reduce the number of rank and file delegates to the conventions.

Voted Down Dues Increase

One of the hottest issues before the convention was the proposal of the international officers to increase monthly dues from \$1 to \$1.50. They were particularly anxious to get the increase passed, because they were preparing to argue for a big salary and expense account increase for themselves, and because they wanted a big treasury to hire more organizers and strengthen their machine.

Addes took the lead in urging the dues increase, claiming that it was needed for a special post-war emergency fund which "should not be disturbed unless by a two-thirds majority vote of the International Executive Board." He also claimed that the higher dues were needed for organizing, although he failed to explain how the

Why The Leaders Stay In Office

The fact that the present leadership has the backing of the Roosevelt administration, and was given the personal endorsement of CIO President Philip Murray in his speech to the convention, also weighed heavily in the minds of the delegates.

Murray gave a lengthy rambling 90 minute speech on the third day of the convention. It was chiefly devoted to boosting the Thomas-Addes leadership, urging the workers to sacrifice for the bosses' war, complaining about how the bosses are taking advantage of the workers, but offering no program of genuine struggle against the bosses.

Pressure for Progressive Stand

The strong pressure of the delegates on the leadership to take a more progressive and militant stand on important political questions, was shown in a number of the resolutions introduced and passed by the convention.

Among them was a sharply worded protest against the internment in concentration camps of labor unionists in Canada and a denunciation of the "fascist-like" policies of the Canadian government; and an endorsement of the "Double-V Campaign," calling for a "Victory for Democracy at Home as well as Abroad." This campaign, initiated by the Pittsburgh Courier, leading Negro newspaper, has been denounced by the Stalinist press. But, while it includes an endorsement of the war policies of the capitalist government, it is a step away from the program of submitting to the complete surrender of the

UAW had grown to be the largest union in the country on lower dues.

The opposition to increasing the dues was largely an expression of the delegates' disgust with the do-nothing policies of the leaders, their failure to carry out effective organizational work and to defend the interests of the workers in the plants. There was also the factor of the failure of the leadership to take effective action in securing the \$1 a day wage increase demanded by the Ford, General Motors and Chrysler workers.

No Bargaining in Plants

Delegate Case, of Flint Local 599, put the matter in the following terms: "I want to say to the delegates here we don't have any bargaining in our plants any more so we can insist on the paying of more dues. I want to say to you while we are here fighting to make them pay more, the people back home are being transferred from their jobs, taken off one day and put back on the next day with a 10 cent cut in wages, and we cannot get a damned bit of help from our International Union."

After considerable pressure was put on the delegates by the international officers, the dues increase motion was put to a vote and turned down by a great majority. The next day, the constitution committee came in with a proposal for a membership referendum on the dues increase, which was approved by the delegates.

Vote Down Proposals Again

The convention was prolonged an extra day, when on Saturday, the Constitution Committee insisted on bringing back to the convention a number of the proposals which the delegates had already defeated. One delegate rose to protest, "How many times do we have to vote down these proposals, before they are finally beaten?" And one after another, the proposals were voted down again.

A striking feature of this entire convention, was the attitude of extreme disrespect and suspicion which the delegates had for the entire union officialdom.

Officials Get Rough Handling

The convention took on the aspect of a running battle between the Executive Board and the delegates. Thomas had extreme difficulty in maintaining order, and was constantly shouting down delegates, pounding the gavel, pleading for order, and getting loudly booed on numerous occasions. Addes, whenever he occupied the chair, received the same treatment.

Frankenstein and Reuther were booed everytime they rose to speak. Reuther played a cagey game, sensing the sentiment of the delegates. He kept silent on every controversial issue. But his failure to speak out against the bureaucratic proposals, indicated his support of them. On one occasion, a delegate asked the chair if it was true that the Executive Board was not unanimous on a disputed question. Thomas demonstratively turned to the board members on the platform and commanded, "If there is any board member in disagreement, let him stand." Reuther remained seated along with all the others.

The fact that the rank and file militants had no developed leadership to run against the Thomas-Addes-Frankensteen-Reuther group was shown in the elections. Although there was some attempt to develop a campaign for the support of opposition candidates, this met with little success.

Role of Communist Party

The Communist Party at this convention continued its betrayals of the auto workers and fully exposed its conniving, double-dealing game against the interests of the workers. The Stalinists did all the dirty work against the rank and file for the leaders, slavishly boosting up the leadership and taking the floor on behalf of its proposals. The Stalinists' one desire, aside from agitating for a "Second Front Now," was to prove their loyalty to the Thomas-Addes regime and thereby pick up a few organizational crumbs and concessions.

The outstanding fact about this convention was its demonstration of the auto workers' irrepressible militancy and inherent devotion to democratic policies within the union. They intend to keep control of union policies in the hands of the rank and file, and every move to weaken their policy-making power, or institute bureaucratic measures, is met by tremendous resistance.

Resentment against the fraudulent "equality of sacrifice" program, used to trick the auto workers out of their rights, is growing day by day. The rank and file of the mighty UAW-CIO can be expected to press forward once more on its traditional path of militant struggle. With a new, militant leadership, and a bold, aggressive program, the UAW will once more lead the way in the battle of the American working class for its rights and conditions.

The "LABOR WITH A WHITE SKIN CANNOT EMANCIPATE ITSELF WHILE LABOR WITH A BLACK SKIN IS MARY." Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

Trotsky and the American Negro Struggle

It is not our purpose on this occasion, the second anniversary of the death of Leon Trotsky, to discuss all of what that great Marxist had to say about the Negro struggle in the United States. Nor is it our intention here to exaggerate the extent of his contributions toward the solution of the immediate, practical problems of uniting the American Negro and white masses against their common enemy. Trotsky did not have the opportunity to study the problems of the American Negro at close hand; for one thing, the "democratic" government of this country — which welcomes Queen Wilhelmina and other oppressors of millions of Negroes — would not let him live here and refused to permit even his dead body to cross the border.

Trotsky's great contributions were in the field of clarifying the tasks and tactics of the world working class and thus bringing together the forces of the world revolutionary party which alone will lead the masses of all races to the solution of their problems. It will be for this above all that the American Negro people will remember and honor Trotsky in the future. In addition, many of his writings dealt with the problems of the colonial people and their struggle for independence from imperialism.

But this does not mean that Trotsky was unaware of or underestimated the significance of the concrete problems relating to the American Negro people. On the contrary, at every possible chance, he kept emphasizing these things:

1. The necessity for winning the Negro people to support of the revolutionary party.

2. The necessity for combating all traces of racial prejudice among the white militants and workers.

Long before the Trotskyist movement was formed as an opponent of Stalinist treachery, Trotsky wrote a letter in reply to some questions put to him by Claude McKay, then a communist. Printed in the March 13, 1923 International Press Correspondence, part of the letter said:

"In North America the matter is further complicated by the abominable outburst and caste presumption of the privileged upper strata of the working class itself, who refuse to recognize fellow-workers and fighting comrades in the Negroes. (AFL President) Gompers' policy is founded on the exploitation of such despicable prejudices, and is at the present time the most effective guarantee for the successful subjugation of white and colored workers alike. The fight against this policy must be taken up from various sides, and on various lines. One of the most important branches of this conflict consists in enlightening the proletarian consciousness by awakening the feeling of human dignity, and of revolutionary protest, amongst the black slaves of American capital. As stated above, this work can only be carried out by self-sacrificing and politically educated revolutionary Negroes."

More than six years later, when the Trotskyists had been expelled from the Communist International for their defense of Marxist principles, and when the Trotskyists were holding their first organization conference in this country as the American Left Opposition, forerunner of the present Socialist Workers Party, Trotsky, already in exile, wrote a letter to THE MILITANT on "Tasks of the American Opposition." In this, the first letter which he was able to write to his American collaborators, Trotsky emphasized the importance of the Negro problem in relation to the revolutionary movement:

"The trade union bureaucrats, like the bureaucrats of false Communism, live in the atmosphere of aristocratic prejudices of the upper strata of the workers. It will be a tragedy if the Oppositionists are infected even in the slightest degree with these qualities. We must not only reject and condemn these prejudices; we must burn them out of our consciousness to the last trace. We must find the road to the most deprived, to the darkest strata of the proletariat, beginning with the Negro, whom capitalist society has converted into a Pariah, and who must learn to see in us his revolutionary brothers. And this depends wholly upon our energy and devotion to the work." (THE MILITANT, May 1, 1929.)

Trotsky's attitude toward the

Negro masses contained not a trace of that condescension and sentimental superciliousness which characterized the Stalinists and social-democrats of ten years ago. He was far more interested in recruiting a Negro worker than a white intellectual. And for very good, very material reasons. To illustrate:

In 1932 an application for membership in the Trotskyist movement was received in this country from 24 Negroes in Johannesburg, South Africa. As soon as Trotsky had seen their letter, he wrote an article for THE MILITANT (July 2, 1932,) in which he said:

"If the Johannesburg comrades did not as yet have the possibility to acquaint themselves closer with the views of the Left Opposition on all the most important questions, it cannot be an obstacle in getting together with them as closely as possible even today and to help them fraternally to come into the orbit of our program and our tactics."

"When ten intellectuals of Paris, Berlin or New York who have been in various organizations, address themselves to us with a request to be taken into our midst I would give the following advice: Put them thru a number of tests on all the questions of program; wet them under the rain, dry them in the sun, and then after a new careful examination, accept one or two."

"The matter changes basically when ten workers connected with the masses come to us. The difference in our relation to the petty bourgeois and to the proletarian groups does not require any explanation. But if the proletarian group works in a district where there are workers of various races, and in spite of this, it consists only of workers of a privileged nationality, I am inclined to regard them with suspicion: are we not dealing with the workers' aristocracy? Isn't the group poisoned by slave holding prejudices active or passive?"

"It is quite a different matter when we are approached by a group of Negro workers. Here I am ready to consider beforehand that we are achieving agreement with them, even though this is not yet obvious; because of their whole position they do not strive and cannot strive to degrade anybody, oppress anybody or deprive anybody of his rights. They do not seek privileges and cannot rise to the top except on the road of the international revolution."

"We can and we should find a way to the consciousness of the Negro workers, of the Chinese workers, of the Hindu workers, all these oppressed colored races of the human ocean to whom belongs the decisive word in the development of humanity."

In a discussion on "self-determination" held with one of the American Trotskyist leaders on Feb. 28, 1933, Trotsky returned once again to the need for fighting racial prejudice among the white workers:

"The Negro can be developed to a class standpoint only when the white worker is educated. . . I am absolutely sure that they (the Negro masses) will in any case fight better than the white workers. That, however, can happen only provided the communist party carries on an uncompromising merciless struggle. . . against the colossal prejudices of the white workers and gives it no concessions whatever."

Considerations of space prevent us from quoting further, but we think we have made the point. Trotsky guided us to a correct working class perspective in this respect as in all others. We Trotskyists do not claim to have a lot of influence among the Negro masses today. The job of gathering together a group of courageous, self-sacrificing Negro revolutionists in a period of reaction has not been an easy one — no easier than that of building the revolutionary party.

But we have reason to be encouraged by the progress of the last few years, especially since the war began. We now number in our ranks a comparatively small but important number of Negro workers, most of them active trade unionists with experience among the masses. The difficulties ahead are considerable, but we are confident that our comrades, both Negro and white, will play a decisive role in the Negro struggles coming. Success in those struggles will be the only kind of monument that Trotsky would have wanted.

English Workers Move Left

British Trotskyists Raise Slogan: "Labor to Power!"

By L. LAWRENCE

The defeats abroad of the British Empire and harsh economic life at home have all been reflected in the consciousness of the organized workers of England. As related in past articles, on the economic field the working class is tearing itself loose from the no-strike agreement between their top labor leaders and the capitalists resulting in hundreds of "illegal" strikes during the past year in defense of their rights and standards.

The working class of England is showing a growing understanding of the slaveholding imperialist role of the British Empire. This fact is brought home to the interested visitor on many occasions. I was talking with a group of 20 average organized workers, none of them Trotskyists, and I was surprised to see the unanimity and the class conscious approach with which they attacked "capitalist" England's role in India.

The continued setbacks and losses of imperialist Britain has not resulted in passivity and apathy among the organized workers of England. The reaction of the organized English worker generally is: let's find a better way of fighting Hitler. While wanting "this bloody mess to end," the English worker nevertheless still takes his side with the United Nations. On the heels of defeats, setbacks, however, the average British worker tends to become more critical and at the present stage this is reflected in his desire for putting a strong "anti-Hitler government" in power. This is generally assumed to mean a government more favorable to their class and having more of their class representatives.

The English working class has

Black Market Flourishes In Steel Industry

There is a widespread black market in the steel industry which, in the midst of much publicized steel shortages, is selling hundreds of thousands of pounds of steel at sky-high profiteering prices. This was revealed last week at New Orleans at a House subcommittee hearing.

Frank O. Higgins, manager of the Higgins Corporation, whose shipyards were recently shut down because of a WPB refusal to allocate steel to them, testified that he had purchased huge quantities of steel from black market warehouses all over the country.

While the WPB could not allocate steel, he was able to buy everything he needed from black market dealers, Higgins testified.

"LEGAL PROFITEERING"
"You have to pay a premium," he said, "but it is not illegal. It is legal profiteering."

So huge are the supplies of steel available in the black market warehouses that it is beyond doubt that the big steel monopolists are engaged in the trade.

Since there is no ceiling price on shipments of less than 40,000 pound carload lots, the warehouses, fed by big mills, contract for 39,000 pound lots at prices "as high as the traffic will bear."

No details on the evidence given by Higgins were revealed by the House subcommittee, which heard the most important testimony behind locked doors.

The fact that the basic steel industry is riddled by black market operations reveals the inability of the government to enforce price ceilings. The operations of a black market and the skyrocketing of prices in the steel industry will affect all important manufacturing and will have a wide effect on prices generally.

Although Roosevelt, on hearing the testimony of Higgins, stated that black market dealers should go to jail, no action has been taken to prosecute them.

CONNECTIONS
IN WASHINGTON
That the black market in steel has high connections in Washington is shown by the fact that the warehouses dealing in the underground traffic know in advance when a manufacturer will get a government contract and flood him with circulars offering immediate delivery of the right types of steel needed.

When informed of the President's statement that the black market dealers should go to jail, Higgins is reported to have smiled and said:

"I don't see what all the excitement is about. Everyone who knows anything about steel or building knows of this market and of the fact that warehouses are bulging with steel."

EDITOR'S NOTE

This is the third of a series of articles by comrade L. Lawrence who recently returned from a visit to England where he was in a position to observe the current political scene in that country and the effects of the war upon the British working class and their political organizations. Comrade Lawrence had an excellent opportunity to meet with trade unionists, advanced political workers and many others and get their direct opinions and impressions of current developments. The final article of this series will appear in a subsequent issue.

more confidence in the type represented by Cripps than in Churchill. It looks to men like Cripps as being nearer the working class and more responsive to its interests. (It should be noted that at the time I was in England, Cripps' infamous role in India was as yet not known to the workers. This was due primarily to the propaganda in their capitalist press, the Labor Party press and the Stalinist lies in covering up his role. The labor lieutenants of capitalism made it seem that Cripps had practically offered independence plus Socialism to the Indian people.)

"LABOR TO POWER!" WIL'S SLOGAN

This confusing but nevertheless leftward moving mass consciousness is of course a very important development on the road to the revolutionary Socialist struggle against fascism. The proof of this can be seen in the most enthusiastic reception accorded by wide layers of organized workers to the great progressive class slogan of the Workers International League (WIL), adherent of the Fourth International: "Labor to Power!" This slogan has had a great deal to do with their phenomenal growth of influence during the past half year.

The WIL has argued that the first step in the direction of a real struggle against fascism must be the taking of the political power out of the hands of the capitalists and placing it in the hands of the labor movement. I understand that even the American press reported the hearty reception given to the WIL propagandists at the recent Labor Party's national conference. Among the workers in the factories the slogan is receiving even more favorable response.

The greatest obstacles to the leftward development of the organized workers of Britain are the die-hard, class collaborationist Labor Party bureaucracy, and the Stalinists. The Labor Party bureaucracy, having a few posts in the Cabinet, has rapidly developed from a "loyal opposition" to a loyal partner in the carrying out of the imperialist struggle and the attempted regimentation of the working class. They are equally responsible for the imperialist defense of Burma and Malaya and the present imperialist defense of Egypt, Suez and India. Together with Churchill and the capitalist class they dared not arm the natives of the Far East and the Nile. In the case of India, of course, they infamously refused together with their capitalist slaveholding partners, to grant the Indian people freedom.

As a loyal partner on the home front the labor leaders also have played an infamous role. H. Morrison, labor party leader, and Minister of Home Security, for example, has been directly connected with the forced-labor decree known as the "Essential Works Order." He has also directly attacked civil rights of the workers by fighting against the lifting of the ban on the Stalinist Daily Worker, and has already suggested in Parliament the possibility of a future ban against the Socialist Appeal, organ of the WIL.

LABOR PARTY LEADERS
BACK POLITICAL TRUCE
These Labor Party collaborators with Churchill's government have also agreed to a political truce between their party and Churchill's party, the Conservatives. This truce is an agreement "in the interests of national unity" to maintain the status quo in Parliament. Since the government has not gone to the country in quite a while, the only elections that take place are by-elections when members of Parliament die. When a Conservative dies, the Labor Party does not challenge his seat and vice versa.

The second big obstacle in the way of the leftward moving workers is the class-collaborationist propaganda of the Stalinists. At the time I was in England, and CP was riding the wave of the glorious Soviet defense struggles of the past winter.

WORKERS LOOK TO
SOVIET UNION
It should be noted that as against their passive acceptance of Churchill's leadership in the war, the workers enthusiastically accepted the Soviet Union's leadership in the war. They looked to the Soviet Union as the leader in the struggle against fascism. Also they fully even though mistakenly

role, the CP has betrayed that confidence in quick-fire time. The Stalinists stand wholly behind the political truce that exists between Labor and the Conservatives. They always give wholehearted support to the Labor or Conservative candidate for Parliament.

STALINISTS BETRAY BRITISH WORKERS

The CP attempts to justify its reactionary role in English politics today by lulling the workers with the belief that the "left" side of the war is automatically taken care of by the Soviet Union's participation in the war. In practice the CP has given all support possible to the imperialist war and the masters of England.

Their servility has even reached the phase where Gallagher, only CP member of Parliament, was about the only "liberal" in Parliament who gave Churchill a vote of confidence after the fall of Tobruk. All kinds of self-styled liberals and Laborites voted against Churchill, and thereby reflected working class sentiment in their respective localities, but not Gallagher. He, above all, was out to support Churchill unhesitatingly and unwaveringly, come what may.

ILGWU Leaders Surrender Conditions To Brass Hats

By WILLIAM GRAY

NEW YORK, Aug. 11. — A serious breach was made in the wage and hour standards of the New York needle trade workers in an agreement reached last week between officials of the ILGWU, New York Garment Manufacturers, and representatives of the WPB and Army procurement officers.

As yet applying to only one small section of the industry, the manufacture of army raincoats, this agreement will eventually cover the whole dress industry, according to Julius Hochman, Manager of the N. Y. Joint Board of the ILGWU. He stated that the dress industry will be ready to handle government contracts on wage bases lower than the prevailing standards.

Union counsel M. Herbert Syme stated that the main concessions by the union leaders were to raise the work week from 36 to 40 hours and to cut the average hourly wage from \$1.10 to \$1.00. The other concessions have not yet been announced.

As reported previously in THE MILITANT, the anti-labor policies of the WPB and the Army procurement officers have resulted in tremendous unemployment in New York City, particularly for the unionized garment workers.

THE UNION'S CHARGES
Union leaders have for weeks been negotiating with the WPB and the Army, trying without success to get substantial war contracts for this city. That the union officials were fully aware of the anti-labor meaning of the Army and WPB policies is shown by many speeches and statements.

An article which appeared in the July 15 issue of Justice, ILGWU weekly, reports that at a special membership meeting of Local 22 on July 2, vice-President Charles Zimmerman accused the

brass hats of discrimination against union labor. He pointed out that their practise of giving Army contracts to the lowest bidders made it impossible for the New York area — with a higher cost of living, union wages and conditions — to compete with the open shop South, which is building new factories and creating a rival to the unionized industry in the south.

Zimmerman said, "We will raise as much hell as necessary to see that we get more defense work in this area."

The union also supported demands that the WPB and army officials allow a price differential to the New York area to enable this area to compete in the bidding for war contracts, and that this area be allocated orders directly proportionate to the volume of civilian work previously done.

A MISERABLE SURRENDER
Thus despite the full knowledge of the union leadership of the anti-union aims of the WPB and army officers, and despite their promise to "raise as much hell as necessary to protect union standards," a miserable surrender of the conditions and wages of the rank and file has resulted.

WPB officials were reported as being highly pleased with the union's agreement to cut its scale and will no doubt use this precedent to further press its anti-labor activity at the expense of other labor organizations. There can be no doubt that the garment bosses are also pleased with the agreement. They are for anything that lowers the workers' wages and raises the hours.

The logical result of the capitulation of the ILGWU leadership to the boss-inspired policies of the government and Army agencies can only be the weakening of a union built by countless sacrifices on the part of the garment workers.

August Fourth International Features Trotsky Memorial

The August issue of *Fourth International*, the monthly magazine, is designated as the Trotsky Memorial Number.

Published this week, it includes "On Some Critics of Trotsky" by Marc Loris, which authoritatively answers such critics as Max Eastman, J. R. Johnson and others who "explain" Stalin's crushing of the Left Opposition in Russia as due to the personal inadequacies of Trotsky. "Trotsky's Revolutionary Optimism" is the Editorial Comment of the month, particularly noting his prophetic views on India and the United States.

"The Trial of the Assassin," by Walter Rourke, summarizes to date the court proceedings and the attempts of Stalin's GPU to get the assassin of Trotsky out of jail. "The Second World War," by Leon Trotsky, is the *From the Arsenal of Marxism* choice of the month; it is the full text of the remarkable interview which Trotsky gave to the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* a few months before his death.

A featured article is John G. Wright's "What the Soviet Press Reveals," analyzing the latest issues of the Russian press to arrive in this country.

"China in the War," by F. Morrow, defends China's war of national liberation as progressive; it is an answer to the pseudo-radical theory of Max Shachtman who asserts that all the present struggles in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are merely "serving one imperialist camp against the other."

C. Charles contributes an article on "American Patent Monopolies," explaining the use made of patents by the monopolies in restricting production.

"The Real Situation in Argentina," by Terence Phelan, effectively refutes Washington's propaganda that Argentina's resistance to entering the war is instigated by the Axis.

Li Fu-jen has contributed an informative article on the death of Chen Tu-hsiu, "A Chinese Revolutionary Passes."

The department of "International Notes" carries unusual material from Yugoslavia, England, China, India, and Poland.

Single copies of *Fourth International* are 20 cents each. Subscription rates are \$2 a year. The office of *Fourth International* is 116 University Place, New York city.

Trotsky's Military Policy And Its Critics

By M. MORRISON

One of the most important current policies of our party was introduced at the suggestion of Leon Trotsky shortly before Jacobson succeeded in the task assigned to him by Stalin's GPU, the task of murdering Trotsky. I refer to the policy of military training under trade union control. This policy will go down in history as one of the most important and one of the most significant in revolutionary Marxist annals.

It is not a new tactic in the sense that military training of the masses had never before been advocated by any Marxist. Lenin had once before proposed essentially the same tactic. What made Trotsky's proposal so significant were the circumstances under which it was advanced. The question of military training was being discussed everywhere and by everybody at that time and hence a proposal which might have gone unnoticed under other circumstances immediately received a great deal of attention and became an important subject for discussion.

A bill was about to be introduced in Congress calling for compulsory military training. The natural tendency of those opposed to a capitalist regime was simply to wage a campaign of opposition to this bill on the grounds of general opposition to militarism and particular opposition to the war policies of Roosevelt.

A CLASS ATTITUDE ON MILITARY TRAINING

Trotsky, however, saw in the introduction of a conscription measure in Congress an opportunity for a different kind of campaign than mere opposition to the conscription bill. He saw in the situation a chance to turn the attention of the advanced workers away from a merely negative opposition to conscription to a positive class attitude on the question of military training.

Exactly what Trotsky foresaw occurred when our party adopted the slogan of "military training under trade union control." The Socialist Workers' Party was immediately distinguished from all bourgeois, pacifist and doctrinaire socialist opposition to conscription. It presented a positive program which, at the very least, had the effect of bringing the attention of the advanced workers to the necessity of a class approach to the question of military training.

IMPORTANT QUESTION FOR THE EPOCH

We are living in a period when all important questions are settled by force. This is the basic premise making military training of the workers absolutely essential. Prosecutors, either through ignorance or malice, may claim that this constitutes advocating the use of force, but intelligent and honest people will recognize it as a statement of fact similar to the statement that night follows the day. It is a generalization based on an analysis of present-day society.

It can be said that this was true during any period in the development of capitalist society. Only theoretically so. The advent of fascism brings that truth sharply to the consciousness of the masses and this makes all the difference in the world. It is one thing when only the most advanced sections are capable of recognizing certain truths and it is another thing when events have developed to a point where the masses of people are able to see the truth of a proposition.

A class or a nation that ignores the necessity of military training is one that is doomed to defeat. Military training is not in itself sufficient to bring victory to a nation or class, but it is absolutely indispensable for victory. If the Indian masses should continue to follow Gandhi's policies of passive resistance defeat is unavoidable for them.

SLOGAN COMBATS PACIFIST ILLUSIONS

The very slogan of military training under trade union control combats pacifism. It teaches the workers the necessity to prepare, in this period, to fight the enemy with his weapons and as skillfully. If that slogan had no other value than to inculcate the advanced workers against pacifist ideas it would be justified.

But it does far more than that. It exhorts the workers not only to obtain military training but to do so on a class basis. It, in effect, says to the workers: let the organizations of your class take control of the military training of the workers. The effect of such a slogan, if carried out, must necessarily and inevitably result in

the organization of a class army prepared and able to defend the interests of the working masses.

They are indeed blind who do not see the significance of the slogan. To oppose it means only an indifference to the dangers of pacifism in the ranks of the workers, if not actually favoring such pacifism. To oppose it means not to understand the desirability and necessity of educating the workers to think along the lines of their own class army to defend their class interests.

WHY THE OPPOSITION REJECTS THE SLOGAN

Reasons given by those who oppose the slogan on allegedly revolutionary grounds clearly indicate either a lack of understanding or an intentional misconstruction of the whole concept. They have in the first place claimed that we advocate trade union control of the army. They do not have to teach us that the present army, as distinct from the individual soldiers composing it, is a capitalist institution and to attempt to gain control of this institution for the trade unions is sheer fantasy. What we advocate is not trade union control of the capitalist army but trade union control of military training. There is quite a distinction between the two.

Another accusation leveled against us because of our advocacy of military training under trade union control is that we favor compulsory military service and that we support any conscription bill introduced by representatives of capitalist parties in the legislature. As indicated above the value of the slogan was greatly enhanced by the fact that the Roosevelt administration had raised the question of compulsory military training and that, consequently the masses were discussing it. Our opponent seized upon that very circumstance to confuse the conscious workers by telling them that we favored the conscription bill introduced in Congress.

At that time we made it very clear that we opposed the particular conscription measure introduced in Congress. Had we had a representative in Congress he would have introduced a bill providing for military training under trade union control and at the expense of the government.

Our opponents never made it clear whether they opposed the idea of military training by the trade unions or the demand that the government defray the expenses for such training, or the idea of conscription. Probably it is the latter that they really opposed. (This is giving them the benefit of the doubt.)

To that we answer: Marxists do not oppose conscription as a principle. The Soviet Union has a perfect right to conscript people to serve in the Red Army. While our emphasis was not and is not on conscription but on military training we would not hesitate to support conscription provided the military training were to be under the control of the workers' organizations. We, as Marxists, always ask: what is the purpose of the particular conscription advocated? whom is it intended to serve?

Conscription for the purpose of furnishing military training to workers under trade union control will always find champions in revolutionary Marxists. Because such conscription and such training would assure the victory of the working class in any struggle forced upon it by the fascists or any reactionary section of the capitalist class.

GREAT VALUE OF TROTSKY'S SLOGAN

Nether Trotsky nor we believed that the idea would immediately be accepted by the workers as a whole but we understood the tremendous educational value of that slogan for the advanced workers. If and when the idea will be acted upon by the trade unions, with or without the government's defraying the expenses, the victory of the working class will be well-nigh certain.

Alas that Stalin succeeded in preventing Trotsky from answering the opponents of the slogan and thus from explaining and elaborating upon the idea. Essentially, however, the idea of military training under trade union control is one of those ideas not acquiring elaborate explanation. It is easily understood by workers interested in the welfare of their class and not corrupted by pacifism or doctrinaire socialism.

To assure the victory of their class the American workers will have to adopt the policy of military training under control of their organizations as well as the other fundamental ideas advocated by Leon Trotsky.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 33 Saturday, August 15, 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. Bundle orders: 5 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

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

Indian Masses Fight For Freedom

(Continued from page 1)

appearance of being beheaded. The British authorities — echoed by all the foreign correspondents — are assuring the world that "firm measures" will put an end to the "disorders." But they are whistling in the dark.

In the first days perhaps the most prominent place in the arena was taken by the students. This phenomenon is familiar enough in the struggles of all predominantly agrarian countries — Russia, Yugoslavia, etc. But the students are merely the harbingers of the next stage, when the peasantry and the proletariat will swing into action.

From the countryside, where more than 70 per cent of the population tills the soil, nothing has yet been heard. Partly that is due to the poor preparations of the Congress leaders, partly to the poor communications with the villages. But the villages will rise, as they always have when the signal is given from the cities, and this time they will rise as never before. An end to payment of taxes and land-rents, setting fire to the mansions of British officials and their native agents, seizures of the grain and livestock of the landowners and princes — all the aspects of peasant rebellions will soon be reported.

Workers Will Have Decisive Say

But the decisive word in the present struggle must be said by the proletariat in the great cities of Calcutta and Bombay and the nearby industrial towns. In the previous "civil disobedience" campaigns there were always great strikes of the textile workers, the oldest section of the still-young Indian proletariat. But with relatively little industry, the principal aspect of the struggle in the cities was the hartal of the innumerable little shopkeepers.

This time, however, the shopkeepers are of minor economic and political weight compared to the rapidly-growing proletariat of the war industries. Already at the beginning of the war there were about five million industrial proletarians in India: two million working in power-driven factories, a million railwaymen and miners, 400,000 transport workers, a million plantation workers. The increase since 1940 is concealed by the British as a "military secret" but has been considerable, especially in power-driven factories. Calcutta has become a gigantic arsenal of war industry, and the Bombay region is only second to Calcutta.

Hence hartals of shopkeepers mean little compared to the new power of the industrial proletariat. Britain can endure closed little shops, but not shut-down war plants. Thus the decisive say in this struggle will be that of the city workers. If they take the lead, and rally the peasantry, Britain is through in India.

Workers Need More Than Congress Plan

The workers stand firmly for independence and for fighting for it. For the workers, however, more than for the rest of the population, the Congress plan for "deadlock" is a hopelessly insufficient method of struggle. The peasant refusing to pay taxes and rents still continues as before his miserable living from the land. The shopkeepers for a time can live off his tiny capital. The workers, however, have neither land nor capital. With the factories closed for an indefinite period, the workers face starvation. Hence for the proletariat the shutting-down of the factories can be merely preliminary to a direct struggle for state power. The general strike of the workers is the signal for revolution, or it is doomed to defeat, either by starvation or by repression. Thus their whole situation drives the proletariat to adopt a revolutionary program going far beyond the "deadlock" formula of the Congress.

Will the proletariat embark on this road? The textile workers are already out, in accordance with their long tradition. Some war plants also are already down. But the situation has not yet unfolded. It is a question of leadership. Will the proletariat find it?

It must be emphasized that the Congress is limited in its appeal to the workers, not only by the limitations of the Congress "deadlock" plan, but also by the malodorous record of the Congress provincial governments of 1938-1939, which ordered the police out to break strikes (especially strikes against the Indian employers who control the Congress!), passed anti-labor legislation, etc.

Part of the official trade union leadership — the unions have grown during the war — is in the left wing of the Congress and is undoubtedly seeking to swing the workers into action behind the Congress campaign. The national committee of the All-India Trade Union Congress is reported in session to decide whether to call a general strike.

The unknown quantity in the situation at this stage is the precise extent of the power of the Stalinists, the principal betrayer of the present struggle for independence. They controlled about 40 per cent of the votes at the last session of the national trade union committee in February. These are votes at the top and by no means indicate great strength in the ranks below. But the Communist Party has been given full legal standing on the eve of this

struggle; money is undoubtedly being poured in by the Kremlin; and with all kinds of covert governmental backing, the Stalinists may for a time appear as a considerable power in the trade unions and factories.

The Stalinists now stand openly at the extreme right wing in India — to the right even of such pro-British groups as the "Moslem" League of Jinnah. No other group, not even the long-time native agents of the British in the government, has more viciously attacked the present struggle for independence.

The Stalinists were the only group in the Congress who openly stood for acceptance of the Cripps proposals for an "Indian" government under control of the Viceroy. To quote one of their own organs, "the Communists urged Congress and the Moslem League to unite in order to achieve a settlement on the basis of the Cripps proposals." (Daily Worker, August 4, 1942.)

When the Congress committee voted on August 8 for the "civil disobedience" campaign, only 13 out of 360 votes were cast against it; "the 13 who voted against the Gandhi non-cooperation proposal were for the most part Indian Communists." (Daily Worker, August 9.)

The Stalinist line is that, independently of whether or not Britain grants Indian independence, the Indian people should support the British war effort. In the Stalinist resolution introduced against the Gandhi-Nehru resolution, the Stalinists said: "To persist in the policy of non-cooperation with or neutrality toward the government war effort or their defense measures is . . . to betray the sacred cause of the defense of the country. . ." (Daily Worker, August 5.) No wonder the British imperialists made the Stalinist party legal just when they were about to outlaw the Congress party!

Like the Moslem League and other pro-British groups, the Stalinists of course give lip-service to independence for India, but condemn any direct struggle for securing it. They deplore the British repressions but condemn any resistance to the repressions. Their main proposal is for Indians and Americans to appeal to Roosevelt "to prevail upon the British War Cabinet in London to immediately reopen negotiations with Congress, Moslem League and other people's leaders, for the purpose of assuring the full and untrammelled mobilization of the Indian people to defend India from Axis aggression." (Daily Worker, August 11) And if Roosevelt refuses, or if he asks and the British refuse? And what shall the Indian masses do, who are being lashed and shot by British troops? Beyond petitions to Roosevelt the Stalinists propose nothing!

Insofar as it lies within their power, it is clear, the Stalinists will attempt to prevent the industrial proletariat from striking in protest against the repressions — not to speak of striking and fighting for independence. In short, in return for the "aid" he is getting from Britain, Stalin has sold the services of his lackeys to British imperialism.

The Stalinist line has nothing in common with the real interests of the Soviet Union. Like China, the Soviet Union would find in a Free India a genuinely reliable ally. The Soviet masses would be re-invigorated by successful revolutions, which would open up to them again the perspective of an end to the isolation of the first workers' state in a hostile capitalist world. But the Soviet masses would then also put an end to the oppression of the Kremlin bureaucracy. Precisely for this reason the Kremlin prefers its alliance with Britain to an alliance with a revolutionary India. Here, as in everything else, one sees the fundamental difference in interests between Stalin and the Soviet masses.

China's Support of India's Struggle

In heartening contrast to the counter-revolutionary role of the Stalinists are the Chinese declarations of solidarity with the struggle of the Indian people. It would not have been surprising had Chungking remained silent, fearing British reprisals by holding up war materials passing through India for China. Indeed, it would not have been surprising had Chiang Kai-shek, like the Stalinists, condemned the Congress campaign, preferring dubious British aid to the future aid for China of a successful Indian struggle. Instead, however, Sun Fo — who speaks of course for the government — declared to the press in Chungking that "Chinese sympathy is entirely with the Indians in their struggle for independence." Once the government had thus indicated its stand, the entire Chinese press expressed the solidarity of the Chinese people for the Congress campaign.

As was made clear when Chiang Kai-shek went to India just before the Cripps negotiations, he was more than ready to help the British make a deal with Gandhi and Nehru, and is still ready to do so. That he now permits open expressions of Chinese sympathy with the Indian struggle is an eloquent testimonial to the power and scope of India's fight. Chiang, it is plain, expects that the Indian people may win against Britain.

The Chinese-language daily in New York, the Chinese Journal, carried a front-page editorial August 11, summarizing the Chinese attitude. It sarcastically laughs at the British idea that jailing the Congress leaders will stop the fight. Two fundamental factors, it says, have made that impossible: (1) The Anglo-American defeats in the Far East have shown that if India remains under British domination it is likely to suffer the same fate as Burma, Malaya, Singapore and the East Indies. The Indian masses are determined to prevent that. (2) The Indian people have learned how to defend themselves by the example of China. Despite lack of arms, China has been able to do what the Anglo-Americans failed to do, namely carry on year after year resistance to Japanese imperialism. India can do the same — but only when it has its own government.

The way out for India, and for all the peoples, will not come from Churchill or Roosevelt, Hitler or the Mikado. The way out is the brotherhood of the peoples against all the oppressors. A Free India will be a powerful and reliable ally of Free China and the Soviet Union. A Free India, putting an end to the imperialist privileges of British capitalism and the crumbs it hands out to its labor lieutenants, would speed the British working class on the road of socialist revolution. A Worker's Government of Britain could inspire European and German revolution against Hitler as no bourgeois government can do.

Thus India's present struggle, if successful, would set in motion vast forces for the re-making of human society. That is why every worker, every honest democrat, throughout the world must give unconditional support to India's fight.

Wartime Flu Epidemic Will Take Heavy Toll

By GRACE CARLSON

War, Famine, Pestilence and Death, the dread "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" have again ridden forth! In every country on the face of the globe, these murderous associates are today taking their terrible toll of human lives, with an even greater harvest in store for them on the morrow — unless the world's workers end the capitalist system which gives the "Four Horsemen" a free rein on their errands of destruction.

In a recent work, *Fatal Partners: War and Disease*, Dr. Ralph Major reviews the great wars of history and describes the frightful pestilences: bubonic plague, typhus fever, smallpox, cholera, yellow fever and many other terrible diseases which were spread far and wide by these wars. The great plagues of the past may seem a long way off to the modern American worker, but everyone in the United States, over the age of 30 remembers the death-dealing influenza pandemic which accompanied World War I and may return during World War II according to Dr. Major.

MOST DEADLY PLAGUE

Public health authorities estimate that there were 21,000,000 deaths in the world from influenza in the ten-month period in 1918 and 1919 during which the disease raged. This global outbreak of deadly influenza ranks with the plague of Justinian in the 6th century and the Black Death in the 14th century as one of the three most destructive plagues which the human race has ever known.

In the United States alone, there were 548,452 deaths from influenza and the pneumonia, which accompanied it; nearly half of these deaths were among men and women between the ages of 20 and 40. Other hundreds of thousands in this country were ill from the disease. In some cities, records show that half of the total population was attacked by influenza in this period.

Medical men were almost helpless before this destructive flood of disease which swept across the earth in the space of a few months. The quick onset of the disease, its strange virulence, the failure of all remedies which had formerly been used in the treatment of colds, gripple and influenza made of the "Spanish influenza" of 1918 a mysterious malady to doctors and laymen alike.

MEDICAL PROGRESS SLOW

A vast amount of research has been done on influenza since 1918 and public health workers now have considerably more information about the cause and cure of flu. "If the widely expected influenza epidemic of the present war holds off a little longer, scientists may be ready for it," wrote one public health authority recently.

The germ which causes influenza was discovered in 1933 and has since been measured and photographed by means of the electron microscope. The particles of the virus responsible for influenza are so tiny that one particle would have to be magnified 65,000 times before it was as large as the period at the end of this sentence. Although small, the influenza virus particles are deadly and have a particularly destructive effect on the cells of the lungs.

Vaccines are being prepared so that individuals may be protected from influenza as they are from smallpox, by vaccination. These are still in an experimental stage, however, and the work of the research workers has been terribly complicated by the discovery that there are at least three and possibly more types of influenza virus.

Immunity against one type does not guarantee immunity against another. Separate vaccines will have to be developed.

The possible use of the sulfa drugs in the fight against influenza is also being studied. It is known that none of the present sulfa products, sulfanilamide, sulfapyridine, sulfathiazole or the others is effective against the flu, itself, but all of them have been found to be useful in the treatment of pneumonia, which so often follows influenza.

PEOPLE'S RESISTANCE LOW

But the groundwork for another world-wide outbreak of influenza and other infectious diseases is being laid by the capitalist rulers of the world. Widespread malnutrition, exposure to the cold and the elements, crowded, unsanitary living-quarters have lowered the resistance of millions of peoples since the beginning of World War II. This is the soil on which epidemic disease flourishes! Influenza is always present in the population and minor outbreaks of the disease occur in one locality or another from time to time. An increase in the virulence of the flu germ and the lowering of

the resistance of populations may combine to set off another pandemic of influenza which will rock the world.

A circular letter issued from the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States in January of this year to all army doctors urges the greatest precautions against a possible outbreak of influenza among soldiers. Every suspected case of the flu should be immediately isolated and the patient kept in bed until 48 hours after his temperature has returned to normal, the instructions read. Moreover, soldiers should resume their normal activities at a very gradual rate while they are convalescing from the flu, because many of the complications of influenza occur during the period of convalescence. The use of vaccines against the flu and treatment by sulfa drugs, if there is any suspicion of pneumonia complications, are also recommended for soldiers in the army.

Similar safeguards must be set up for civilians. Trade unions should see to it that adequate paid sick leaves are allowed to their members and that workers are given some protection against the speed-up system after they return to work from a siege of the flu. Only the members of militant and powerful trade unions can hope to secure such protection, however, and even these safeguards may be pushed aside by a tidal wave of disease sweeping across a war-torn world.

For Indian Independence

(Continued from page 1)

leaders, fearing that the repressive measures taken against the struggle for Indian freedom will expose the fraudulence of the "democratic war against fascism," are appealing to Roosevelt to intervene. They are not concerned with Indian freedom, they merely want to save their own skins. Roosevelt will no more grant independence than Churchill. The Socialist Workers Party has no such illusions. It demands the immediate withdrawal of all British and American troops from India. These troops will undoubtedly be used in the attempt to crush the movement for independence. As for an invasion from Japan, let the British and American governments—if they are primarily interested in repelling an invasion—supply arms to the 400 million Indians who under their own command and with their own army will be more than a match for any invader. Refusal to arm the Indians reveals only too clearly that the presence of British and American troops is aimed primarily at the Indians themselves for the purpose of keeping them in imperialist bondage.

Real Aid to China and Soviet Union
The Socialist Workers Party indignantly rejects the slander that Indian independence will impair in any way the struggle of the Soviet masses against the Nazis or the struggle of China against the Japanese militarists. On the contrary, victory for the Indian people will give the greatest impetus to the struggle of the Soviet and Chinese masses. The fall of imperialist tyranny in one part of the world cannot fail to shake it everywhere else. The masses of occupied China, of Malaya, of Burma, of the East

Indies and of Japan itself will receive tremendous encouragement from an Indian victory and will eventually be set into motion for their own liberation. The reverberations of a successful struggle cannot fail to penetrate into Germany and into occupied Europe. Above all Hitler hates and fears revolution anywhere in the world. Hitler wants not independence for India but to supplant British imperialist rule with his own imperialism.

Our Program for India

Our program for India is that of our co-thinkers, the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India, section of the Fourth International. For the complete support of the present movement even though it is temporarily being led by bourgeois leaders who will attempt to compromise it at the first opportunity. No trust in the Indian bourgeois leaders! For the complete independence of the workers movement and the creation of independent and democratically elected organs of struggle.

Arm the Masses! Withdraw Troops!

All aid to the struggle for Indian freedom!
Withdraw all British and American troops!

Release the Congress leaders, lift the ban on the Congress Party!

For the alliance of the Indian workers and peasants with the organized workers of Britain and the United States!

Subscribe to the "Fourth International"

Leon Trotsky's Last Letter to The Indian Workers

In May, 1940, Leon Trotsky predicted that the second imperialist world war would create favorable conditions for the struggle of colonial peoples for independence, especially the people of India:

"By its very creation of enormous difficulties and dangers for the imperialist metropolitan centers, the war opens up wide possibilities for the oppressed peoples. The rumbling of cannon in Europe heralds the approaching hour of their liberation." (Manifesto of The Fourth International on The Imperialist War and The Proletarian Revolution.)

The greatest dangers to the Indian revolution are those that threaten from within. That is why Leon Trotsky warned the workers against placing any reliance upon the native Indian bourgeoisie:

"Gandhi's 'moral' revulsion from violence," states the Manifesto, "merely reflects the fear of the Indian bourgeoisie before their own masses. They have very good grounds for their foreboding that British imperialism will drag them down too in the collapse. London for its part warns that at the first display of disobedience it will apply 'all necessary measures' — including, of course, the air force in which it is deficient at the Western Front."

On July 25, 1939, on the eve of the actual outbreak of hostilities, Leon Trotsky wrote in a letter addressed to the Indian workers:

"The Indian bourgeoisie is incapable of leading a revolutionary struggle. They are closely bound up with and dependent upon British capitalism. They tremble for their own property. They stand in fear of the masses. They seek compromises with British imperialism no matter what the price and lull the Indian masses with hopes of reforms from above."

("An Open Letter to the Workers of India," New International, September, 1939.)

Treachery of the Stalinists

No less insidious and dangerous enemies of the Indian masses are the Stalinists. In the above-cited letter to the Indian workers, Trotsky likewise warned against Stalinist treachery:

"Communists, according to Manuilsky, 'subordinate the realization of this right of secession. . . in the interests of defeating fascism.' In other words, in the event of war between England and France over colonies, the Indian people must support their present slave owners, the British imperialists. That is to say, must shed their blood not for their own emancipation, but for the preservation of the rule of 'the City' over India. And these cheaply-to-be-bought scoundrels dare to quote Marx and Lenin! As a matter of fact, their teacher and leader is none other than Stalin, the head of a new bureaucratic aristocracy, the butcher of the Bolshevik Party, the strangler of workers and peasants."

To be sure, the above warning was directed against the policy of the Stalinists in the period of the "People's Fronts." The Stalinists dropped this policy temporarily during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact only in order to return to an even viler and more treacherous version since Hitler's assault on the USSR. Today Trotsky's warnings against Stalinist treachery apply with a redoubled force. Upon orders from the Kremlin, the Indian Stalinists are trying to paralyze the struggle for India's independence.

Is It a War for Democracy?

"Agents of the British government," wrote Trotsky in his open letter, "depict the matter as though the war will be waged for principles of 'democracy' which must be saved from fascism. All classes and peoples must rally around the 'peaceful,' 'democratic,' governments so as to repel the fascist aggressors. Then 'democracy' will be saved and peace stabilized forever. This gospel rests on a deliberate lie. If the British government were really concerned with the flowering of democracy then a very simple opportunity to demonstrate this exists: let the government give complete freedom to India. The right of national independence is one of the elementary democratic rights. But actually, the London government is ready to hand over all the democracies in the world in return for one-tenth of its colonies."

Today, the Stalinists are in the forefront of those who are spreading the lie about the 'democratic' nature of British imperialism and its war-program.

Trotsky did not fail to foresee the possibility that the Indian bourgeoisie might be compelled, despite itself, to come into conflict with the British rulers. What should the workers do in this case?

In his Open Letter on the impending Indian revolution, Trotsky wrote:

"In the event that the Indian bourgeoisie finds itself compelled to take even the tiniest step on the road of struggle against the arbitrary rule of Great Britain, the proletariat will naturally support such a step."

"But they will support it with their own methods," continues this letter, "mass meetings, bold slogans, strikes, demonstrations and more decisive combat actions, depending on the relationship of forces and the circumstances. Precisely to do this must the proletariat have its hands free. Complete independence from the bourgeoisie is indispensable to the proletariat, above all in order to exert influence on the peasantry, the predominant mass of India's population. Only the proletariat is capable of advancing a bold, revolutionary agrarian program, of rousing and rallying tens of millions of peasants and leading them in the struggle against the native oppressors and British imperialism. The alliance of workers and poor peasants is the only honest, reliable alliance that can assure the final victory of the Indian revolution."

The Manifesto of May, 1940 repeats this warning that the Indian revolution can march to victory only under the leadership of the Indian workers:

"The only thing that can weld India together is the agrarian revolution under the banner of national independence. A revolution led by the proletariat will be directed not only against British rule but also against the Indian princes, foreign concessions, the top layer of the Indian bourgeoisie, and the leaders of the National Congress as well as against the leaders of the Moslem League. It is the pressing task of the Fourth International to create a stable and powerful section in India."

TROTSKY MEMORIAL MEETING

Friday, August 21, at 8:30 P. M.

IRVING PLAZA 15th St and Irving Pl

Chairman:
GEORGE GRANT
ORGANIZER, LOCAL N. Y.

Speakers:
JULES GELLER
ALBERT GOLDMAN
Defendant and Defense Attorney in the Minneapolis Trials
For the Defense of the Soviet Union!
For Indian Independence!

Commemorating the Second Anniversary of the Death of the Great Revolutionary Leader at the hands of Stalin's GPU

IN MINNEAPOLIS
TROTSKY MEMORIAL MEETING
FRIDAY, AUGUST 21, 8 P. M.
MINNEAPOLIS BRANCH HEADQUARTERS
919 MARQUETTE AVE., MPLS.

Main Speaker: LYDIA BEIDEL of Chicago