

ATTACK ON "THE MILITANT" IS A BLOW AT FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Help "The Militant" Fight Suppression!

THE MILITANT is determined to use every legal means to fight for its right to be circulated through the U. S. mails. This sort of a fight is always expensive and funds are needed at once!

During the first World War, many labor papers similarly held up by the Post Office Department, were forced to suspend publication without ever making a real test of the ruling because of the heavy expenses involved in fighting their cases.

Don't let this happen to THE MILITANT!

Since this is the first move against the anti-fascist labor press in World War II, it is to the vital interests of all workers to see that funds are available to make a real test of freedom of the press.

We appeal to all readers of this paper to contribute to this fight for the right of labor to speak its mind.

Send all contributions to THE MILITANT, 116 University Place, New York City.

"THE POWER OF POST OFFICE CENSORSHIP"

(From "Free Speech in the United States," by Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Langdell Professor of Law in Harvard University.)

"The federal government can restrict speech during war in other ways besides punishment. It possesses a virtual censorship over all criticism of its policies, and exercises this power at the arbitrary will of an administrative official, who is of course directly interested to preserve those policies from attack, especially when they touch his own department."

"That this official is not called a censor is immaterial. Under the Espionage Act the Postmaster General can exclude from the mails, the only profitable and often the only possible means of effective publication, anything which he considers to be in violation of the statute."

"In no case during the war did any court set aside his decision by injunction or mandamus after Judge Hand was reversed as to the 'Masses.' Some judges said that they would not review the Postmaster General's ruling unless it was clearly wrong, which meant never. Others declared that an opponent of the war did not come into court with clean hands and therefore could not get judicial relief even tho the ruling was illegal."

"And the power of the Postmaster General is not limited to the particular issue of the periodical which he declares non-mailable. For instance, after Mr. Burleson had suppressed the August number of the 'Masses', he refused to admit the September or any future issues to the second-class privileges, even if absolutely free from any objectionable passages, on the ground that since the magazine had skipped a number, viz., the August number, it was no longer a periodical, since it was not regularly issued!"

"He took the same position as to Berger's Milwaukee Leader, and in both instances the courts sustained him, thus confirming his right to drive a newspaper or magazine out of existence for one violation as determined by him."

"Let us now see what Mr. Burleson considered to violate the Espionage Act. . . He suppressed an issue of the 'Public' for urging that more money be raised by taxes and less by loans. He suppressed Lenin's 'Soviets at Work', a purely economic pamphlet, although we were not at war with Russia."

"He suppressed the Nation of September 14, 1918, either for criticizing the great slacker

round-up in New York City which Mr. O'Brien states to have been in contravention of specific instructions from the Attorney General and a mistake which could not be condoned, or more probably for attacking Mr. Gompers."

"He censored any adverse comment on the affairs of the British Empire. He censored a pamphlet by Lajpat Rai on India. He censored the 'Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register,' for reprinting Jefferson's opinion that Ireland should be a republic. . . and the 'Irish World' for expressing the expectation that Palestine would not be a Jewish kingdom but on the same footing as Egypt, and for stating that the trend of French life and ideals for a century had been toward materialism."

"And finally, Thorstein Veblen's Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution, which was published in 1915, was recommended by Mr. Creel's Committee on Public Information as containing damaging data about Germany, and then excluded by Mr. Burleson from the mails."

"It is clear that exclusion from the mails practically destroys the circulation of a book or periodical, and makes free speech to that extent impossible."

Post Office Censorship During 1st World War

From the American Labor Year Book, 1919-20:

"The arbitrary discretion vested in the Postmaster General by the Espionage Act was exercised to the limit in the control of opinion. Under the guise of military necessity, scores of radical publications were summarily put out of business by withdrawal of second class mailing privileges, and by total exclusion from the mails of certain numbers of periodicals and various books and pamphlets. . ."

"Books and pamphlets barred from mails:

"The Finished Mystery," The Russell Society
"The Great Madness," Scott Nearing
"The Price We Pay," Irwin St. John Tucker
"The Soviets at Work," Nikolai Lenin."

They Collaborate With Fascists Abroad And Persecute Anti-Fascists At Home

By James P. Cannon

National Secretary, Socialist Workers Party

During the same week that the American authorities clasped hands with the French Quisling, Darlan, in Africa and sought collaboration with the Fascist Franco in Spain, here in the United States they took the first steps to suppress a bona-fide anti-fascist workers' paper — *The Militant*.

As reported last week, the issues of November 7 and November 14 were held up by the Post Office authorities. Since then the November 7 issue has been destroyed at the Post Office on orders from Washington, and the issue of November 21, which carried a report and protest against these arbitrary actions, has likewise been held up. We have learned from attorneys of the Post Office Department that *The Militant* has been subjected to these persecutions because of its editorial policies and criticisms of the administration.

The Militant thus has the honor of being the first workers' paper to suffer a reactionary attack on the freedom of the press, just as the Trotskyist movement was singled out for the first prosecution under the notorious anti-labor Smith Act. But the Trotskyists are hit first only because they are the spear-head of militant resistance to the developing reaction. These attacks against the Trotskyists are, in essence, aimed at all workers' rights and against the labor movement as a whole: The entrenched reactionaries are feeling their way toward a general assault on the constitutional rights of free speech and free press. They want to silence all criticism.

One of a Series of Persecutions

The arbitrary, bureaucratic violation of *The Militant's* mailing rights is only the latest in a series of actions against the Trotskyist movement in the United States during the past year. They all fit into the same pattern.

(1) In June, 1941 FBI agents raided the headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party in Minneapolis and St. Paul, seizing literature which was on public sale there. Three weeks later the Department of Justice secured indictments against 29 members of the Socialist Workers Party and leaders of Local 544-CIO. After a five-weeks' trial before a jury which did not contain a single trade unionist, in Minneapolis in October-November, 18 defendants were found guilty of violating the Smith Act of 1940. These were sentenced to prison terms of 1 year to 16 months. Appeal of these convictions has just been heard in the Circuit Court at St. Louis, and will be carried, if necessary, to the Supreme Court.

(2) Several weeks ago the Department of Justice apparently sought to lay the basis of a new frame-up against us, when two FBI agents questioned me about a train wreck that occurred over a year and a half ago. The obvious implication of the inquisition was that Trotskyists engage in such acts of violence and sabotage, although the whole record of our movement, and its literature, prove the contrary.

(3) The inquisition about the train wreck fits in with the announcement that a motion picture of ex-Ambassador Davies' "Mission to Moscow" — a brazen whitewash of the monstrous Moscow Trials of 1936-37 — is soon to be released with the obvious design to prejudice public opinion in favor of the hangman, Stalin, and against the victims of his frame-ups. The quasi-governmental "spices of this motion picture of the ex-Ambassador's doctored book present a most sinister aspect of this affair."

(4) In the November elections this year the Socialist Workers Party ran as its candidate for U. S. Senator from Minnesota, Grace Carlson, who had received almost 9,000 votes in the previous election. Although other candidates received their returns, the vote given the SWP

candidate was uncounted and unrecorded by the election authorities.

(5) Now the Post Office authorities have struck at the mailing rights of *The Militant* without even specifying which article or editorials are objected to.

To cap these crimes, news of these suppressions has itself been suppressed. The managers of the paper were not notified of the suppressions and were informed of them only after they had inquired concerning the non-delivery of the paper. None of the big capitalist papers has published reports of this blow against the freedom of the press.

Thus Trotskyists have been the first to be indicted and tried under the infamous and unconstitutional "gag" act of Poll-Tax, Representative Howard Smith. The Department of Justice is apparently trying to devise a "train-wreck" frame-up against us. A "propaganda" frame-up is soon to be unreel on the motion picture screen. The SWP candidate in Minnesota is the first to be deprived of electoral rights. *The Militant* is the first labor paper to suffer suppression since this war began. Finally, the authorities have tried to suppress the news of this.

Such are the facts in the sustained campaign of persecution directed by the Roosevelt administration against our movement.

Promises and Performances

In a featured article in the N. Y. Times, Sunday, September 21, 1941, Roosevelt's Attorney-General Biddle was quoted as saying: "Insofar as I can, by the use of the authority and influence of my office, I intend to see that civil liberties in this country are protected; that we do not again fall into the disgraceful hysteria of witch-hunts, strike-breakings and minority persecutions which were such a dark chapter in our record of the last world war."

We could quote similar declarations of intent from President Roosevelt and other high officials in his administration.

These declarations flagrantly contradict the policy of persecution initiated by Roosevelt's administration against our movement. Despite their promises Roosevelt and his aides have set their feet upon the path of persecution blazed by the Wilson administration in the last war. President Roosevelt takes up where Wilson left off: Attorney-General Biddle, with his raids and prosecution, imitates Attorney-General Palmer; Postmaster General Walker suppresses socialist and labor papers like his Democratic predecessor, Burleson; OWI head Davis suppresses the news of our suppression like propaganda minister Creel during the last war. They "use the authority and influence" of their offices, not to protect civil liberties, but to abridge them. Persecutions speak louder than promises.

The administration claims that it is waging this war to defend democracy against the fascists and to preserve the four freedoms, among them the freedom of speech and freedom of the press. But what are they actually doing? They attack free speech. They attack the free press. While dealing with Quislings and fascists abroad, they strike at genuine anti-fascists at home.

The uncompromising anti-fascist policy of the Trotskyists is known to every informed person. The Trotskyists of Spain fought in the Spanish Civil War against Franco's fascist dictatorship; they are fighting against him today while Washington seeks alliance with him. Under terrible persecution the Trotskyists of France fought against Darlan and all the other men of Vichy. Jean Meichler, a Trotskyist leader, was executed by a Nazi firing squad in France. Leon Lesoil, leader of the Belgian Trotskyists, has just died in a German prison for fighting against the Nazis. The Trotskyists in Germany fight under the most

adverse illegal conditions for the overthrow of Hitlerite imperialism.

Roosevelt's Department of Justice knows precisely what we stand for. The leaders of our party explained our program and policies in full detail to the judge, prosecutors and jury at the Minneapolis Trial. This testimony has been published and distributed in thousands of copies to workers all over the country, all over the world in fact.

Our program and our record demonstrate that we Trotskyists are anti-fascist to the core. We are unremitting fighters in the interests of labor. We fight for the preservation of all democratic rights and civil liberties, against every form of inequality and injustice. As revolutionary socialists, we are principled opponents of the Roosevelt administration and criticize it from the standpoint of the socialist and labor movement.

These are our crimes in the eyes of the administration, and they add to their crimes in attacking us for them. The Roosevelt regime claims to oppose fascism but it collaborates, when expedient, with the fascists. It claims to be defending the four freedoms while trying to deny these freedoms to its political opponents. We Trotskyists, however, are defending democratic rights here at home against Roosevelt's assault upon them. We are fighting for the freedom he hypocritically pretends to be safeguarding.

Warning to the Labor Movement

But we are not defending these rights for ourselves alone. We are fighting on behalf of the entire labor movement in the United States. We are only the first to be attacked. If the government can put through these initial moves without a wide protest, prosecution of others will surely follow.

If *The Militant* can be suppressed, any CIO or AFL paper can be likewise suppressed. If our party's candidates are not given their electoral rights, other parties can be similarly disfranchised. If the leaders of Local 544-CIO can be convicted under the Smith "Gag" Act, this law will be used against other militant trade-union leaders. If the FBI can succeed in their frame-ups against us, they will extend the frame-up system to others.

The persecution against the Trotskyist movement is simply the first step towards an all-out campaign against the militants in the trade unions and the civil liberties of all working-class critics of the administration. The workers have already been denied the right of collective bargaining and the right to strike. Are they now to be deprived (by the powers that be) of the elementary right to express their convictions, to criticize the acts of the government and the reactionary plots of the profiteers, to defend their interests even in words? Wages have been frozen. Are civil liberties also to be frozen? The cost of living is mounting daily. Is the wave of reaction to be permitted to rise along with it?

These are the issues involved in our fight against the persecution of our party and the suppression of *The Militant*.

These are the reasons why our fight should be supported by the whole labor movement and every sincere believer in democratic rights and civil liberties.

Over 100 years ago, when William L. Garrison started his famous abolitionist newspaper, *The Liberator*, he wrote in its first issue: "I am in earnest — I will not equivocate — I will not excuse — I will not retreat a single inch — and I WILL BE HEARD."

With this same spirit, we intend to wage our struggle against the censorship of today's reactionaries. It is with this call that we summon to action every individual and organization determined to fight for the preservation of genuine democracy here in the United States.

POST OFFICE REFUSES TO SPECIFY REASONS

But Its Objections to 'The Militant' Are For Its Uncompromising Pro-Labor Policy

The Post Office has thus far refused to specify the reasons for its action in withholding recent issues of THE MILITANT from the mails, this paper was informed by its attorney, Albert Goldman, after his conversation on Nov. 18 with Mr. Calvin Hassell, assistant to the Solicitor of the Post Office Department in Washington.

Goldman made inquiries in Washington after it was learned in New York that the Nov. 7 and Nov. 14 issues of THE MILITANT had not been permitted through the mails. He was informed that the Post Office Department had previously declared the Aug. 22, Sept. 5, Sept. 12 and Sept. 19 issues of the paper as non-mailable. These issues, however, were permitted to go through the mails.

Evidently the policy followed until recently was to permit the paper to be mailed and to

examine the contents subsequent to the mailing. It is believed that because issues of the paper were declared unmailable, this policy was changed and the New York Post Office was ordered to withhold future issues until the contents were examined. Mr. Hassell said that the Department now instructs the Post Office every week whether to withhold the current issue.

C. P. Approves, Asks Suppression Of 'Call' Also

Wants Gov't Action Against All of Its Labor Opponents

The *Daily Worker's* first comment on the withholding of THE MILITANT from the mails comes in the middle of a story in its Nov. 24 issue calling for the suppression of another working class paper, but it says enough to indicate the whole-hearted approval of the Stalinists for the Post Office's action.

The article says: "It has just been revealed that the Trotskyite sheet, THE MILITANT, is being barred from the mails for publishing subversive matter, yet Trotskyite Lillian Symes is spreading equally dangerous propaganda in the Socialist Call. . ."

"Trotskyite Symes and the paper she writes for are enemies of America, and should be treated as such."

The Stalinists know very well that Lillian Symes is not a Trotskyist. For the Stalinists, the name Trotskyist is an epithet to be used against all working class opponents of Stalinism — and an especially appropriate one, they feel, when the Trotskyists are under reactionary attack.

Of all political groups in this country, the Stalinists have been most insistent in demanding the suppression of THE MILITANT and other labor papers that expose Stalinism and take a critical attitude toward the administration.

On numerous occasions during the last year the *Daily Worker* has reported instances of Stalinists in some of the unions introducing resolutions calling on the government to investigate or suppress these papers as "fifth column sheets."

While the administration probably did not require too much "prodding," it undoubtedly welcomed such resolutions as "trade union endorsement" of a measure that strikes a heavy blow against the whole labor movement.

The comment of the "New Leader" on the Post Office action against THE MILITANT will be found on Page 2.

IDEAS CONSIDERED OBJECTIONABLE

Mr. Hassell refused to specify the articles of the different issues which were found objectionable or subversive. However, Goldman noted down several ideas which Mr. Hassell evidently thought justified the withholding of any issue from the mail. They are the following:

1. To assert that this is an imperialist war and that this is not a war for democracy.
2. To urge Negroes to fight for their rights at the present moment.
3. To urge the workers to insist on their rights (especially the right to strike) during the war.
4. To attack Stalin or belittle any ally of the United States.
5. To say that the men are fighting for interests of bankers.
6. To say that the administration is anti-labor.

Goldman pointed out that Mr. Hassell did not say specifically that THE MILITANT was withheld from the mail because it contained matter in favor of the ideas enumerated. Hassell simply mentioned these things in such a way as to indicate that in his opinion the suppression of the paper is justified if it contained these ideas.

Mr. Hassell said that the Post Office Department was contemplating filing a petition for a rule to show cause why the second-class mailing privileges should not be taken away from THE MILITANT.

He also declared that the Department of Justice has examined the contents of various issues of THE MILITANT and given its report to the Post Office.

LATEST DEVELOPMENTS

Following Goldman's return from Washington, THE MILITANT was informed by the New York Post Office that the Nov. 7 issue had been destroyed. The only reason given was that it violated the Postal Laws. It took two weeks for the Department to make the decision.

This means that even if the Post Office decides to permit an issue through the mails, the delay practically destroys the second-class privileges of the paper.

The Nov. 21 issue has also been withheld from the mails.

Republicans Join Democrats To Save Poll Tax

Deal Was So Dirty That Gov't Censored News of It Going Abroad; President Roosevelt Also Did His Share to Help Kill the Bill

By George Breitman

The bill to abolish payment of poll taxes for federal elections in eight southern states is dead. It was killed by a dirty deal, participated in by both the Republican and Democratic Parties and approved by the Roosevelt administration.

In fact, the whole debate on the poll tax was so dirty that the administration censored all dispatches going out of the country, refusing to permit news of it to be sent even to Britain.

The administration may hope in this way to suppress abroad the story of how the

poll tax was saved — a vain hope, for such news will spread like wildfire to the oppressed peoples of the world. But it can never wipe out of the minds of millions of Americans the growing realization of the vast difference between the fine democratic ideals professed by the government and the viciously undemocratic practices which the government refuses to abandon.

POLL TAXERS' STRATEGY

For a full week the poll tax minority had refused to let the anti-poll tax bill even come before the Senate. But although they had threatened to filibuster and prevent a debate on the bill until Jan. 2, when both the present Congress and the bill expire, the poll taxers realized that to actually conduct the filibuster for that length of time would invite such a widespread mass reaction of anger and dissatisfaction that the bill might be passed despite all their efforts.

REPUBLICAN HYPOCRISY

The Republicans had promised, almost to a man, in the recent election campaign that they would vote against the poll tax. But they were far more desirous of coming to a deal with the poll taxers than of making it easier for ten million white and Negro workers and sharecroppers to vote. So they gave the nod to the poll taxers.

After this, the spokesmen of the poll tax states — who had been doing everything they could to keep the bill from coming to the floor because they were afraid that a motion for closure (to end debate) might put an end to their filibuster — brazenly stood up and offered to let the bill be entered for debate, provided the supporters of the bill would agree to a vote on closure within two days, and to withdraw the bill if closure was not adopted.

THE "LIBERALS" AGREE

Closure requires a two-thirds vote. The poll taxers would never have requested the vote unless they had more than one-third of the vote in their vest pocket. The supporters of the bill — Barkley, Norris, Pepper, etc. — realized this.

They realized too that under these conditions the only way the bill could be passed was by prolonging the debate until the angry protests of the masses would force the non-poll tax Senators to go through with a vote for closure and the passage of the bill.

In spite of this, they came to agreement with the poll taxers in what can be characterized only as a sell out. One of the many revolting aspects of this deal was that it was committed in the name of not disgracing "the good name" of the Senate!

The bill was introduced, the motion for closure was voted on and defeated by a vote of 41-37, and the anti-poll tax bill was withdrawn. Sixteen Democrats from non-poll tax states voted against closure, and so did ten Republicans. The Republican minority leader, McNary, who had bragged that he was against the poll tax, led the Republicans in voting down the motion for closure that could have led to the abolition of the poll tax.

None of the liberal or Stalinist supporters of the anti-poll tax bill have commented on the role played by Roosevelt.

The "great humanitarian" had

"nothing to say" about the bill while it was being debated in the House, although last February he had briefly stated that he was against the poll tax and had "always" been against it. His silence on the matter was maintained until the time when the deal in the Senate was being arranged. In a press conference on Nov. 20, he said that he knew nothing about the filibuster.

"Asked whether he thought the poll tax repeal bill should pass, he reiterated that he knew nothing about it, had talked to no one about it, and therefore could not express an opinion." (N. Y. Times, Nov. 21.)

By this openly cynical expression of contempt for a struggle which had aroused both the labor and liberal movements, Roosevelt no doubt thought he was very "cleverly" side-stepping the issue.

WHERE ROOSEVELT STOOD

But actually that statement revealed his true stand on this fight! For if he "talked to no one about it," that means he talked to no one FOR it. That means he didn't use a single iota of his tremendous influence to try to get the anti-poll tax bill passed. In the present situation that can only mean that Roosevelt didn't want the bill passed.

Let the workers not be fooled by Roosevelt's stonewalling on this issue! When they were fighting to kill the poll tax, they were fighting the Roosevelt machine as well as the poll taxers and the Republicans and the Democrats.

When Roosevelt wants legislation passed, he knows how to go about getting it. He showed this last Labor Day when he ordered Congress to give him wage-freezing and price-fixing powers by Oct. 1, or he would take them. And he has showed it a hundred other times when he threw the full force of his administration in motion — through the press, over the radio, in Congress — to pass what he wanted.

Roosevelt can indulge in as many wisecracks as he wishes, but they will not be able to obscure the fact that Roosevelt, by his silence if nothing else, helped to kill the anti-poll tax bill.

LABOR PARTY NEEDED

The workers should let the full significance of this fact sink in: The responsibility for the defeat of the anti-poll tax bill lies on all wings of the Democratic Party — the Northern, Southern and Rooseveltian — and on all wings of the Republican Party, the isolationist and interventionist.

If the workers cannot depend on either capitalist party to pass such an elementary democratic measure as the abolition of poll taxes, how then can they expect the slightest assistance from these parties in the struggle to safeguard their trade unions and living standards?

The chief lesson of the fight around the poll tax is that the workers need a new party, ready to challenge the power of the capitalist parties, willing to fight without compromise, and able to sweep away the rule of capitalism and all the reactionary measures which it uses to keep itself in power.

On the Caucasus Front



Red Army soldiers are shown fighting a Nazi spearhead driving toward vital oil regions in the Mzdech area of the northern Caucasus. (Federated Pictures)

Irish Strike Holds Fast In Face Of Boss Threats

By BOB ARMSTRONG

BELFAST, North Ireland, Oct. 21 (By Airmail) — The strike of electrical workers in this city, which has thrown up a picket line of (censored) workers, shows signs of increasing in scope and militancy.

Actually there are two strikes in progress, the strike of the electrical engineers in factory No. 1 (name censored) and the strike of electricians in factory No. 2 (name censored). There are also wide-spread sympathetic strikes.

The walkout in factory No. 1 came like a bolt from the blue to the general public. The situation had been simmering for a long time, but was precipitated by a series of provocative incidents: insolence by the management toward the shop stewards, repeated violations of the Factory Act, especially regarding the hours worked by young girls, and gross mismanagement.

The immediate issue which precipitated the strike was the question of Sunday work. The workers asked to be allowed to work on Sunday with a view to earning more money so they could make ends meet.

The management, however, calculating that Sunday work would be unprofitable, refused this. When Sunday arrived and the workers showed up for production, the management called the police and had them ejected. The workers then resorted to strike action to enforce their demands.

The strike in factory No. 2 was caused by the management hiring a non-unionist. The boss of this plant is notoriously anti-union and the strike has now been in progress for 26 days.

Great mass meetings have been held almost daily in Belfast's largest hall. All press representatives were kept out because of the unfair comments printed in the papers. Now, however, the bosses of the newspapers are going easy because they fear the

anger of the typographical unions in their own shops.

STRIKERS' DEMANDS

The Joint Strike Committee has formulated a 5-point platform. The first three are conditions laid down for the resumption of work. They are: 1. The full reinstatement of dismissed shop stewards; 2. The immediate dismissal of the non-union man; and 3. The cancellation of all fines.

The fourth and fifth points call for the increase in production. These two demands are weak for the simple reason that they do not point out the only method of obtaining increased production in the interests of the masses — namely, the control of the factories by the trade unions. The bosses have already shown that they are not interested in increasing the output.

However, even with these modest demands, the employers are not willing to concede an inch. They want to beat the workers into complete submission to their autocratic rule, and while accomplishing this, they are perfectly willing to let the "war effort" go to hell.

STALINIST ROLE

The Stalinists played a typical role in this strike. They gave lip service to the workers but demanded that the strike be called off at once. The proposition that only when the wheels of industry were revolving again (churning out the bosses' profits) could an outcome favorable to the workers be achieved, was a puzzle that only the Stalinists could understand.

It was generally agreed by the strikers that for the workers to go back to work on the bosses' terms would have a catastrophic consequence for the struggles of the whole North Ireland working class.

Fortunately, the Communist Party line has been rejected by both the workers and by stewards who belong to the CP. The stewards defied the Party line and stood in the vanguard of the struggle. This is an important sign for the future.

The militant shop stewards have not yet succeeded in finding the alternative program to counterpose to the betrayal of the Stalinists and regular union bureaucrats. Yet on the basis of their class consciousness and experience, they are instinctively adopting the essentials of the program advocated by the Socialist Appeal — workers' control of industry.

STRIKERS DETERMINED

As I write these lines, a great mass meeting has just ended in which the strikers voted to reject any compromise with the bosses and to press for the original strike program. A girl striker, speaking from the floor, called for great public rallies to place the full facts of the strike before the whole Belfast working class.

In spite of the pressure of the bosses and Stalinists, the spirit of the workers is high and the end of the struggle is not in sight.

Cap Union Fights Arnold's Latest 'Anti-Trust' Suit

The Department of Justice, through Thurman Arnold, head of its anti-trust division, launched its latest union-busting drive against the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union, AFL, on Nov. 16.

Following his new familiar tactic, Arnold is pressing suit in a Philadelphia District Court, charging the cap and hat workers' union with being a "trust" and operating "in restraint of trade." His reasoning is that by chasing scabs out of the industry, the union is restraining the freedom of the bosses.

Arnold is employing against labor the Sherman Anti-Trust Act which was originally written to prevent the growth of big business monopolies. At a time when the Roosevelt administration is cancelling anti-trust suits against such monopolies as General Electric and the duPonts, the Sherman Act is being used more and more against labor unions.

The cap union has announced its intention to fight the charges "all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary." Cap Makers of Local 2 in New York met last week and voted unanimously to tax all working members to raise a defense fund. The tax will be \$5 on all workers earning up to \$35 per week and \$10 on all earning over that amount.

What appeared to have precipitated the government suit just at this time was the union's success in organizing the Southern open shops which had been receiving the bulk of army orders. Jacob Roberts, vice president of the International, said at the New York meeting of Local 2:

"What we are charged with doing, when you strip away the legal language of the indictment, is striving to secure a decent living for our workers. But that is precisely what the brass hats resent. They could never forgive our union for its success in securing a \$27 a week minimum for government contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act—the highest minimum of any industry in the country."

Their resentment was even greater because after they went to great pains to give contracts to non-union shops, our union succeeded, through economic pressure, in organizing those shops and bringing them up to our union's standard. . .

"Having failed in his efforts to break the big unions, he (Arnold) hopes for success with a small union."

Roberts was referring to Arnold's ill-fated suits against the musicians and building trades unions. In both suits the unions were acquitted of the charge of being a trust.

LIST OF NAZI VICTIMS IS GROWING IN GERMANY

Hitler Considers Revolutionists Greater Enemies of His Reich Than Foreign Spies

By MICHAEL CORT

Fascist terror against the German workers has sharply increased during the past few months. Not only do underground sources tell of a new program of repression, but official Nazi publications have been doubling and tripling public lists of imprisonments and executions.

Since the Nazis usually publish news of their working class victims only as a warning and deterrent to the masses, the publicity now being given this bloody work indicates increased anti-fascist activity among the German people.

Paul Hagen, writing in the Nov. 21 issue of The Nation, and B. F. Heine, writing in the British Left News, both list recent victims of the fascist terror with name, address and the "crime" charged. From underground and official sources Hagen reports 1,103 workers killed or imprisoned during the single month of Sept., 1942.

FIVE CATEGORIES

Heine, an executive member of the German Social-Democratic Party, analyzes the official German lists, finds that the crimes now being punished are divided into five chief categories, namely: association with prisoners of war, offering resistance, radio criminals, treason and high treason.

Heine reports that "radio criminals" seem to be receiving the most attention in the German press right now. German figures released the first of the year list 82 persons sentenced to a total of 3,713 months of penal servitude for this "crime." The terms imposed in individual cases vary from 12 to 108 months.

"Treason" and "high treason" are also much publicized crimes. The German law makes a distinction between "high treason" and "treason against one's country." The spy is a traitor to his country, while a revolutionist is guilty of "high treason." To Hitler the espionage agents of Britain or America are not as reprehensible criminals as the leaders of the German working class.

"Shot for offering resistance" is a category that covers much of the work of bloody Himmler. Workers guilty of no crime but previous union activity are often murder victims under this heading. The Left News lists 45 men and women killed, none of whom had been tried or sentenced to death, but all of whom were shot in prison because they "offered resistance."

ASSOCIATION WITH PRISONERS OF WAR

"Association with prisoners of war" is a crime that is becoming more and more regularly committed, according to the German press. Germans must not treat as their equals Polish prisoners of war on forced labor in Germany. It is illegal for a German to show French prisoners the most elementary kindness. The government, press and the Nazi party have launched a crusade against "softness with enemy prisoners." The most severe penalties are imposed upon those who do not observe the rules.

There is now an endless chain of trials and convictions for such crimes as: the gift of cigarettes, or bread, or clothing, or even a kind word to foreign prisoners.

The anti-union jury returned a verdict of guilty against both defendants. When it came to sentencing, the white Klepfer who admitted being involved in the fight, was given 2½ to 5 years; the Negro Gilmore, the admitted spectator, was given a prison term of 9 to 10 years!

Upon appeal to a higher court the sentences were reduced to 1 to 2 years, and 5 to 10 years, for Klepfer and Gilmore respectively. Klepfer (the white man) was released on parole in April of this year. Gilmore (the Negro) is still in prison.

The Workers Defense League is asking unions and individuals to write to Governor H. H. Lehman, Albany, N. Y., asking for clemency for Gilmore, and to contribute to the Gilmore Defense Fund. All contributions should be addressed to the Workers Defense League, 112 E. 19 St. New York, and checks should be made payable to George S. Counts, Sec'y.

In all crime categories, the lists published for the month of September were the longest published by the Nazis for any single month since seizing power. An analysis of the lists reveals, further, that the greatest increase is precisely in those industrial areas which have received the most bombardments from the British air force.

All this indicates that the resistance of the workers increases in direct ratio to the military reverses suffered by the Nazis.

This is not the first time that the Nazis have resorted to mass murder at home. There has always been a quiet liquidation of militant workers, but now Hitler is forced to deal with his own population in the manner and on a scale approaching that used in the occupied countries.

GERMAN MASSES LOOKING FOR WAY OUT

All underground sources warn against the assumption that the German workers are on the verge of revolt. The increase in the "radio criminals" indicates, however, the restlessness of the German workers and their search for outside aid and leadership in their struggle against Hitler. Such aid is indeed hard for them to find, even if they had the most powerful short-wave radios. Moscow tells them to look to the "United Nations" for help. And the current news from the "United Nations" is that the French fascist Admiral Darlan is collaborating with the "United Nations" forces in North Africa.

A German worker might now well hesitate in expressing his opposition to the Nazis—even if the "United Nations" were on the German borders—because some General Eisenhower might come to an understanding with their fascist oppressors.

That the German workers still dare to raise their voices in opposition to Hitler, in spite of the lack of outside aid and leadership, testifies both to the desperation of conditions within Germany and to the vitality of the workers.

Aid Asked For Negro Striker Framed in 1940

Carl Gilmore is a Negro member of Local 693 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, AFL. As a result of his color, he was sentenced to ten years in jail because he happened to be present at the moment a striker hit a scab.

Gilmore's unjust sentence is now being appealed to Governor Lehman of New York by the Workers Defense League. Even if the League is successful in its plea, Gilmore will already have served two years in Attica state prison.

In August, 1940 the teamster local was on strike against a Bing hampton, N. Y., trucker. Gilmore and Ellis Klepfer, an official of the local, attempted to persuade a scab not to unload his truck. The scab became abusive and a fight broke out between him and Klepfer. The scab's nose was hurt and he got a cut over the eye.

The following day Gilmore and Klepfer were arrested; later they were charged with second degree assault. When the trial finally opened, Klepfer testified that he alone hit the scab and that Gilmore was only a spectator. Several witnesses confirmed this fact.

The anti-union jury returned a verdict of guilty against both defendants. When it came to sentencing, the white Klepfer who admitted being involved in the fight, was given 2½ to 5 years; the Negro Gilmore, the admitted spectator, was given a prison term of 9 to 10 years!

Upon appeal to a higher court the sentences were reduced to 1 to 2 years, and 5 to 10 years, for Klepfer and Gilmore respectively. Klepfer (the white man) was released on parole in April of this year. Gilmore (the Negro) is still in prison.

The Workers Defense League is asking unions and individuals to write to Governor H. H. Lehman, Albany, N. Y., asking for clemency for Gilmore, and to contribute to the Gilmore Defense Fund. All contributions should be addressed to the Workers Defense League, 112 E. 19 St. New York, and checks should be made payable to George S. Counts, Sec'y.

'New Leader's' Comment On Post Office Action

The Nov. 21 issue of the *New Leader*, official organ of the Social-Democratic Federation, made the following comment on the Post Office's action against THE MILITANT:

"Two issues of The Militant, organ of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, have been held up by the Post Office as unmailable. The *New Leader* learns as it goes to press. One issue, that of November 7th, has been ordered destroyed. The second issue, dated last week, is still undecided. Even if it is released, however, the issue will be more than a week old when it reaches subscribers."

"Under Post Office regulations, apparently, all papers are read by the Post Office and the Department of Justice, after the issue is out, for 'obscene,' 'objectionable,' and 'subversive' material. It is understood that four issues of The Militant previous to the November 7th issue were declared unmailable, and new orders issued regarding this particular paper. Under the new order, the Post Office holds up each issue of The Militant before it is mailed and decides whether or not it can be released. On this basis the November 7th issue was ordered destroyed; there has been no official statement on the November 14th issue."

"Apparently no specific reasons were given for this new order applying to The Militant, and no reason given why one issue was destroyed and the other held up until this date. Observers see a likelihood that steps may be taken to revoke the second-class mailing permit of the paper."

"A quick analysis of the issue ordered destroyed reveals several articles highly critical of Stalin, and one of the Roosevelt labor policy. It is doubtful whether the extent of the criticism can be compared either in tone or content with the vituperation and acid remarks made by the McCormick Chicago-Tribune and other papers highly critical of the President from the reactionary right."

Prices Still Rising

Prices are soaring, and with the rise in prices, the real wages—the amount of food, clothing and shelter the money wages can buy—are sinking.

According to a nation-wide survey made by the Department of Labor, the cost of living rose 1 per cent in 50 principal cities in the month between Sept. 15 and Oct. 15.

The Labor Department report offered as an excuse that the price rise in the 30-day period was caused mainly by increases in food prices before the Oct. 5 order of the Office of Price Administration which brought an additional 30 per cent of the family food costs under price control. This excuse does not hold water.

Although uncontrolled prices did go up, still the Department of Labor itself is forced to admit that OPA-controlled foods had

gone up in price as well, with the sanction of the OPA. The price of bituminous coal has also gone up, by order of the OPA.

Further proof that prices are rising, in spite of the claims of the OPA, can be seen in the fact that in the week ending Nov. 14 — more than five weeks after Oct. 5 — the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported an increase in the general price index of .4 per cent. This was in one week; if this rate is maintained for a month of 4 1/3 weeks, the price rise will be nearly twice as great as that of the month ending Oct. 15.

Prices on Nov. 14 had reached 100.1 per cent of 1926 levels. This is the high mark in over 16 years and more than 5 per cent above the height of the boom in July, 1929.

OTHER METHODS

One of the indications that

prices will continue to rise is seen in the dairy products rationing program submitted by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. One point of this program calls for the revision of price ceilings to increase prices for cheese and possibly butter and evaporated milk.

Besides the clear-cut price increases, hidden price rises — the worsening of the quality of workmanship — are reported. While the legal price remains the same, the consumer will get much less use out of these articles.

Another method of evading the price ceilings is by "rebranding" — simply changing the brand of a commodity without changing the contents and then charging higher prices. The OPA admitted this week that many retailers, particularly grocers, are using this method of charging increased prices.

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

What Kind of 'Progress' Is Being Made?

The Uncle Toms and the Stalinists keep assuring the Negro masses that the war is resulting in automatic progress for the struggle against Jim Crowism. The purpose behind these assurances is to convince the Negro masses that it is not necessary to conduct a militant, all-out fight against those who are responsible for racial prejudice.

But every week that goes brings additional evidence that the Uncle Toms and Stalinists are lying in their teeth. Every week that goes by offers new proof that the rights of the Negro people are under greater attack than ever before.

The chief argument behind the claim that progress is being made, rests on the fact that there has been a slight decline in Negro unemployment and the likelihood that there will be a further decline in the coming period.

But that is no proof of progress. It simply shows that the Jim Crow forces are willing to use Negro labor to help win the war. But it does not show the slightest indication on the part of the Jim Crow forces to grant equality to the Negro. After all, Hitler is reported to be using some Jewish doctors and workers in his war. But only a fool or a liar would contend that means the Jewish people are making progress in Germany or other Axis-controlled countries.

A far better criterion for judging progress or lack of progress can be found in the numbers of physical attacks on Negroes, in the violations of civil liberties and of democratic rights. We do not have the figures relating to such attacks since Pearl Harbor, but a week-to-week examination of the Negro press convinces us that the situation is at least as bad as it was before the United States entered the war.

The number of recorded lynchings has certainly increased. So, probably, has the number of unrecorded lynchings, which are now listed in many cases as ordinary killings or accidents or disappearances.

In the last two weeks alone the following stories were printed in the Negro press:

In Alexandria, La., Raymond Carr, Negro soldier who was on duty as an MP, was attacked (on Nov. 1) by one white state trooper while another shot him in the stomach and back as he at-

tempted to rise from the sidewalk to which he had been knocked.

"The wounded man was taken to a civilian hospital where he lay bleeding in the basement for several hours. Later he was transferred to the hospital at Camp Livingston, where he died four days later following an operation." (Associated Negro Press report).

The attack was so flagrantly unprovoked that the army authorities asked the state to arrest the trooper and hold him for trial, the same report adds. But the state has refused to do this.

More than 1500 Negro soldiers and civilians in Florence, S. C. battled with throngs of officers and white men for more than two hours last Saturday, according to the Nov. 21 issue of *People's Voice*.

"Witnesses at the scene contend that two police officers accosted a Negro soldier, in the Negro section of the city, attempted to arrest him and began mistreating and beating him without cause. Other soldiers gathered, surrounded the officers and tried to free the soldier..."

The crowd grew, and "every available city and military policeman, county officer and highway patrolman was called, supplemented by the fire department.... Police used riot guns, hand grenades, tear-gas, sub-machine guns and every available weapon to disperse the crowd which had reached the proportion of two squares of the section." More than 20 were jailed, and a large number reported injured.

The same issue of *People's Voice* carries a story about New York City which proved that such attacks on Negroes are by no means confined to the South.

A white city detective, who was drunk according to an eyewitness account, shot down an unarmed, defenseless Negro busboy last Monday morning. Just as the newspapers in the South usually cover up such attacks by the cry of "rape," so the New York capitalist press printed a completely unconfirmed story about a "mugging" attack on the detective. A Voice editorial correctly describes the affair as "no different from a lynching."

If this kind of "progress" continues — and it will, unless the Negro people offer it greater resistance — Negro rights by the end of the war will have reached a new low for the 20th century.

WOMEN IN INDUSTRY

Double Standard for War Plant Wages

By MARIE TAYLOR

We hear a great deal these days about how the women of the United States are "doing their bit." Making guns and ammunition, operating lathes, milling machines and drill presses, setting up tools, working on ships, in steel factories and aircraft plants — women are entering industry in greater numbers than men, and are rapidly replacing them in the most skilled types of jobs.

Reports of the U. S. Department of Labor show that in Sept., 1942 almost 15 million women were employed, and that one-fifth of these were working in war industries. By the end of this year, an additional one-half million will join them. And, according to the AFL Weekly News Service of Nov. 17, "the figure is expected to be increased by another 3,000,000."

Secretary of Labor Perkins last week lowered the age requirement to permit girls 16 and 17 years old to work in war plants. The War and Navy Departments had requested this action on the grounds that continuation of the 18 year minimum for women "would impair seriously the conduct of government business by retarding essential production."

Every woman from California to New York who has applied for work in these new fields knows about the double standard of wages. For the same jobs that pay men anywhere from 75c to \$1.10 an hour, women are offered from 45c to 60c.

In one large defense factory, women instructors receive 60c an hour, although the men they teach are paid 70c.

The gun manufacturing industry, for example, maintains a sex differential for experienced workers as well as beginners. Rates for men start at 60 to 74.6c an hour, while women are given only 43.5 to 45c.

The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor reveals that

in nearly all cases, the lowest rate for men was always at least 10 cents above the highest rate for women. Women do the same work, do it just as well — in fact, experts claim that in certain types of work, such as the handling of precision instruments, women show greater aptitude and accuracy — yet almost without exception they are paid less. This amounts to a wage cut.

Many women workers are beginning to wonder just who benefits from all this shouting about women in industry "doing their bit." If the bosses are able to pay women 10 to 50 cents an hour less than they formerly paid men, then that extra money simply goes back into the bosses' pockets. Surely this wage cut does not help the woman worker who is struggling to maintain her home and family in spite of the high cost of living. Nor is it any help to the soldier at the front. In fact, just the opposite is true; it is a serious blow both to the workers and to the soldiers.

Women who are working in the plants and factories today must realize that it is their duty to protect the wages and working standards of the men whose places they are taking. These men spent long and bitter years of struggle to achieve better wages and decent working conditions, and it is up to the women workers to at least maintain these standards. If soldiers come back to find their jobs which paid 90c an hour being filled by women who accept 60c, that will mean a serious setback to their long fight.

In self-defense, then, all workers, women and men, and all trade unions must fight for the right of women workers to receive the same pay as men workers. Women in industry, "do your bit" — but make sure it is for the workers and soldiers, and not for the boss.

Production Is Sabotaged By Big Business, CIO Charges

CIO Convention Reporters Describe Chaos in Industry

By FELIX MORROW

The high point in the CIO convention at Boston, Nov. 9-13, was the discussion Wednesday afternoon on the real situation of war production.

On this question the CIO leadership lifted the lid a bit and revealed some examples of what is going on under the auspices of the War Production Board.

The principal report was made by Walter Reuther, UAW vice-president and "advisor" to the Labor Production Division of the WPB.

"When the records are had, if they are ever had," Reuther declared, "we will learn that the great, powerful monopolies in America who control

the economic life of this nation, will be found guilty of the most deliberate sabotage of the efforts of this country to totally mobilize its national resources of production machinery."

There is no real over-all planning by the representatives of Big Business who run the WPB, said Reuther. Each one is looking out for his own private interests. "They always think about their own shop, they always think about post-war competitive problems, and if they think doing a certain thing will put their industry in an unfavorable position in the post-war period they don't do it, even though it means that 10,000 more boys will have to give their lives on the fighting fronts."

DIFFICULTIES WITH TANKS

Soviet tank experts have sharply criticized American tank performance, particularly motors. There is lack of standardization of motors in American tanks, creating tremendous difficulties in servicing and repairing them. Even worse, in the case of the M-3 tank, aircraft engines were used which required 100 octane gasoline which ignited very easily, turning tanks into flaming coffins.

Why, then, when orders were placed for M-4 tanks, didn't the government insist that all tanks should have the same kind of motor? The chaos in this field was described by Reuther:

"We found that Ford was building a tank engine for their M-4 tanks, that General Motors was building two Diesel engines for their M-4 tanks, and that Chrysler was going to put five automobile engines in each M-4 tank."

"We checked with engineers, and every engineer we talked to, whether in Ford, Chrysler, or General Motors, the engineers — not the coupon clippers — said that the thing should not be done that way. The Chrysler engineers said that to put five automobile engines in a tank was the

Carlson Vote Was Not Recorded By Minn. Officials

Canvass'g Board Did Not Even Include Official County Vote

No figures showing the vote received by Grace Carlson, write-in candidate of the Socialist Workers Party for U. S. Senator from Minnesota in the Nov. 3 elections, are recorded in the report of the state's official Canvassing Board, released by the Secretary of State's office last week.

This failure to record the Carlson vote has all the earmarks of political discrimination. For in the same Secretary of State's office are filed the official reports of the different counties, some of which do record votes for Grace Carlson.

And while the Canvassing Board failed to record the vote for Carlson, it issued the following figures for other sticker candidates, who are all Republicans or Democrats: 18 votes for C. Elmer Anderson, candidate for Lieutenant-Governor; 298 votes for Harry O'Brien, candidate for Congress from the Sixth District; 2 votes for Frank O'Brien, also candidate for Congress from the Sixth District.

The official report to the Secretary of State from Hennepin County gave 15 votes to Carlson; the Ramsey County report gave her 5 votes.

A check on the precincts from which these votes came showed that in Hennepin County votes for Carlson were shown in only 10 out of 427 precincts; in Ramsey County only 4 precincts were recorded. The check also shows that many of the known votes from Minneapolis and St. Paul were not reported.

But if the highest election board in the state suppresses or conceals the vote recorded for a minority candidate, how much better can be expected of precinct, ward and county boards?

The failure to record duly registered votes is a corrupt election practice, according to the Minnesota state-election laws,

worst technical abortion that ever came out of our industry."

Why, then, didn't the government put an end to this chaos and see to it that one standardized engine was used in all M-4 tanks?

Because, Reuther said, the big companies could not agree among themselves to do so. Ford was in a position to manufacture enough standardized engines for all M-4 tanks but, said Edsel Ford to Reuther, "General Motors would be sore and Chrysler would be sore."

Then, Reuther said, he went to Washington to try to get the War Department to agree to it. Under-secretary of War Patterson sent him down the line. "I talked to half a dozen generals, and they said it sounded good, but there was one more fellow we would have to convince."

WHY HE REFUSED

This fellow was General Glancy, in charge of tank production in the Detroit area. Reuther talked to him and got nowhere. The conclusion of their interview is told by Reuther as follows:

"This gentleman whom we were unable to convince said to me, 'You don't know, Reuther, I am a Vice President of the General Motors Corporation.'... What happens to a labor leader or a fellow in the shop who holds up the war effort like that? He doesn't get promoted, and yet this fellow has since been made a General."

COMPANIES HOARD SCRAP

While the government is exhorting the country to collect scrap, the big corporations are sitting on huge quantities of it, refusing to release it except as they arrange for favors in return from the War Production Board, Reuther reported.

"I believe that collecting tin cans is all very fine, but the real scrap in America is inside of the factories. In the automobile industry there are tens of thousands of tons of chromium steel piled up, management refusing to

turn it in because they think some day they may be able to use some of these tools and dies. We have been pressuring, but the people in Washington in charge of the scrap campaign lack the courage and the vision to go out and get this scrap."

"Three weeks ago in Detroit and in Pontiac, General Motors was asked to turn in some of the scrap piled up in one of their plants. They finally agreed, after the WPB agreed to buy them off: in order to get the scrap piled up in that plant the WPB agreed to let General Motors make up fenders for 1936, 1937 and 1938 jalopies although it was contrary to the order of the WPB which says that only functional replacement parts shall be manufactured. There again you get this tie-up between big business and the people who are running the war effort in Washington. General Motors has to be bribed to get their scrap."

The same chaos, resulting from private profiteering, takes place in the Manpower Commission, Reuther reported. Orders for uniforms placed by army brass hats in non-union areas results in the following:

"One day the pants makers come in to the Manpower Commission and they haven't any work in New York City. We learn that the pants are being made in the South by agricultural workers who have been thrown into these new plants in the South, and yet they say there are no agricultural workers, because the agricultural workers are making the pants and the pants makers in New York are walking the streets."

U. S. STEEL'S BONANZA

Another delegate, Rutenberg of the United Steel Workers, told the outrageous story of how WPB and Army officials insist on building, with government funds, a gigantic armor plate mill for U. S. Steel Corp. at Gary, Indiana, although the plant is not needed. Rutenberg stated:

"The armor plate now being produced for the tank program is being produced by 31 small businesses through a pool. Philip Murray suggested that these small sub-contractors be expanded instead of building a brand new plant for U. S. Steel. It is admitted by the Army and the WPB that these small companies can adequately fulfill all the needs of the army tank program."

"It is admitted that the Gary project for U. S. Steel, expanding into an area that is congested, is not necessary, and all the Army says is that they are merely completing the Gary plant to have stand-by facilities. . . Some of the smaller companies are going to have to be eliminated in order to make way for this new gigantic armor plate mill of the U. S. Steel Corp. built with government funds."

CHAMPAGNE FOR AUSTRALIA

Harry Bridges of the CIO longshoremen added this story:

"Just two weeks ago in the port of San Francisco, CIO waterfront and warehouse workers had to unload and help store a large cargo of Australian wines, champagnes and brandies that had just come from Australia. Right across the dock, at the same docks our men were engaged in loading practically a full load on another ship of California wines, champagnes and brandies to go down to Australia."

"At the same time other ships, waiting to load and transport weapons and materials to the U. S. Army in Australia were being delayed because there was not sufficient manpower at that time to do the job."

The workers call this the "booze and bananas policies" of the government, reported Bridges.

WPB ANTI-LABOR

Sabotage of war production in the interest of private profit goes hand in hand with anti-labor activities in the War Production Board, Reuther reported.

"I am going to name names, because I think the time has passed when we should protect these fellows down there who are doing a job on us," he said, and singled out the example of WPB head Donald Nelson's adviser, Sidney Weinberg. Reuther declared:

"I saw a document which proves beyond doubt that Mr. Weinberg is using material put out by a notorious strikebreaker, labor biter and anti-Semite, one Harry Jung in the 'Chicago-Tribune' Building. . . Mr. Weinberg is using material from this fellow's agency in his fight against organized labor inside the WPB."

The same charge was made in general form by CIO President Philip Murray, in his opening address, when he said: "What are they running in Washington? A war production organization to win the war, or a war production organization to destroy labor?"

Neither Murray nor Reuther enlarged on this important revelation, but it is clear that they have detailed knowledge of a deliberate union-busting campaign conducted by the heads of the WPB.

But isn't labor supposed to be represented on the WPB, etc.? Reuther said, on that score: "On the question of labor representation I think we had better be honest with ourselves. We do not have any labor representation in Washington. Labor has been completely liquidated. We have a little bit of window dressing down there in spots, but it is nothing more than window dressing."

ROOSEVELT'S NAME TABOO

Who is responsible for this situation? Reuther began by promising to name names, but one name he did not name: the man who appointed the heads of the WPB and the Manpower Commission and who has used labor leaders as window-dressing for Big Business control of war production.

That man is, of course, President Roosevelt. But neither Reuther, Murray or any of the other top CIO leaders named him. Instead, as last year at the Detroit convention, they renewed their servile pleas to Roosevelt to give labor "better representation." Why their last year's pleas had not been answered, none of them dared say.

(Another of Felix Morrow's articles on the CIO convention will appear next week.)

HOW SOVIET UNION CONDUCTED WAR UNDER LENIN AND TROTSKY

In the near future *THE MILITANT* will begin a series of articles showing how the policy of revolutionary warfare carried by the first Soviet government defeated the efforts of the most powerful imperialist powers to destroy the workers' state.—Ed.

THE LIBERALISM OF WENDELL WILLKIE

By M. Morrison

It is not to be expected that an individual representing the interests of American monopoly capitalism should openly proclaim that fact. On the contrary, it is to be expected that he should try to conceal his real sentiments as much as possible under a cover of words and phrases that convey the impression of the noblest altruism.

At times, however, a situation arises when the representative of an imperialist group is in a position to utilize liberal phraseology without being guilty of too much hypocrisy. It is a situation where the interests of the imperialist group which he represents coincide, for a short period of time, with a course commonly taken to be liberal in character.

On the one hand we have Churchill who, with the best of intentions for mankind, especially that section of it comprising the big capitalists of Great Britain, must, nevertheless, play a role which every liberal condemns as reactionary. He has not come, says Churchill, to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. His role is being played under circumstances which make it difficult, if not impossible, to stand forth as the champion of freedom for all the oppressed peoples.

Wendell Willkie, on the other hand, is far more fortunate in that the same situation which compels Churchill to be a die-hard reactionary, enables Willkie to come forth as the champion of economic and political internationalism. Willkie glories in his newly-acquired role of liberal protagonist and all the democrats are entranced by and astounded at the transformation of the Willkie of 1940, representing the Republican Party and Wall Street against the liberal Roosevelt, into the Willkie of 1942 calling for the liberation of India and an end to all imperialism.

It would not at all be surprising if some liberals and labor leaders would begin a campaign for a new party led by Roosevelt and Willkie in opposition to the reactionaries of both the Republican and Democratic parties. Did not Dubinsky, the president of the International Ladies Garment Workers, express a desire to draft Willkie to run as candidate for governor of New York against Dewey and Bennett?

Marxists do not rule out the possibility of a change of heart on the part of an individual. It has happened that socialists have gone over to the side of imperialists and it is possible for the reverse to occur, though not so probable. Social pressure is all the more so.

In the case of Willkie, however, it is not at all necessary to postulate the theory of a fundamental change in his thinking. It is only necessary to analyze correctly the situation calling forth his liberal expressions to conclude that he still represents the same group that he represented in 1940 when he was campaigning against Roosevelt.

As against Roosevelt, Willkie in 1940 emphasized the desire of American monopoly capitalism to free itself from the restraints placed upon it by the labor legislation of an administration anxious to solve the problems of American capitalism through a liberal approach. At present, under Roosevelt the social gains of labor are being whittled down and from the point of view of American monopolists do not at all constitute the most important problem confronting it. What Willkie is concerned with is the desire of American monopoly capitalism to win the war and the peace. In this task his main enemy is not Roosevelt who agrees with him on all essentials, but Churchill, the representative of British imperialism.

Willkie represents the same group now that he did in 1940. But his ideas at present appear to be liberal because his opponent, Churchill, represents a decadent and reactionary empire requiring direct political control of its colonies. The group of monopoly capitalists represented by Willkie has everything to gain and nothing to lose, at this particular period, by adopting a "liberal" position towards the colonial peoples.

American monopoly capitalism is much more powerful, industrially, than British monopoly capitalism. On the basis of "fair" competition, that is, where Great Britain does not have the political control of any colonial nation, the advantage is all with American monopoly capitalism. What chance has British monopoly capitalism in India, Malaya, Burma and other colonial nations as against American monopoly capitalism, provided the British do not have the power to levy taxes on American capital and goods? What chance have the Dutch capitalists in the East Indies as against the American capitalists?

Granting the colonial peoples the "freedom" to choose between the commodities of the competing highly developed capitalist nations means assuring supremacy for the American capitalists.

"Now assume," says Willkie in his speech before the *Herald-Tribune Forum*, held in New York City last week, "that the Allies reconquer these areas (Hong Kong, Singapore, etc.) — shall we return them to their previous status where their defense was courageous but inadequate and their peoples undeveloped under the governmental custody of some one nation? Or shall they be wards of the United Nations, their basic commodities made freely available to the world . . . the full yield of their resources used for their own health, their own education and development? . . ."

Noble sentiments indeed! But it so happens that they coincide with the interests of American monopoly capitalism. We can of course exclude everything referring to granting the full yield of their resources to the colonial peoples. It is hardly conceivable that American monopoly capitalism is so altruistic as to give up all profits voluntarily. Its altruism is confined to taking the colonial peoples away from the exclusive jurisdiction of British monopoly capitalism.

It is not necessary to assume that Willkie is a hypocrite, in the sense that he consciously uses liberal phraseology to cover up his real designs. This point need not be argued, not only because it is difficult to prove it one way or another, but because it is immaterial. The important thing is to understand the forces Willkie represents and why, at this time, he can and does express liberal sentiments. Equally important is it that no one be fooled by these liberal expressions.

But is it not true that in his own Republican Party there are many leading elements hostile to Willkie's liberal ideas? And does that not prove that Willkie is a real liberal and that only the reactionary Republicans voice the sentiments and desires of American monopoly capitalism?

It would be altogether too mechanical to conceive of the American capitalist class as a homogeneous group always united on all policies. The contradictions and conflicts within the capitalist class are too many and various to permit complete unanimity under all circumstances. With some sections of the capitalist class isolationism still plays and will continue to play an important role.

The far-sighted sections of the American capitalist class, understanding the needs and interests of American capitalism, will back Willkie and Roosevelt. One can rest assured that this is the decisive section of the American capitalist class, and that, regardless of Willkie's personal political fortunes, will succeed in having Willkie's foreign policies adopted.

As against Willkie's economic internationalism, which represents the interests of American monopoly capitalism, the American workers must propose world socialism which means true internationalism without exploitation and with true equality and freedom for all nations and peoples of the world.

Where You Can Get THE MILITANT

Boston—Adelman's Newsstand
284 Tremont St.

Chicago—Socialist Bookshop,
Room 421, 160 N. Wells St.

Detroit—The Saturday Bookshop, Room 5, 3513 Woodward Ave., open Saturday evenings from 6 to 9 o'clock.

Harlem—Newsstands at north-west corner of Lenox Ave. and 125th St. and at the northeast corner of Lenox Ave. and 135th St.

Minneapolis—Shinder's News Agency, Hennepin Ave. and 6th St.; Pioneer News Agency, 238 2nd Ave. South.

Newark (Downtown)—Newsstand, 11 Springfield Ave., near Court House.

New Haven—Nodelman's News Depot, 106 Church St., near Chapel.

New York (Manhattan)—14th St., between 4th and 7th Aves.; Newsstands on 42nd St., between 4th and 5th Aves.

Rochester—Newsstand, Main St. and Clinton Ave., south-east corner.

Roxbury, Mass.—Friendly Variety Newsstand, Grove Hall.

Seattle—Eckhart News, 102 Washington Street.

SUBSCRIBE NOW

READ

THE MILITANT

WEEKLY

Six Months \$1.00
One Year \$2.00

(Clip and Mail This Coupon)

THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Place New York, N. Y.

I enclose \$ Please send my subscription to:

Name
Address
City State

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 48 Saturday, Nov. 28, 1942

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 6-8547

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.

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

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

A Reminder To The FBI

Last week THE MILITANT carried an open letter to Attorney-General Biddle by James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, reporting inquiries made by FBI agents of SWP leaders concerning a train wreck that occurred in Pittsburgh in March, 1941.

According to the FBI agents, a train carrying engineers and officials of the Soviet Union narrowly escaped being involved in the wreck. On this ground, the FBI agents declared, they were investigating and would continue to investigate leaders and members of the Trotskyist movement.

As Comrade Cannon pointed out in his open letter, all our writings and activities "show clearly that we are opposed to individual violence and sabotage" and "any attempt to attribute ideas and practices to us outside of those that are openly advocated by us must be publicly called by its right name: a prelude to a frame-up."

To this might be added another fact to demonstrate the fantastic character of the inquisition being carried on by the agents of the Department of Justice.

In March, 1941 the Soviet Union had just concluded its war with Finland. At that time the Trotskyist movement was one of the few organizations in the United States which openly advocated defense of the Soviet Union.

At that time, when all the fair-weather "friends of the Soviet Union" had succumbed to democratic capitalist pressure and were denouncing the workers' state as "imperialist," the Trotskyists alone stood firm, calling on the workers of the world to support the Soviet Union, despite the crimes of Stalinism, against the assaults of imperialism and the agents of imperialism.

In that same period, everyone will recall, the government of the United States was also denouncing the Soviet Union and encouraging campaigns to send aid to "poor little Finland."

And yet today the agents of this same government have the audacity to imply that the Trotskyists might have been connected with anti-Soviet sabotage!

They Explode Their Own Alibi

For the past week Washington has been justifying its embrace of French fascist Admiral Darlan in North Africa on the ground of military expediency. Those who protested the placing of the Atlantic Charter in moth balls so early in the game, were told that this was a question for hard-headed military men who weighed all things upon the realistic scale of tanks and ships and planes.

Arthur Krock, N. Y. Times' Washington correspondent, interviewed top military men and administration spokesmen in Washington and then wrote in the Times of Nov. 17:

"One of those questioned said today: 'War has

forced us idealists and democrats to quantitative, rather than qualitative, morality as the test. If, for example, Goering should offer to come over with a few planes, we don't want him. He will cost more than he will contribute. But if he can bring the Luftwaffe with him we'll receive him.'"

Washington's claim, then, is that democratic principles are subordinated only when forced by military necessities. But even this alibi was exploded last week when news arrived of a deal between the U. S. State Department and Vichy fascist Admiral George Robert, High Commissioner of the French West Indies and French Guiana.

A State Department official has signed a pact which guarantees the French Admiral that the United Nations will underwrite his control of the French possessions in South America if he would cut loose from the Laval Government and "act independently." The Admiral has done this and is thus assured of the continuation of his power and policies.

What "military necessities" forced this scuttling of the Four Freedoms? Admiral Robert controlled no strategic territory, nor did he have a military machine capable of resisting the "United Nations." Certainly his materials of war were not in sufficient quantities to be coveted by the American generals. In fact, the few French war ships stationed in French Martinique will continue "immobilized" under the agreement.

Surely the natives of the West Indies and South America are anxious to obtain the benefits of the Four Freedoms for themselves. Since the excuse of "military necessity" can't be presented in this case, what possible conclusion can they draw except that the Four Freedoms serve merely as window dressing in this war?

Roosevelt said that the Atlantic Charter applied to the whole world. However, the world seems to be shrinking. Churchill has exempted the British Empire, and now Roosevelt has exempted the French Empire.

Manpower And The 40-Hour Week

Numerous individuals and committees have been busying themselves with the problem of the approaching manpower shortage. But under the guise of solving the problem of the labor supply, a determined attack is being launched against the wages and conditions of the workers.

Compulsory labor service, the step advocated by War Manpower Commissioner Paul McNutt, has been shelved as unnecessary for the time being. The consensus of opinion is that centralized hiring would be able to handle the immediate situation. Although exact plans for centralized hiring are still obscure, the end result would be to further deprive the workers' rights to bargain collectively.

McNutt calls for "centralized hiring" which would give him authority to shift the supply of labor from industry to industry at will. Under this plan all hiring would be done through a central government office, probably the United States Employment Service. No worker could get a job except through this office and no employer would be allowed to hire workers except as received through this office.

Under such conditions the right to quit a job and find a better one would be nothing but fiction. If a worker quit because of low pay or poor conditions, the central hiring office could send him right back to the job he had left.

The present status of manpower control is as follows: whatever governmental regulation exists is being applied through Selective Service by the method of deferment or induction into the army. In industries where shortages have developed (copper mining, lumbering, dairy and other agricultural industries) the workers are deferred from military service so long as they do not leave their jobs. If they leave their jobs, they are subject to immediate induction into the army.

This method is sufficient to freeze labor in a particular industry, but does not give the government authority to move workers from one job to another. To get this authority McNutt and General Hershey of Selective Service have been conducting a see-saw struggle for the past several months.

The National Association of Manufacturers, with its own particular anti-labor axe to grind, has entered the picture with a program for "easing the labor shortage." The NAM wants the work week lengthened to 48 hours before overtime will be paid.

At the head of the move to abolish the 40-hour week are members of the Senate and House, with those from poll-tax states playing the leading role. Their statements that the abolition of the 40-hour week will increase the amount of labor power available is only an attempted swindle to hide a proposed wage cut. The work week is not at present limited to 40 hours. A worker may work as long as the boss requires him to, provided he is paid overtime rates for all hours over 40.

The aim of this campaign is not to increase the labor supply, but to increase profits.

McNutt, General Hershey, the bosses and their Congressmen are all whittling at the workers' wages and conditions from different sides. They shroud their drives with patriotic talk, but their motivations spring from profit and personal ambition.

WORKERS' FORUM

Write to us — tell us what's going on in your part of the labor movement — what are the workers thinking about? — what are the bosses up to? — the labor leaders? — the Stalinists? Send us that story the capitalist press wouldn't print and that story they buried or distorted — let us know whether you agree or disagree with the views expressed in this paper. Letter should carry name and address, but indicate if you do not want your name printed.

A Delegate on the Convent'n of the AFL Distillery Workers

The first biennial convention of the Distillery, Rectifying and Wine Workers International Union, AFL, was held Oct. 26 to 28 in Hotel Commodore, New York City. Though the union is young, a right wing bureaucracy is already beginning to crystallize and it railroaded the convention in a manner that would have done William Green proud.

There were two key committees — the resolution and constitution committees. The International officers saw to it that these committees were composed of people they could keep in line. And brothers, they went right down the line with all the bureaucracy's suggestions. There was only one organized group in the convention and that was the machine of the International officers.

The convention lasted three days and fully two of those days were wasted with speeches from outside union leaders, boss politicians, and even the bosses themselves. All of the speakers said about the same thing: "Win the war" and "Down with the prohibitionists!" For that matter, there was little difference between the outside speeches and those of the union officials. One could have closed his eyes during any of the speeches and not been able to tell a labor leader from a boss politician.

The only fight in the convention took place when the International officers introduced a resolution which, in effect, raised the per capita tax paid by the locals. Several delegates spoke in opposition to this move and demanded that a roll call be taken.

The leadership tried to block this move. They failed to block the roll call but they won the increase in per capita by an extremely narrow margin.

In conclusion I would say that this first convention showed that the International officers have things well in hand, but that there is a militant rank and file which is ready to fight when important issues arise and when they are given any leadership.

A DELEGATE

Wants To Help THE MILITANT

I have subscribed to THE MILITANT but have not received my copies. Can you give me any information?

I have a relative that gets the Sunday Worker through the mail regularly. Of course we know that outfit has gone all out on the "War Deal" and maybe that's the reason.

So if my paper is held up for any reason, please let me know and maybe we can take some action here.

H. R.
Flint, Michigan

Stalinist Role In the UE

You might be interested to learn that the Stalinist bureaucrats in my union are beginning to have difficulty even with their own rank and file, in putting across their sell-out actions.

At the last meeting of Local 430 of the UERMWA in New York City, the Stalinist leadership attempted to set a precedent where in case a union member is just a little too militant, he

can be expelled and discharged from the job. But this move was even too raw for the Stalinist rank and file.

Horn Signal, a plant employing 425 workers, has been giving the men a lot of overtime during the last few months. One morning there was a notice on the time clock that all overtime would be discontinued in a couple of days. That afternoon 50 people of one department punched out after 8 hours instead of working overtime.

The boss called up the union saying this was a wildcat strike and named one man responsible for it. The three organizers, two of them Stalinists, had a meeting and sent a letter to the boss stating that the worker had been discharged.

At the local union meeting there was a storm of protest. The discussion revealed the rising doubts that assailed the rank and file Stalinists concerning their line. Many workers took the floor to speak against the action of the organizers. The shop chairman said that the workers in the shop thought the fired man should be given another chance. One member said that 61 workers had decided not to report for work the next day if the fired militant was not reinstated.

The Stalinist bureaucrats, when they saw resistance in their own ranks, backed down pretty fast and promised the membership to reinstate the worker.

All this shows that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the honest Stalinists, who believe they are fighting for the working class, to reconcile the concepts of militant unionism with their own boss-appealing line.

R. S.
NEW YORK CITY

Workers' BOOKSHELF

THE RIDDLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT, by Robert Bendiner, Farrar and Rinehart, 1942, 231 pages, \$2.00.

The collaboration in Africa between Roosevelt, his State Department and the coterie of French fascist military leaders headed by Admiral Darlan, has touched the sensitivity of the liberals to their democratic quicks.

From "The Riddle Of The State Department," by Robert Bendiner, managing editor of The Nation, it can be seen that the newest insult to democratic idealism in French Africa is only the latest moral injury to the liberal supporters of Roosevelt.

As a spokesman for the aggrieved gentry on the liberal front, Bendiner presents the history of the pro-fascist policy of the State Department, and puzzles over the "paradox" for a couple of hundred pages.

State Department Record

Bendiner complains that the United States fed supplies to Italy, Franco and Japan, and followed a policy of appeasement.

This accusation is backed by plenty of facts. After Roosevelt gave his "Quarantine the Aggressor" speech on Oct. 7, 1937, the U. S. sold Japan 90% of her scrap iron and steel imports, 90% of her copper imports, 76% of her aircraft and plane parts imports.

While the State Department refused to allow the shipment of two Red Cross planes to Ethiopia, export of raw materials to Italy during the Ethiopian war rose in a rapid spiral. Crude oil exports to Italy rose from 61,708 barrels in October, 1935, to 417,474 barrels one month later. In the same month Ethiopia got 999 barrels of oil.

After assuring Franco's victory in Spain by enforcing an embargo against the Loyalists, the United States arranged a \$100,000,000 loan to fascist Spain through Argentina. Bendiner quotes the statement of Franco following the embargo of the Loyalists:

"President Roosevelt behaved in the matter like a true gentleman."

But to the liberals this support of fascism was a breach of democratic etiquette, and constitutes the real riddle which faced Bendiner when he wrote his book, and which still faces the liberal wing of Roosevelt's supporters.

Most of Bendiner's book is devoted to an attempted explanation of Roosevelt's "paradoxical" lapses in manners.

According to Bendiner, Roosevelt is beset by difficulties in his pursuit of foreign policy. The State Department, he shows, is dominated by aristocratic scions of the rich. This state of affairs is due to "tradition" which Roosevelt apparently observes in order not to hurt the feelings of antiquarians to whom such things are so very important.

The aristocratic composition of the State Department is further explained by more practical considerations. "Diplomatic plums have tradi-

tionally been held as suitable award for a newly elected president to bestow on generous contributors to his campaign fund," Bendiner states. Roosevelt has meticulously observed this tradition also.

Rewarded for their generosity to Roosevelt's campaign funds were Anthony Biddle, Doris Duke Cromwell's husband, Joseph E. Davies, and other multi-millionaires.

For other considerations it is customary to appoint millionaires to diplomatic posts, since the salaries of ambassadors cannot begin to finance the champagne parties necessary to the efficient functioning of the embassies.

But Bendiner goes deeper than all this. There are more profound reasons to explain why Roosevelt "tolerates the State Department," the policies of which are not in line with the "Democratic Ideal."

"If politics were simply an exercise in cold logic it would be impossible to explain why Roosevelt tolerates the State Department," writes Bendiner. Obviously then, "cold logic" must be discarded.

Although Roosevelt has full control of foreign policy by constitutional authority, Bendiner claims that "he lapses into appeasement by way of surrender rather than choice."

"The President is not an independent force. . . he is a resolution of conflicting forces," and these conflicting forces, strange to say, result in his surrender to the forces of Big Business, reaction and fascism.

Surrender, unfortunately, is not quite the word. Roosevelt is under pressure, to be sure. But he represents and expresses the views and interests of the capitalist class.

The Liberal Analysis

Bendiner goes to great pains to avoid this conclusion. Progressing from a repudiation of simple logic, in favor of a more "scientific" analysis, he finally lapses into liberal sentimentality in order to explain Roosevelt's foreign policy.

"Hull is an old friend. . . and personal relationship is involved," he states.

"Welles, besides having generously contributed to (Roosevelt's) past campaigns, is one of the President's last ties with the Groton-Harvard world of his youth. . . he enjoys society with Welles."

This is why Roosevelt "allowed" the State Department to do business with Mussolini, Franco and the Mikado. Nothing so crass as the interests of Wall Street were involved.

And why should politics or world affairs interfere with old school ties or beautiful friendships?

It is, after all, a human thing to do. . . to succumb to the State Department for the sake of something higher, something finer than politics.

The Loyalist victims of Franco should understand that.

Reviewed by JOSEPH ANDREWS

Empires Fall, But AT&T Carries On

By C. CHARLES

For year after year, decade after decade, through years of prosperity and years of depression, with the regularity of a fine chronometer, the five billion dollar monopoly, American Telephone and Telegraph Company, has declared its \$2.25 dividend each three months.

The big question that has kept Wall Street in a state of intense excitement for the last few weeks was: Would AT&T continue its custom this quarter? Last week the top committee of AT&T met and gave its decision. Wall Street is happy. Righteousness has once more conquered. The noble tradition will be maintained. Each shareholder of AT&T will get \$2.25 for each share he owns.

Nations may fall and be devastated; the youth of the world taken from their jobs and families and thrown at one another on battlefields all over the globe; women and children driven into industry; children, left without care, become delinquent; farmers forced to give up their land; small businesses go under; the workers and dirt farmers taxed heavily; the necessities of life rationed; millions torn up from their roots and forced to migrate;—but amidst all this upheaval and turmoil and change, one thing still remains certain as the coming of night and day, the dividends of the largest corporation in the world!

Franco and Roosevelt -- Friends for a Long Time

With the beginning of the Allied invasion of French North Africa, President Roosevelt sent warm letters of greeting and assurance to General Franco in Spain and General Carmona in Portugal.

The letter to Franco opened: "It is because your nation and mine are friends in the best sense of the word, and because you and I are sincerely desirous of the continuation of that friendship for our mutual good that I want very simply to tell you of the compelling reasons that have forced me to send a powerful American military force to the assistance of the French possessions in North Africa."

After an explanation of the military situation, Roosevelt writes: "I hope you will accept my full assurance that these moves are in no shape, manner, or form directed against the government or people of Spain or Spanish territory, metropolitan or overseas."

The letter concludes with, "I am, my dear General, your sincere friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Franco, the tool of Hitler and Mussolini and the butcher of thousands upon thousands of Spanish anti-fascist workers, is embraced in the warmest terms by Roosevelt and assured that his reign of terror will be respected by the "United Nations."

The government of Portugal is no less a military dictatorship than Germany and Spain and she too is assured by Washington that no move will be made against her.

This is no sudden blossoming of a beautiful friendship between Roosevelt and Franco. A few months ago Roosevelt promised the Spanish fascist that American funds would be available to him for "reconstruction" after the war. And before that it was the Roosevelt policy of "non-intervention" that prevented the heroic Spanish workers from receiving arms when they were fighting the Hitler-Mussolini supported counter-revolution of the Spanish fascists.

It is clear that Roosevelt and Churchill are not fighting against fascism, but rather against German and Italian attempts to build their own imperialist empires.

Newsman Denounce Censors In Washington and London

The British people are being prevented from knowing what the Americans think and the Americans are kept in ignorance of British public opinion. This is a charge made this week by both American and English correspondents who are victims of tightening censorship on both sides of the Atlantic.

Raymond Daniell, N. Y. Times' London correspondent protested this censorship in the Nov. 18 issue of the Times when he cited instances of the mildest sort of criticism of government policy being blue penciled by the official censors in London. Sometimes, as in the case of Wendell Willkie's objections to the British policy in India, the news is merely held up until its news value is lost.

That this censorship works both ways across the Atlantic is proven by the protests filed with the authorities by newsmen stationed in both London and Washington. Don Iddon, Washington correspondent for the Sunday Dispatch in England, finally cabled a story under a headline informing his readers that "because of the United States censors' gag" they were not getting the whole truth from America.

Iddon said that not only was all comment critical of the U. S. State Department forbidden, but opinions of "America's leading columnists were censored" before transmission out of the country.

"As a result," writes Daniell, "American readers of newspapers today are not getting as complete a picture of what is happening here among the exiled governments and within them, or for that matter, of British reactions to American political developments as they did, say, a couple of years ago."

"Never has the censorship been more odious here than since Lieut. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower found it expedient to accept the good offices of Admiral Francois Darlan for the pacification of North Africa," continues Daniell, "British disgust at this trade has been very frankly expressed but it has had to be sugar-coated for transmission to the United States."

The governments of the "United Nations" no longer confine their censorship to "news of value to the enemy." They now attempt to conceal from each other internal criticism of their own policies.

The censorship of foreign cables is a logical first step to more stringent control of what is printed within the country. The Post Office's action in withholding recent issues of THE MILITANT from the mails is a big step in this direction.