

What Kind Of Labor Unity Is Lewis Seeking?

An Editorial

There is no more persistent and progressive sentiment in the ranks of organized labor than the desire for trade union unity. The recently published Gallup Poll figures, showing that 71 per cent of the members of the AFL and CIO are in favor of unity, merely attest to a fact long recognized by anyone with the slightest knowledge of the labor movement. An overwhelming majority of trade unionists want unity. We endorse and wholeheartedly support that sentiment.

But if the desire for unity is so strong and wide-spread in both the AFL and CIO, what has prevented unity up to now?

The chief obstacle to unity has been the refusal of the AFL craft union bureaucrats to give up any part of their privileged position in the American labor movement and to abandon their narrow and selfish jurisdictional claims, a large part of which exist solely on paper.

In addition, the AFL craft union tops actually look with fear at the prospect of millions of mass production workers joining the AFL ranks. The industrial workers, because of their less privileged position, are more militant than those in small, highly-paid and well-protected crafts. They are less submissive to bureaucratic control. That is why the CIO has been more militant and more democratic than the AFL. The craft union leaders, steeped in a tradition of conservatism, are tormented by the question of how to control and stifle the militancy and democratic instincts of the industrial workers. They know of no other method than they have always used, to divide the workers up into small and conflicting craft groups.

Up to now, John L. Lewis has insisted that these were the main factors barring the road to unity. He maintained that unity between the AFL and the CIO was impossible on any progressive plane so long as the craft union chiefs were in a position to threaten the gains and the future of industrial unionism.

Granted that Lewis was motivated by personal considerations, nevertheless, at that time he did uphold the progressive principle of industrial union organization in the mass industries. Regardless of the motives which brought him to this position, the position itself was sound. We, together with all forward-looking sectors of the labor movement therefore agreed with Lewis' stand on the question of unity.

That stand was forcefully expressed by Lewis on Nov. 19, 1940, in his address to the Atlantic City convention of the CIO, when he told the delegates:

"There is no peace because you are not strong enough to command peace upon honorable terms. And there will be no peace with a mighty adversary until you possess that strength of bone and sinew that will make it possible for you to bargain for peace on equal terms."

Today, however, Lewis has abandoned that position. Without either the knowledge or consent of the CIO members and leaders, he has taken it upon himself to initiate negotiations for unity between the CIO and AFL. In his letter to the heads of the two organizations calling for immediate negotiations and fusion, he asserts:

"Conditions are now changed. . . . The sequence of events since the last meeting (for unity negotiations) some two and one-half years ago, have enfeebled certain obstacles and factors of control which then existed."

But how have conditions changed? What has happened

(Continued on page 4)

Trotskyist Leader Issues A 'Statement On the War'

Reaffirms Previous Characterization of the War, Explains Support of USSR-China, Offers Program for Fighting Fascism

James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, issued a "Statement on the War" in the January issue of *Fourth International*, monthly magazine, which went on the news-stands last week.

The statement recalls that up to Dec. 8, "We considered the war upon the part of all the capitalist powers involved—Germany and France, Italy and Great Britain—as an imperialist war." Then it says:

"This characterization of the war was determined for us by the character of the state powers involved in it. They were capitalist powers in the epoch of imperialism; themselves imperialist — oppressing other nations or peoples — or satellites of imperialist powers. The extension of the war to the Pacific and the formal entry of the United States and Japan change nothing in this basic analysis."

DEFENDS USSR, CHINA

The statement then goes on to emphasize that its attitude toward the Soviet Union and China is entirely different than its attitude toward the great capitalist powers. It says:

"We make a fundamental distinction between the Soviet Union and its 'democratic' allies. We defend the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is a workers' state, although degenerated under the totalitarian-political rule of the Kremlin bureaucracy. Only traitors can deny support to the Soviet workers' state in its war against fascist Germany. To defend the Soviet Union, in spite of Stalin and against Stalin, is to defend the nationalized property established by the October revolution. That is a progressive war."

"The war of China against Japan we likewise characterize as a progressive war. We support China. China is a colonial country, battling for national independence against an imperial-

ist power. A victory for China would be a tremendous blow against all imperialism, inspiring all colonial peoples to throw off the imperialist yoke. The reactionary regime of Chiang-Kai-shek, subservient to the 'democracies', has hampered China's ability to conduct a bold war for independence; but that does not alter for us the essential fact that China is an oppressed nation fighting against an imperialist oppressor. We are proud of the fact that the Fourth Internationalists of China are fighting in the front ranks against Japanese imperialism."

"The real war against fascism, the statement says, can only be waged by a Workers' and Farmers' Government. "When the people of Germany can feel assured that military defeat will not be followed by the destruction of Germany's economic power and the imposition of unbearable burdens by the victors. Hitler will be overthrown from within Germany. But such guarantees against a second Versailles cannot be given by Germany's imperialist foes; such guarantees can be given only by a Workers' and Farmers' Government."

DEMANDS DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

The statement concludes with a section on the conduct of the revolutionary minority in wartime. It says:

"Our program against Hitlerism and for a Workers' and Farmers' Government is today the program of only a small minor-

ity. The great majority actively or passively supports the war program of the Roosevelt administration. As a minority we must submit to that majority in action. We do not sabotage the war or obstruct the military forces in any way. The Trotskyists go with their generation into the armed forces. We abide by the decisions of the majority. But we retain our opinions and insist on our right to express them.

"Our aim is to convince the majority that our program is the only one which can put an end to war, fascism and economic convulsions. In this process of education the terrible facts speak loudly for our contention. Twice in twenty-five years world wars have wrought destruction. The instigators and leaders of those wars do not offer, and cannot offer, a plausible promise that a third, fourth and fifth world war will not follow if they and their social system remain dominant. Capitalism can offer no prospect but the slaughter of millions and the destruction of civilization. Only socialism can save humanity from this abyss. This is the truth. As the terrible war unfolds, this truth will be recognized by tens of millions who will not hear us now. The war-tortured masses will adopt our program and liberate the people of all countries from war and fascism. In this dark hour we clearly see the socialist future and prepare the way for it. Against the mad chorus of national hatreds we advance once more the old slogan of socialist internationalism: Workers of the World, Unite!"

(For reports of other labor statements on the war, see page 4 of this issue.)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI. — No. 4

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1942

FIVE (5) CENTS

ALL-OUT WAR PROFITEERING EXPOSED IN SENATE REPORT

New Jersey L.N.P.L. Votes Support Of 18

TRENTON, N. J., Jan. 19.—The States Legislative Conference of Labor's Non-Partisan League of New Jersey yesterday passed a resolution calling on all its affiliates to support the defense of the 18 members of Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party, convicted last month in a Minneapolis federal court of violating the 1940 Smith Gag Law.

The League, representing many CIO and AFL unions, denounced the Smith Gag Law as a "dangerous weapon against labor and the democratic rights of the American people," condemned "the convictions in the Minneapolis case" and protested "the use of the FBI to interfere in the democratic procedure of the labor movement."

The resolution urged League affiliates to give "support in this case, to aid in the appeal of this case to the Supreme Court to test the constitutionality of the Smith Act and to free the eighteen defendants."

Last month the State Council of the New Jersey CIO had passed a similar resolution in support of the 18 defendants.

UNIONS SEND MONEY
Contributions were received last week from UAW-CIO Local 854, Syracuse, N. Y., and Local 6-28, CIO International Woodworkers, Portola, Calif.

What Truman Report Showed

Dollar-A-Year Men Aid War Profiteers

A handful of giant monopoly corporations are making tremendous war profits through "outrageous" contracts which they have secured with the aid of the OPM, declares the Truman report. It adds that the OPM is controlled "by persons holding important positions with large companies who were willing and anxious to serve on a dollar per year, or without compensation basis."

On Jan. 5 there were no less than 255 dollar-a-year and "without compensation" men on the OPM "dealing with matters involving the welfare of the class of clients by whom they were formerly employed and by whom they naturally expect to be employed in the future."

Most of these men "loaned" to the government by the big corporations retain their business connections, draw down company pay and in some cases have been given substantial pay increases for their services to the companies.

"All important procurement contracts must be approved by these men," declares the report, "which means that contracts must conform to their theories of business. Since they represent the largest companies, this means that the defense program in all its ramifications must obtain the approval of the large companies."

Even when the dollar-a-year men are not permitted formally to pass upon a contract to their own companies, "they are in a much better position. . . to know what type of contracts the government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration."

"They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their request for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and no-compensation men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested."

The men running the war production program "subconsciously reflect the opinions and conclusions which they formerly reached as managers of large interests with respect to Government competition, with respect to taxation and amortization, with respect to the financing of new plant expansion, and with respect to the margin of profits which should be allowed on war contracts."

(Other highlights of the Truman Committee report will be found on page 3.)



SENATOR TRUMAN, Chairman of the Special Senate Committee which spilled some of the beans about war profiteering.

War Dept. 'Favored' 19 Plane Companies

Labor disputes and strikes were among the principal reasons given by the War Department to the Truman committee for the lag in plane production.

But, after a nine months' investigation, the Truman committee was forced to conclude in its report:

"It now appears obvious that the above reasons are not reasons for failure of production, but are excuses."

The real reason, it is apparent from the report, is that "nineteen favored manufacturers of military aircraft" secured a monopoly on all war contracts. Cooperating with the big monopoly companies, the Army and Navy procurement services froze out over 60 smaller companies able to "produce a minimum of 2,000 planes a month."

"Our present production," states the report, "appears to be entirely the result of the procurement policies of the service agencies and the Office of Production Management." It appears that "our services have merely purchased what the manufacturers had to offer" — including obsolete models totaling 75 per cent of war plane production from which the "favored" corporations made "staggering profits."

Auto Bosses Demand New Plants As Gift

Of course, the auto corporations didn't turn down any juicy war contracts which were a "very important and profitable sideline," relates the Truman committee. But until the government came across with the gift of new plants, the industry heads saw no harm in taking advantage of the war boom to concentrate on commercial production.

Between their "profitable sideline" and the expanded consumer market, the big three of the industry, General Motors, Ford and Chrysler, raked in \$430,604,778 profits in the first nine months of 1941 as compared with \$408,212,589 for all of 1940 and \$296,075,775 in 1939.

The auto industry knew that war was coming. It knew that it would be one of the basic war industries.

Nevertheless the auto barons delayed the job of conversion and waited for the government to give them more new plants. The automobile industry had a lot of idle tool makers and convertible unused facilities but "announcements were made to the effect that automobile plants could not produce tanks and airplanes, and that it was advisable and necessary to build new plants for that purpose."

In fact, the industry heads advised the OPM that only ten percent of its tools could be utilized in the production of airplane engines. William Knudsen, former GM president and also "master of production" as the president has termed him, naturally accepted the estimates of his former colleagues.

The Truman Committee, delving into the matter a bit more deeply, came to the conclusion that "the information furnished to the Under-Secretary of War by the automobile companies and the Office of Production Management was quite inaccurate" — not to say downright deliberate falsification.

Now that the industry will have to discontinue auto production, the committee finds, the auto manufacturers and OPM "take the position that the plants can in fact be convertible in a relatively short time."

After the job of conversion is completed, says the Truman report, the committee "will insist upon receiving an explanation. . . upon which they (the auto bosses) contend that they should be given millions of dollars to spend over months of time to create entirely new plant facilities instead of being required to convert a substantial part of their existing facilities."

450,000 jobless auto workers can give the "explanation." In a word—profits!

Naming Of Nelson Offers No Solution

Same Pro-Monopoly Government Officials Remain In Control

Shocking revelations of all-out greed in the organization of war production fill the partial report of the Truman Special Senate Committee for Investigating the National Defense Program, made public last week. The report, summarizing data uncovered during the past nine months, drips with the sordid facts of corruption, graft and profiteering which saturate every war industry and every government war production agency.

One day before this report was made public, President Roosevelt announced a grand re-organization of the government's war production agencies, centralizing them under one super-board headed by Donald Nelson, who ostentatiously resigned his big executive position with Sears-Roebuck and Co. before assuming his new government post.

Highlights of the Truman committee report include the following:

ROLE OF THE \$1-A-YEAR MEN

Hundreds of dollar-a-year and "without compensation" men, "loaned" to the government by the big corporations, have been running the war production program in the interests of the monopolies, which are making "stag-

(Continued on page 3)

The Truman Report Had Some Effects

(From the New York Herald Tribune of Jan. 17)

Judge Charles S. Colden suspended sentence yesterday on Harry Goldberg, of 1645 Forty-Seventh Street, Brooklyn, who had pleaded guilty of forgery in the third degree in Queens County Court, in appropriating \$3,250 he obtained on a check he signed as the representative of a furniture company.

"Today we are suffering from the shock of the terrible things that we have discovered in the report of the Senate investigating committee," said Judge Colden. "Men who were supposed to be men of great character and moral integrity and patriotism have been guilty of things displayed by that report. We find men who are gorging themselves with the wealth that is being contributed by patriotic Americans, so that they can enrich themselves like swine in the feeding trough. We read such things as one man saying that the profits of his company were so great that they needed a steam shovel to handle them."

"Until we have a firing squad to take care of people of that kind, we ought not to deal harshly with some foolish individual who has a good record and has been a pretty decent sort of man and who has made a slip. So today I am going to suspend sentence upon you, Harry Goldberg, upon the understanding that henceforth you will never do anything which will cause you to be brought into court."

Goldberg fainted.

Why USSR Gets So Few Prisoners

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The official dispatches issued by the Kremlin in connection with the recent Soviet victories have been marked by reticences on many significant aspects of the struggle. Very remarkable, for example, is the dearth of information concerning the number of captured German soldiers.

Communicate after communicate lists the number of captured tanks, cars, guns, etc., together with the estimated number of German soldiers killed or wounded, but has nothing to say about the number of those who surrendered. This has been naturally accepted to mean that there have been comparatively few surrenders.

The Soviet Bureau of Information has at last officially confirmed this fact. "Until recently," said the Soviet bureau, "in many cases the German soldiers, despite the proposals of the Soviet command refused to surrender" (Daily Worker, Jan. 19).

Why have the German soldiers refused to accept the "proposals of the Soviet command" to give up a hopeless struggle? Why have the Soviet armies had to pay the costly price of such last ditch resistance?

An answer to this question has obviously an important bearing

on the current as well as the future course of the struggle on the military arena. The Soviet Bureau of Information evades answering this question directly, but offers instead the purported explanation of the German soldiers themselves.

"German war prisoners declare that refusal to surrender is explained exclusively by the fact that the German officers shoot down all soldiers who give themselves up to the Soviet troops" (idem).

This explanation, if it means anything at all, is simply an affirmation that the discipline of the German army remains unbroken, despite the recent defeats, even at times when the soldiers are completely surrounded and know that the struggle is a hopeless one.

In other words, the much publicized propaganda of the Kremlin, all its "appeals," etc., to the German soldiers to turn against Hitler, have not had the slightest effect thus far in separating the rank and file of the German army from the officer corps.

United States of Europe. Stalinism bars this road. The Kremlin fears to advance such slogans as that of fraternization between the Soviet and German soldiers. It dares not breathe a word about socialism.

Among the Soviet masses the memory is still alive of the development of events during the Civil War of 1918-1920. They have not forgotten that in the course of this bitter class struggle, the ranks of the enemy were disintegrated by the propaganda of the party of Lenin and Trotsky.

The very course of events must pose more and more insistently in the minds of Soviet soldiers and the Soviet masses, the difference between the policies of the leadership at that time, and the leadership today. Furthermore the price that they are paying for the Stalinist leadership is being brought more and more closely home.

In this way does the contradiction between the regime and the needs of the country and of the masses manifest itself in every important sphere.

Goldman Analyzes Real Aim Of the Prosecution

The Committee of 99 covered up its real motives in the fight against the leadership of 544 by claiming to fight socialism. The prosecution likewise conceals its real motives.

Since January, 1938 when the party was organized, we have been issuing a weekly paper, a monthly magazine and many pamphlets. I am sure that the all-powerful Federal Bureau of Investigation must have been aware of these facts known to many thousands of people. It was not, however, until July 15, 1941 that the Federal Government indicted the conspirators.

On June 9, 1941 the members of 544 decided to disaffiliate from the AFL and join the CIO. A little over a month after that the indictment in this case was voted. The nearness of the two dates is a mere coincidence, the government claims, but it is certainly a very peculiar coincidence.

And why, pray, was the prosecution started in Minneapolis? The party headquarters is in New York. But the indictment was voted in Minneapolis and the government brought four of us from New York in order to cover up its real motives.

Was this case started in Minneapolis because a Union Defense Guard was organized in Minneapolis? The fact is that in New York the party organized a Workers Defense Guard which actually fought with the fascists and Bundists on the streets. The conclusion is inevitable: the indictment was brought in Minneapolis where the activities of the leadership of Local 544 incurred the enmity of powerful persons with influence in Washington, especially the enmity of one person whose name I am not permitted to mention.

Grace Carlson was a candidate for Senator in the fall of 1940. She spoke on the same platform with candidates from other parties. She spoke over the radio. Everyone heard her and not a single complaint was registered. Could it be presumed that the FBI and the whole government were asleep? No, that is not the explanation. The indictment came after the decision of Local 544 to secede from the AFL Teamsters International.

MR. SCHWEINHAUT: Are you willing to have me tell you why it was brought up, Mr. Goldman?

MR. GOLDMAN: Sure, try to explain it. You cannot convince reasonable people, who know that for three and a half years the party carried on its activities openly and with its headquarters in New York, that there is any other explanation for bringing the prosecution in Minneapolis and at this time, except as a result of the fight in Local 544.

HOW THE COURTS FUNCTION

One piece of evidence I must mention because it was introduced by the government only for the purpose of prejudicing the jury. It was my article on the federal courts. Perhaps the government will contend that because I do not think the courts have as their purpose the protection of working class interests, I am therefore to be considered as one who would want to overthrow the government by force and violence.

I said in that article that under the present system the courts could not possibly give a fair trial to a poor man as to a wealthy man. I didn't blame the situation on the individual judge; I placed the blame upon the system. A judge may be as fair as any human being can possibly be and yet when he fines a wealthy man \$200 and a poor man \$200, there can in reality be no equality between these two fines. It is not a question of the intention of a judge but of the operation of a system. I think that in the article introduced in evidence I gave an example of a case where some oil companies indicted under the Anti-Trust Laws were fined \$5,000 and some workers participating in a strike fined \$500. It was no difficulty for an oil company to pay \$5,000 but imagine how difficult it was for a worker to raise \$500. The injustice lies in the social system which the courts mirror. Real justice cannot exist in a world that permits such vast differences between human beings.

SWP MEMBERS DENIED RIGHTS OF ORDINARY CITIZENS

If you accept the theory of the government with reference to the activities of the defendants, then you have this peculiar situation, that a person who becomes a member of the Socialist Workers Party has no right to do anything at all which every other citizen has a right to do.

A person living in the United States has a right to join a union and to participate in the activities of the union. A member of the Socialist Workers Party cannot join a union and participate in its activities because if he does, it will be used against him as evidence that he was a member of a conspiracy to overthrow the government.

Other people have a right to oppose the country's entry into the war now raging in Europe, but if a member of the Socialist Workers Party opposes the war, he is immediately subject to the charge of conspiring to overthrow the government by force and violence.

The government has introduced evidence covering a great many activities of the defendants. What follows from this? A member of the Socialist Workers Party cannot be active in a trade union; he cannot oppose the war; he cannot propose the creation of a Workers Defense Guard to defend unions against fascist bands; he cannot possibly go hunting because he would have to purchase a rifle and that would be evidence of conspiracy.

Reporters, journalists, politicians, authors, could go to Mexico for the purpose of seeing Trotsky, but not a member of the Socialist Workers Party because his visit to Trotsky

Chief Defense Counsel Ends Final Argument To Jury By Clarifying Issues In Minneapolis 'Sedition' Trial

We proclaim that men are born equal but can it be said that the child born in a wealthy family, with all advantages assured him, is equal to the child born in poverty, deprived of the possibility of getting proper food and a decent education?

THE RANK-AND-FILE DEFENDANTS

I do not intend to consider in detail the evidence against the individual defendants. You already know that I did not try the case on the basis that some defendants may be more guilty than others. Still, as a lawyer not only for myself but for all the defendants, I wish to point out that the evidence against some of the defendants could not possibly justify a verdict of guilty, even if you should consider that the party is guilty of conspiring to overthrow or to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. The government is obligated to prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that each one of the defendants not only joined the so-called conspiracy but knew the nature and object of the conspiracy. As far as I am concerned, as far as Jim Cannon and Farrell Dobbs and others who rightly can be considered as leaders of the party, we stand on the proposition that there could not possibly have been any conspiracy to overthrow the government by force and violence or to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. We stand on the proposition that our program, if rightly interpreted and correctly construed, does not and cannot mean that we are guilty of this kind of a conspiracy.

But who knows. Perhaps all that I said about our program will not avail us and I must therefore try to save from the clutches of the government those people who cannot be considered as leaders of the party, who joined not because they read the literature of our party but because from bitter experience they learned the truth of our fundamental principles, that in this world there is a class that produces the wealth of society and a class that gets all the benefit of that wealth. These members are not acquainted with all the theories of Marx but they are, as we call them, class-conscious. The government has not proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, that every defendant knew and understood the nature of our program or the nature of the so-called conspiracy.

The fact that the government witnesses testified about certain defendants — that they said this or that about armed revolution — does not prove that those defendants knew the program. You must consider all the evidence from this angle: Did the government prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendants were members of the conspiracy and knew the object and nature of the conspiracy?

The second count in the indictment is based on a statute which was passed June 28, 1940. Did the government succeed in proving that all of the defendants were members of the conspiracy subsequent to that date?

This, of course, is a minor matter but after all, if you believe the preposterous contention of the government that we advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence, then you must make the government prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that all the defendants were members of the party subsequent to June 28, 1940. And the government must also prove that all the defendants had knowledge of the nature and object of the conspiracy. The government undoubtedly proved that the leaders knew what the party stood for, but in a legal sense they did not prove that all the defendants knew and understood the principles of the party.

* Assistant Attorney-General Schweinhaut, who followed Goldman in the final argument, never tried to explain it.

CONCRETE PROOF OF OUR PREDICTION

I must for a moment, ladies and gentlemen, go back to the question of whether we advocate the violent overthrow of the government, or simply predict that the social revolution will be accompanied by violence exercised by the minority. I want to give you an example taken from the evidence, proving that our prediction will undoubtedly be fulfilled and also proving that they who want to put us in jail because of our ideas are the very ones who use violence.

You heard Sidney Brennan testify that he is Secretary-Treasurer of Local 544. He admitted that he was not elected to that office, that he was appointed by Neal, Tobin's Receiver. He admitted that the defendants were elected to office in Local 544 in the elections of January of this year. There was a fair election, a secret ballot and no one contested that election.

Who, ladies and gentlemen, practiced democracy in 544? Who used the ballot in order to get power in 544? The defendants.

Who are now in office in 544, ladies and gentlemen? The defendants who were elected? No, Sid Brennan, Bartlett and the other witnesses who could never get elected to office

but who were appointed by Tobin's Receiver.

Who practiced violence, ladies and gentlemen? Tobin's goon squads. Who took defendants Roy Orgon and Jake Cooper off their jobs and beat up Jake Cooper? The minority who couldn't and didn't get elected to office in 544 organized their forces and exercised violence against the defendants who were elected to office and against the rank and file who elected the defendants to office.

And we make the same prediction with reference to the change of the social order. The defendants will get a majority to accept their ideas and the minority, determined to retain their power and their privileges, will be the ones to use violence.

In the case of Local 544 there was no possibility of answering violence with violence. Against the state govern-

DEFENDANTS SEEK BETTER SOCIETY, NOT PERSONAL GAIN

MR. GOLDMAN: Before you, ladies and gentlemen, are people who are in this court room because they are dissatisfied. Dissatisfied not with their personal fortunes, but with the social system, with the evils that exist under the present social order.

I presume that by and large the defendants could, if they wanted to, solve their own problems in a very satisfactory manner. And perhaps we ought to be in jail because we have spent our lives defending what we thought to be ideas that could solve the problems of mankind. As for myself, who knows, maybe I could be a district attorney, perhaps even a judge. Perhaps Jim Cannon would be far better off personally if he thought and acted the way most people think and act. But we represent that type of person who does not think very much about his personal fortunes but thinks of mankind, of society in general.

The agony, the death of millions of human beings are not abstractions to us. We feel them keenly and we react to them and we try to create a world where destruction, and war and poverty and disease would not be the lot of man.

We have studied and our studies have led us to certain conclusions and we have banded together to propagate those conclusions. We proclaim to the world that it is possible to build a new social order guaranteeing every human being a decent livelihood and a chance to develop his individuality, free from economic worries, free from the dangers of war. We say that we have reached an epoch where mankind must go forward to socialism or else back to barbarism.

With great effort and amidst tremendous suffering, man has traveled throughout the centuries in the direction of a better world. Men have laid down their lives by the millions in order to permit future generations to cross over their bodies to achieve a world of greater freedom and more happiness. And throughout all history there have been men and women a little ahead of the procession telling the masses to proceed in a certain direction and to struggle for a larger share of the things that they create. And these men who have led the procession have had to pay for it — the prophets, Christ, Marx, Lenin, Trotsky — these are the men who fought for

STRENGTH OF IDEAS LIES IN OUR BELIEF IN SOCIALISM

The strength of our ideas lies in the very fact that we are living in a thoroughly unorganized society. The strength of our ideas lies in the fact that our general predictions, based upon the laws operating in society, inevitably come true. At the beginning of the first World War we said that it would not solve any of the problems confronting the peoples. Who can deny that we were right? And now we say to the people of this country, "This war which your leaders claim is a war for democracy against fascism will not solve any of your problems because if the capitalist system is permitted to endure, the inevitable result will be fascism and more wars."

We base our activities upon a theory that has withstood the test of time and events. In the midst of a catastrophic war that will necessarily envelop the whole world, in the midst of the roar of cannons and the shrieking of shells, amidst the sobs and the wailing of mothers, amidst tears and blood, we still have hopes that the people will come to accept the ideas of socialism. The darkness that surrounds us can be destroyed only by the sun of socialism.

WHAT YOUR VERDICT WILL MEAN

No matter what your verdict will be, it will be an historic one. Should it be guilty, then it will be an aid to reaction. It will, to that extent, aid the powers that are interested in preventing a change in the social order. It will not bring to a stop the struggle that is going on in society because, as I have indicated to you many times before, that struggle is a result of social conditions and not of our agitation.

A verdict of not guilty will mean that to that extent

SPECIAL Subscription Offer

valid until February 1, 1942

2 issues of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (20c each)

8 issues of the MILITANT (5c each) both for

50¢

THE MILITANT

116 University Place

New York City

ment, against the federal government, against the goon squads, the defendants were helpless. We had to submit, but if there is anything that proves our contention that violence will come from a minority, it is this very example of what occurred in Local 544.

Where is this democracy that some people are willing to fight for in Germany? Why didn't the government give the truck drivers of 544 a little democracy? Why didn't the government suppress the violence of the minority? Why didn't the government see to it that the truck drivers obtained the right of having the union of their choice? Hypocrisy and nothing else characterizes the case for the government! Frame-up and nothing else! The government is part of the Committee of 99 and belongs to the faction led by one whom I am not permitted to mention.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the heart and the essence of this case.

THE COURT: I think, Mr. Goldman, that we will have a short recess.

(AFTERNOON RECESS)

a new world and against them have always been arrayed the powers that be, the priests and Pharisees.

YES, WE STIR UP THE PEOPLE

When Pilate said, "I found no fault in this man," the priests became more furious and said, "He stirreth up the people throughout all Judea."

"He stirreth up the people" — almost the exact words that Mr. Anderson used against us when he said we stir up the people. And we cannot deny that we tried to stir up the people. We try to bring them a message of hope that a new world is possible and can easily be created if only they take their fight into their own hands, a new world where war and destruction will be unknown. But as I have indicated to you, all our stirrings, all our messages, will be in vain unless we are correct in our general analysis, unless we are correct in our theory that the social system has reached a point of decline where no road other than the road to socialism will lead mankind into a peaceful world. All our pamphlets, all our papers, all our speeches will be for naught unless we are correct in our fundamental theory, and if we are correct in our fundamental theory, all the efforts of the prosecution to silence our voice will not avail.

The prosecutors, and those that give them orders, do not understand that to thwart our agitation it is only necessary for them to solve the problems of mankind. Do they think that by silencing the voices of a few agitators they can satisfy the people who will suffer the agonies of war and hunger that will come with economic dislocation after the war? In our place there will be thousands and tens of thousands who will follow our ideas.

Mr. Anderson, in his opening speech, referred to the attempts of the defendants to destroy organized society. Imagine calling a society "organized" that permits millions of human beings to be slaughtered, that permits poverty in the midst of plenty, that permits the spiritual and physical violence that exists throughout the universe! Chaos and destruction and death are not characteristics of an "organized" society.

you are unwilling to lend your aid to the forces of reaction, that you are determined to live up to the Bill of Rights guaranteeing every minority in this country the right to free speech and free press.

We do not ask you to agree with our ideas. We have not asked you to do so once throughout this trial. We ask you only to understand these ideas and therefore to understand that we are not guilty of the charges leveled against us by the government. By a verdict of not guilty you will not only guard the constitutional rights of all minorities but you will help transform this chaotic world in a peaceful way.

The more democracy that exists, the greater the chances for a peaceful transformation. Do away with democracy, and violence will surely accompany the social revolution. What more can I ask of you than by your verdict to guard the Bill of Rights and help prevent the plague which is threatening to destroy civilization, the plague of fascism.



More than ever before, emphasis must be placed upon securing new subscriptions and the renewal of old subscriptions to THE MILITANT. There is no better medium for drawing closer to us workers who are beginning to interest themselves in the ideas of socialism than that offered by regular and systematic reading of our press, and the subscription is the best assurance of a long-term association.

The last month has shown a slight increase in the number of regular subscriptions and some have come from very important parts of the country. St. Louis, Flint and Quakertown show particularly well in the gathering of subscriptions.

The record of the last 2 weeks is as follows:

St. Louis	8
New York	4
Flint	4
Quakertown	4
Minneapolis	4

St. Paul	3
Chicago	3
Los Angeles	2
Youngstown	2
Allentown	1
Boston	1
Memphis	1
Cleveland	1
Toledo	1
Miscellaneous	9

From now on, the real influence of the press in a locality will be best gauged by the number of subscribers. Inquiry has revealed that MILITANT agents quite commonly have long lists of names of sympathetic individuals, none of whom have been systematically solicited for subscriptions. These people must now be visited and their support to the press secured.

The function of THE MILITANT as an organizer and educator of the working class can be realized fully only if the business of keeping a constantly renewed and growing list of subscribers is seriously and regularly pursued.

OUT THIS WEEK!

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

116 PAGE PAMPHLET — ONLY 10 CENTS!

The official court record of James P. Cannon's testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial, with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Negro Struggle
By Ernest Williams

The Alexandria "Riot"

The Jim Crow treatment of Negro soldiers in Southern training camps led to open riots last week in Alexandria, Louisiana. Ever since Negro draftees, mainly from the North, were sent into the heart of the deep South, where they faced insult, segregation, and terrorism on a scale far greater than above the Mason and Dixon line, all indications have pointed to inevitable and bloody outbreaks.

Violence broke out in Louisiana in the heart of the local colored section, allegedly when a white M. P. arrested a Negro soldier on charges of not paying attention to a theatre. It is claimed that the M. P. started to beat the soldier, when several colored soldiers who were passing by, jumped into the fight.

State police were summoned by the M. P.'s, and civilians of both races joined in the general fighting. Guns, bricks, rocks, and finally tear gas were used in the battle. It was reported that over 3,000 Negro soldiers were rounded up and sent back to their camps, and an equal number of Negro civilians were dispersed. Although no official comment has been made, it has been rumored that the so-called "ring leaders" of the Negroes will face army court-martial.

As long as Negro soldiers are kicked around, discriminated against, denied equal rights in the army, prevented from becoming officers in the same proportion as white soldiers, etc., it is inevitable that these outbreaks will occur again and again. As long as colored draftees are shipped to the South where lynchings and Jim Crowism are allowed to flourish as part of the "American way of life", it is a foregone conclusion that resentment will continue to smolder. And if these conditions are allowed to exist, not only will there be resentment and outbreaks, but it is likely that there will be bloody struggles of an intensity at present undreamed of.

A Conference of National Negro Organizations to Consider the Negro's Part in the War Effort was held over a week ago at the Harlem branch of the YMCA in New York. The meeting was held under the auspices of several organizations, principally the National Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

According to the Pittsburgh Courier, a storm broke loose when William H. Hastie, Negro civilian aide to the Secretary of War, stated: "We believe the colored people are not wholeheartedly all-out in support of the present war effort."

The delegates at first disagreed as to whether or not this sentiment should be voted on, but the majority decided in favor of a vote. With several present declining to vote, the conference went on record 36 to 5 that the Negro is not unreservedly, 100 per cent all-out for the war effort.

Reminder that Race Discrimination Is Not A New Thing

The following is an editorial reprinted from the Jan. 9 "St. Paul Recorder", one of the leading Negro newspapers published in the Northwest:

State Department officials including Mr. Cordell Hull from Tennessee, radio news commentators and the daily press are incensed over reports of racial discrimination practised against whites in Manila.

Such righteous indignation causes us to pose this question to our indignant brethren: "Where have you been all our lives?"

After 300 years millions of American citizens of Negro origin, the Constitution of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding, carved their lives and future here in America despite that same racial discrimination.

At this moment that same discrimination keeps American Negroes from their rightful share of defense and other jobs for which they qualified. It bars them from the Marines, the Navy (except as menials), the Army (unless "called"); it deprives them of the right to vote in thirteen states; in many states it has kept them from higher education (for which they are taxed); and in its more varied and subtle forms it attempts to stifle, frustrate and deprive them of all fundamental rights guaranteed American citizens.

If racial discrimination is really distasteful and rankles our indignant white brethren we say, keep up the fight, but open it up on the home front, too, and by home front, we mean home front, i.e., Twin Cities.

For a start we beg to submit the Northern Pump Co., Minnesota Mining Co., Diamond Iron Works, our state Home Defense Force and countless firms holding defense contracts as possible objects of attack.

You will find discrimination in all of them and you will not need a magnifying glass.

All of this of course does not justify Japan's treatment of our white nationals but it does make our great show of indignation seem hypocritical.

AVAILABLE NOW

Bound volumes of THE MILITANT for 1941 are now available at the price of \$3.00.

Since the supply is limited, we urge that all orders be sent in at once to the business office of the Militant Publishing Association, 116 University Place, New York City.

WAR PROFITEERING EXPOSED

What Truman Report Showed

(Continued from page 1)

Shipbuilding corporations are making profits on Navy contracts as much as eight times greater than the worth of their properties. One official of the industry was able to boast "we couldn't have handled our profits with a steam-shovel."

Army and Navy procurement agencies gave aircraft contracts only to "nineteen favored manufacturers," freezing out over 60 smaller companies able to "produce a minimum of 2,000 planes per month."

The auto corporations, aided by the OPM, deliberately misinformed the country as to their capacity to reconvert existing plants for war production and, refusing to use their own enormous capital for expansion, demanded that the government give them a flock of new plants. This is the story behind the failure to reconvert the industry in time to prevent stoppage of auto production and long lay-offs for 450,000 auto workers.

GREED AND PROFIT. Bethlehem Steel, with over a billion dollars in war orders, and the Aluminum Company of America, a 100 per cent monopoly, blocked expansion in their industries until they secured from obliging OPM and Defense Plant Corporation officials contracts giving them huge new plants virtually as gifts at government expense.

Army camp and ordnance plant construction has been shot thru with graft and "excessive" profiteering. Private contractors have been able to name their own terms and have secured contracts which permit them to boost "costs" almost at will. Army land purchasing agents, paid commissions on the price of land they purchased for camp sites, played ball with land speculators to buy land at incredible prices.

REACTION ON THE UNIONS

What adds greater weight to the report is the fact that the Truman committee is composed of pro-capitalist and anti-labor Senators. They showed their pro-boss bias by dragging into their report a condemnation of labor for strikes and an endorsement of anti-strike legislation, without in any way considering the responsibility of the employers in provoking strikes by their refusal to grant the legitimate and just demands of the workers.

Their blanket condemnation of strikes was arrived at even though they considered only three strikes in coming to their conclusions. It is clear that the reason they made this attack on the unions was for the purpose of offsetting as much as possible the effect on public opinion of the bosses' profiteering and use of the war program to advance their own interests.

The chief value of the Truman committee report lies in the facts which it exposes. But the report falls to the ground completely in two respects: 1. when it tries to explain the facts it cites as the result of "shortsighted" and "lackadaisical" ineptness, instead of as the result of capitalist control of production; and 2. when it makes its final recommendations.

PROPOSALS OF THE COMMITTEE

Its cover-all panacea for the corruption and thievery it exposes is endorsement of the oft-made proposal for greater centralization of the government's war production agencies under one all-powerful individual. Aside from the elimination of a few lesser scape-goats among the dollar-a-year men, the committee proposes nothing more than simply changing the status of these same men, paying them regular salaries out of the government payroll and compelling them to formally resign their connections with private corporations.

It is clear that this arrangement would not interfere with the basic attitude of the dollar-a-year men or eliminate their control of the war production program.

In this sense, the establishment

Navy Contracts Give 'Staggering' Profits

"If it hadn't been for taxes, we couldn't have handled our profits with a steam-shovel."

This candid assertion was made to the Truman committee by James E. Barnes, Washington representative of the Todd Shipbuilding Corp., who told the committee further that the Navy "gave us a profit of \$1.80 a day on every man we had, and I think we had about 35,000."

But taxes are not really worrying the private shipbuilding corporations. This is shown by the committee's report that nine of the 13 companies studied by the committee had contracts in 1941 from which they would receive guaranteed profits greater than the worth of their entire properties in 1939.

One company is now making 800 times more profits than it averaged between 1936 and 1940. What the committee calls the Navy's "extremely liberal" policies led to its providing the Cramp Shipbuilding Co. with \$12,000,000 for new plants and equipment, and following this up with contracts on which the company will make a profit of \$7,442,280. The company gave as its original worth the sum of \$4,442,937.

Bethlehem Steel had Navy contracts on July 16, 1941, totalling \$1,060,000,000. It expects to make a net profit on its ship contracts, after all tax deductions, of about \$59,233,000.

The report states that when the word was given out that the Truman committee intended to investigate the Navy contracts, several of the leading companies "voluntarily" hastened to the Navy to ask for a reduction in their contract fees.

The eagerness with which the Naval procurement agency sought to cooperate with the profiteering corporations is indicated by the fact that private companies

were given contracts for 70 per cent of the Navy's new tonnage, while the public yards are producing only 30 per cent. Instead of expanding the government yards, "the Navy provided the bulk of the funds to expand the (private) shipyards." It costs from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 more to build a battleship in a private than in a government yard.

The War Department, according to the committee's findings, has shown no less a solicitude for the profits of private contractors.

The committee submitted an exhaustive report showing graft prevalent in the construction of Army camps and new ordnance plants.

Cost-plus, fixed fee contracts, with so-called "escalator" clauses, have been awarded which permit contractors to jack up "costs" by over-buying materials, etc. Other contractors, securing fixed fees, subcontract the work for an additional fat profit and thus draw down double fees.

The Army in purchasing land for camp sites used agents who were paid a percentage of the purchase price, and who naturally bought land at the highest possible price.

Among the outstanding Army contract cases cited by the report was that of the Wolf Creek and Milan ordnance plants in Tennessee. "Excessive costs" increased the originally estimated \$35,741,000 cost of this project to almost \$50,000,000.

OPM Offered 'Gift' To Bethlehem Steel

The Bethlehem Steel Corporation has grabbed up every war contract it could get. Its war profits are phenomenal and it is out for even more.

At the same time, for the sake of squeezing all possible profits out of the war and maintaining their monopoly po-

sitions, this corporation — cited as "typical" by the Truman committee report — has not hesitated to hold up expansion of steel production.

The OPM, after months of denying the possibility of steel shortages, finally was forced to admit last August that expansion of the steel industry was necessary. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation, although holding \$1,368,000,000 in war orders representing "staggering profits", refused to invest its own tremendous capital for plant expansion.

Instead, it demanded that the government build a \$55,000,000 plant under contract terms which would have made the proposed plant a virtual gift to the company.

This "outrageous" demand led the Truman committee to conclude "that Bethlehem was using the defense program to obtain, at Government expense, modern facilities which would have a material value in peace-time operations."

According to the terms of the contract drafted by Bethlehem — and approved by OPM director Knudsen, though not as yet signed because of the Truman committee investigation — the new plant would be built on Bethlehem Steel land. The government's lease on the land would end with the expiration or cancellation of Bethlehem's lease on the facilities. Thus, all the government could do with the plant at the termination of the lease would be to remove it, "a right of dubious value as the cost of removing the facilities might well approximate, if not exceed, the salvage value."

The plant, according to the contract, would be leased for 35 years, a period having "no reasonable relation to the present emergency." The government could not terminate the lease unless Bethlehem operated the plant at less than 25 per cent capacity for five successive years and then the government could remove the plant — at its own expense.

Deep-Going Effects Of War Costs On American Economy

By A. ROLAND

What the War Budget Means

All the warnings of the administration to the American people of the tremendous changes that will be brought about by the transformation to a full war economy, do not suffice to bring the realization of the deep-going cut in standards of living that will be experienced in a short time.

The administration itself has been forced almost every few months to revise its estimates concerning war needs. The latest revision, in which the President announces a budget for the fiscal year 1942-1943 of fifty-nine billion dollars, is actually too stupendous to grasp in its impact on the previous American way of life.

War expenditures in 1943 will be just about 90 per cent of total government expenses. Compare this figure with the puny eighteen and a half billions spent in the biggest year of the first World War. The public debt no longer has any ceiling, in view of the necessity for borrowing the major part of the vast sums required. In 1943 that debt will rise to over one hundred and ten billions of dollars, more than the entire national income.

The financial side of the war alone would require a total government control of the entire economy to mobilize these resources. But the money and credit side, involving the laying on of new taxes to drain every last cent possible from the masses, is not enough. The United States has been forced, like every other country engaged in the war, to resort to industrial planning on a scale never before contemplated. For the war will require the shifting of whole industries — not alone the automobile industry — to war production, the mobilization of skilled labor, the strict allocation of materials of production.

That this will not be entirely effective with capitalist industry still in private hands, is a foregone conclusion. But America is now well on the way to the establishing of that form of "war socialism" which has misled some into thinking that a new kind of economy was coming into being — one that was neither capitalist nor yet socialist.

Depression Economy And War Economy

The strain on the economic system will not be reduced by the fact that purchasing power, potentially speaking, will go up at the same time that shortages of all kinds of goods will develop. Nobody has analyzed enough the contradictory anomalies of capitalism in this respect. Different parts of the system are at sixes and sevens; these different sides of economy seem totally unable to get into step with each other. Think back for a moment to the period of the crisis following 1929. Then there was a super-abundance of goods — but the masses did not possess the money to purchase the goods, which therefore went begging. Goods were plentiful, money was scarce. Now a new kind of crisis develops: goods are scarce, money is too plentiful, relatively speaking.

It seems obvious that the entire system has no balance wheel and swings crazily from one extreme to the other. The kind of planning that the government devises, instead of alleviating conditions, brings new disproportions and new dangers. The danger now is inflation in its worst form. Even if purchasing power remained stationary, the shortages will tend to cause the bidding up of prices. The government is therefore forced to step in and attempt to fix prices to prevent the internal disruption of its war planning.

In the depression years, the object of government regulation was to try to restore purchasing power and to raise prices. Relief measures, such as they were, created a bigger market for articles of consumption needed by the masses of people. Regulation today is exactly the opposite. Its purpose is to take as much purchasing power out of the hands of the masses as possible, by taxation, by loans, by every means imaginable. Its purpose is to restrict the market for consumption goods, to cut that market down to the bone.

Differences Between 1917 and 1941

It is only as the government begins to tighten the screws on all the multifarious ways of regulating the market to eliminate competition between war requirements and civilian needs, that the masses will really begin to appreciate what the war means in their daily lives. The amount that the government proposes to spend in so short a time, means that American life will change at a tempo far greater than that of any other country.

Roosevelt is trying to achieve in one or two years what Germany and the European countries in general did in a period of five or six years. The resources of this country may be vast, but even these rich resources will not cushion the effects of the changes to be wrought by the new war economy.

There is this great difference to be noted also between America's entry into the first World War and its entry into the present war. The first world war had resulted in a stalemate in which both sides were on the verge of exhaustion. The entry of this country therefore tipped the scales decisively in favor of the Allies. The war did not last very long after this tipping of the scales, despite the fact that Russia had been knocked out of the war by Germany.

But the situation now calls for the mobilization of the resources and the man-power of the United States on an undreamed-of scale. The mere entry of the American colossus does not yet tip the scales in the manner of the last war. America has to supply the entire group of nations fighting Hitler with munitions. America has to face war on two fronts, in two oceans. The second World War strains United States production to a far greater degree than did the first war. All of this will be reflected in the standards of living of the workers and toilers,

C. P. IS OUT TO 'GET' KNITGOOD UNION LEADER

NEW YORK — Louis Nelson, manager of Knit-goods Workers Local 155 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, was under attack here last week by Communist Party forces in the union as an "appeaser" who carries on "fifth column activity" and follows an "anti-U. S. line." The attack was part of the current drive of the Stalinists to use the war for the suppression of all working class opponents of their reactionary policies.

Wrapping themselves in the American flag, a handful of Stalinists at the local's recent meeting of shop chairmen took the floor to denounce Nelson, whose leadership of the union they have fought for many years, because he was not a 100% supporter of the war.

The other "crimes" of which Nelson is accused by the Stalinists is that he recently protested to USSR Ambassador Maxim Litvinov against imprisonment of the two Polish Socialist leaders, Ehrlich and Alter, in the Soviet Union; and that he was instrumental in securing employment in a knitgoods shop for Fred Beal, who was paroled after serving almost four years of a sentence on a frame-up charge growing out of his activities as leader of the Gastonia textile strike of 1929.

The Stalinists have organized a "Rank-and-File Unity Committee", which is preparing to oust Nelson at the coming local elections and is making a bid for collaboration with the national leaders of the ILGWU against Nelson.

The developments of the lynch campaign of the Stalinists in this union will be watched with

BOSSSES STILL CONTROL PRODUCTION IN ENGLAND

Because a few British trade union leaders have been given prominent posts in the British government, there is no reason for assuming, as some American union officials do, that the British workers have any more influence over production policies in England than before, or that labor now "shares" control of industry with the owners.

According to C. T. Hallinan, United Press correspondent, writing from London on Jan. 8, the control of British industry remains completely in the hands of the bosses. Hallinan states: "It is noteworthy that whereas setbacks on the war front have resulted in four different Secretaries of War, four different Chiefs of the Imperial Staff and four different deputy chiefs since the war started, all main industrial controls, with few exceptions, have remained firmly in the hands of those appointed by Neville Chamberlain in the days of the 'phony war'."

That is, control of the war economy remains in the hands of the big industrialists and capitalists who dominated the Chamberlain government. The presence of a few trade union officials in the government has in no wise altered the production situation in England, since the capitalists continue to exercise the real control and to impede production with their "business as usual" methods.

Hallinan describes the effect of this control as follows: "The painful slowness with which industries were reorganized and both man and woman power mobilized for fighting the war acquired in 1914 an almost 'nightmarish' quality. The City of

London — heart of financial England — with confidential sources of information, declined to accept at face value optimistic governmental claim regarding rising production.

"On the contrary, there was gloomy agreement with the charge of C. A. Gordon, chairman of the Engineering Industries Assn., that Britain's rate of war production actually has declined this year . . ."

The problem of production will not be solved by placing union leaders in the government or on so-called joint "advisory" committees as window-dressing. This has been graphically demonstrated in England.

Announcing . . . A LOS ANGELES BUFFET SUPPER AND DANCE to greet

James P. Cannon leading defendant in the Minneapolis labor trial, who will tell the story of what happened at the trial and what was behind it
SATURDAY, JANUARY 31 8:00 P. M.
at AMERICAN TURNER HALL
900 W. Washington Blvd.
—Admission, \$1.00—
Auspices: Los Angeles Branch Civil Rights Defense Committee

The New York School of Social Science

Announces Four Courses:

WEDNESDAYS 6 weeks beginning Feb. 4 7:45 to 8:45 <i>The Labor Movement of Russia</i> Lecturer: JOHN G. WRIGHT 9:00 to 10:00 <i>Modern World Capitalism</i> Lecturer: C. CHARLES	FRIDAYS 6 weeks beginning Feb. 6 7:45 to 8:45 <i>Progress of American Culture, 1870-1940</i> Lecturer: WILLIAM F. WARDE 9:00 to 10:00 <i>Labor in World War I</i> Lecturer: FELIX MORROW
---	--

Fee: \$1.00 per Course — Single Lecture, 25c
All Classes Held in Room 32

LABOR TEMPLE
242 EAST 14th STREET, NEW YORK

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI.—No. 4 Saturday, January 24, 1942

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALexandria 4-8547

Editor:

FELIX MORROW

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 1 cent per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

Registered 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.

What Kind Of Unity Is Lewis Seeking?

(Continued from page 1)

to "enfeeble" the obstacles to unity which then existed?

Certain conditions, we grant, have changed. For one, John L. Lewis has lost his commanding position in the CIO and the American trade union movement. For another, he sees no reasonable prospect of regaining it so long as the CIO exists in its present form and with its present leadership. For a third, he now seeks a working collaboration with the Tobins, Wolls, Hutchesons, et al., of the present AFL Executive Council, as an aid to restoring himself to his former influence, even if this has to be achieved at the expense of the industrial unions — excepting his own miners union, of course.

But what of those conditions affecting questions of principle which have long barred the way to unity? Have they changed?

Nothing which has been said or done by the craft leaders who dominate the AFL — and who propose to dominate any future unified organization — indicates that they have changed their position in the slightest degree. On the contrary, their policies and actions continue to reveal their hostility to industrial unionism, their readiness to subordinate the interests of the industrial workers to their own narrow craft interests and to slice to pieces any industrial union that falls within range of their craft jurisdictional claims.

Conditions within the AFL itself affirm this fact. Daniel J. Tobin, czar of the AFL Teamsters, continues unabated his bitter jurisdictional assault against the industrial union of brewery workers. This is but one example among many of the hatred of industrial unionism that still persists in the top councils of the AFL.

What other conditions have changed? Do the CIO unions now possess "that strength of bone and sinew that will make it possible (for them) to bargain for peace on equal terms," as Lewis himself so eloquently put it?

That is the case in three or four industries, perhaps. Lewis' own union, the United Mine Workers, is undoubtedly strong enough to defend itself against raiding craft unions. The CIO auto and steel unions are also powerful enough to hold their own.

But in a dozen or more other vital industrial fields where the CIO is weaker, the AFL craft union chiefs would welcome the chance to descend like a wolf-pack and tear the CIO unions to pieces. In the packinghouse, the electrical, radio and machine, the aircraft and shipbuilding fields, AFL craft unions are even now engaged in a struggle to destroy the CIO unions.

These considerations — the chief considerations in effecting a unity that will guard the interests of industrial labor — are not even mentioned in Lewis' letter. In their place, he substitutes something else, the needs of the war.

He pleads the self-same argument that the employers and all the reactionaries are advancing to force the CIO into the AFL under any terms. The bosses view the unification of the labor movement as a means of binding the unions to the war machine, destroying their independence and curbing their freedom of action. The employers and their press will undoubtedly hail the proposal of Lewis — he whom they damned such a short while ago. And in the same breath they will attack those CIO leaders who propose to weigh

all unity propositions with care and caution.

The only factor to be considered by the CIO workers with respect to any given unity proposal is: How will this affect our interests as workers? They must ask themselves: What are the specific terms of this unity proposal and will these terms safeguard the gains won by the industrial unions? Significantly, it is on the matter of specific unity terms that Lewis' letter is most vague.

This move should serve to forewarn every trade unionist in the CIO and AFL to be on guard against a campaign to "blitzkrieg" the CIO back under the hegemony of the old-guard craft union heads of the AFL. The union workers — wherever they come from — must be on the alert to resist all attempts to shanghai the CIO into the AFL under conditions and terms which would dismember a large part of the industrial union movement, and thus weaken the labor movement as a whole.

Was It 'Bungling'?

"Bungling" has been the term most frequently used by the capitalist press to characterize the corruption, graft and criminal profiteering in the war production program revealed in the Truman Committee report.

The word "bungling" is used to convey the idea of honest and well-meaning individuals who blundered innocently into "mistakes."

The boss press would have us believe that shrewd big business executives like William Knudsen and Jesse Jones didn't know what the score was when they proposed to give free gifts of new plants to outfits like Bethlehem Steel and the Aluminum Corporation of America.

The bosses would have us accept the notion that Stettinius and Knudsen and Jones are mere babes-in-the-woods who didn't have the vaguest idea that they were spreading misinformation when they issued reports that there would be no material shortages, that the auto plants couldn't be converted, etc.

Are we to suppose that the army procurement officials didn't realize the fantastic profits they were permitting in their camp construction contracts, or that the Navy officials suffered from little worse than unwarranted faith in the patriotic integrity of the shipbuilding corporations when they provided these corporations with "staggering profits?"

This wasn't "bungling". It was conscious and systematic policy. The big corporations are out for profits and monopoly advantages; the so-called "bunglers" have been aiding them deliberately.

This "bungling" will continue so long as private corporations and their agents control and run the war production program. It will cease the moment the government takes over and operates the war industries under the control and management of the workers.

Davies Must Endorse This Too

As we walked by this morning we noticed that the window-display of books at the national headquarters of the Communist Party on 13th Street is now primarily devoted to, Ex-Ambassador Davies' *Mission to Moscow*. Davies' whitewash of the Moscow Trials has brought him that dubious honor.

The window-display is incomplete, however. It does not include the records of the Ramzin Trial of 1930 and the Menshevik Trial of 1931. Nor does Mr. Davies, in his endorsement of Stalinist jurisprudence, recall those trials. No wonder! For those trials were the exact duplicates of the later trials which Mr. Davies has endorsed — the same type of charges, the same "confessions", etc., etc. But what was "proved" neither the Stalinists nor Mr. Davies would like to recall.

Let us remind Mr. Davies what those earlier Moscow Trials "proved":

1. In the Ramzin Trial, the engineers-defendants "confessed" that they worked "upon direct instructions of the ruling circles and the general staff of France" and had "ties with the English general staff" and that among their plans were: "a section of the Caucasus, primarily the oil-bearing regions, to be ceded to England; and a section of the right shores of the Ukraine to Poland and France." (*Pravda*, Nov. 11, 1930).

2. In the Menshevik Trial, the socialists-defendants "confessed" that there was a "close tie between the Russian Mensheviks and the emigres abroad, and through the latter with the Second International;" and on the other hand a close tie with Ramzin and the other engineers "through which in turn they were connected with the French General Staff." (*Official Minutes of the Trial*, Moscow, 1931).

Mr. Davies and the Stalinists would be ready to repeat the old charges against the French General Staff, perhaps, but not against their present allies, the Second International and the English General Staff!

We'd like to hear Mr. Davies' explanation of those other trials. Maybe all Moscow Trials which are anti-English are frame-ups, while all those which "link" defendants with Hitler are bonafide.

In that case, what would Mr. Davies do about the Bukharin-Rykov Trial of March, 1938 — when Stalin was beginning to move away from the "democracies" toward Hitler. In accordance with the diplomatic situation that trial "proved" the defendants included not only German and Japanese agents, but also British agents. We'd like Mr. Davies to explain that one!

Welles Tries To Line Up So. American Countries

With Vargas As His Chief Lieutenant, He Uses Economic Pressure As Well As Words

By C. CHARLES

JAN. 21. — On Jan. 16, the Conference of American Foreign Ministers assembled in the palace of the former Chamber of Deputies of Brazil at Rio de Janeiro. At the opening session Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles presented the proposal of the United States Government calling for the complete breaking off of relations with the Axis by all the Latin American countries.

The aim of Welles at the conference was to make sure that the United States and its allies would receive all the civilian and military exports of Latin America. This is part of the long-range military strategy of blockading the Axis. The United States is also attempting to secure air and naval bases.

Ten nations, primarily in the Caribbean area, are at war alongside the United States, while three others have broken off diplomatic relations with the Axis.

The representatives of Argentina and Chile are proving difficult to "convince". Fearful that the Allies will not be victorious and that the Axis powers in this case would take revenge upon them; anxious to avoid an Axis declaration of war against their own countries, and bargaining for more economic concessions from

the United States as a price for their support of the resolution calling for hemispheric unity and an unanimous rupture with the Axis — they are hesitant about lining up.

Welles, in his speech attempting to overcome these obstacles, assured the assembled diplomats of the superior military power of the Allies over the Axis. In addition the threat of economic and financial pressure is being used behind the scenes.

Other resolutions presented called for the establishment of a Pan-American defense committee, for hemispheric adherence to the Atlantic Charter, for the investigation on an inter-continental scale of Axis activities, the suppression of Axis organizations, the closing of communication channels with the Axis and the strict regulation of movement

of Axis citizens. The chief lieutenant of Welles is Getulio Vargas, "president" of Brazil.

Vargas on Nov. 10, 1937, declared himself dictator of Brazil, dissolved the Congress (which has never met since), promulgated a new constitution which declared him dictator for life. He has gone even further — he has appointed the next president, the head of the Supreme Court, Eduardo Espinola, to take over when Vargas dies. All unions have been abolished. Vargas loves to pass out nicely noosed lengths of rope when he wants people to hang themselves, saving himself the trouble of doing away with them. A thousand opponents of his government are in prison.

With this as the stage and with Vargas as his lieutenant, it is no wonder that the references by Welles to the war as a "war for democracy" are very few. In the house of the hanged one does not speak of gallows. In Brazil one is polite and considerate to Vargas and one speaks rarely and vaguely about democracy, but one does speak of finance, trade and industrial concessions.

The events at the palace where the Brazilian Congress used to meet, before it was dissolved, the actors on the stage, the lines that are spoken — all promise that the Rio de Janeiro conference will be the season's best satire

Socialist Party Divided Over Policy Toward War

The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party last week published a formal statement reversing its previous position toward the war. It endorsed a statement published in the Dec. 20 issue of *The Call* which had called for a "struggle for anti-imperialist war aims."

The N. E. C. resolution, published in *The Call* of January 17, launches as its main slogan: "A Democratic and Socialist Victory."

Attached to the resolution are statements by Norman Thomas and Travers Clement which bring out the full implications of the resolution.

Clement's statement announces his resignation as editor of *The Call* because the attitude of the pro-war majority of the N. E. C. "is one I do not support and could not possibly interpret satisfactorily in *The Call*." However, Clement continues as National Secretary of the party.

A minority of Clement's, his wife Lillian Symes, and three

others had introduced an amendment to the resolution, which stated in part:

"The basic issues involved in the present world conflict are the same today as they were before America formally entered the war. . . . For this reason we, like our fellow-Socialists in the British Independent Labor Party, cannot give our political support to any war conducted for imperialist aims."

This amendment was voted down by the majority led by Norman Thomas, whose explanatory statement says in part:

"Try as I may, I can see no

practical political alternative today to the war as a means of stopping the worldwide triumph of fascist totalitarianism."

Criticizing the Clements-Symes proposal, Norman Thomas says:

"I think that the phrase 'critical non-support of the war' would add not clarity but confusion to an understanding of our position within and without the Party. I think that has been the effect of the I.L.P. statement in England. It is too easy to make political non-support equal an ill-considered opposition, or to use the phrase as a means of purely verbal escape."

It is reported that anti-war elements in the Socialist Party and the Young People's Socialist League are insisting upon an immediate referendum of the membership on this issue, rather than to wait for the party convention, which is scheduled for May.

CIO Unionist Discusses Task Of Labor In War

James Peck of Newspaper Guild Argues Unions Must Continue Fight Against Bosses

"There should be no moratorium in labor's fight against the employers during the war." This was the clear statement on labor's tasks during the war enunciated by James Peck, member of the Labor Press-Unit of the New York Newspaper Guild, CIO, in a letter printed in the Jan. 1 issue of *Guild Reporter*, the newspaper union's official

paper. Peck told how labor, by giving up the strike weapon in the last war, had placed itself at the mercy of big business, which launched an anti-labor wave of terror and smashed many unions in the postwar depression.

"Labor's reward for fighting for the 'four freedoms' will be the same," Peck warned, "unless it profits by the lessons of the last war and fights to strengthen and solidify its position while the international conflict is going on."

Peck's full letter is printed below:

"Editor, *Guild Reporter*:
"As the member who voiced the lone 'no' vote on the New York Guild's resolution supporting the war, I feel obligated to explain my action to both the local and national membership.

"Because I consider the present world conflict another profit-imperialist war, I am opposed to labor's supporting it. But even if I were 100 per cent in favor of labor's endorsing the war, I would be unable to support the Guild resolution, because it fails to point the guilty finger at American big business and because it adopts a policy of appeasement in employer relations.

"The guilt for the present war lies clearly at the hands of American, British and French big business, and any union resolution dealing with the war should point this out. The J. P. Morgans, the Ernest Weirs and the Eugene Grasses should be denounced in no uncertain terms.

"Carrying out their traditional policy of selling to both sides, U. S. bigwigs have armed Japan

and without giving in to organization of the unorganized.

"In the last war, labor heeded the pleas of big business to forego fundamental union rights and to maintain the status quo in labor relations. When the post-war depression set in, business was in a position to crack down, and did. Anti-union terrorism reached a new peak and the AFL lost half of its membership within two years.

"This was labor's reward for fighting for the 'new freedom'. Labor's reward for fighting for the 'four freedoms' will be the same unless it profits by the lesson of the last war and fights to strengthen and solidify its position while the international conflict is going on.

"An union statement, regardless of whether it is for or against the war, should pledge to use the strike weapon whenever necessary, to fight for a share in the war profits and to actively advance its organizing activities while the war boom is on. There should be no moratorium in labor's fight against employers during the war.

JAMES PECK

LENIN MEMORIAL MEETING

Featuring

"TSAR TO LENIN"

Famous Full Length Documentary Film of the Russian Revolution

Speaker:— ART PREIS

SUNDAY JANUARY 25th 8 P. M.

WERDERMANN'S HALL

156 3rd Ave. Admission 50c—Tax Included

Auspices:— New York Local, Socialist Workers Party

Davies' Book And The Elimination Of The 'Fifth Column'

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

Six months ago the people in this country were told by the so-called military experts that the Soviet Union didn't have a chance in the world against Hitler. Since then, the stubborn resistance of the first workers state to Hitler's attack, even when the German armies were advancing, has aroused much admiration. And since late November, when at Rostov and Moscow and then along the whole front the Red Army, aided by detachments of armed workers, began to gain ground and drive back the German troops, popular interest in the USSR has grown and is seeking the explanation.

If Joseph E. Davies' "Mission to Moscow" becomes a best seller, it will be because the author, in his capacity as Ambassador to the USSR for two or three years, is supposed to have discovered the explanation and written it down in his official dispatches to the State Department which make up the bulk of this book.

But actually the reader will not find an honest explanation of the Soviet Union's resistance in this book. Instead he will find the same false explanations that he can read any time in the *Daily Worker* or the *New Masses*.

Davies "Reconsiders" the Trials

The world already knows that one of the chief differences between the Soviet Union's war against Hitler and the war of practically all the capitalist governments is that at no time has there appeared in the Soviet Union any "Fifth Column" to obstruct or sabotage the war effort in the interests in the enemy. In other countries there had always been groups in the government or leading political circles who advocated collaboration with Hitler or aided in capitulation to him. In the Soviet Union no one has been able to point to a single figure or group of great or small importance who favors the victory of the Nazis.

Like everyone else, Davies originally doubted the validity of the Moscow Trials. His book shows that after the shooting of the Red Army generals without public trial, his dispatches were crowded with speculations whether this marked the beginning of Stalin's downfall. Late in 1941, however, he sharply changed his mind.

He tells how at a lecture three days after Hitler invaded the USSR, someone in the audience asked: "What about Fifth Columnists in Russia?" "Off the anvil, I said: 'There aren't any — they shot them.'"

Then, thinking this over after the lecture, "there came a flash in my mind of a possible new significance to some of the things that happened in Russia when I was there." So he hastened to read his old dispatches, he says, and the old entries in his diary — and to reconsider.

He brings forward no new documents or fresh analysis to account for his sudden change of mind. He does not mention — let alone try to answer — the findings of the Dewey International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials, which after searching and thorough investigation pronounced the trials to be frameups; he does not attempt to explain any of the fantastic contradictions about the trials that led the whole world to reject their validity.

Quickly he reached the conclusion that he had been wrong; that the trials had not been frameups; that the defendants, many of them Lenin's comrades-in-arms who had led the October Revolution which created the Soviet Union, had really been guilty of plotting to hand the USSR over to the fascists.

What He Bases His Argument On

Davies does not try to convince anyone of the validity of the trials by what happened at them, and therefore it is unnecessary here to add anything to previous comment on the frameups. But Davies does ask the world to accept the Moscow Trials now because something happened in 1941, because a Fifth Column failed to appear during the war with Germany. This reasoning, weak though it is, requires an answer.

To understand this answer it is necessary to understand the basic difference between the capitalist states and the Soviet Union as a workers state. In the USSR there is no capitalist class. This class disappeared when the economy of the country was nationalized. The basis for a "Fifth Column" disappeared when the capitalist class disappeared. No important force in the Soviet Union wants the return of capitalism — and that is why Hitler can find no "Fifth Column". In capitalist countries, however, as in France, there are always important sections of the ruling class which are willing to come to terms with Hitler, rather than face a revolution by the masses in their own country.

There is no "Fifth Column" in the USSR — but the credit for this does not belong to the butcher in Kremlin for his murder of his pro-Soviet political opponents. The "Fifth Column" was destroyed in the USSR more than 20 years ago by those who, under Lenin and Trotsky, replaced capitalism with a workers and farmers government.

Davies argues that Stalin strengthened the USSR by murdering the old Bolsheviks and the leaders of the Red Army, industry and agriculture. But it is clear that if the only reason he can give is the absence of a Fifth Column exterminated 20 years ago, then the trials and purges weakened, not strengthened, the resistance of the Soviet Union to imperialist attack.

Davies' chief conclusion from his argument is that: "There are no saboteurs, secret agents, or Fifth Columnists to cooperate with the invaders, because the Russians were sufficiently far-sighted to eliminate them before it was too late. That is a fact which other liberty-loving nations might well ponder."

We know what Davies means: that the United States government should proceed with frame-up trials against its political opponents just as Stalin did.

To this we can only reply: Yes, the Russians were far-sighted. They eliminated their "Fifth Column" 20 years ago. American workers must "ponder" this. And they must join the movement, before it is "too late", to eliminate the "Fifth Column" here. The way to do it is by helping to establish a Workers and Farmers Government in the United States.

*Mission to Moscow. By Joseph E. Davies. 659 pages. Simon and Schuster. \$3.00.