

How Can Hitler's Hold On German Soldiers Be Broken?

— See Page 2 —

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 15

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, APRIL 11, 1942

207

FIVE (5) CENTS

WAR PROFITEERING GETS SENATE O. K.

What Boss Press Hides About The Cripps Plan

An Editorial

The game in India of both the British and American ruling classes is now absolutely clear. With one voice, the American capitalist press is singing hosannas to the Churchill-Cripps plan, which spells continued subjection of India to British imperialism.

The main point of the Cripps plan is an absolute denial to the Indian masses of the right to vote democratically on their own fate.

We pass by entirely, for the moment, the question of how Britain is going to run India "for the duration", in return for which the Indian masses are to spill their blood and spend their resources in the service of their British rulers.

After the war, after the suffering and blood-letting, the promised so-called constituent assembly, the constitution-making body, is NOT TO BE ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE OF INDIA.

The British insist it is to be chosen thus:

1. More than twenty-five per cent of the delegates are to be APPOINTED by the native princes, those feudal land-holding tyrants who rule their oppressed subjects with the aid of British bayonets and whose last wish is to see those bayonets withdrawn from India.

2. The rest of the constituent assembly is to be chosen in an indirect manner calculated to give the people no voice in the creation of the constitution and to completely thwart their will. This will be done as follows:

(a) Elections to the provincial legislatures will first take place under the provisions of the 1935 Government of India Act. This Act limits suffrage by property and educational qualifications, which, as indicated by the 1937 elections, AUTOMATICALLY EXCLUDES 75 PER CENT OF THE POPULATION FROM VOTING.

(b) This same Act arbitrarily sets aside a certain number of seats in the provincial legislatures for "religious communities", the Moslems and other religious minorities. The number of seats thus arbitrarily set aside is, of course, far out of proportion to the actual relative size of these "religious communities" to the total population. This device was placed in the Government of India Act as a means of ensuring seats to reactionary British agents, such as the heads of the Moslem League.

(c) The provincial legislatures, thus "elected", will act in turn as electoral colleges to name the actual delegates to the constituent assembly. In this way, the members of the constituent assembly would be twice-removed even from that tiny minority of privileged individuals allowed to vote at all.

But the decisions of even this unrepresentative and pro-British constituent assembly are to be subject to a masked veto by the British rulers.

The Cripps plan provides that provinces or native states which don't like the new constitution will have the right to set up their own separate governments. Thus, the threat of what was done to Ireland, partitioning under the pretext of "self-determination" and the "protection" of religious minorities, would be a strong weapon in the hands of the native princes and other British agents to force the writing of a constitution favorable to British and native reactionary interest.

And, in addition, the constitution-making body would be pledged in advance to sign a treaty with the British, which would include guarantees for British investments and continued economic domination.

This, then, is the measure of the "democracy" for which the British masters are asking the Indian masses to fight and die. This is the extent of the "national independence" which Britain promises the people of India for some time in the vague future.

At the present time, the bourgeois press is hurling a veritable barrage at the American people in an effort to sell them the idea that the Indian masses are stupidly refusing to accept a good proposition. This hypocritical chorus just a few weeks ago was railing at the Colonel Blimps, sarcastically referring to the "faded trappings of British imperialism" — all as preparation, it is now apparent, for giving support to the Cripps plan in the guise of "friends" of India.

It is easy enough for the American people to see through that guise. Let us suppose that the American masses were granted "freedom" along the lines of the Cripps plan. We would have a constitution drafted by a body, 25 per cent of whose members would be hand-picked by a few individuals like J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., etc.; the rest would be appointed by state legislatures which in turn would be elected only by the people who own at least an eight-room house and have a college degree; and the states where most of the people can't vote, such as our southern poll-tax states, would have the right to secede from the union if they didn't like the constitution. Would the workers and farmers in this country want to fight for that kind of independence and democracy? No! They'd fight to the death against it!

The only kind of national independence the masses of India want is for the British and all other imperialists to get out of and stay out of India. The only kind of constitution they want is one drafted by the true representatives of the Indian people, a constituent assembly elected by the free vote of the workers and peasants. That is the least they will fight and die for. And no Cripps or any other smooth-tongued "friend" of India, will be able to sell them some shoddy substitute labeled "just as good."

Militant UAW Delegates Resist Holiday Pay Cut

Convention Accepts Administration Demand Under Pressure of FDR and Union Leaders

April 8. — Despite strong opposition from many delegates, the special convention of the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers in Detroit last night adopted a resolution giving up time-and-a-half and double-time pay for week-end and holiday work within the 40-hour week.

But it took every trick the union's executive board could muster to carry through the adoption of this measure — the inclusion in the same resolution of a program advocating "equality of sacrifice" and containing many progressive demands; a letter from President Roosevelt promising that the money given up would go to the government and not to the employer; demagogic threats that failure to adopt the resolution would cause the passage of anti-labor legislation in Congress; appeals to the patriotism of the delegates, etc.

150 HELD FIRM AGAINST PRESSURE
Nevertheless, 150 of the 1200 delegates from the union locals stood firm under this barrage, holding to the position that the payment of the established wage rates for week-end and holiday work was not holding up production. They warned that to surrender on this issue would only encourage the employers and the anti-labor politicians to become bolder in their attacks on the workers' standards.

FDR'S Letter Shows Bosses Caused Holiday Shutdowns

President Roosevelt's letter to the United Automobile Workers special convention this week played a big part in helping to put over a resolution to surrender the established contractual wage standards for week-end and holiday pay.

Roosevelt's two main points of persuasion were that such wage standards are impeding war production and that the government intends to see to it that the bosses do not profit from this sacrifice by the workers.

An examination of his letter shows how hollow and false Roosevelt's arguments are.

He states that such double-time and premium pay is "quite understandable in peacetime" but "in wartime it puts a brake on production. It causes factories to close on Sundays and holidays."

Roosevelt, like the employers whose argument he is merely repeating, carefully avoids any elaboration on this point. Just why and how does it "put a brake on production?" Why does it do so in wartime, but not in peacetime?

The labor is available, the factories are there to run. Aside from the factor of material shortages the only other reason the factories are closed, then, is that the bosses have closed them down in order to provide a pretext for refusing to pay the workers the established pay scales and thereby to cut wages and make more profits. It is the bosses who are directly responsible if the industries do not operate to capacity. And Roosevelt's letter

itself gives a revealing clue to how false and hypocritical is the bosses' argument that they are being forced to shut down on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays because they can't afford to pay double-time.

"It is the intention of the government," wrote Roosevelt, "to renegotiate contracts with the employers wherever necessary to insure that the savings from relinquishment of double or premium time go not to the employer but the nation."

"Renegotiate contracts" means that in their present contracts the employers are receiving funds for the payment of overtime and double-time wages. The employers have not been out-of-pocket one cent by running their factories on week-ends and holidays. They have been getting the money right along from the government to meet the costs of overtime pay.

This explodes the lie that payment of overtime rates has held up production. What held up production was the desire of the bosses to put into their own pockets the money given them by the government for holiday pay.

The UAW gave up something very important, something that had, in the words of the resolution adopted at the convention, "been won thru decades of struggle" and which "means acceptance of substantial wage cuts, even in the face of the sharply increased cost of living during the past twelve months."

But the surrender of this right is not going to increase production one bit.

vote against the executive board's proposal, finally were persuaded to vote for it, "but only under repeated assurances by the union's top leaders that they would wage a last-ditch fight for similar sacrifices by industry." (PM, April 8.) Still, others were swayed by the president's letter.

HOW VOTE WAS TAKEN
The delegates debated the issues for almost six hours. Then just before the vote, President R. J. Thomas reread the final paragraph of Roosevelt's letter promising renegotiation of contracts, and Richard Frankenstein, director of the union's Chrysler department, shouted: "Are you going to tell the President of the United States to go to hell?"

A standing vote followed, with an estimated 150 delegates rising to vote against. The number of delegates who did not rise to vote for or against was not counted.

As PM pointed out, sentiment against giving up the overtime pay was much stronger among the rank-and-file delegates and the local union officials than among the national leaders. "The bulk of the oratory in support of the executive board came from the union's top councils. The minor functionaries, who deal daily with the gripes and uncertainties and resentments of the rank and file, were less disposed to accept unconditional abandonment of double Sunday pay."

It was also estimated by the New York Times reporter that three-quarters of the delegates bore no specific instructions from their locals on how to vote; the reason for this was that the convention had been called on such short notice that most locals had not had adequate time to discuss the convention issues; this undoubtedly made it more easy for the leaders to sway some of the delegates.

TYPICAL ARGUMENTS
Typical of the comments made by the delegates in opposition to the surrender of holiday pay were the following:

"We're not convinced that giving up double-time is vital to winning the war. Labor is making sacrifices everywhere — we gave up the right to strike, our brothers and sons are dying in the trenches. Can anybody show any signs that the men who sign our pay checks have made one sacrifice?"

"Every time we make a sacrifice they ask for more. Many of

(Continued on page 4)

Profits Curbs Voted Down At Administration Demand

Approval of 'Toothless', 'Innocuous' Bill Is Go-Ahead Sign for All-Out Profiteering

Prompted by the administration, the Senate this week turned the green light on all-out profiteering.

Wall Streeters and the corporation monopolists could scarcely conceal their joy at the news that the Senate last Tuesday voted down a proposal for "profits limitations" and approved a measure, demanded by the administration, which would leave it up to the government procurement agencies to determine the amount of profits on all war contracts.

An amendment was attached to the latest war appropriations bill providing that there be a clause in all war contracts reminding the bosses that, if the government so desires, it can "renegotiate" any contract "when profits can be determined" and require repayment of any sums considered to be "excess profits."

From their knowledge of what the War Production Board, War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission have up to now considered to be "excess profits," the war profiteers are undoubtedly caressing their bellies in delighted anticipation of the war profits feast in store for them.

The capitalist press could not refrain from noting with undisguised satisfaction the real character of the Senate's action, "Toothless," "entirely innocuous," "the least harmful solution to a knotty problem" the *New York Herald-Tribune* took pleasure in pointing out to its Wall Street readers. And the *New York Times* stated forthrightly that it "would leave the curbing of profits largely to the system now employed."

BIGGER PROFITS AHEAD

With over 150 billion dollars of war appropriations in the government "kitty," the war profiteers know that even the lush take of 1941 — the largest in history, not excluding the golden harvest of 1929 — will be chicken-feed compared to the picking ahead.

Senate and House investigations have brought out some of the facts about what the "system now employed" has provided the big trusts and monopolies in the way of war profits. With "emphasis on production" and "to hell with the costs," as War Production Board chief Donald Nelson has put it, it takes no imagination to visualize the millionaires turning into billionaires, and the billionaires getting too tired to even count their rake-in.

From the start, the Congress

ional talk about "taking the profits out of war" and "profits limitation" has been nothing but a calculated fakery. Even the House measures for a six per cent profits limit on war contracts and the Senate proposal for a two to ten per cent sliding scale limit on profits were just eye-wash.

Such profits limits, fixed on contracts rather than in relation to invested capital, would still permit the corporations to make hundreds of per cent profit on their actual capital. Nor would such measures take into account cost-padding, hidden profits sunk into so-called "contingency" reserves, and, above all, the monumental gifts which the government is giving the big corporations in government-financed new plants and facilities. The RFC and the government's Defense Plant Corporation have already given the bosses more than 11 billion dollars in this way.

BOSSSES' OBJECTION; REAL PURPOSE

The capitalists object to such worthless measures because they are opposed to any legal recognition of profits limitations even in principle.

The real purpose of all this "profits limitation" chatter is to appease a popular resentment, aroused by the Truman Committee and other recent disclosures with the idea that Congress is going to "do something" about the war profiteers.

And further, as the *New York Herald Tribune*, April 8, admits, wrapped up in the "profits limitation" talk is "the political consideration that on April 20 a host of labor bills will begin to be acted on in Congress."

Congress has shown its attitude to the bosses. On "Der Tag" — April 20 — it will launch its Spring Offensive against its real objective, the rights and conditions of labor.

Standard Oil Bosses Lie About Deal With Nazis

New Evidence Piles Up Despite Efforts of Company and Boss Press to Stifle Truth

By ART PREIS

Despite powerful efforts of the Rockefeller interests and the nation's capitalist press to put a lid on the truth, damning evidence continues to pile up about the Standard Oil-I. G. Farbenindustrie conspiracy.

Last week, the Truman Senate Investigating Committee

heard further government testimony showing that Standard Oil, in conformity with its arrangements with the Nazi interests, continued as late as December, 1941 to provide oil and other necessary operating supplies for Nazi and Italian air-lines bringing "spies, propaganda and profit-producing goods" to South America and returning to Europe with "essential war materials."

The committee heard from the lips of a leading Treasury official the details of Standard's efforts to turn over its Hungarian plants to the Nazis for \$24,000,000 gold, a deal which the Treasury blocked because it would have "permitted the Standard Oil Co. to have been preferred by Germany over other American owners of capital investments in Germany" and would have furthered

ment — which included a further understanding reached after the start of the war in October, 1939 for a means of working together during the war "whether or not the U. S. came in" — Standard turned all its chemical patents over to I. G., including its invaluable butyl rubber process which it refused until two weeks ago to give to American concerns, and I. G. gave Standard its synthetic gasoline and similar patents and "the privilege of stifling competition."

In accordance with its agreement with I. G. Farben and its "natural monopolistic desire," Standard withheld its synthetic rubber processes from American industry, "frustrated the creation of an American synthetic rubber industry," and contributed in a large measure to the present rubber famine which has seriously crippled American production and caused a drastic curtailment of consumers goods.

STANDARD OIL GALL

But the significant development before the Truman Committee last week is that Standard Oil — far from admitting its guilt — still defends its practices and

(Continued on page 3)

Negro Soldiers Killed In Jersey, Arkansas, Texas

Army Jim Crow Responsible for New Wave Of Violence That Takes Lives of 4 Negroes

By ALBERT PARKER

A new wave of violence has broken out against Negro soldiers. On April 2 two Negro privates were shot dead and five wounded by Military Police in Fort Dix, New Jersey. On March 29 a Negro sergeant in Little Rock, Arkansas, was shot dead by a white policeman, aided by white M. P.'s. A few days before that a Negro private in Houston, Texas, was shot dead by a white soldier assigned to guard

him. At the same time a Negro private stationed in Georgia reported that he had been cruelly beaten by white policemen as white M.P.'s stood by and watched.

Military and even civil investigations and hearings are under way in most of these cases. But it is already clear that attempts will be made to whitewash the cases and gloss over the Jim Crow treatment of Negroes which is at bottom responsible for these killings. The public statement by Colonel C. M. Dowell, Fort Dix post commander, that the whole case was "merely a brawl," laid down the line that will probably be followed by the authorities.

Brigadier-General Benjamin O. Davis, ranking Negro officer and assistant to the Army Inspector General, has been sent to Fort Dix to supervise the inquiry, and to lend a show of "impartiality" to the proceedings. Davis has been used for such work before, notably in the case of Private Ned Turman, Negro soldier who was killed at Fort Bragg, N. C., last summer, for resisting the brutal attacks of M.P.'s.

HOW FORT DIX FIGHT BEGAN

The Fort Dix killings took place at a small community called Pointville, bordering on the army reservation. In a place called Waldron's Sports Palace a dispute arose among a number of soldiers, Negro and white, who were waiting in line to use a telephone. A white military policeman named Hayhoe came up and began to

abuse a Negro who was accused of trying to get to the phone before his turn.

None of the boss newspapers reported it, but an eye-witness in the building told a MILITANT correspondent that the M. P. called the Negro "a nigger and other insulting names." Naturally, the Negroes within earshot resented this.

The M.P. then reached for the pistol in his holster. A Negro, Private Joseph Gray, who had been engaged in a bowling game, observed this, and he snatched at the holster to prevent the M.P. from using the gun. He did not get the gun, and he turned and ran out of the building. (The stories in the capitalist press all failed to tell why Gray reached for the holster; none of them mentioned that the M.P. was reaching for his gun.)

Hayhoe was joined by another M.P. named Strouth, and they rushed out after Gray and fired at him. Gray halted and started back.

Major Aage Woldike, post public relations officer, declares that the M.P.'s shots then "brought forth a fusillade of shots from the barracks across the road," which

(Continued on page 2)

How Can Hitler's German Soldiers Be Broken?

Says Program A Revolutionary Policy Of 'Militant' Is Not Practical

A Sailor Describes The Attitude of German Prisoners

A Letter to THE MILITANT

In an editorial, "Why Germans Are Not Surrendering," in the March 7th issue, you say that to class German soldiers as fanatical Nazis is to identify the people with Hitler's clique. You say that the Red Army has but to propagandize the German soldiers with promises of a "Socialist United States of Europe" and these soldiers would not only surrender but join the Red Army for that purpose. I'm afraid you're all wet. I wish you were not.

I have just returned from the Red Sea. While there I paid a visit to Cairo (not far from Port Suez). Here I had an opportunity to see these much publicized German soldiers being led thru the streets as prisoners of war. Their only answer to onlookers was a sneer. Their attitude toward British soldiers was one of contempt — the contempt that one who considers himself superior to others might show.

Later, I talked with British soldiers, asking them about the morale and attitude of German prisoners. They told me that these fellows refuse to work in prison camps (they would be paid if they did). They rarely, if ever, talk to anyone but fellow prisoners. But what is most important — to me, at least — is the fact that the longer they are imprisoned, the more sullen they become. The Nazi salute to British and colonial troops is a popular form of insult. This should prove their morale.

ATTITUDE TO HITLER

We have to remember that Hitler's war program put German capitalism on its feet. Jobs were everywhere after his appointment. German industry soon gave the people a much higher standard of living than they had known. And jobs and a better living are the best morale builders everywhere. And let's admit that the German workers looked to Adolf Hitler as the direct cause of all this. War and easy victories soon put him on a level with Christ in the minds of everyone — farmers and workers alike.

So in the face of all this let us not try to fool ourselves that a mass of pamphlets, promising a "Socialist United States of Europe," can ever change the opinions of millions of soldiers — who do not care, much less realize or understand, what a Europe

A Revolutionary Policy Can Win Soldiers

By ANTHONY MASSINI
William J. Burns' letter, and the editorial his letter refers to, are concerned with an important problem — the relationship of the soldiers in the German army to the Soviet Union. But this itself is only one part of a far more crucial question: how can the Soviet Union be saved and Hitlerism defeated?

This question becomes more and more urgent with the first melting of the snow in the Soviet Union. If the workers state is to be able to resist the offensive for which Hitler has been piling up reserves throughout Europe all winter, it requires substantial outside aid. As Brother Burns says, the Soviet Union "has not the arms to hold off much longer."

It would be foolhardy to depend for such aid on what the United States and Britain can and will send; what they have delivered thus far is a mere drop in the bucket, and what they have promised does not equal the amount of supplies and equipment lost in the first week after the German invasion of Soviet territory last June.

THE MILITANT and the Trotskyists contend that the outside aid which will save the Soviet Union can come only from the masses of Europe and especially of Germany. We do not pretend that arousing these masses to revolutionary action will be an easy task; but, difficult though it may be, there is no other way.

Brother Burns evidently does not disagree with us when we say that Hitler's drive against the Soviet Union could be smashed if the European masses and the German workers and soldiers were aroused to revolutionary action, if they would strike Hitler in the rear, disintegrate his army from within, etc. The question which he argues is how can they be aroused — more, particularly, how can the German war machine be cracked and the German soldiers set into motion against the Nazi dictatorship which they now appear to either accept or support?

We have never claimed, contrary to Brother Burns' erroneous assertion, that this can be accomplished by "a mass" of pamphlets promising a Socialist United States of Europe. What is involved here is not a question of pamphlets, but of a program, of a perspective to hold up before the German masses.

HITLER'S POWER
Brother Burns reminds us that Hitler has a powerful hold on the masses. This is true, but not for the reasons Burns gives. The advanced workers in Germany — and there were 13,000,000 votes cast for the Socialist and Communist Parties before Hitler came to power — do not thank Hitler for the jobs they have. Nor do they now have "a much higher standard of living than they had known." On the contrary, the conditions of the masses are worse on the whole than they ever were; it was only by smashing the trade unions and lowering the living standards of the workers that Hitler was able to "put German capitalism on its feet," that is, put it in a position to compete with other capitalist countries. Nor did "war and easy victories" change the conditions of the masses; instead, they must have made conditions even worse.

No, the hold that Hitler has over the German people does not arise from their gratitude for Nazi oppression; it arises from their fear of what will happen to them if Germany loses the war.

VERSAILLES MEMORIES
Most of the German soldiers may still be young men, but — as with the older generations — ingrained deep in their consciousness is the memory of what happened to Germany in the last war. The Versailles Treaty stripped Germany of its resources, its trade and chance to recuperate from the war. Children starved for lack of milk, workers were unable to find work, inflation wiped out the small businesses, demoralization swept the masses. Hitler was able to find mass support for his policies because he claimed that he would do away with the restrictions of the Versailles Treaty and bring Germany

back to its "place in the sun." Once he was in power, his destruction of the people's democratic rights prevented them from doing anything about the betrayal of many of the "radical" promises he had made to them.

From the very beginning of the war, Hitler and Goebbels have seized every opportunity to remind the German people that if Britain and its allies win the war, Germany will be faced with another Versailles Treaty. When admitted that the people were suffering, but he added that if the war was lost, there wouldn't be any ratons to cut. When the going got harder, when the Soviet Union was invaded, this became the chief point of agitation of the Nazi propaganda machine.

HOW HITLER IS AIDED

At the same time, Britain refused to differentiate between the Nazi ruling machine and the masses oppressed by that machine. It refused to state its war aims, it refused to state what it would do to a defeated Germany. All this was grist to the Nazi mill.

Then came the Atlantic Charter, which paid a little lip-service to the question of a just peace but which stated in unmistakable terms that Germany would be disarmed and subjugated by the victorious nations. Goebbels was able to dispose of the lip-service by reminding the people that this was not the first time they had been given promises; he recalled that Wilson in the first war had made all kinds of nice-sounding promises, about a peace without revenge, etc., and had broken all of them. The Atlantic Charter was undoubtedly worth ten divisions to Hitler.

It is not hard to estimate the effect of this on the German people. They hate Hitlerism, but they also hate the foreign capitalists who will try to make them pay the costs of their war. Overthrowing Hitler will be a tremendous task, it will mean suffering and death for many. One does not lightly undertake such a task unless one feels there is a chance for success and improvement of conditions. "If we go through all that," the people feel, "if we succeed in overthrowing the Nazis and establishing our own workers' government, what will happen to us? Didn't we overthrow the Kaiser in the last war and establish a democratic republic, only to have the Allies treat the whole nation as though it were responsible for the war? Won't they do the same thing again in this war? Won't they try to make us pay for Hitler's crimes? Won't they still try to impose another Versailles on us?"

As long as the German people fear this, Hitler will be able to do what he wants with German resources and manpower.

STALIN'S POLICY
It is in the light of these facts that Stalin's policies in the war can most easily be understood for the betrayals they are. The Stalinist bureaucracy has not dared to take a single effective step to arouse the German soldiers and workers against Hitler. In return for the trickle of aid he receives from the "democracies", Stalin endorses the Atlantic Charter which to the German people is synonymous with the Versailles Treaty. True, in his order of the day on the twenty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Red Army, he declared that "it would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German state." But this is just verbiage, isolated from the general course of his war policies; it is certainly completely negated by his support of the Atlantic Charter. Stalin identifies the struggle of the German people with the war of Britain, confusing in the eyes of the German masses the differences between the Soviet Union as a workers state fighting to preserve the conquests of the October Revolution and Britain as a capitalist state fighting to preserve the Empire and the right of British imperialism to exploit the colonies.

In short, Stalinism offers no perspective to the German soldiers capable of arousing them to make sacrifices for the overthrow of Hitler. In return for the hope of a second front to be opened by the imperialists — concerned not with saving the workers' state but with winning the war so that their brand of imperialism can rule the world — Stalin throws away the possibility of creating a second front in Hitler's rear through the German and European revolutions which would save the Soviet Union and sweep away the whole system of capitalism which as long as it continues will always

threaten the existence of the USSR.

A PRACTICAL POLICY

Some people — Brother Burns seems to hold this view — dismiss this revolutionary perspective as utopian and impractical. They completely overlook the lessons of the past, of the early days of the Soviet Union. In those days, 1918-20, the Soviet Union, just organizing the Red Army, had to face invading armies of Britain, France, Japan, United States and others, in addition to the counter-revolutionary Russian forces. If all it had had to rely on then was material aid from capitalist countries, it would surely have been defeated.

But Lenin and Trotsky knew that the Soviet Union had real allies — they appealed for aid from the masses in the very same capitalist countries that had sent armies against the workers state, they sought the support of the soldiers in those armies.

And they received this support. The morale of the armies of intervention was undermined, the masses in Britain and France forced the withdrawal of the armies, and the Soviet Union was saved. The Leninist policy of class struggle proved far more "practical" in those days than the Stalinist policy has proved in this war.

The same policy today would break Hitler's hold on the German soldiers. It would extend a hand of solidarity to the German workers and soldiers; it would promise support to them against the establishment of a new Versailles; it would offer assistance to them in overthrowing Hitlerism; and it would pledge collaboration to them in the building of a Socialist Germany.

The German soldiers would see a way out of the war, their fear of a German defeat by the Soviet Union would disappear. The Socialist United States of Europe would be not a mere slogan to them, but a program for their own emancipation.

PRISONERS' ATTITUDE

Brother Burns cites eye-witness evidence about the attitude of German prisoners in Cairo, which by and large probably holds true of German prisoners everywhere. But what he describes can be considered only as additional evidence of the inability of Churchill — and Stalin following behind Churchill — to drive a wedge between Hitler and the German soldiers. The German soldiers are hostile to the British, they refuse to work in the prison-camps even though they would be paid for it, etc. What does this all mean but that the German soldiers are still convinced that a German defeat would bring them only new suffering?

Burns says, "The German people and soldiers will have to undergo a lot of suffering before they will listen to any propaganda whatsoever." To say this is to overlook the fact that they already have undergone a lot of suffering under Hitler. What is more important it is no argument at all against the use of propaganda which proved effective in 1918 and which has never been utilized in this war even by the Soviet Union.

LENINISM IS NOT OUTDATED

Burns concludes his letter by rejecting the teachings of Leninism on war as outdated as well as impractical. It would have been far wiser for him to familiarize himself with those teachings before making such pronouncements on them.

Lenin never said that all wars are imperialist in character, and neither do we. We differentiate, for example, between the war of Britain as a capitalist state in the epoch of imperialism and the war of China as a semi-colonial country fighting for its freedom from imperialism. Lenin's attitude toward imperialist wars was formulated before the Soviet Union was founded; but the foundation of a workers state — and the participation of a workers state in a war — does not in any way alter the character or role or weaknesses of capitalist states at war.

The strategy and tactics of Lenin and the Bolsheviks for defending a workers state against imperialist attack, however, were worked out after the foundation of the USSR. Neither the course of the war, nor the distortions of Leninism by the Stalinists, nor the arguments of Brother Burns give any reason for abandoning or altering that strategy and those tactics which proved completely practical and successful in action.

The Editor.

AFL Heads Help Company Union To Fight The CIO

AFL Charter Is Given to Curtiss-Wright Stoges After NLRB Denies It Recognition

BUFFALO, N. Y. — The AFL national officialdom has leaped to the aid of the open-shop Curtiss-Wright Corporation, which has been conducting a bitter 20-months war against the organization of the workers in its giant aircraft plant here into the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers, CIO.

Immediately after a recent decision of the National Labor Relations Board ordering the company to cease to recognize the company union known as The Aircraft, Kriegbaum, head of the company union, announced that The Aircraft was going to "emerge under the AFL aegis." He announced that the Curtiss-Wright workers were being urged to join the AFL "with the blessings of the independent (company union) officers" and that the local AFL, Central Labor Union was supporting the move.

Shortly thereafter, the UAW-CIO local officials triumphantly announced in a leaflet, calling on The Aircraft members to join the CIO ranks, that William Green, AFL president, had announced that "no federal charter had been granted and no federal charter will be granted" in the Curtiss Buffalo plant. The leaflet praised Green for his "fine expression of the sincere efforts of the AFL to aid America's war effort by preventing any jurisdictional struggles."

GREEN CHANGES MIND

The praise turned sour in short order. On April 1, the announcement came out of the AFL national headquarters in Washington — after an all-day conference between Green, AFL Secretary George Meany and President Harvey Brown of the AFL's International Association of Machinists with local Buffalo AFL leaders and the company union heads — that the AFL will issue an IAM charter and start an organizing drive in Curtiss here.

It is clear that the company

management is assisting this effort of its company union stoges and the AFL leaders to prevent the Curtiss-Wright workers from joining a genuine industrial union. AFL recruitment is being carried on openly in the plant while all CIO organizational activity is prohibited. Through its power to arrange draft deferments for "necessary" men, the company is further able to discriminate against CIO militants and attempt to intimidate the workers into a new company-dominated set-up under the "AFL aegis."

MUST DO MORE THAN FILE NLRB COMPLAINT

The UAW-CIO has made substantial headway in the plant, claiming at least 50 per cent of

the workers, despite the fact that the union leadership has failed to put forward a clear-cut program of union demands and carry on an aggressive organizing drive. Too much reliance was placed on a favorable NLRB decision to accomplish the CIO's organizing task.

This task has been complicated now by the activities of the AFL, and the union leaders are once more seeking to get the NLRB to help them through filing a complaint against the company's aid to the AFL. But like the previous appeal, a complaint by itself will not organize the workers, who will respond only to a program which meets their demands for better conditions and an aggressive organizing policy to show that the CIO will really fight to win the workers' demands.

Wage Scales Cut By Auto Bosses In The New Plants

CHICAGO, Ill. — The drive of Local 6, United Automobile Workers to organize the Buick Aviation Engine Plant in Chicago is going ahead full speed. In spite of the fact that one of the reasons General Motors built their plant in the Chicago area was to get cheap labor and to get away from the strong CIO movement in Michigan and Wisconsin, the men in Chicago are flocking into the union every day. Together with their more experienced brothers from Wisconsin and Michigan, the Chicago men have organized Buick to the point where the union estimates that it will have an 80 to 85% majority in the coming National Labor Relations Board elections.

The local filed a petition, to which General Motors consented, for an election in the Aviation Engine Plant of Buick and the date for the election is set for some time in April. Four or five AFL Machinist locals originally sought to contest the election,

but they soon withdrew because they could make no headway against the CIO. Machinist Local 113 is still asking for bargaining rights for the tool room only, but there is no question that the UAW will get bargaining rights for the whole plant.

The union men from Michigan and Wisconsin who have come to Chicago have tremendously helped the organization drive by concretely pointing out to the new union men, the glaring difference in wage rates between the strongly organized plants in Michigan and Wisconsin and the rates paid here. For example, a drill press operator in the engine plant at Ford receives \$1.37 an hour while at Buick the same operator receives 90c.

The militancy of the newer Chicago men has in turn gratified the seasoned Michigan and Wisconsin unionists. The Chicago men have not only solidified themselves with their older brothers but in many instances, have taken the initiative in the organization drive.

Negro Soldiers Killed In Jersey, Arkansas, Texas

(Continued from page 1)

was occupied by a number of Negro soldiers who, if this is true, must have had their rifles very handy and must have been in possession of ammunition against regulations. The New York Times April 4 report of the affair is that one of these soldiers, Private Isaac W. Brown, shot and killed Strouth, whereupon Brown was shot down by Hayhoe.

WHY WERE THE SOLDIERS ARMED?

A gun fight followed, in which the capitalist press estimates "forty Negro soldiers illegally armed" participated. At least 50 shots were fired. When the fight was finally stopped, five other Negroes were found wounded and taken to the hospital, and the Negro regiment stationed near the Sports Palace was confined to its regimental area.

Woldike announced that "a preliminary investigation indicated all of the dead and injured were struck by .30 caliber rifle bullets. Military police are equipped with .45 caliber pistols." But if this is an attempt to whitewash the M.P.'s, the authorities will have to explain how it is that eyewitnesses are supposed to have seen the M.P. Hayhoe shoot the Negro soldier Brown. Did he perhaps shoot him with Brown's own .30 caliber rifle? Such a tale would be going too far, even for the whitewash business.

But even more important, the authorities will have to try to explain why it is that an estimated forty Negro soldiers were armed, and why they opened fire immediately after the M.P.'s fired, and why the ammunition they were not supposed to have was already loaded into their rifles where any routine inspection would have revealed it.

Soldiers are not in the habit of arming themselves in such large numbers against orders — for which they could be strongly punished — unless they have a very good reason, unless they feel that they have to protect themselves from something that is threatening them.

(PM of April 5 reports that "anti-Negro feeling had been deliberately whipped up at times" and "there have been frequent fist fights between the white and Negro troops, particularly the Southern soldiers.")

If the boards of inquiry at Fort Dix really want to know what caused the gun battle, let

them find out why these soldiers felt it necessary to arm themselves. If they overlook this aspect of the question, then it can be taken for granted that nothing fundamental will be done to prevent similar tragedies of this nature.

PLAIN AND BRUTAL MURDER

The Little Rock case is simpler, and an even more vicious example of brutality against Negro soldiers. A Negro soldier in the Negro section of the city was accused of being drunk. White policemen came along and began to beat him up.

Sergeant Thomas P. Foster of Company D, 92nd Engineers at Camp Robinson, Ark., inquired of the police why they did not turn him over to the Military Police, who are supposed to have jurisdiction over all soldiers accused of misconduct.

White M.P.'s standing by then attacked Foster. He tried to resist but was outnumbered and beaten helpless on the ground.

One of the white cops, named A. J. Hay or Hayes, took out his gun. A by-stander, Walter Johnson, pleaded with him not to shoot. Hay fired five bullets into Foster's body; he died later that night.

The army then swept into action. It rushed trucks into town, and began rounding up — all the Negro soldiers!

"Sweeping investigations were ordered by military and civilian authorities. A preliminary report issued by the chief of police was an outright whitewash. The military boards have been ordered to decide the following question: Did Foster die in line of duty? Are his parents entitled to receive a pension?"

"FAIR AND IMPARTIAL"

In Houston, Texas, Private Tyree Jackson was fighting with another soldier. Private Frank Covey, who was in charge of the two men, working near the Fort Sam Houston prison, ordered them to halt. They didn't. He fired his gun, and Jackson fell dead.

Jackson was under confinement at the time, awaiting trial on three charges of violations of the Articles of War: disobeying a superior officer, being absent without leave and damaging a government truck.

The post public relations officer has assured the press that Covey

will get "a fair and impartial trial," and he has invited Negro reporters to be present.

Whatever else happens at the trial, one thing is sure: they will not try to analyze the reason why Jackson was in jail; nor will they discuss the rights and wrongs of the orders given soldiers guarding prisoners to be on the safe side and shoot when trouble arises; nor will they discuss the hundred and one subtle ways in which white soldiers are trained to look down on Negro soldiers as "inferior." Maybe it will be a trial fair and impartial to Covey; but it won't be fair and impartial to Jackson.

The Georgia story is shortest and simplest of all. Private Enoch Earle made a bad mistake. He was seen talking to white soldiers on the street. The white cops who saw this didn't like it. So they beat him up. White M.P.'s did nothing to stop it. The only unusual thing about this story is that it got into the press at all — such incidents occur all the time.

"AT MY DIRECTION" BOASTS ROOSEVELT

In the face of all this, a letter from President Roosevelt to the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, released on April 5, takes on a most ironic character. In effect, Roosevelt in this letter takes credit for what has been happening to the Negroes in the armed forces:

"At my direction, the armed services have taken numerous steps to open opportunities for Negroes in the armed forces of our country, and they are giving active consideration to other plans which will increase that participation."

What these other plans may be, we do not know. But unless they provide for the complete elimination of the present system of segregation and discrimination in the armed forces, they cannot prove satisfactory to the Negro people or the labor movement.

What they want, if Fort Dix tragedies are to be prevented from happening over and over again, is:

Democratic rights in the Army!
The abolition of military Jim Crowism!

Subscribe to the "Fourth International"

Two pamphlets that deal concretely with present day problems of the war, the struggle against Hitlerism, trade union democracy, etc., in a language so simple and clear every worker will immediately grasp and understand the fundamental Marxist ideas...

JUST OUT

IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM

by Albert Goldman

The official court record of his final speech for the defense in the Minneapolis "Sedition" trial

100 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

ALREADY A FAVORITE

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

The official court record of his testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial, with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

116 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

Order from:

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK

Join the Socialist Workers Party

The Negro Struggle
By Albert Parker

Congressman Threatens Negro People

Last week in this column I pointed out that the Negro people in the South will not automatically get the right to vote with the passage of the Pepper bill abolishing payment of poll taxes for federal elections. I predicted that even if the Pepper bill were passed, the reactionary ruling class in the South would try to utilize other legal means to prevent Negroes from voting, and that if it ran out of legal schemes, it would not hesitate to resort to violence, to the use of lynch mobs and organized terrorist groups.

On practically the same day that I wrote to this effect, a Southern poll taxer speaking in the House of Representatives made a speech as though he was trying to prove everything that I had said.

The speech is entitled "Stop Nagging the South" and it is reprinted on Page A1306 of the Congressional Record of March 26. The author of this not-at-all veiled threat against the Negro people and their rights is John E. Rankin, Representative from Mississippi. He says:

"Certain radicals in the CIO, certain Negro agitators, and a few white demagogues (are) going before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and trying to stir up race trouble throughout the Southern States by attacking our election laws.

"We are getting along pretty well with the Negroes in the South, and will continue to do so if these agitators will leave us alone. The Negroes know their places and we know ours. Any man who goes around now and directly or indirectly tries to create race trouble is simply aiding and abetting the enemies of our country. The good Negroes of the South know they will be protected when any trouble arises and the bad ones know they will be looked after. . .

"If they (the so-called radicals in the CIO, etc.) could get control of the South, the horrors of reconstruction would seem like a Sunday-school picnic in comparison. But they will never get such control. The white people of the South are on the alert, and the better elements of the Negro race refuse to join in any such movement. They know it would simply mean the death of thousands of their own race. . .

Do not make the mistake of assuming that this is the ranting of an irresponsible individual, to be dismissed as a man who represents no one but himself. No mistake could be greater. Rankin is speaking for the southern ruling class, and the proof of it is that not a single one of his Democratic Party brothers from the South rose to repudiate or dissociate himself from these remarks, not even Pepper.

War for What?

Do you recall how a couple of weeks ago a Negro in Philadelphia was arrested and almost brought to trial for "sedition" because he said that this was a "white man's war"? Well, listen to what, in the course of the speech mentioned above, Rankin had to say about the war:

"There are no more patriotic people under the shining sun than the white people of the South. They are bending every effort to aid their country in these perilous hours; their sons are in the service, thousands of them are at the front, many of them are giving their lives, the last full measure of devotion, in order that our country may live, that our way of life and our sacred institutions may be perpetuated, and that the white man's civilization may not perish from the earth. . .

The first American Negro troops to be sent abroad in this war have wound up in Australia. Australia is an all-out Jim Crow country, where Negroes are not permitted to come in time of peace. The country's war minister, Francis M. Forde, gallantly greeted them as follows: "We look upon the Negro troops as part of the United States Army and we would not be so presumptuous as to place any bar against any form of assistance to the defense of this country." Oiver Harrington cleverly summed up the situation in a People's Voice cartoon showing a Negro soldier being greeted by an Australian official standing in front of a sign which reads, "Colored persons not allowed in Australia." The official is saying to the Negro soldier: "Jolly glad to see you, old boy. Just ignore these bloody signs around here — for the duration." The final payoff is that the Negro troops are not to be used for combat but only as work-gangs to do the dirty work.

Last week the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People released a story about Walla Walla, Washington, telling how the Negro soldiers of the 25th Infantry had been ordered by their officers to stay out of 20 public places in the town because the proprietors of these places did not want to serve Negroes. This week the NAACP Press Service carries a letter from one of the Walla Walla soldiers, charging that he knows the proprietors of many of these places did not ask that Negroes be barred, that on the contrary they are quite willing to serve Negroes on the same basis as anyone else. The letter declares that these Jim Crow regulations were instigated wholly on the initiative of the army officers themselves.

Recently, the press carried stories about how the Japanese in the Philippines had ordered the people to surrender their native weapons. This was widely interpreted as a sign of the hostility of the natives to the Japanese. Now comes a story from Johannesburg, South Africa, that according to a new proclamation issued by Captain Reitz, Minister of Native Affairs, the natives must give up their weapons, battle axes, bludgeons, axes, etc. What does that signify?

Standard Oil Bosses Lie

(Continued from page 1)

brazenly denies the very documentary evidence from its own files which conclusively prove its conspiracy and its monopoly motives.

Thus, for two days last week the American people witnessed W. S. Farish and Frank Howard, president and vice-president respectively of the \$2,000,000,000 Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, arrogantly wave aside the government's documentary evidence and blandly deny every charge against their corporation. They had the gall to go so far as to insist that the Standard-Nazi deal was to the "interests of the United States."

Principally, their statement declared that there was not "a shadow of foundation" to the charge that Standard had "delayed" or "retarded" or "stifled" synthetic rubber in this country." They lyingly asserted that they had given "full information" to the government agencies about butyl rubber and were, in fact, "anxious" to advance synthetic rubber production.

It was brought out, however, that in 1939 an official of the Navy's Bureau of Construction and Repair had sought "first-hand information on the compounding" of butyl rubber, according to a letter from Standard's files. This letter, from a Standard employe to the Standard officials, goes on to state that: "You (Standard officials) will recall that I took up this question with you before his arrival. As agreed upon I took Mr. Werkethin over to see the K plant when it appeared that I

could not very well steer his interest away from the process. However, I am quite certain that he left with no picture of the operation. . ."

Farish and Howard tried to make it appear that they had sought to interest the government in the German buna rubber process; but it turned out, according to Standard's own documents that Standard had no knowledge of this process and had not received information on it for eight years.

On this point, after Farish had read into the records that "the only thing I. G. Farbenindustrie was withholding was the detail of its government-sponsored program for producing Buna rubber," he was forced to hand to the press a revised version excluding this assertion and admitting that as I. G. fell "more and more under the control of the German Government there was an apparent reluctance to respond to further request for information." That "reluctance," however, did not apply to Standard itself which in 1938 turned over its butyl rubber process to I. G.

Farish and Howard sought to show that butyl rubber was in an "experimental" stage and was too costly for large scale production. But, here again, the documentary record from Standard's files showed that Standard was prepared to produce butyl rubber, which it admitted itself to be superior in most respects to natural rubber, for 6.6 cents a pound to a 14.4 cents cost for the German buna rubber and the 21

cents a pound price on natural rubber.

BRITISH, DUTCH INTERESTS

This information, incidentally, brought out the fact that Standard was not alone in desiring to frustrate synthetic rubber production. The British and Dutch rubber interests were just as eager to do so in order to maintain their market for crude rubber at a high monopoly price.

A memorandum in Standard's files, dated Feb. 21, 1941, stated that: "Also Sir John Hay, representative of the British Rubber Control, has been very persuasive that the production of synthetic rubber is uneconomic. . . will impose a drain on the American productive power. . ."

Significant light was shed on the role of the government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the big rubber companies in helping to block synthetic rubber production.

It was brought out that the RFC had given Standard contracts for a small gov't-financed plant, also agreed to give Standard a three percent royalty on all synthetic rubber produced under the government program. This agreement was partially engineered by R. R. Deupree, president of the Proctor & Gamble Soap Co., which had a "limited partnership" in the Standard-I. G. cartel arrangement. Deupree had been head of the rubber division of the OPM and later special rubber adviser to the RFC.

Standard tried to get plants "to be financed 75 per cent by the RFC", not, however, to get production, but to go into limited manufacturing in order to establish a stronger legal claim to its patent monopolies.

RUBBER INTERESTS

But most of Standard's plans to get free plants were balked by the big rubber corporations which opposed expansion of synthetic rubber to be controlled by Standard because this would compete with the natural rubber industry and force down prices.

A battle royal, it appears, ensued between the agents of these contending interests. It was not until the Far East defeats cut off virtually all supplies of crude rubber that the government, under pressure of the rubber corporations in particular, two weeks ago finally extracted from its files the complete documentary evidence it had held for nearly a year about Standard's conspiracy and forced Standard to release its patents royalty-free for the duration of the war.

Having obtained these patents, the administration has since tried to play down the Standard affair — the complete details of which make the Tea Pot Dome scandal look almost like a Sunday School picnic. The administration has demonstratively called for the cessation of all anti-trust prosecutions which "interfere with war production" and the Defense Plants Corporation has announced a program of government-financed synthetic rubber plants to be divided up principally among the rubber corporations and Standard Oil.

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS IMPLICATED

In their testimony about supplying the South American airlines of the Nazi and Italian Fascists, the Standard officials argued that they had followed the policy laid out by the State Department. This, according to a subsequent State Department statement, appears to be true to a degree.

While Secretary Hull had urged Standard not to supply these lines from its American stocks and tried to discourage the practice, the State Department did permit Standard to continue giving these supplies to the fascists with the approval of the American ambassador in Brazil. According to Farish's statement, which the State Department has not denied, after October, 1941 when the government had threatened to black-list Standard's Brazilian company, "limited deliveries to Condor (Nazi line) continued under the instructions

of Ambassador Caffery in Rio."

The indisputable documentary evidence proves that Standard Oil — and all the big trusts, according to Thurman Arnold's own admission — have deliberately curtailed war production and given the Nazis exclusive industrial processes literally worth whole armies.

ROLE OF CAPITALIST PRESS

But most of the big capitalist papers, fearful lest the masses get a real picture of the "patriotism" represented by the American monopoly capitalists who run and control the war program, have joined in a frantic whitewash campaign of Standard Oil. Papers like the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune deliberately played down Arnold's testimony and played up the lies of the Standard officials.

Both of these papers — giving the lead to the rest of the capitalist press which followed suit — avoided all editorial comment on the Standard Conspiracy, and then, as soon as the Standard agents had testified, came out with long editorials giving full credence to the Standard statements. Thus, the Times, April 2, asserts that: "In the light of this evidence (Standard's) Mr. Arnold's charges that the Standard Oil Company is responsible for the shortage of synthetic rubber simply evaporate."

Far from "evaporating", however, the demonstrable lies of the Standard officials serve to prove these charges to the hilt. They prove that the monopolies don't give a tinker's dam about a "war for democracy against fascism." They prove that in war as in peace, the capitalists hold their profits and monopoly advantages above everything else, not hesitating to strike blows at their own government's interests and to aid the Nazis if this is to their own interests. And this entire affair shows, finally, how unwilling the government is to take effective action against the powerful financial groups which dominate the economic and political life of the country.

Local Proposes Contract For The Steel Industry

YOUNGSTOWN, Ohio — Reflecting the rank-and-file steel workers' desire to defend their interests during the war and safeguard union standards and working conditions, a proposed model contract has been adopted for the consideration of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, CIO, by the Ohio Works Local 1330 of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, chief U. S. Steel subsidiary. The local is circulating the contract in printed form to the other SWOC locals and is urging its adoption as a basis for the forthcoming Big Steel negotiations.

Outstanding in the model contract is a section providing for a rising scale of wages to meet rising prices. This includes "an automatic increase in the wages" every three months, the percentage of increase to be based on the amount of increased living costs over the previous three months period, and to be determined by the CIO's own research department.

TAXES INCLUDED

A particularly splendid feature of this section provides that "any taxes that are added to the burden of the workers . . . shall be considered as a part of the rising cost of living." The bosses figure their profits and incomes after all taxes are paid, and the steel workers similarly want their taxes to be taken into account in determining what their real wages shall be.

In addition, the contract calls for a flat general wage increase over present pay of 12½ cents per hour and provides that there shall be "no incentives, bonuses, tonnage or other piece-work methods" to establish a competitive speedup among the workers that can be used as a cover for wage-slashing and creating dissension among the union workers.

FORTY-HOUR WEEK

Of particular importance are the provisions covering hours of work. The contract calls for the forty-hour week, 8-hour day and five day week. It further requires time-and-a-half overtime pay for work beyond the standard work hours — and for meals at company expense when a worker engages in more than two hours overtime in any day. The overtime work is to be equally divided among all the workers.

Showing what the workers really think about giving up the established wage standards for week-ends and holidays, the contract calls for double time pay on holidays.

The Special Features Of India's Agrarian Problem

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The agrarian problem in India assumes especially aggravated and peculiar forms owing to the preservation and reinforcement of feudal and semi-feudal conditions and regimes in the country.

In this respect India differs sharply from contemporary European countries like Rumania, Spain and others where vestiges of feudalism still survive and the agrarian problem still remains largely unsolved.

In these countries the landowning classes and the bourgeoisie are closely integrated and an equilibrium of class rule is established through a bloc of two classes. India is ruled by a bloc of three classes — the English imperialists, the feudal princes, the native bourgeoisie. This combination is far more unstable and far less flexible.

What is equally important is that in the backward European countries there is a degree of differentiation among the peasantry: their rural areas contain layers of middle-peasants side by side with an agricultural proletariat. Large scale agricultural enterprises while rare nevertheless do exist. Essentially the same thing was true of the former Czarist empire, just as it is true today of Japan. Even in a semi-colonial country like China the dissolution of feudal and semi-feudal relations, the integration of the landowners with the native bourgeoisie, and the differentiation among the peasantry long ago reached stages far beyond the conditions surviving in India today.

Large scale farming is virtually unknown on this subcontinent. There are only the beginnings of an agricultural proletariat. As for a stratum of landowning peasants, the English did for a

time play around with the idea of fostering such a formation but nothing ever came of it.

In Czarist Russia the ruling classes (under the Minister Stolypin) attempted to forestall the agrarian revolution by the introduction of reforms which would permit the development of small-landowners, and thus provide a social base for the regime in the countryside. Although the serfs had been emancipated and although only vestiges of feudal conditions actually remained in Russia, the attempt proved abortive. The very same phenomenon is to be observed today in Japan.

However, the measures applied in Czarist Russia and in Mikado's Japan are revolutionary by comparison with the "reforms" instituted by the English or those advocated by the native Indian bourgeoisie. These "reforms" come down in all cases to nothing more than promises to alleviate the burdens of the Indian peasants through slight lowering of taxes, rent, usury rates, etc.

In other words, the agrarian problem is far more acute in India than in any other major sector of world economy in the epoch of imperialist decay. This distinguishing feature of the Indian revolution will undoubtedly play a vital role in the development of events. What will be the general trend of these events?

The closest approximation to the condition of the Indian peasantry is to be found not in such countries as Czarist Russia, or Rumania, or Japan or even China but rather in a country like France of 1789, i.e., on the eve of the Great French Revolution. The likelihood therefore is that the unfolding Indian revolution will combine in a complex way the features of the Great French Revolution (1789-93) with those of the Russian Revolution (1905, February, 1917 and October, 1917).

L.A. Stalinists Assault Woman Selling 'Militant'

Also Attack 'Labor Action' Salesgirl and Severely Beat Up a Young Male Worker

LOS ANGELES, April 1 — While engaged in their customary sale of papers on the street in front of the CIO building here, two young women workers, distributors respectively of THE MILITANT and Labor Action, were assaulted and manhandled last night by an organized group of about 20 men led by known Stalinists. Their papers were taken by force and destroyed.

Two young male companions of the distributors were also seized and one of them was severely beaten.

This attack, part of a general nation-wide lynch campaign against Trotskyists and all other working-class militants who oppose reactionary Stalinism, was made under cover of a resolution which the Stalinist union leaders

deliberate attack was obvious. It was conducted swiftly and systematically, none of the group speaking a word to the victims. While the attack was taking place, a number of young women, some of whom were recognized as Young Communist League followers, occupied themselves exclusively with picking up every trace of the torn papers to remove all evidence of the attack and the reason for it.

Representatives of THE MILITANT and Labor Action are seeking the aid of the American Civil Liberties Union and other organizations concerned with the defense of civil liberties to expose and halt these Stalinist attacks.

They have issued a challenge to any person or group to come before any responsible commission or meeting of bona-fide labor or liberal organizations to present proof of the GPU slanders that the papers which the Stalinists seek to ban are "fascist" or "sedition." From past experience, it is certain that no one will dare to accept this challenge.

British C. P.'ers Employ the Same Hoodlum Tactics

Stalinist attacks against distribution of newspapers presenting a militant point of view are the same the world over. Following is a report, dated March 6, received from a Trotskyist group functioning in the area of Liverpool, England, which sounds word for word like a report that could be given for Boston, Cleveland or Los Angeles:

"The Stalinists here are of a particularly vicious type, whenever we sell our papers at their public meetings they organize their bands of hoodlums in an attempt to prevent us from selling. It goes without saying that they do not succeed but we are sometimes hard pressed.

"Several of our sellers have been brutally attacked, papers torn, and have only been saved from being beaten up by intervention of members of the crowd, our own comrades, or, as on one occasion, sympathetic soldiers.

"The displays of hoodlums, however, do the Stalinists more harm than good, and we actually benefit by it by increasing our literature sales. It is significant that in a local C. P. branch, a resolution was passed protesting against these methods and demanding that they be stopped."

That this was an organized and

The New Leader, The Dies Committee And Civil Liberties

By A. ROLAND

Attitude to Dies' Witch Hunts

The New Leader takes the Dies Committee to task for "erring" in denouncing certain employes of the EWB in Washington as communists. The spokesman for social democracy takes up the records of the men involved and shows how wrong Martin Dies was in picking on them.

The matter that interests us is not so much the attempt of the New Leader to keep the record straight, but rather its attitude to the whole issue of witch-hunting by the Dies Committee. Thus the column written by Robert Trevor called "Inside and Out" remarks: "Very strange it is that while perfectly guiltless people are catching the tar-and-feathers, well known Communist liners hold office in other government agencies. For example, the Donovan office, Coordinator of Information, has been harboring Dan S. Gillmor. You will remember him as the barefoot boy who allegedly sank his fortune in Friday, the anti-British, anti-war, and 100% Stalinist weekly."

The general news article on the Dies "blunder" makes the statement that "Undoubtedly one of the dangers in a democracy comes from public servants who hew to a party line; their loyalty to their country is transcended by the fanatical adherents to the party."

The New Leader shows its loyalty impartially by denouncing all "totalitarians" to the government. One week it points to fascists who have found their way into the army, navy or government work of one kind or another. The next week it puts the finger on Stalinists who have done the same thing. Doesn't this prove that these democrats are real honest brokers?

In a principled sense there is no difference between these social democrats and the very Stalinists they denounce. The Stalinists also feel quite free to demand that the government act against various elements whom they lump into one amalgam as "Fifth Columnists", not excluding the social democrats of the left.

What Dies Committee Represents

Both these groups play into the hands of capitalist reaction. The Dies Committee is a useful instrument to the extreme right wing of the bourgeoisie, that wing which seeks to stifle every striving, every movement of labor tending towards its emancipation. The Dies Committee knows precisely what it wants in this regard. Its "errors" are purposeful errors. It calls everything communist which takes a liberal attitude towards the working class, just as Hitler calls everything that is anti-fascist Jewish. What Dies calls patriotism and loyalty to country is loyalty to the party of extreme capitalist reaction. When the New Leader calls on the Dies Committee to take action against the Stalinists, it is calling on the capitalists who placed Dies in Congress to take this action.

But these capitalists are quite ready to take action not only against Stalinists, but also against all labor unions, radicals, the labor press, working class organizations of all kinds. That is why main questions should come first, the bigger problems ahead of the lesser ones. To grant to a section of the government, the capitalist government, the right to fire someone not for some act but for his or her political opinions, is to strike a blow at civil liberties. Blows of this type — all history proves it over and over again — strike inevitably at the working class. Thus when we denounce the Dies Committee, it is not because that Committee picks on the wrong people, but because its witch-hunts are meant fundamentally to strike at and weaken the workers and their movement. Our denunciation of the Dies Committee is therefore for the purpose of guarding the rights of workers. This is the only principle involved and it determines our attitude toward the activities of the reactionary Congressional Committee.

No Real Class Point of View

It is quite well known that we hold no brief for the Stalinists. It is equally well known that we are enemies to the death of the Fascists. If we do not wax enthusiastic when the capitalist government aims its wartime blows even at the despicable Fascists, it is because we have seen so often in the past how such blows to the right precede far greater blows to the left, at the working class movement, particularly at its most militant wing.

The New Leader is totally unable to draw proper distinctions as to its conduct — even while showing up the similar conduct of the Stalinists — because it has no real class point of view. It attempts to draw a line not between capitalists and workers, but between liberal capitalists and reactionary capitalists. It identifies itself with liberal capitalism, with the New Deal. That is why it feels no contradiction at all in taking the liberal capitalist attitude towards democracy and civil liberties. As a defender of bourgeois democracy it feels perfectly free to denounce individuals to the government who might be a menace to capitalist democracy. It does not matter much which camp the menace comes from.

But this is emphatically not the road to working class democracy and emancipation from wage slavery. Those who wish to travel that road must not permit the capitalist class or any of its organs to decide what opinions it is permissible or impermissible for a worker to hold. The matter of opinions can be fought out within the ranks of the workers. That is the wisdom taught by all the great teachers of Marxism. It is a wisdom that cost the movement too much for it to be forgotten.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 15 Saturday, April 11, 1942

Published Weekly by THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: Algonquin 4-8847

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN

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

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

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.

'Profits Limitation'

Donald Nelson, War Production Board chief, opposes war profits limitations by law. Before a Senate committee last week he proposed his own "better" idea — which the Senate accepted last Tuesday.

His proposal was that the matter of war contracts profits be left to the "discretion" of the WPB. The WPB, he promised, would see to it that the corporations receive no more than a "fair" profit.

The "discretion" of the WPB, however, is virtually synonymous with the "discretion" of the monopoly corporations themselves. It is the corporation dollar-a-year men who are running the war production program. It is the monopoly corporations themselves which dictate contract terms in Washington.

What kind of discretion about war profits limitations can we expect from the corporation-dominated government procurement agencies? The *AFL Monthly Survey* last month issued a report on corporation profits after all taxes and costs which gives us a vivid example of how that "discretion" has operated up to now.

In the last war, according to official sources, the corporations made 6.4 billion dollars in 1916; 6.7 billions in 1917; and 4.6 billions in 1918.

In the boom year, 1929, the corporations made 7.2 billions.

In this war, corporation profits have been as follows: 4.2 billions in 1939; 5.5 billions in 1940; 7.2 BILLIONS IN 1941.

In short, according to these official figures the corporations made as much profit last year as they did in 1929, despite the fact that taxes were six and one-half times higher!

Actually, they made more profits in 1941 than in 1929. It is now the standard corporation practice to put large chunks of profits into so-called contingency reserves for "future uncertainties." A special study of 30 big corporations, printed in last Sunday's *New York Times*, showed that in 1941 they had set aside \$72,000,000 as "reserves" as compared to \$41,000,000 in 1940 and just \$2,000,000 in 1936.

Neither the "discretion" exemplified by these profits figures nor the phony Congressional proposals will "take the profits out of war." The one sure way to put a halt to war profiteering is for the government to take over the war industries and operate them under the control and management of the workers.

FDR's Court On Maritime Strikes

The Supreme Court ruling this week that a seamen's strike aboard a ship tied up in any port — domestic or foreign — constitutes "mutiny" is the most reactionary decision ever handed down by this particular body.

Although issued to decide a case that arose out of a sit-down strike, this ruling virtually outlaws the right of seamen to strike under all circumstances once they have signed their articles for a particular ship. Under maritime regulations, a seaman cannot even leave ship except by expressed sanction of the officers.

The ruling was based on an appeal by the South-

ern Steamship Company of Philadelphia against a National Labor Relations Board decision, sustained by the Third Federal Circuit Court, ordering the company to re-instate five National Maritime Union members fired for participation in a sit-down strike, July 18, 1938, while their ship was tied to a dock at Houston, Texas.

In making its five to four ruling, the Supreme Court majority brushed aside the plain facts of the case.

The company had deliberately provoked the strike by refusing to recognize the union after it had won a collective-bargaining election. The ship was not at sea and was, in fact, tied up in an American port. There were no criminal acts charged against the strikers. And there was no question of the safety of passengers and ship involved.

The very language of the majority ruling indicates its anti-labor bias and animus. It places a strike of maritime workers in the category of "a rebellion by seamen against their officers." This is no different than the typical contention of the bosses that any strike of workers for better conditions constitutes "rebellion," "revolution," etc.

The ruling declares: "Ever since men have gone to sea the relationship of master to seaman has been entirely different from that of employer and employee on land."

It is precisely this that the seamen have been fighting against for decades. The reward of seamen for daily risking their lives at sea is a Supreme Court decision upholding maritime feudalism.

This ruling places in the hands of the shipping corporations a powerful weapon for framing up union seamen and rairoading them to prison on "mutiny" charges. It can be used to terrorize seamen into submitting to all kinds of abuses by the ship-owners and their agents.

As a reflection of administration war labor policy, this "mutiny" ruling is further indication of a growing anti-labor offensive designed to slice away piece by piece the workers' rights and conditions. Wall Street's hue and cry several years ago against Roosevelt's Supreme Court "reorganization" finds no echo today. Roosevelt's "New Deal" court has put its "liberalism" in cold storage. There is a "war for democracy" to be fought.

Why We Demand Browder's Freedom

We stand for the freedom of Earl Browder. We have always raised the demand for his immediate release from prison, where he was sent over a year ago under the pretext that he had violated a passport regulation. We recognize that the Roosevelt administration prosecuted Browder and "threw the book" at him solely because he headed a working-class political party expressing views which the administration didn't like.

Our reasons for demanding Browder's release, it must be pointed out, have nothing in common with those advanced by Browder's own party.

A year ago, the Communist Party claimed that Browder was prosecuted and sentenced because of his "opposition to imperialist war." That was a lie. Browder and the Stalinists did not oppose imperialist war. Under a pseudo "anti-imperialist" cloak, they carried out the Kremlin's line, flowing from the Stalin-Hitler pact, of aiding Stalin's Nazi ally by attacking the Anglo-American bloc of powers.

What is true is that the administration prosecuted the fake "anti-imperialist," Browder, in an attempt to intimidate and silence all who opposed the war, including the genuine anti-imperialist fighters.

Today, however, Hitler's assault on the Soviet Union has caused the Stalinists to shift camps. Now they are mum about Browder's "opposition to imperialist war." They dare not even state that it is the Roosevelt administration which jailed Browder and still keeps him in jail. Today, the Stalinists spread a different lie.

They claim Browder should be freed because he is "needed for the fight against fascism." But Browder is no more a fighter against fascism than he was against imperialist war. His program — the program of the Communist Party — is to support the administration's war policies in return for the crumbs of aid the American government is sending, or may send, the Soviet Union. The Stalinist "fight against fascism" consists of aiding the "democratic" capitalists to silence and suppress militant labor, force the workers to surrender their rights and submit to speedup and wage cuts.

The Stalinists also claim — the biggest lie of all — that they are for Browder's release in the name of civil liberties, particularly the protection of the rights of political minorities. But the Stalinists themselves are virulent enemies of the rights of all working-class parties opposed to their policies. At this very moment, they are taking the lead in inciting a lynch campaign against the Socialist Workers Party and other anti-Stalinist groups and calling for their suppression.

Regardless of the Stalinist reasons and motives for defending Browder, we continue to call for his release. We defend Browder as a victim of boss class persecution and fight for his freedom as part of the general battle to protect the workers' civil rights, without which they would find it extremely difficult to conduct an effective struggle in defense of their interests.

Browder has committed crimes. But they are crimes against the working-class. They are crimes which the workers alone, in their own time and in their own way, will judge, and for which they alone have the right to exact a penalty.

American capitalism did not jail Browder for his real crimes. It prosecuted him as a means of striking a blow at the civil rights of all labor. That is why the workers, while rejecting every political idea which Browder represents, must nevertheless defend him from their class enemies.

Controversy Over The Jewish Question

The Case Against Milton Mayer and His Critics, Ingersoll and Hook

By M. STEIN

When people are under a strain, sighing sometimes sounds to them like jeering and the faint sound of a distant fire cracker can create the alarm that would be caused by an exploding bomb. This is why one must be particularly careful with provocative noises in an atmosphere charged with great tension, such as the atmosphere surrounding the Jewish question.

The tension of close to sixteen million Jews the world over is far from imaginary. The wrecked lives, the shattered homes of half their number who had lived in the countries overrun by the fascists, is only too real. Real also is the relentless Nazi drive to throw the surviving Jews into medieval ghettos, to cut them off from contact with the outside world. There they live crowded together, deprived of proper sanitary facilities, starved, dying a slow death at a rapidly mounting rate.

Very real indeed is the spread of anti-Semitism in this country too. Is there anyone who is bold enough to say that "it cannot happen here"? The Jew feels that the last refuge of his people is threatened. He is losing hope!

Incidents like the sinking of the *Struma* in the Black Sea with the loss of 765 Jewish men, women and children, only serves to emphasize the hopeless plight of the Jews. The story of these Jews — fleeing the Nazi terror machine, denied refuge by the British administration in Palestine — epitomizes the treatment afforded to the Jews by the fascists on the one hand, and by the "humanitarian democracies" on the other.

The Case Against Mayer

Milton Mayer's article in the March 28 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* under the provocative title, "The Case Against the Jew," falls into the category of a sigh that sounds like a jeer, of a firecracker set off by a mischievous lad in a very tense atmosphere. "The Case Against the Jew" is no more than a case against Milton Mayer and his group of petty bourgeois Jewish intellectuals who see the world which they had taken for granted, the world of bourgeois democracy, collapsing before their very eyes and dragging down with it the democratic rights of the Jews and their chance for equality with other citizens. We shall presently return to Milton Mayer, his diagnosis and proposed remedy. But first a word about some of his critics.

The editor of *PM*, Ralph Ingersoll, belated Don Quixote of bourgeois democracy, donned his suit of armor; mounted his horse and, brandishing his lance, set out the morning after the Mayer article appeared, to tilt at it. At least that's what he thought he was doing. The trouble with Mr. Ingersoll must be that he suffers from faulty vision. He cannot distinguish between the front of bourgeois democracy and its rear.

He rises solemnly to the defense of

Nathan Hale and Abraham Lincoln; he sounds as profound as my little niece returning from a history lesson in Junior high school when he speaks about the constitution, equal opportunity, etc. But what of the heart of the question, the fact that the same system which was so progressive only yesterday breeds war and fascism in its death agony, and cannot any longer find a place for the Jew, cannot assimilate him, cannot tolerate him and tries to disgorge him?

Sidney Hook, the not unknown professor of philosophy, leads the assault on Mayer's article for the *New Leader*. But he fails to display the zeal one would expect of a new convert when he comes to the defense of bourgeois democracy — his most recent creed.

Hook confines his jabs to Mayer's manner of presenting the problem, which feeds the Coughlinite arguments, and to Mayer's conclusions, which propose a withdrawal of the Jew into a religious shell. But Hook has little to say about his own proposed solution to the Jewish problem. He begs the real issue, just as Ingersoll does.

Both Ingersoll and Hook are exercised over the idea, implicit throughout Mayer's article, that this "war for democracy" is not going to solve the Jewish question. It angers them, it infuriates them — but it does not draw from them any arguments to show that the Jewish problem will be solved if the "United Nations" win the war, or to demonstrate that the defeat of Hitler in Germany will eradicate anti-Semitism in the United States.

A Distorted Picture

Mayer's article presents a thoroughly distorted view of the American Jew. Not altogether because of commission, but also because of his omission of an extremely important and weighty element in the Jewish community. Mayer makes no mention whatever of the Jewish worker.

Even if we weren't informed by the *Saturday Evening Post* that he is a former Chicago reporter, or by the *New Leader*, that he is at present an assistant to the President of the University of Chicago, one could have surmised this or something similar. His writing is reportorial. His style is that of a yellow journalist interested in a sensational presentation of the problem rather than the truth. His subject matter is the immediate circle of his bourgeois friends, Jewish intellectuals and business men. The result is a caricature of the Jews.

We know of a different type of Jew. We know of Jewish workers who have built powerful unions, who have been in the vanguard of the struggle for higher wages and shorter hours. We know of the Jewish workers and intellectuals who have been among the most sacrificing soldiers of the movement for a better world built on the foundations of socialism. But Mayer's beat as a reporter did not include this territory

— it lay on the other side of the tracks.

Another omission which is likewise typical of a reporter who does not care to look below the surface, is the total lack of reference to the economic basis of anti-Semitism. This by the way, applies also to the other reporter and interviewer, Ralph Ingersoll, and even to the professor who used to call himself a Marxist. This is one thing they share in common. Even the most casual reference to the economic basis underlying anti-Semitism would expose the "decaying capitalist system as the cause of this evil, as well as the evil of fascism and wars.

An analysis of the economic roots of anti-Semitism, might furthermore suggest the solution. But that would not suit the Jewish bourgeois of Mayer's circle, nor the Gentle bourgeois of Ingersoll's circle, and it would not even suit Hook, who finds himself perfectly at home in the petty-bourgeois social democratic circle.

Product of Reactionary Period

Mayer, the superficial reporter, has strung together for the *Saturday Evening Post* a whole series of anecdotes about Jews, all of them obviously wealthy who have tried in every way possible to look like Gentiles. He says: "They tried to adjust, this pitiful people who once were so proud. They tried to look like, talk like, be like everyone else. They tried to lose themselves in the crowd, like men who have picked a pocket on a busy street. They resorted to every dodge known to fugitive criminals, from changing their names to changing their faces. And for all their trying, they were strangers in Egypt still."

And then he concludes: "Running away hasn't saved him. Resettlement hasn't saved him. Changing his name, his face, his clothes and his faith hasn't saved him. And the suddenly crowded temples won't save him. Denouncing Coughlin won't save him. The destruction of Hitler won't save him. All these fallacious faiths are based on the grand fallacy of adjustment. The Jew will be saved when he saves his own soul."

Here you have in two paragraphs his complete line of argument. All the rest are mere trimmings.

Every crisis in history, every period of defeats, has produced schools of God-seekers, those who sought escape in the supernatural; those who sought salvation in the purification of their own souls. These were particularly numerous in Russia after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution. Many radical intellectuals, having no real roots among the masses, saw in the defeat of the revolution a lasting triumph of Czarism. The revolutionists were persecuted mercilessly by the Czarist police, everything looked dark, hopeless. In this atmosphere the God-seekers and soul searchers got a hearing. Even mass suicide theorists had a following.

The arguments of Mayer have an im-

portance insofar as they emphasize the disorientation that flows from the present dark picture on a world scale, and show to what fantastic lengths this disorientation can go.

His attack against Jewish assimilation might just as well have been leveled against the steam engine and electricity or general human progress and development. His arguments are reactionary through and through. The Jew could no more continue a ghetto existence once the gates of the ghetto were flung open, than could the Negro be held on the plantation once slavery was abolished. The whole process of assimilation isn't something that somebody had wished, it was part and parcel of the general capitalist development. There is no return. The road lies before and not behind. A fascist triumph might for a while drive the Jews into a ghetto, but the Jew will never go there voluntarily, regardless of Mayer's counsel.

Mayer, were he to get a following, would do a great service to fascism. He is trying to get the Jew to voluntarily pin upon himself the yellow star of David which Hitler is trying to force upon him. He is trying to get him to submit when he should stand up and fight.

The Russian Revolution

There is no single reference in the article of Mayer or his critic Hook to the Russian revolution. And yet that great movement of liberation is very germane to the discussion. How can anyone consider the Jewish problem and the problem of national minorities in general in this day and age without a mention of the country where this problem was once most acute — the country of pogroms and the "Black Hundreds," the forerunners of the fascists whose slogan was "Kill the Jews and save Russia." Doesn't the Russian Revolution suggest an answer to the Jewish problem?

Mayer thinks that "The Jew will be saved when he saves his own soul." But what will save the worker? Every worker, black, white, Jew, Catholic, Protestant — what will save their standard of living, their democratic rights, their trades unions, their parties? The fascists are pushing the Jew away from the Gentile for their own purposes. Mr. Mayer is pulling the Jew away from the Gentile, may we ask for what purpose? There seems to be a division of labor there.

As for us, the Russian Revolution is a good enough model for the solution of the problem of national minorities. In fact, it is so good, that all the years of Stalinist distortions and abominations haven't undone the basic job accomplished by the October Revolution. And if Mayer ever has the reporter's assignment of covering our political party rather than some exclusive Palm Beach club, he will find that the relations between Jew and Gentile, black and white bear even today the characteristics of the free society of tomorrow.

Auto Workers On Guard Over War Pay-Cut Issue

(Continued from page 1)

our members are fighting abroad. We must protect their rights at home. On the West Coast we have declared our willingness to work for just living expenses if the management give up profits. But they won't give up any of their profits."

"These men are deliberately misleading us — Congress won't treat us any better, no matter what we give up."

THE PROGRAM ADOPTED
The "equality of sacrifice" program reflected many of the demands of the rank and file workers. It called for: an end to all war profiteering, and a 3 per cent profit ceiling; no war millionaires; stop rising costs; democratic control of rationing of available consumers goods; the adjustment of wages to meet the increased living costs and to insure a decent standard of living; security for dependents of those in the armed services; a moratorium on debts for those unemployed through conversion of industry and of all debts of those in the armed forces; greater labor participation in the war production agencies; planning for post-war adjustments.

The convention will continue and conclude today.

Next week's MILITANT will contain an eye-witness report and an analysis of the proceedings of both days of the convention.

Don't Miss The
**SPECIAL 8-PAGE
MAY DAY EDITION
of THE MILITANT**

The New York School Of Social Science

announces
a new series of lectures

WEDNESDAYS 7:45 P. M.	FRIDAYS 7:45 P. M.
<i>The History of American Trotskyism</i>	<i>The Progress of American Culture</i>
JAMES P. CANNON	WM. F. WARDE
8:55 P. M.	8:55 P. M.
<i>Modern American Capitalism</i>	<i>The Wave of Revolution, 1917-1923</i>
C. CHARLES	FELIX MORROW

25c for single lectures All classes held at

LABOR TEMPLE

242 East 14th Street, New York

A CASE FOR THE FBI?

By JOHN CORBETT
As part of its "evidence" against the 28 defendants in the Minneapolis "sedition" case, the FBI offered the book *New Ways of War* by Tom Wintringham. This book was not written by a Trotskyist. Far from it. But the press of the Socialist Workers Party had committed the "crime" of reviewing this book for the benefit of trade unionists interested in establishing military training at government expense but under trade union control, and so the book itself was submitted as "evidence."

Now appears, however, that those who advocate the views of Trotskyism are not the only ones who have found this book of interest. The March 1942 issue of *Infantry Journal*, a monthly military magazine, in advertising a new book on guerrilla warfare, announces as an added attraction that it carries a "foreword by Tom Wintringham, author of *New Ways of War*." On page 70 an editorial speaks of "such excellent volumes as *New Ways of War* by Tom Wintringham..." And upon still another page the magazine even carries an advertisement for this "subversive" book itself. For 25 cents you can obtain *New Ways of War* by ordering "from your Post Exchange or direct from the Infantry Journal, Inc." at 115 Seventeenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C. (You can also get it through Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Pl., New York—J.C.)

Since *Infantry Journal* is quite definitely out to influence the thinking of the armed forces whether for good or bad, this case would seem to call for investigation by the FBI.

make an open and shut case as he attempted in Minneapolis, we suggest that Mr. Biddle either immediately drop a money order for 25 cents in the mail box asking this subversive outfit for a copy of this particular piece of subversive literature, or if he prefers the melodramatic touch used in the notorious Minneapolis case, let Mr. Biddle roll up a truck to the Washington office of *Infantry Journal*, raid their book shelves, and arrest en masse the whole group of high ranking army officers who are peddling this subversive literature to the American armed forces.

We rather think, however, that Mr. Biddle, true liberal and democrat that he is, will prefer to call up these generals on the phone and tell them for God's sake to quit advertising this particular book until he gets those Trotskyist defendants safely behind bars.

Harlem Meeting To Discuss War And Negro People

The timely subject of The Negro and the Second World War will be dealt with by colored and white speakers at the next meeting of the Harlem Workers Club, 72 West 125th Street, on Friday, April 10, 8:45 P. M.

Bill Bran, a noted New Jersey Negro leader, and Lydia Beldel, of the staff of THE MILITANT, will present the subject, which will be discussed from the floor following their speeches. A social and refreshments will follow the meeting. Admission will be free and everyone interested in this vital subject is invited to attend.