

# Significance Of Trend To Government By Decree

- See Page 3 -

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI.—No. 38

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

## Stalingrad and The Churchill -- Stalin Talks

By GEORGE COLLINS

A million German troops are hurled at Stalingrad, but the city holds out. Dive bombers, tanks and artillery throw thousands of tons of explosives at the defenses, but the invaders gain only by inches. For every mile of territory gained, the Germans pay with thousands of their best troops. With deathless heroism the defenders of Stalingrad — Red soldiers and armed workers — are writing the story of one of the greatest battles into the annals of history.

But the fate of the Volga city is not decided only by the workers defending it to the last ditch with bayonets and hand grenades. Stalingrad was undoubtedly under discussion when Churchill and Stalin met in Moscow. The details of the Kremlin talks are still suppressed, but in the information released we can once again perceive the forces that are primarily responsible for the Soviet defeats.

Churchill told the House of Commons that he had explained to Stalin the difficulties of British military assistance to the Soviet Union. Stalin's publicity experts countered by omitting from the Soviet press sections of Churchill's explanation and releasing an inspired story to the world that the Allied General Staff was deciding their general strategy without consulting the Soviet military leaders and was not giving decisive consideration to the fate of the Soviet military front.

Little imagination is needed to put oneself in the place of a Red Army soldier resting for a few minutes from the inferno of the Stalingrad battle to read the Soviet press reports of Stalin's conference with Churchill. What do they say to him? "I have met with Mr. Churchill, the man whom I urge you to rely upon for military assistance and for military operations that would constitute a diversion against the Germans. Mr. Churchill explained that he had more important business to attend to. You are alone."

What is this other business that so greatly preoccupies the Churchills to the detriment of the Soviet Union? It is the business of waging a world imperialist war, the business of preserving the Empire against the millions of people it oppresses. In effect, Churchill's talks with Stalin made it clear that the basic interests of imperialism were not compatible with the preservation of the Soviet Union, but that so long as the Soviet resistance served Anglo-American military aims, the Soviet Union would be tolerated as a second-class ally. Stalin then told the Soviet workers and soldiers that his allies were not very trustworthy, but they were his only allies.

What a despicable lie and betrayal! No wonder Stalin suppressed Churchill's disgusting tribute to him. "A man of massive and strong personality. . . inexhaustible courage. . . blunt in speech. . . a saving sense of humor. . . a great leader," etc., etc., ad nauseum. Yes indeed, Stalin has been a "massive" support for Churchill and Roosevelt against the revolutionary workers of the Soviet Union and the world.

It may be too late to save Stalingrad from the fate that overtook Odessa, Sevastopol and Rostov. But if the Soviet workers recognize this betrayal by Stalin and reverse the course of the Soviet Union — relying not upon Churchill but upon the workers of England against Churchill and upon the Indian masses against the Empire; not upon an annihilation of Germany but upon the German workers against Hitler — if they take the affairs of the Soviet Union into their own hands, then not only can the Soviet Union be saved but the whole trend of history turned in a revolutionary direction.

Not Churchill, but the Indian masses!

Not a second Versailles, but a German Soviet Republic!

Not Stalin, but revolutionary internationalism!

For such a policy, the defenders of Stalingrad and of the whole Soviet Union will not fight in vain.

# F.D.R. DECREES HIT AT LABOR

## India's Struggle Grows Despite British Terror

### Churchill Intends to Try Crushing India Into Submission

By Felix Morrow

The three outstanding facts in the India situation this week are:

1. India's struggle for independence is rising to ever greater heights, it is clear from several sources despite the totalitarian British censorship.

2. The Roosevelt administration no longer is confident that British repression can crush the mass movement for independence, is now exerting pressure on London for reopening of negotiations with the Congress leaders, but is meeting refusal.

3. Private rebuffs to proposals from Washington were followed by Churchill's statements to the House of Commons, which was designed primarily for American consumption, to discourage as far as possible any further proposals by Washington.

### "TURNING INTO A REVOLUTION"

After several weeks of diplomatic silence or perfunctory comment, the influential newsweekly, Time, came out in its September 14 issue with the flat assertion that India's "third great mass movement in 20 years was turning into a revolution despite five weeks of ruthless police prosecution."

Time also stated that "the plan to crush Gandhi's threatened civil-disobedience campaign by suppressing the National Congress party was a monumental failure." General Wavell's broadcast, calling India's fighters for independence "undisciplined schoolboys and ignorant hoodlums," was characterized by Time as "the slipshod arrogance of the military mind."

The news commentator, Samuel Grafton, obviously on the basis of direct information from India which has not been published, writes:

"Popular Fallacies: 1. That all is now quiet in India, the independence movement having come to a halt, perhaps in answer to editorials in American newspapers. . . Not true. The story of the last five weeks in India is the story of a civil disobedience campaign becoming a violent revolutionary swing. The London News Chronicle has let the cat out of the bag that 'bills for the damage done in recent riots in India will total millions of pounds.' There are major strikes. The Moslems, who never cared for the Hindus, have begun to like them much more since the British have been pushing their leaders around. Popular movements are peculiar that way. An India which could have found its unity by fighting under its own government against the Axis, may be finding its unity by fighting under its own leaders against Britain."

(New York Post, Sept. 11.)

### CHURCHILL'S STATEMENT DENIED IN INDIA

Virtually all political tendencies in India this week gave the lie to Churchill and Amery's statements that the situation is quieting down.

The Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement on September 12, stated:

"The internal situation of India today is far more serious than what it is depicted to be. The reign of repression has accentuated bitterness and deepened anti-British feelings to an extent unknown in the history of the administration of British India. Let Churchill, along with some

### Rules Out Indian Freedom



WINSTON CHURCHILL

representatives of America, Russia and China, visit India and see things for himself."

Even the so-called "liberals" of India, collaborators of Britain, had to repudiate Churchill's "facts." One of them, an anti-Congress Moslem, Sir Sikahder Hyatkhan, on Sept. 10 told newspapers: "The vast majority of Hindus sympathize with the Congress."

Allah Bakhsh, Moslem Premier of Sind Province, in a press conference Sept. 12, declared that the average Moslem outside Jinnah's Moslem League "sympathizes with the aims of the Congress." He repudiated Churchill's claim that the Moslems "are any less desirous of seeing the British go or any less patriotic than the Hindus."

Typical of much of the non-Congress Indian press statements

### Washington Irked by Rejection of Plea to Reopen Negotiations

was that of the Bombay Chronicle which said: "Churchill's statement is an amazing misrepresentation. India, of course, will not be deceived by the statement and her destinies are being shaped here and not by the British Premier's utterances."

These statements from the Indian bourgeoisie confirm Time magazine's estimate of the growing revolutionary development of the struggle in India. Only these few bourgeois statements have come through from India. What the workers and peasants are saying and doing is blacked out by the British censorship.

But it is extremely significant that the British have made no claim that the great wave of political strikes in the factories has ended. India's greatest enterprise, the Tata Steel and Iron Works, whose 50,000 workmen went on strike August 21, appears to be still shut down.

The Roosevelt administration of course has infinitely superior sources of information about the struggle than the press, and Washington's changing attitude is therefore extremely significant.

When the struggle broke out, Washington adopted the policy of full support to the British. This was evidenced by the completely pro-British attitude of the American press and radio, which for the first four weeks echoed every British slander against India's struggling masses.

The British authorities set great hopes by this: they believed American hostility to the struggle would dishearten the Indian Congress leaders, who had long hoped for American support for their demands.

(Continued on page 4)

## Rubber Production Held Up By Boss Greed For Profits

By HOWARD ALLEN

Something new has been added to the long list of scandals involving industrial monopolies. The scandal in rubber now joins the ranks of scandals involving black markets in steel; patents-pools between U. S., English and German aluminum, chemical, plastic and allied industries; fantastic profiteering, etc.

The rubber revelations are particularly significant since without rubber the war machine will be stopped, and civilian life disrupted.

And what is the essence of the scandal? The essence is this, that rubber could have been produced in quantity but was not produced because it would have interfered with the profits and industrial control of the petroleum monopoly. This sabotage of rubber production, it has been revealed, was perpetrated by the monopolies through the administration's Rubber Reserve Corporation with Jesse Jones in charge.

Last week's report of the Baruch committee revealed that the administration was offered the services of Soviet engineers experienced in the successful production of synthetic rubber. This offer was rejected because the method involves the use of agricultural products instead of petroleum.

The petroleum industry saw a threat to its profits in the large scale production of synthetic rubber from wheat, corn, blackstrap molasses or other agricultural crops or by-products. Through their control of the various dollar-a-year boards established by the administration they prevented this production.

The petroleum industry is no

minor section of American capitalism. It is controlled by the Morgan-First National, the Rockefeller, the Dupont and the Mellon interest groupings. According to the June 1939 report of the National Resources Committee, this financial oligarchy together controlled assets of more than 42 billion dollars.

These powerful sections of the capitalist class want to win the war—there is no question about that. But their greed for profits is so excessive that they can't help interfering with the prosecution of their war.

### Arnold's Aid Indicts WPB

The September 16 World Telegram carries the following interesting story. It amply confirms charges that the monopolies take advantage of the war situation to increase their control over all industry.

"WASHINGTON, Sept. 16.—The influence of big industrial interests in WPB, irked at his aggressive championship of little business in distribution of war contracts, was blamed today by Guy Holcomb for his resignation Saturday as chief of the Small Business Section of the Justice Department's anti-trust division.

"He charged that he had been blocked in certain quarters of WPB in trying to open up opportunities for small business, most notably in the case of cold-cathode fluorescent lighting concerns which compete with General Electric, Westinghouse and the Sylvania Corp., which he called the 'Big Three.'"

## Anti-Labor Drive Is Facilitated by Labor Heads, CP

Roosevelt's assumption of decree powers, setting himself up as the "Czar" over wages, working conditions and rights of the workers, has been facilitated by the treacherous role of the top officials of the AFL and CIO.

The whole top officer clique of the AFL and CIO have not only supported Roosevelt's so-called anti-inflation program, which is aimed primarily against the workers' living standards, but have been clamoring for this program to be enacted.

This support gave Roosevelt his pretext for his decree rule, which he claimed was necessary in order to "protect" labor.

His first moves to "protect" labor were his decrees abolishing premium pay and regimenting 2,300,000 federal workers. The labor leaders themselves were responsible for these vicious attacks against the unions they were elected to defend.

According to the CIO News, a meeting of the CIO Executive Board the first week in September called for the "immediate enforcement of all sections of the seven-point program and reiterated flat opposition to any form of wage freezing or the setting up of a Wage Czar."

### NO PROTESTS FROM UNION LEADERS

But when Roosevelt this week set himself up as a "Czar" over wage standards by his decree abolishing premium pay, not one word of protest was heard from Philip Murray or any member of the CIO Executive Board.

William Green had also stated repeatedly that the AFL was opposed to a wage "Czar." But like his counterparts in the CIO, he did not oppose Roosevelt's decree.

The union leaders were given warning of Roosevelt's intention to assume decree powers by his Labor Day speech. But this speech, including its brazen threat to usurp absolute power for the President, was greeted with acclaim by the top union officials. Immediately after the speech, William Green stated:

"The AFL supports the President's program to stabilize the cost of living. . . We feel confident that the President's program seeks to protect farmers and industrial workers."

On Labor Day, Murray said: "I am going to support you (Roosevelt) and the CIO is going to stand by your side, come what may."

What came were Roosevelt's attacks by decree against basic democratic rights and living standards of the workers.

### DISGUSTING SPECTACLE

The role of the top leaders of the UAW-CIO on the issue of premium pay provided one of the most disgusting spectacles of labor misleadership since the rise of the CIO.

Having forced the surrender of overtime pay by the UAW, these officials then demanded that Roosevelt enforce a similar wage cut against all the American workers by imposing the abolition of premium pay universally.

Roosevelt willingly complied. Thus, these leaders, Thomas, Frankenstein, Reuther, and Addes openly played the part of governmental tools and policemen against the workers. Philip Murray, by his silence, gave tacit support to this shameful policy.

### STALINISTS LOUDEST LACKEYS

The subservience and servility of the top union officials is outstripped only by the Stalinists.

Roosevelt's Labor Day speech threatening to assume a dictator's powers was greeted in the Daily Worker with acclaim. The September 13 issue stated: "Roosevelt's action is a continuation of his fight for a People's Congress."

Joseph Curran, leading Stalinist trade union hack, in a statement issued in the name of the Greater New York CIO Council, said: "If Congress does not act within the time limit, then it is

(Continued on page 2)

## End Premium Pay; Federal Workers Put Under 'Czar'

By Joseph Andrews

President Roosevelt this week followed up his Labor Day threat to assume dictatorial powers by issuing two executive decrees directed against the living standards and the democratic rights of the workers.

That Roosevelt's arrogant ultimatum to Congress was preparatory to a series of dictatorial blows against the labor movement was shown by the anti-labor character of the three steps taken by his Administration in the last week.

1. On September 9 Roosevelt decreed the abolition of all premium pay for week-ends and holidays, thereby abrogating all existing union contracts providing for such overtime pay.

2. On September 14 a Presidential decree empowered Paul V. (Hoosier Hitler) McNutt, chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to transfer from job to job, to force into factories or other work, the 2,300,000 federal employees, without their consent. This decree is the first step toward the establishment of industrial peonage in the United States.

3. On the same day Roosevelt, through his Selective Service officials ordered that workers in the lumber and non-ferrous metals industries in 12 western states who leave their jobs without permits, will be reclassified and drafted into the army.

This followed the September 7 decree by McNutt freezing the workers in these industries to their jobs, and is designed to strengthen and enforce McNutt's order.

Workers will now be forced to obtain certificates of separation, or permits, before leaving their jobs in these industries. This is the beginning of the internal passport system, which prevails in the Fascist countries.

The application of this drastic measure against government workers is only the first step in the regimentation of all workers. When questioned by reporters, McNutt said that he would like to see the government take as complete control of employment in private industry as it

(Continued on page 2)

means slave labor.

The implication of the overtime decree goes beyond the fact that it is a blow against living standards.

The decree invalidates clauses in existing union contracts, which provide double time and time and a half pay for week end and holiday work, and at the same time places arbitrary limits upon

### How to Fight Rising Living Costs

Prices are shooting upward. In the month ending August 15 food prices jumped 1.2 per cent.

While this increase was being registered, Congress was working, in response to Roosevelt's Labor Day speech on two bills to control wages and prices.

The method of price control which the Congressional bills propose is in reality an attack on the living standards of the wage workers and the farmers. If the President were to inaugurate his decree laws, the aims and results would be exactly the same as those of the two Congressional bills.

Prices can be controlled, however, to the benefit of the workers and the dirt farmers by a program of struggle. This program consists of three points:

### HOW TO FIGHT HIGH PRICES

1. The rising scale of wages. Every increase in the cost of living must be met by an equal increase in the workers' wages.

2. The organization of committees composed of unions, dirt farmer organizations, housewives and small storekeepers to regulate and control prices democratically. These committees would have as their only aim the improvement of the living standards of the masses and would have absolutely no interest in maintaining or continuing the profits of the capitalist class, the banks, the landlords, the railroads and the middlemen.

3. Workers' control of production and expropriation of the war industries, which now embrace all large-scale industry including food. Capitalist ownership of industry results in placing profits first and the welfare of the masses last, in cutting wages wherever possible, in boosting prices, in hidden profits, in waste and graft. Workers' control of production and expropriation of the war industries constitute a real step toward planned production and distribution that will lower the costs of production and distribution and raise the living standards of the masses.

(Continued on page 2)

## Congress Prepares To Give Roosevelt Power He Demands

SEPT. 16. — Congress was busy this week working on legislation to give President Roosevelt the price-fixing authority he demanded in his Labor Day message. At first there were a few grumbles, and the best possible face-saving devices are still being sought, but it was clear at the beginning of this week that the majority of Congress was knocking down.

The bill proposed in the Senate gives Roosevelt the power "to stabilize prices, wages, salaries and other factors affecting the cost of living" on the basis of the August 15, 1942 levels; to fix farm prices at parity; to suspend the operation of laws which are "inconsistent" with his "stabilization" program; and to prevent employers from paying, and workers from receiving, wages "in contravention of the regulations" to be promulgated by Roosevelt.

The House bill authorizes Roosevelt to fix maximum wages by decree, and to set farm prices at parity; it provides also for establishing a new and somewhat higher parity.

It is too early to say which of these two bills, or what combination of their features, will be finally adopted. But in either case it already seems certain that Roosevelt will get what he is after by October 1.

The reactions of Congress were similar to those of the capitalist class as a whole, as reflected in the overwhelming majority of the capitalist press. Their approval of Roosevelt's main economic objectives was complete and undisguised. They were also aware of the significance of his threat to rule by decree. As the N. Y. Times said, "If he can carry out this threat on this occasion. . . what constitutional barrier would prevent his using the same plea for whatever other powers he wished to exercise, for whatever other laws of Congress he wished to suspend?"

The Times and the capitalist class know the answer to that question. But they are not very worried by the assumption of decree power, nor by the precedent it would set, because they know that Roosevelt can be depended on to act in their interests.

The capitalist class, press and politicians are not fully united on this question — they seldom are on any question. The reactionary and isolationist press, politicians like Senator Taft, have declared their opposition to Roosevelt's ultimatum. But their opposition has nothing in common with labor's interests. They don't care if wages are frozen — as a matter of fact, they wanted that done long ago. They are not opposed to decree-rule as such, they are merely opposed to Roosevelt doing the decreeing.

Labor's interests have found no defenders in either capitalist party, neither among the New Deal supporters nor the "isolationists." Labor needs its own party, its own independent program, if it is to successfully resist attacks on its rights and standards.

### CRDC to Give Affair for 18 Mpls. Defendants

The New York Branch of the Civil Rights Defense Committee will sponsor a social this Saturday evening, Sept. 19 at 116 University Place.

A very interesting program of entertainment has been arranged.

The CRDC is in charge of the defense of the eighteen Socialist Workers Party members and CIO trade unionists convicted last fall in the Minneapolis "Sedition" trial.

This is an ideal opportunity for our friends and sympathizers to lend further support to the CRDC's fight and at the same time spend an enjoyable evening.

### Stalin's Purges Directly Linked To Defeats

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The best informed circles of the American capitalist class have no illusions about the kind of leadership Stalin's regime has given to the Red Army. This is revealed by an informative article entitled "Policy and Strategy in the War in Russia" in the current issue of the quarterly *Foreign Affairs*.

From the content of this article it is clear that the author, who prefers to remain anonymous, is well versed not only in military matters but also with the background of the Red Army.

It is an irrefutable historical fact that the policies and strategy of the Red Army were originally shaped not by Stalin or the figurehead Voroshilov, but by Tukhachevsky and Gamarnik and the General Staff under them. Stalin murdered these men in the monstrous purges which preceded the signing of the pact with Hitler. This beheaded the Red Army. These men had modernized and mechanized the armed forces of the Soviet Union. They constructed the fortifications and prepared the plans of defense.

The writer of the article in *Foreign Affairs* proceeds from this fact and states:

"It is only now possible, in the spring of 1942, to appreciate fully the constructive imagination and the strategic genius of Tukhachevsky and his fellow officers of the General Staff, diluted or perverted as their plans have been in execution by lack of equal imagination on the part of troopers like Marshal Budenny and other amateur commanders." (*Foreign Affairs*, July, 1942.)

The handicapped nonentities appointed by Stalin in place of Tukhachevsky and other murdered generals did not devise any plans of their own. They merely botched up and misapplied the original strategy of Tukhachevsky and his colleagues.

The article in *Foreign Affairs* asserts that Stalin's high command committed one enormous blunder after another. The defending armies were never properly placed or distributed. Among the disastrous mistakes committed was the concentration of "too great masses of troops in the western frontier far beyond the Stalin line." In addition to this, key sectors which had been originally designated as central points in Tukhachevsky's strategy of defense were either inadequately defended or surrendered in favor of making a stand in positions unsuitable for this purpose.

From his analysis of military operations throughout the first year of the war the writer of the foregoing article concludes that:

"The Russian armies employed to halt the invader after he had broken through the Stalin line did not operate according to any strategic plan. They never had the initiative and were defeated in separate units."

Stalin's "experts" in this country have thus far not challenged this military analysis in one of the most serious American bourgeois publications. They have simply ignored it.

## Basic Union Problems Remain Unanswered At UE Convention

### Stalinists In Control, Interested Only In Speedup and Curb On Militancy; Careyites Have Fundamentally Same False Policy

CLEVELAND, Ohio, Sept. 14. — The eighth national convention of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, held in this city last week, presented a revealing picture of how the Stalinists betray the interests of the workers in the trade unions. The UE is the largest American union under Stalinist domination, as well as one of the more important organizations in the CIO; it claims a membership of more than 400,000.

For the Stalinist machine in the leadership of the union, the convention was only a gathering for the purpose of further transforming the UE from an organization to protect and advance the conditions and rights of the workers, into an instrument of the war machine.

There was little talk by the Stalinists of resisting the attacks of the bosses against the workers' living standards; the chief theme they harped on was how the union could speed up the workers, curb militant labor activity and thus aid the war machine. The Stalinist functionaries did not speak much about gains for the workers — what they extolled over was "accomplishments" such as the large number of joint management-labor speed-up councils that they had managed to create.

The convention itself was rushed through on the ground that the officers did not want "to keep production workers too long from their jobs;" the officers were elected on the second day of the convention.

The usual Stalinist resolutions were adopted — ranging from the second front question to demands for greater union representation in the government boards dominated by the monopoly dollar-a-year men to requests for political activity to help support the "win-the-war candidates" of the capitalist parties.

"sacrifice" policy. According to the Stalinist officer, James Matles, this would "hit the UE members more seriously than those of any other union."

But instead of proposing that the convention take a stand on the decree, the Stalinist leaders said they would await the full text of the decree. Anyhow, they added, they doubted that the employers would benefit financially by this decree, as possibly the government would take steps to reclaim it. This was evidently supposed to satisfy the UE members who had received a wage cut.

Matles recalled that the UE officers had offered last April to give up premium pay if the money "saved" was given to the Treasury Department, but that the employers had refused to consent to this "patriotic" offer.

From the beginning of the convention to the end, the Stalinists followed this policy of shying away from all discussion of measures to protect the interests of the members. They were concerned only with putting across their war line and showing Roosevelt how effectively they could keep the workers in line.

**THE CAREY GROUP**

While the Stalinists, through the activities of their large machine in the UE organizing staff, had a majority of delegates supporting them, they by no means had all the delegates' support. There was only one decisive test vote in the convention, and it was apparent from this that almost one-third of the convention was unwilling to go along with the Stalinist leadership.

But unfortunately there was no strong organized progressive group to give leadership to this opposition, and the leadership was seized by James Carey, former president of the UE and now secretary of the CIO. Carey's differences with the Stalinists are not at all fundamental — he

agrees with all their basic policies. His chief difference with them is over who should lead the union — his proposal is that he and his small group do it instead of the Stalinists.

Consequently, the disputes he had with them at the convention were not over questions of union principle — but over minor issues, which ignored the needs of the members or confused and disoriented the delegates and thus made it easy for the Stalinists to get a majority.

The test vote came over the second front resolutions. Carey is as ardent a supporter of the war as the Stalinists; he argued the question from the point of view of the "advisability" and "timeliness" of calling for a second front at this time — after all, he said, it's a question for the military authorities, and it should be decided by them, etc.

Seeking to distinguish himself from the Stalinists, Carey also supported a red-baiting resolution to prohibit Communists from holding office in the union, and another motion giving the local unions the authority to decide this question for themselves. His defense of "autonomy" sounded like a poll-tax Congressman's defense of state's rights.

A significant statement he made — considering the fact that he is one of the two members of the recently established CIO committee to fight racial discrimination — was that while he himself opposed Negro discrimination, he was opposed to disciplining a local that insisted on practicing it; the clear implication was that a local had the right to practice Jim Crowism if it wished.

**NEED MILITANT PROGRAM AND NEW LEADERSHIP**

One consequence of all this was the demoralization of many delegates who were looking for a militant program to defend their rights in the plants and against government attacks. They felt they had nothing to choose from as between the reactionary Stalinists on the one hand and the reactionary Careyites on the other.

And they were right. The convention showed that the crimes of the Stalinists will not be corrected by a clique group that has the same fundamental program as the Stalinists. What is required in the UE today is a third group — a group which will reject the Stalinist-Careyite policy of retreats in the face of a growing offensive by the bosses, and will seek to build the union by fighting to improve conditions and to take the leadership of the UE out of the hands of the Stalinists, who are concerned only with protecting the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union.

### DuPont Conspiracy Restricted Output Of War Material

How three of the largest chemical concerns in the world combined to extort super-profits through a monopoly in the production and sale of a vital war material was revealed by the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice in an indictment presented against the American participants in the conspiracy on September 10.

The indictment stated that the plastic products subject to the agreement are "among the most important plastic materials, have a wide industrial application and are used for such things as transparent bomber noses, cockpit enclosures and gun turrets of all military planes manufactured in the United States."

The pact was arranged between chemical concerns in the United States, Germany and Great Britain. The U. S. firms were DuPont and Rohm and Haas of Philadelphia; the German firms were the giant chemical trust, I. G. Farbenindustrie, and Rohm and Haas of Darmstadt; the British Empire was represented by Imperial Chemical Industries, a concern employing 70,000 people.

The tri-power pact was entered into in October 1934. All the participants agreed to refrain from sending acrylic products (from which the transparent plastic is manufactured) into the United States while the American firms agreed not to export. Similar monopoly markets were recognized for each of the concerns taking part in the agreement.

**"EXORBITANT" PRICES**

The concerns agreed to fix "exorbitant," "uniform and arbitrary" prices in all the world markets. Patent rights were exchanged.

Following the outbreak of the war in 1939, the British firm asked DuPont to supply the plastic products to certain markets in the British Empire, while the German concerns, asked Rohm and Haas (U.S.) to supply their South American customers.

In spite of the war, the agreements between the U. S. and British concerns to exchange patents, divide markets and fix prices, are still in effect.

Upon the request of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Department of Justice has agreed that the case should not go to trial until after the war.

Thus for these monopolies the war is and will continue to be an unhampered opportunity to reap a rich harvest in profits.

War need, or no war need, the monopolies live up to their principle of "Profits first and always."

## Govt. 'Cracks Down' On Farmer-Not On Bosses

By LARISSA REED

DETROIT, Mich. — Who can doubt the ability of the Roosevelt administration to crack down upon hoarders and speculators, after its grand exploit near Detroit last week when its agents swooped down upon Farmer Benjamin and captured his junkpile? "A mighty republic cracks down on one recalcitrant and seizes his junk to help save 130 million people," blared the *Detroit Free Press*. "This was history in the making — the Government of a hard-pressed people moving majestically against a citizen who would not do his share to beat the common foe."

Five passenger cars with government requisition orders and members of the press armed with plenty of cameras were followed by trucks and crews eager to salvage the scrap. They rolled into the farmyard and got busy. The net haul is an abundance of colorful pictures of the farmer and his junkpile for the front pages of the local papers — plus 50 tons of junk.

While government sleuths have succeeded in locating and capturing these 50 tons of junk, according to U. S. News, the War Production Board is "unable to trace" 12,000,000 tons of steel a year (more than England's total annual production). It is true that Mr. Higgins of the Higgins shipbuilding corporation of New Orleans has spilled the beans about warehouses all over the country "bulging" with hoarded steel, which he said are very easily obtainable at premium or bootleg market prices.

It is also true that the big corporations are hoarding tremendous quantities of steel, and steel producers and dealers are getting premium prices — or else! What does it matter to them if shipyards and plants have to close down for want of steel? Everyone knows that profits come first with the bosses.

The little farmer near Detroit thought that he had the same privileges as the big boys and could hold out for a higher price. But he did not reckon with the penetrating eye of the United States government, which moved in majestically and forced him to surrender his scrap for the requisition price of \$12 a ton.

Can we now expect the government to move, majestically or otherwise, in the direction of the millions of tons of steel bulging out of the warehouses all over the country? Let us take a peek into the "inside story of how Donald Nelson and WPB moguls

blocked the Justice Department from cleaning up the Black Steel bootleg market," revealed by Drew Pearson in his Sept. 6 column.

Last spring Thurman Arnold's Anti-Trust Division of the Justice Department was getting set to investigate the hoardings of "certain big companies which had dominated the steel market for years." The Justice Department was convinced that if all this steel could be got out of hiding and distributed to war industries, the nation would have plenty of steel.

Thurman Arnold planned to make a surprise check-up one morning of all the steel on hand in every important steel company in the country. The plan was prepared in secret so that no word would leak out to the steel companies. But when Donald Nelson heard about the plan, he "objected vigorously," declaring that such an inventory would have a "disquieting effect upon industries operating under the war effort." So the surprise inventory was called off.

While President Roosevelt at a recent press conference declared that persons who sold steel in bootleg markets should go to jail, "a back-stage debate has been going on between the Justice Department and Leon Henderson's OPA, as to whether criminal charges should be lodged against big steel hoarders and law violators."

Justice Department officials have concluded their duties by handing out a "confidential" report. They say: "The real evil which created the entire misapplication of steel was the method used by WPB and other governmental agencies. Any proceedings consequently would involve important government officials. . . Investigation would unquestionably involve negligence and maladministration on the part of high officials of WPB."

Under these circumstances, it is easy to see that there will be no serious investigations, which would implicate not only monopolist steel hoarders, but their servants in the government as well.

The big steel capitalists still hoard their steel and sell it only at speculative prices. But, unlike Farmer Benjamin, the junk hoarder of Michigan, they do not get their pictures in the front pages of newspapers. They conduct their operations in private, while all the publicity and penalties are reserved for such colossal criminals as the Michigan farmer hoarding his junkpile.

Moral: If you're going to hoard steel, don't hoard a little; hoard a lot.

## What Happened In France Under Decree Rule

By MIRIAM CARTER

President Roosevelt's Labor Day threat to institute government by decree recalls to mind what happened to labor's rights and conditions when the head of another democracy, Edouard Daladier, Premier of France from 1938 to 1940, was permitted to rule by decree.

Daladier came into office in 1938 as Premier of a Popular Front government, fully supported by the Stalinists and the Socialist Party. In 1938 the French economic system was in a dangerous state of collapse. The capitalists were sending their capital out of France to safer havens; the government was piling up an enormous debt in a feverish armament program; a tremendous inflation was imminent, as it is today in the U. S.

Thoroughly frightened, the agents of the French capitalist class in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate shoved aside their "socialist" lackey, Premier Leon Blum, whose usefulness as their servant among the workers was at an end, and made Daladier premier with full decree powers. This action was fully supported by the Stalinists, "socialists," and trade union leaders; their support continued until the signing by Daladier, in conjunction with Chamberlain, of the Munich pact.

Once in power Daladier proceeded to prove that he would do his utmost to make France safe for the bosses. The only way this could be done was at the expense of the workers.

An 8 per cent tax increase was established. Public works were curtailed.

The 40-hour week, which had been proclaimed by the now defunct Popular Front as one of its greatest victories, was abandoned for a 60-hour week, and later for a 72-hour week in war plants. Strikes called to protest this decree were ruthlessly crushed by Daladier.

With the advent of war in 1939, still more oppressive laws were imposed on the workers. Just as Roosevelt delegates powers to various agencies to control wages, prices, workers' jobs, etc., so Daladier delegated powers to various ministers to control these things.

As a result, wages, prices and all collective agreements between workers and bosses were frozen by decree as of Sept. 1, 1939. While wages remained at that level, prices kept rising; by June 1940 they had already risen 12 to 13 per cent.

Various heavy taxes were decreed which further reduced the workers' living standards.

Just as today the War Manpower Commission is beginning the freezing of workers to their jobs, so in France this was accomplished by decree.

While Daladier's decrees undermined the workers' living standards, the bosses were treated far differently. They rapidly recalled their money to invest in France. There was a general boom in industry, and in profits.

Daladier gave way to Reynaud, and the French capitalists, who feared a workers' revolution far more than they feared fascism, came to terms with Hitler. Petain took the reins.

Petaïn had a lot for which to thank Daladier. Daladier's decrees had served to tie the hands of the workers' organizations and to crush their resistance to attacks on their interests by the bosses. The decrees which he had passed in the name of a "war against fascism" facilitated the establishment of the Petain regime collaborating with German fascism.

The workers in this country who want to avert capitalist dictatorship should heed well the lessons of France, especially the lesson of the Stalinists and trade union leaders who fall all over themselves to show their servility to the capitalist politicians when they threaten to rule by decree.

The head of a capitalist state always considers his primary task the preservation of the capitalist system. To accomplish this, he uses decree powers. Such powers are always directed against the best interests of the masses, and lay the precedent for complete dictatorship and fascism.

Roosevelt, as representative of the monopoly capitalists in this country, is finding himself in Daladier's shoes. Driven by the same forces, he is bound to try to use decree power in the same way.

## FDR Abolishes Premium Pay; Govt. Workers Under 'Czar'

(Continued from page 1)

has now assumed for federal employees.

**REASON FOR DECREES**

It is obvious from these two decrees that the centralization of authority and dictatorial rule is aimed primarily at destroying the gains and taking away the rights of labor.

The monopolists, whom Roosevelt represents, faced with a long war which will cost hundreds of billions of dollars, plan to unload the tremendous burden of their war for profit on the backs of the working-class. To do this, the shams of democracy are being cast aside and replaced by dictatorial rule by decree.

To carry on their war the capitalists must drive down the living standards of the workers. This is as true in the United States as it is in Germany. As the costs of the war pile up, as the complications and difficulties of the chaotic system of private profit interfere with the war effort, the big monopolists take charge of the government through the concentration of iron control in the hands of the executive. This control is used to prosecute the war in the exclusive interest of the Wall Street monopolists, to wipe out small business, and to smash the living standards of the workers and poor farmers.

**DANGEROUS PRECEDENT**

Roosevelt's Labor Day speech, and his rapid fire decree against labor a week later, are warnings

to the union movement. If rule by decree can be imposed on the workers, none of their hard-won gains are secure. If the steps proposed can be carried through successfully, new and even more drastic measures will follow.

If Roosevelt can wipe out premium pay by decree, he may very well next decree further wage cuts by cutting out all overtime pay. If allowed to continue his concentration of power, he can destroy the 40 hour week, the Wagner Act, and all progressive labor legislation.

If the union movement bows to rule by decree, the labor movement will be threatened with increasing government regimentation and control. Should Roosevelt succeed in taking the power to rule on all questions of wages, hours of work, and working conditions, the unions will be rendered impotent. It would mean the reduction of the unions from progressive instruments to protect the workingclass into mere appendages of the government apparatus.

It is necessary that Roosevelt's swift moves toward dictatorship be exposed and explained. The workers' organizations must gird themselves for a fight to defend their democratic rights and their living conditions. Roosevelt, by his arbitrary actions, has served notice that totalitarian regimentation awaits the American workers; the fight for democratic rights today is on the home front.

### Anti-Labor Drive Is Facilitated by Labor Heads, CP

(Continued from page 1)

plainly necessary for the President to act."

Now that Roosevelt has acted, the Stalinists who failed to warn of the anti-labor meaning of Roosevelt's impending rule by decree, have remained his most subservient supporters. His order regimenting federal government workers, which directly affects the CIO United Federal Workers, in Stalinist control, has not been answered by a single word of protest by the Stalinists.

On the contrary, these cynical tools of the bureaucratic Stalin regime in the USSR are the most vociferous defenders in this country of Roosevelt's anti-labor acts.

**BETRAY THEIR CLASS**

The CIO and AFL leadership and their Stalinist flunkies have, by their alliance with Roosevelt, flagrantly violated the basic interests of the workers. They have moved the union movement another long step towards governmental domination.

Roosevelt, who acts in the interests of Big Business, has acted against labor to strengthen the capitalists and their war for profit. This was to be expected.

But the union officials have betrayed the class they supposedly represent. Their support and acceptance of Roosevelt's slashing anti-democratic and anti-labor acts have widened the gap between themselves and the interests of the 11 million workers in the AFL and CIO.

As Roosevelt's decrees impose more and more burdens upon the backs of the workers, the militant membership of the AFL and CIO must fight for a new leadership and a new program to win back the independence of the unions, and to fight in defense of their democratic rights and economic conditions.

**Trotsky's Last Work**  
MANIFESTO OF THE  
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL  
on the  
IMPERIALIST WAR  
and the  
PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION  
48 pages 5 cents per copy  
PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
116 University Place  
New York City

**WHY we Defend the Soviet Union**  
By ALBERT GOLDMAN  
Pioneer Publishers  
116 University Place  
New York City

IN DETROIT  
**THE SATURDAY BOOKSHOP**  
(Open Saturday Evenings from 6 to 9 o'clock)  
carries THE MILITANT, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, and a full list of Pioneer Publishers books and pamphlets on the labor movement.  
3513 Woodward Ave.  
Room 5  
Detroit, Mich.

**Build Your Marxist Library NOW!**

**A Low-Priced Special Combination Offer**

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

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN, by Felix Morrow, 202 pages, paper, List Price ..... 50

TOTAL LIST ..... \$1.50

**Special Combination Price - \$1.75**

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**  
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK CITY

## Articles On India Feature Latest Issue Of 'F.I.'

Four articles on India's fight for freedom feature the September issue of the monthly magazine, *Fourth International*, which appeared last week. Two of these articles discuss important aspects of the present Indian struggle which have been distorted in the press or concealed by British censorship; the other two analyze the stand on India taken by various organizations in this country.

The greatest obstacle to the mobilization of support by American workers for the Indian struggle is the misconception — fostered by the American and British press — that Cripps actually offered the Indian people genuine independence after the war and a large degree of self-rule until then. Felix Morrow's article, *The Truth About the Cripps Mission*, effectively disposes of this lie by an analysis which lays bare the facts about the Cripps mission that have never before been revealed in their entirety.

Every worker who reads this article will be convinced that Cripps offered the Indians nothing but a continuation of the status quo during the war — with the British Viceroy to remain in complete charge of Indian policy — and that his post-war independence plan was a fraud, which would have left India under the control of British imperialism.

**POLITICAL STRIKES**

The editorial comment, *The Working Class of India*, discusses the significance of the news recently received here of a wave of political strikes involving India's factory workers, and explains the importance of the Indian workers' role in the struggle for independence.

American Labor on India surveys the reactions of various workers' organizations in the United States: The UAW-CIO convention resolution; the New York State AFL convention reso-

lution; the stand of the leaders of the Negro March-on-Washington movement; the Social-Democratic Federation statement; the attitude of Norman Thomas' Socialist Party; and the Communist Party.

A separate article, *Petty-Bourgeois Radicalism On the Struggle In India*, analyzes the cowardly failure of the Shahtman group to take a clear stand on the present Indian struggle under the Gandhi leadership, and relates their present stand to their refusal to support the USSR and China in the war.

Other articles in the September issue are:

**The Auto Workers: A Step Forward**, in which E. R. Frank explains the contradictions facing militant delegates to the recent UAW-CIO convention, who wanted on the one hand to resist attacks on labor's gains but who nevertheless pledged support to the Roosevelt administration which is taking the offensive against the workers.

**THE NATIONAL QUESTION**

The National Question In Europe by Marc Loris, a discussion article on the national struggles now being conducted in occupied Europe.

**Geopolitics: An Imperialist Myth** by James Cadman exposes the use by the imperialists of this pseudo-science as theoretical justification of their policies.

The second section of *The Second World War*, an interview given by Leon Trotsky to the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* in 1940, in which he discussed the role of United States imperialism in the war and predicted Hitler's assault on the Soviet Union.

**International Notes** for this month includes Brazil's entry into the war, Canada and Mexico.

The magazine — 20 cents a copy; \$2.00 for a yearly subscription — can be secured from Business Manager, *Fourth International*, 116 University Place, New York City.

**IN DOWNTOWN NEWARK**

THE MILITANT may be purchased at newsstand, 11 Springfield Avenue (near Court House.)

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

Three Stories About Georgia

These are three stories about the treatment of Negroes in Georgia. The first two are taken from last week's press service of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the third was sent to me by a friend who lives in that state, and is hereby called to the attention of the NAACP, which may be able to take a hand in the matter.

Here's how the Negro is treated by the state officials in Georgia:

"Information that members of the Georgia state highway patrol have been instructed to 'stop and search every Negro we saw on the highway after 9 o'clock at night, use our blackjacks on them, jerk them out of cars and search the cars. Run them off the highways," was transmitted by the NAACP Friday, September 11, to Wendell Berge, assistant U. S. Attorney-General, asking an immediate investigation of the state highway patrol.

"These instructions are attributed to Commissioner John Goodwin of the Georgia State Highway Patrol Commission, and are quoted in an affidavit signed by a district commander of the Georgia Highway patrol who was resigning. The district commander also stated: 'He said we should tell all troopers to do this to all Negroes.'"

And this is how the Negro is treated by city officials in Georgia:

Macon, Ga. — "Captured after the biggest manhunt in years here, lasting 27 hours, Private Edmund Reed, charged with the murder of a local policeman, will be defended when he goes on trial soon by the Macon branch and the national office of the NAACP."

"Private Reed, in the army for five years, was arrested here August 20 by a military policeman, Sgt. M. W. Whitmore, on suspicion of being AWOL. While waiting for the police patrol wagon to come it is claimed that the MP hit the soldier with his first. Reed is said to have thrown up his hands to protect his head."

"At this point a city policeman standing nearby stated: 'Turn him over to me.' "A crowd began to gather threatening the soldier. He was struck a severe blow at the back of the head, leaving a deep gash. He then is said to have grabbed the pistol of the MP and to have shot the city officer, who died, and the MP, who suffered wounds. Reed then ran away from the crowd which was said to have been beating him."

"The NAACP stated that there is evidence that other Negro soldiers had been beaten before the attack on Reed."

"White citizens of Macon, joined by Mayor Charles L. Bowden, formed a mob numbering hundreds, which scoured the countryside in search of the soldier."

"When Reed was captured, after a 27 hour pursuit, he had a bullet wound in his right leg, which members of the posse refused to explain, and was bleeding from the gash in his head. He was dragged from a small lake near the Southern railroad switchyards."

And this is how the Negro is treated by federal military authority in Georgia, as related to us by a friend who lives in Lowndes County:

"I have heard a story, substantiated by both white and Negro soldiers stationed at the Moody Field army flying school, which seems to me so terrible that I feel I must impart it to you. For some time I had heard that there was a Negro soldier in solitary confinement in the guard-house awaiting trial for having struck a major in a fit of rage. Recently the word has got about that he has been sentenced by court-martial to be hung."

"The decision is so outrageous that it would seem to be impossible. However, although I do not remember specifically what is the punishment for striking an officer in time of war, anyone who has read the Articles of War, with its frequent refrain of 'death or such other punishment as a court martial may decide,' cannot logically be surprised at such a decision, however much he may be shocked by its being applied in its full severity."

"Although the story has leaked out, as it was bound to, the whole affair is being conducted in an atmosphere of secrecy so that the details of the story, even the soldier's name, are unavailable. However, I have some of the outlines of the affair on good authority: "This Negro soldier was taunted and jeered by a white civilian in town (Valdosta). The soldier restrained himself and refused to

be provoked into a fight. Somehow or other, he got to see the major with his complaint. The major dismissed it brusquely and contemptuously. The soldier was so infuriated that he took a punch at the major, jarring him to his heels, but not knocking him down. There was no question of an attempt at murder.

"Since then the army authorities have solved the problem of the Negro soldier's complaint by getting the city authorities in Valdosta to pass an ordinance establishing zones for white and colored population within the city of Valdosta, providing penalties for extraneous loiterers therein, and for other purpose." Under this ordinance a virtual Negro ghetto is established. Of course, this practice of segregating Negroes is not a new one in this city. But the army officials got the city to adopt it formally so that they could then issue an order to the Negro soldiers to stay out of the white sections of the city and say that they were merely adjusting themselves to local customs, laws and ordinances."

"The army order that Negro soldiers may visit the 'white' districts only when on duty or to go shopping during business hours reminds me of the Nazi enactment that Jews may show themselves on the Unter Den Linden Strasse and other streets famous for affording beautiful strolls only if they have some business at hand which forces them to walk there and then they must walk by a 'brisk, business-like pace.'"

"I understand that it is possible that the sentence on the Negro soldier may be lightened by the higher authorities reviewing the case. It seems that a judgment is practically never reversed, but often the sentence is made lighter. Even should this be done, however — and it is by no means certain — it does not lessen the outrageousness of the whole affair."

Many people who support the war never tire of reminding us that, bad as the conditions of the Negro are today, they would be worse under a Hitler. True. But will some of these loquacious people please volunteer to inform us just how much worse conditions could be than those described here, which are quite typical of the South, in peace-time as in war-time?

UAW Leaders Are Condemned by Allentown Local

ALLENTOWN, PA. — Three thousand workers of Mack Local 677 of the United Auto Workers, CIO, have demanded that their International Executive Board call a halt to the policy of retreats in the face of boss attacks and anti-labor decisions.

After the War Labor Board's recent denial of the local's request for a general wage increase, the membership voted at special meetings for the following steps:

- 1. To take an immediate strike vote.
2. To ask the International Executive Board to demand the reopening of the case before the WLB.
3. To demand the International Executive Board's authorization to strike, and the "financial, material and moral support" of the International for the strike, if the WLB refused to reopen the case.

The strike vote was taken and carried by a better than 3-to-1 majority. The International leaders then denied strike authorization to the local and pleaded that no strike action be taken, contending it would mean the wrecking of the local because the International could not support any strike.

Consequently another special local meeting was called on Sept. 13. The local executive board recommended that the local accept the WLB ruling under protest, since it was considered unwise in the given situation to call a strike of this isolated group of workers with the International officials refusing to give support.

It was pointed out that the entire responsibility for failure to negotiate a good contract is now placed on the International Executive Board, which had crippled the negotiation effort of the local by refusing to support its motion for a strike.

The local's motion to accept the WLB decision under protest was thus not only directed against the WLB, but also against the criminally false policy of the International Executive Board.

Masses Are Still Bitterly Opposed To Franco Regime

Workers' Revolutionary Spirit Has Not Been Destroyed

By Grandizo Munis

MEXICO—Directly or indirectly, the news coming from Spain justifies optimism about the future of the workers' movement there. Nothing at present promises clear sailing or permanence for the clerical-military-Falangist dictatorship. If this dictatorship should be temporarily strengthened—and this is not to be excluded—it will come more from aid outside the country than from a lessening of the internal contradictions and frictions.

All dictatorships and dictators have known moments of exaltation and glory—that glory, genuine or fictitious, with which the great and small capitalists surround their saviors, who are real or fabricated great figures. In this respect Franco is an unfortunate dictator, a caricature. He has not known, nor will he ever know the deification enjoyed by Mussolini during the latter's early years as a dictator or by Hitler during his spectacular victories in western Europe.

At bottom the whole reason for the burlesque character of the Spanish "Caudillo's" dictatorship lies in the stubborn military resistance with which all the poor of Spain opposed him. A proletariat vanquished after an obstinate struggle, to use the approximate words of Marx, will recuperate more easily than one which capitulates without resistance.

France's military victory is one which brings only dishonor. He defeated a disarmed front, betrayed by its own Popular Front government, betrayed by the Soviet government and with the entire capitalist world against it. And still he needed three years, the military aid of Germany and Italy and the active or passive complicity of all governments except the Mexican to accomplish this. (The Soviet government did not help Franco actively but by the political conditions it imposed when it granted military aid to the Loyalists, it became one of the main obstacles to a revolutionary victory.)

FRANCO NOW PAYS FOR AID RECEIVED

The large amount of help that the German and Italian troops lent Franco and the installments he must now pay for this help at the cost of the pauperization and misery of the people, have discredited him even from the purely capitalist point of view. I have had occasion to talk with Spaniards, obstinately pro-Franco during the civil war, who have returned from Spain discouraged and unable to face the criticisms of the "reds" after a visit to the peninsula where they had hoped to see the realization of their hollow patriotic illusions. They themselves are obliged to admit that the major part of the foodstuffs produced in the country is sent to Germany.

Fascism could not hope to acquire the popularity in Spain that it enjoyed in Germany where, thanks to the real maltreatment of the country at the hands of foreign powers following the first World War, nationalist concepts were aggravated. But a fascism, whose predominant function is the humiliation of the country and the impoverishment of the masses for the benefit of a foreign power, ceases to have any moral authority even from a strictly capitalist standpoint. The absence of a nationalist camouflage exposes its two real and fundamental features: multiplied repression and intensified exploitation.

The Hitler invasion and the creation of the puppet governments — Petain, Quisling, Antonescu, Franco, etc. — have forever put an end to any development of fascism as a mass movement on the European mainland. It can still rise in England and perhaps with greater probability in the United States; in continental Europe where the fascists of the conquered countries, or of the countries collaborating with Hitler such as Rumania, have laid their strident patriotism at the feet of the foreign oppressor, fascism has been doomed forever as a popular or pseudo-popular movement.

MASSES HATE REGIME

If in France, Norway, Poland, etc., the hate for the Nazi dictatorship has its parallel in hate for the native forces that serve it, then in Spain the situation is no different even though there are no Hitlerite "protectors" or military governors. And if in those countries, in spite of suffering and terror, there grows among the masses a movement whose explosion will pulverize fascism, then similarly in Spain a shake-up is being prepared that

EDITOR'S NOTE

This article on the opposition to Franco's regime today was written by a revolutionary fighter in the Spanish Civil War, who is now residing in Mexico. The facts in this article clearly show that without foreign assistance, Franco would fall in short order. The collapse of the Franco regime can result only in a socialist revolution.

It is precisely the fear of such a development that motivates the attitude of both the Axis powers and the United Nations toward Franco today. Roosevelt's "art and culture" offer to prop up the Spanish government by financial aid flows from this fear as well as from his desire to keep Spain neutral or to win it to the side of the United Nations.

will overthrow the whole regime and give the proletariat another opportunity to take power.

The revolutionary threat is perhaps more visible in Spain than in any other country. Travelers who have very recently passed through or who lived there for several weeks, refer to the boldness and decision with which the opposition to Franco works and publicly speaks.

An Austrian worker who lived with the Spanish proletariat from 1932 to the end of the Civil War, has just arrived after an illegal stay of several weeks in Spain. The cafes, important centers of social life all over the country, are points of very energetic anti-Franco propaganda; no one hesitates to criticize and speak adversely of the dictatorship and to tell jokes at its expense.

Collections for loyalists who are in prison are conducted in almost a public manner in cafes and even in the streets. Women revolutionists dressed in the uniform of the "Auxilio Social," the charitable organization of the

exaggeration or momentary discouragement coming from a secondary leader, was demonstrated a few weeks later by a government decree excluding all persons from the Falange who actively or passively had helped the loyalists during the civil war; this means the exclusion of much more than half the population. The decree admitted exception only in cases especially authorized by the leading bodies of the organization.

The feeling of general and violent enmity was shown several months ago by another decree that established trial by military court for everyone who by word or deed injured the ministers, high functionaries of the government and the Falange or their family. For injury by word, the punishment is up to five years in jail; for injury by deed, it can be death.

"THEY STILL HAVE NOT PASSED"

Another visitor who spent several weeks in Madrid, tells how, in order to see the city, he took a taxi and told the chauffeur to show him the most interesting places and buildings. The car went straight to University City, scene of more than two years of military struggle. The chauffeur got out of the car, and pointing to the ruins, said:

"Look, WE were here, poorly armed, poorly dressed and poorly fed; THEY were there, well provided with everything. And we held them off for more than two years! They are inside of Madrid now, but they still have not passed!"

(To be concluded next week.)

The Plight Of The Jews And The Democracies

By A. ROLAND

More than any other people, the Jews have become the burning symbol of capitalism in decay, of a civilization that threatens to fall back completely into barbarism. The Nazis have made the Jewish people the scapegoat of their system of rule by terror. In the treatment meted out to the Jews the masses of Germany, France, Poland and all the other conquered countries are constantly shown an example of what to expect in cruelty if they dare to rebel.

The inhuman treatment of the Jews by the Nazis has served also to test the pretensions to humanity of the democratic capitalist governments of the democratic capitalist world. It is one of the worst kind of hypocrisy. They have paid lip-service to democracy, but this did and does not prevent the most callous indifference to the fate of the Jews in deed.

The Vichy regime, before and after Laval, treated the Jews only a shade or two differently than did the Nazis. The unfortunate refugees from Germany and other lands who managed to keep one step ahead of the German armies, found that unoccupied France was the frying pan instead of the fire. It was not enough to herd them into the filthiest and most horrifying concentration camps. The Petain regime — for "reasons of state" no doubt — found it necessary to separate husbands from wives, and children from parents. Children down to four years old were sent alone into the most wretched camp conditions. For three years now the Jews in unoccupied France have suffered untold misery in the hands of the French collaborators with Hitler.

BRITISH-U. S. ATTITUDE

Meantime what was the attitude of England and the United States? We know how England refused permission to whole boatloads of Jewish refugees to land in Palestine, even when already in sight of several such boats with the loss of hundreds of lives became international scandals — quickly hushed up by those supporting "democracy against fascism" in the Nazi prisoners of war better than she has treated Jewish refugees.

The United States, once populated by those escaping from tyrannical persecution in Europe, has shown the same hypocritical attitude as the British. The whole machinery of government, from State Department to foreign consular officials, was set into motion for but a single purpose: to keep the Jews out. Only the thin-

Secretary Hull Makes Hypocritical Reply To Taunt by Laval

next trickle was permitted past the mountainous barrier of red tape erected as a wall against the Jews. Only fools can take comfort in the empty protests of the Roosevelts and Hulls. We have in the case of the Jewish refugees a typical instance of the real as against the pretended policy of our capitalist government at the present time.

FRENCH MASSES PROTEST

The Germans applied pressure on Vichy to exile 20,000 Jews from unoccupied France. Laval pretended that these Jews were to be sent back to their homelands. Actually, they were to be shipped off to Russia and Poland as slave labor — if not to be killed outright by gas or machine-gunning on the way! The Petain-Laval government proceeded to act as it has done hitherto, with utmost inhumanity. The concentration camps were emptied, families were separated, individuals of all ages were herded into closed freight cars for shipment.

The French people were aroused to sharp protest by this latest collaborationist move. This latest example of complete subservience of Petain-Laval filled the masses cup of bitterness to overflowing. But these protests resulted only in one more gesture of hypocrisy. Laval agreed not to separate the families of those being herded off. Now, it seems, the children will be reunited with their parents. All will be sent together to slavery and death.

The government of the United States, which might have saved all these unfortunates during the past three years by granting them visas, now that it is too late registers its protest against the French treatment of Jewish refugees. Laval promptly retorted that he would gladly send all those to be deported to the United States, if this country would receive them. Had the Roosevelt government been really concerned about the fate of the Jewish refugees, it would have eagerly seized on this statement by Laval. Its answer would have been: Yes, we will receive them. Send the refugees here at once.

HULL ATTEMPTS TO EVADE ANSWER

Instead, Hull reacted in typical fashion when Laval's remark was called to his attention by a newspaperman. Hull stated hypocritically that he had received no information from the American Embassy at Vichy that the Laval government would permit the Jews to come to the United States. This lying cant serves to make people think that Hull might otherwise accept Laval's challenge. The situation will again be met by permitting a

handful of the refugees to be saved, letting the vast majority suffer a terrible fate.

The State Department has meantime — so we are informed — suppressed information that it received from its consular agents in Switzerland. This information has to do with the treatment of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto. Evidently the greatest of atrocities has occurred there in connection with the renewed campaign to exterminate all Jews. Rumor even has it that the ghetto there have been completely wiped out. The reason this report has been suppressed by the State Department is that it does not wish any mass protest here that will force its hand on policy.

Let those Jews who think that this is still the great haven of the oppressed, the land of democracy, ponder over the treatment of the Jews by the democracies. Many of them accept the war as a fight between fascism and democracy. They support the democracies heart and soul under the delusion that if the democracies win, the Jewish question will find its solution.

The truth is that a victory for the United Nations will still leave the Jewish question unsolved. This question cannot possibly find its solution under decaying capitalism. The same underhanded diplomacy will be practiced in the post-war period as now. Each country will point to the others for the solution. Hull will gladly help the Jews to get into — Palestine, or Santo Domingo, or Brazil. Britain will just as gladly direct the attention of the Jews to South America or — the United States.

Under capitalism the Jews remain nothing but a football of diplomacy. The democracies might even (assuming that the world remains as it is — a capitalist world) send the Jews back to Germany and Poland.

CAPITALISTS INDIFFERENT

How can a capitalist government be deeply concerned over the fate of the Jews? It represents a ruling class that is not much concerned with the fate of the masses over which it rules. It is quite ready to sacrifice millions of the lives of those masses to assure its continued making of profits. The war is itself the proof of the brutal, callous indifference of the imperialists to the fate of the oppressed masses.

The roots of the oppression of the Jews are intertwined with the general oppression of the workers and toilers by the ruling class. That is why the solution of the Jewish question can be achieved only with the aid of the world proletariat, only with the victory of socialism over capitalism. Socialism will end all oppression, including the oppression of the Jews.

Significance Of Trend To Government By Decree

By M. Morrison

In his Labor Day speech the President promised to stabilize wages. He also threatened to violate an act of Congress if that body did not pass the legislation demanded by him, to the effect that prices of agricultural products be placed at parity and not at 110 percent of parity as provided by the present law. At about the same time the War Manpower Commission issued an order practically "freezing" workers in the lumber and metal industries of twelve Western States.

All three — the promise, the threat and the order — involve the same question of government by decree and it is this question to which the attention of the workers should be directed again and again.

To avoid misunderstanding it is necessary to state that government by decree is not necessarily fascism. A fascist government rules by decrees but not every government that does so is fascist. Fascism is not a movement which gains power by the process of usurpation of authority by the executive branch of the government. It is not so peaceful as all that. It comes to power as a result of a mass movement of the lower middle classes rendered desperate by a crisis and offered no leadership by the working class.

But even if government by decree is not fascism, it does represent a great danger to the working class which must have the fullest democracy in order to play its role in history. Here and there a decree may be entered which is directed against some other section of the population, but under capitalism it is the working class that must necessarily suffer most through government by decree. The ruler by decree may appear to be above classes and appear as an arbitrator between classes but essentially government rule by decree must and will protect the basic interests of the big capitalists.

Here we shall omit discussion on interesting questions of secondary importance, such as whether or not Roosevelt intends to keep his promise to restore, after the emergency is over, the powers that he assumes now. It is all-important to impress upon the militant workers the basic reasons for the phenomenon of government by decree and to draw the necessary lessons.

It is, above all, essential for the workers to understand that in this period of the development of capitalism it is necessary to establish their own government if they want to escape some form of authoritarian rule where their rights will be limited or be taken away altogether. Accepting the capitalist order means, in the last analysis, to accept government by decree and, in the end, fascism. There can be no middle road of capitalist democracy or of a temporary resort to government by decree.

That capitalist democracy is at a great disadvantage when it comes to waging war against a fascist state is by this time quite obvious. War, at all times, demands such a concentration of effort on the part of the state involved, that democratic forms are not likely to be respected. And in a war between a democratic capitalist state and a fascist capitalist state, the advantages of fascism are so great that it would be foolish to expect democratic

rights and institutions to remain intact.

In capitalist society the struggle between the capitalist and the working class is the main struggle, but it is not the only struggle. There are conflicts constantly raging between the various sections of the capitalist class, each section struggling for its own gain and advantage. Sectional and group capitalist interests play an important role and during a war these conflicts prevent decisive action on the part of the democratic capitalist state.

Fascism suppresses not only the organizations of the working class, thus giving the capitalist state a free hand against the workers. In the interests of monopoly capitalism it also suppresses the democratic rights of all sections of the capitalist class and is therefore able to act ruthlessly and decisively. It eliminates the inevitable hesitation and time-wasting of a democratic capitalist state.

This does not mean that in this war the fascist states are bound to win. The industrial power of the democratic imperialists is so much greater that they may win in spite of the political advantages possessed by the fascist states. But it is inevitable, as the war continues, that the democratic imperialists rid themselves of the handicaps of democracy.

To wage war effectively centralization and authority are essential. These can come either from a capitalist government, bringing complete subjection to the working masses, or from a workers' government, in which case the authority and centralization would be products of the democratic institutions created by the working class.

Authority and centralization under capitalism leave the workers only with the right to obey. Authority and centralization of a workers' government are a product of the initiative and energy and democracy of the workers.

It is true that the Stalinist bureaucracy succeeded in suppressing all democratic rights of the workers in the Soviet Union. But it is also true that under Lenin and Trotsky, the Russian Revolution brought authority and centralization but at the same time gave democracy to the workers, and released their initiative and energy to an unheard-of extent. Historic conditions enabled Stalin, subsequently, to destroy the rights of the Soviet masses.

With the democratic traditions of the English and American workers and with the great development of industry in those countries a workers' government in England or in this country would assure the continuance of the democratic rule of the workers and farmers, at the same time releasing the devotion and energy of the masses to a point where no foreign invader in the world could destroy their rule.

There is no escape from the alternative—either a capitalist government, during and after the war, must eliminate the democratic rights of the workers or a workers' government assuring democracy, peace and economic security to everybody. Without ceasing to struggle against every individual manifestation of government by decree, the workers must consider the trend towards government by decree from this fundamental aspect.

A NEW PAMPHLET!

DEFENSE POLICY in the MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL

- 1—A Criticism by Grandizo Munis
2—An Answer by James P. Cannon

The policy of the defense in the historic trial of 28 members of the Socialist Workers Party and the CIO is analyzed and discussed from two points of view in this clear and illuminating polemic on Marxist principles and propaganda methods.

This pamphlet will be of especial interest to all who have read the two other Pioneer Pamphlets on the trial — James P. Cannon's "Socialism On Trial" and Albert Goldman's "In Defense of Socialism."

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK

48 PAGES
TWENTY CENTS

# THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People.

VOL. VI.—No. 38 Saturday, September 19, 1942

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

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN

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

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

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

## 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.

## Roosevelt's Speech: Study In Contrasts

President Roosevelt's Labor Day address offers an interesting and instructive study in contrasts.

It was marked by great determination and energy. It was obvious Roosevelt knows what he wants and how to get it. Congress had passed an act setting farm price ceilings at 110 percent of parity. Roosevelt threatened: set ceilings at 100 percent parity by October 1, within 23 days, or I will do so myself by decree. His threatened act would be in violation of an existing law, but this did not cause him to falter in his program of attacking the living standards of the masses.

Immediately after the message Roosevelt showed that he means business: By executive order he formally outlawed premium pay for week-end and holiday work. Through his War Manpower Commission he decreed the freezing of labor in the lumber and non-ferrous mining industries of 12 western states. Through his Selective Service administration he strengthened this latter decree by threatening to reclassify all those who left their jobs. By decree he put the 2,300,000 federal employees under the control of the War Manpower Commission, which may transfer them to other jobs at will. All this took place within a single week.

But the determination and speed of the administration is exhibited mainly when it comes to attacks on the labor movement. When he deals with the income and privileges of the capitalist class, his attitude becomes one of caution and his pace becomes that of the snail.

In the course of his address he spoke about the advisability of limiting individual incomes of the capitalist class to the far-from-starvation level of \$25,000 a year. But this part of his speech lacked aggressiveness. He made no threats concerning it. In all probability Congress will not even act on this suggestion. And Roosevelt will invoke no decree laws.

For decades the labor movement in this country has tried to pass a child labor bill. The bill has remained bogged down in red tape, and if things remain as they are, many more decades will pass before the child labor bill will become law — if ever, under capitalism.

Each year hundreds of miners lose their lives and thousands are injured in mine accidents. For years the miners' unions have attempted to pass a mine safety act. The president has never threatened to enact the mine safety bill by decree if Congress did not act in 23 days, weeks or months. The act would mean a lowering of the mine companies' profits. This makes all the difference in the world.

For 23 years and more the Negro people and the labor movement have tried to get an anti-lynching bill passed. But the Southern ruling class has use for lynching as a weapon of intimidation against Negro farm and industrial labor, and has prevented the enactment of the bill. There has been no ultimatum from the president demanding that Congress pass this act in 23 days.

The president's determination, energy, vigor and dispatch are reserved for use in favor of the capitalist class and against the masses.

## India's Struggle Sharpens Despite British Terror

(Continued from page 1)

In spite of Roosevelt-Churchill unity on India, however, the struggle has continued to broaden in scope to such an extent that, it is clear, Washington finally abandoned hope that the British can crush the movement.

### Washington Wants New Negotiations

Accordingly Washington began privately urging Churchill to reopen negotiations with the Congress. Writing from Washington, Raymond Clapper reports on Sept. 15 that "officials here have sought quietly to persuade London to take a more open-minded attitude toward India and have had no luck whatever." Such persuasion can be backed by the tremendous pressure of the United States, including holding up execution of the plans formulated by the American Economic Mission in India for expanding war production there.

Churchill's statement in the House of Commons on Sept. 10 was primarily, as Raymond Clapper correctly puts it, "an attempt to end further meddling from Washington. He tries to make India a closed issue."

Churchill's calculations are quite clear. Washington and Chungking's pressure for reopening negotiations are predicated on the assumption that Britain is unable to crush the independence movement. To reopen negotiations would be to admit that this assumption is correct.

But if Britain cannot crush the movement, and thus tacitly admits it, then why should the movement stop? Even if the Congress leaders were to reach a compromise with Churchill in new negotiations, the mass struggle for independence, enormously encouraged by the British admission of defeat, would go on without the Congress leaders. The workers and peasants, Churchill well knows, have long been impatient with the Congress leaders' moderation and would not follow them in patching up a compromise.

What, indeed, could Churchill concede in new negotiations? Any new proposal, just as much as the Cripps "offer," would leave the British grip on India untouched. No British capitalist government would let go of the rich booty of India. Churchill would rather see Japan conquer India and hope to reconquer it, than to give up India forever to a real Indian national government. The situation has reached the stage where no face-saving formula can be concocted which would keep India for the British capitalists and yet enable the Congress leaders to keep the Indian masses quiet. Hence new negotiations, even if they bring a compromise with the Congress leaders, will solve nothing. Either independence or naked British rule over India—those are the only real alternatives.

### What Washington Hopes To Get

Such are Churchill's calculations, and from the imperialist viewpoint, they are essentially accurate. Washington of course understands this, but hopes by new negotiations and a compromise to quiet down India long enough to defeat Japan. After that Washington will shed no tears if the British are driven out of India by the independence movement; indeed, Washington would welcome that as a post-war development, for then dollar-imperialism would attempt to take the place of British imperialism in the economic exploitation of India.

The note of asperity in Churchill's statement was directed in reality at Washington and not at India. He was really saying: "It's all very well for you to be giving away empires, but give your own away and let mine alone."

In order to slam the door on American advice, Churchill went far indeed. He made it plain that India would never be freed by Britain. His formula for this was that "many of the races" of India "would never consent to be ruled by the Congress nor shall they ever be against their will so subjugated." At this an outcry from all sides rose in India, with Churchill's most useful native agents embarrassed by his brutal statement. But the universal hostility of India was something Churchill expected anyway. If he added to it, he appeared to feel, it was worth it if he could discourage Washington's pressure.

### New Line Of The Times

It is clear, however, that Washington's pressure will continue. This week came the first editorial statements in the leading American newspapers since the first days of the struggle. Apparently Washington had finally given the nod to break their silence. The Sept. 15 N. Y. Times stated:

"The Indian moderates must view with disappointment Churchill's seeming insistence that force is the only answer to the Indian question. We hope the Indian moderates will persevere in their attempts to find a formula that will permit an immediate grant of additional powers of self-government. Such a formula would have a friendly hearing in this country and, we believe, among the democratic masses of Britain."

Thus the N. Y. Times appeals to the "democratic masses of Britain" against Churchill's Indian policy. This is the same paper which, only a few weeks ago, was whitewashing Churchill as the voice of Britain's masses.

On Sept. 12, the Chicago Sun, which is nothing but a rubber stamp for the Roosevelt administration, indicated the government's line. It editorially declared that "bitterness in India" has grown as a result of Churchill's statement, and that "Churchill's present policy vis-a-vis India weakens the moral position and military security of the United Nations." Referring to those in the Labor Party and elsewhere in England who disagreed with Churchill, the Sun declared: "We can only hope that they produce a less intransigent policy on the part of the Prime Minister."

The conflict between Washington and London over India will, however, not develop very rapidly. If Washington is in a position to put powerful pressure on Churchill, he in turn is indispensable to Washington's war plans. Roosevelt has nightmares at the thought that Churchill might fall and open the way to a Labor Government, for that would be opening the road to revolutionary developments. Hence Washington's pressure will be extremely cautious.

And long before that pressure gets very far, we are certain, there will no longer be room for reopening negotiations. The Indian revolution sweeps on.

## British Union Leader's Speech Helps Hitler

In his speech opening the annual conference of the British Trade Union Congress last week, Frank Wolstencroft, president of that body, said:

"I am one of those who feel bound to recognize that a vast majority of the German people — all that matter — were behind the Nazi gangsters when they gave effect to their policy of attempting the conquest and domination of Europe."

Wolstencroft also advocated that the 80 to 90 million Germans "should be held under bond, if necessary," because they "are prepared to accept, decade by decade, domination by a few bloodthirsty war mongers."

The very next day, on Sept. 10, the lie was given to Wolstencroft's claim that all the Germans "who matter" supported Hitler, by a Stockholm news dispatch reporting that nearly 1,000 German soldiers were imprisoned in a Norwegian concentration camp. Even in his army Hitler has to punish and terrorize significant numbers of Germans — is that a sign that "a vast majority" of the German people support the Nazis?

### HOW HE HELPS HITLER

Wolstencroft was trying to be of service to Churchill and the "democratic" imperialists. Actually his speech was of the greatest aid to Hitler:

1. Hitler wants the world to believe that he has the support of the German people, so that he can present a picture of "invincibility" to the world.

In reality, no one hates fascism more than the German masses who have had to live under its brutal rule for almost 10 years now, and whose organizations

Hitler first had to smash before he could come into power. Wolstencroft's speech helps Hitler to propagate the myth of "German unity."

2. Hitler's chief weapon for keeping the German masses "in line" is their fear of a second Versailles Treaty if German imperialism is defeated by British and American imperialism. When Wolstencroft echoes the threats of the "democratic" imperialists about keeping the German people as a whole "under bond," he is helping Hitler to restrain the German workers' revolution against Hitler.

3. The only real opposition to Hitler within Germany comes from the revolutionary socialists and internationalists who, despite conditions of great danger from the Gestapo, are struggling to organize the workers to overthrow Hitlerism. Their work is difficult to carry on, but it is made still more difficult by Wolstencroft's speech.

For when the German masses are told by Allied leader that they — as well as the German ruling class — will be held responsible for the war, they tend to accept the idea that they have no allies outside of Germany and that efforts to overthrow Hitler and establish socialism are futile.

### A FOUL SLANDER

Wolstencroft wants the German masses punished because, he says, "they are prepared, to accept, decade by decade, domination by a few bloodthirsty war mongers." This is as big a lie as was ever told by Hitler.

The German masses did not want the first imperialist war any more than the workers in other countries did. They showed

this by overthrowing the Kaiser at the first opportunity they got. They then tried to make a revolution to do away with the capitalist system that later produced Hitler. But their efforts to establish socialism were drowned in blood by the German labor leaders of the Second International — the German Wolstencrofts.

When Hitler threatened to take power, the German masses wanted to resist — but they were restrained by the German Wolstencrofts who either joined the Nazis when Hitler came to power or beat it out of the country to save their own hides. And let no one forget that before the German ruling class could feel safe to go ahead with its plans to redive the world, it first had to destroy all the organizations of the workers and murder or imprison their revolutionary leaders.

### WHO HELPS THE FIGHT AGAINST FASCISM

The only way to destroy fascism in Germany is by arousing and helping the German working class to establish a workers' government in that country. Wolstencroft — who lumps the German masses with their oppressors, who threatens to punish them if Germany is defeated, who distorts history and lies about the hatred of the German people for Hitlerism — does not aid the struggle to destroy fascism; on the contrary, he hinders it.

Only those who tell the truth, only those who oppose the aims of all imperialists, only those who look upon the oppressed German people as their comrades in the struggle against all reaction, are able to contribute to the destruction of fascism.

## The Workers' Bookshelf

WILL GERMANY CRACK? by Paul Hagen. Harper & Bros. \$2.75.

Paul Hagen is research director for the Inside Germany organization. He is a social-democrat ardently supporting the United Nations. Unlike those who play up every incident in Germany that can be interpreted to mean revolt against Hitler, Hagen examines the possibility of Germany's cracking from within fairly soberly. Written before the recent successes of the Germans in the Caucasus, but after the Russian winter campaign, his book is quite up to date.

Hagen limits his inquiry to the possibility of revolt in the near future. The general question of the manner in which Nazism is piling up tremendous internal contradictions that will result in an explosion, he leaves aside. But the tendencies towards internal deterioration are examined somewhat exhaustively from the economic, political, military and psychological angles.

### Economic Problems In Germany

The lack of German labor reserves is a well known fact. Hitler keeps importing foreign labor feverishly in order to stave off the decline in productivity. But slave labor is notoriously inefficient, just as much now as in the past. Germany's declining production affects the entire military situation, since it means that the armies cannot be expanded much further without the danger of collapse on the production front. The keen competition for labor on the part of various sections of the war economy has tended to make the Nazi labor policy unstable, particularly for skilled labor. But on the whole the labor code remains very severe. For the vast majority of workers wages are incredibly low.

The book gathers together specific details concerning the decline in production of fuel (coal and oil), iron and steel, etc. The crisis in transportation, owing to Hitler's concentration on military roads to the exclusion of the railroads, is of some interest. The comparison of the status of transportation in this war and in the last war shows how much greater the present strain presses on the entire German economy.

Hatred for the Nazis exists not only among the factory workers. The government is surrounded by a veritable sea of hatred on the farms. Hitler did nothing for the small farmers and the agricultural laborers. Their lot has become worse than ever before.

The peasants were among those middle class elements who helped boost Hitler into the saddle. Their disillusion is the same as that of the middle class in general as Hitler forces every artisan and many shopkeepers and white collar slaves into the factories to produce for the war.

The writer has a fairly sane, if not completely correct, point of view on the relation between Nazism and Big Business in Germany. He is not taken in by the idea that Hitler is building a New Order against the will of finance capital. Monopoly capitalism, says Hagen, is more powerful than ever. Of course, Hitler finds it necessary to exert force and pressure on the big bosses to get their financial support. The bankers much prefer to invest in stocks than in government paper. On this account, viewing Hitler's apparent independence from direct control of finance capital, the author takes a cautious middle-of-the-road position:

"This is the present balance of power, which shows that it is definitely wrong to interpret the

German system as a system in which the Nazi lackey serves the interests of monopoly capital." But then he hastens to add: "On the other hand, there is in Germany no Brown Bolshevism which would have liquidated and expropriated private ownership. Those who hope that one day the big businessmen of Germany will turn against the Nazi oppressor and join the anti-Nazi front are equally wrong."

Thus Hagen explodes any idea that the German Revolution will receive any help from the capitalists. He deals similarly, and quite adequately, with the other idea that there is a serious rift between the Nazis and the army leaders. The fate of all these elements is inextricably tied together. When one goes down, all will go down together.

There remains then the exploration of the moods of the workers inside and outside the army. Hagen reproduces faithfully reports of conversations with workers by those engaged so hazardingly in the underground German movement. What do these reports show? They show a lack of faith of the German workers and soldiers in the democracies. The German masses see no future for themselves in a victory for United Nations. That is why Goebbels has laid so much stress in all his recent propaganda—since it became clear that the quick victory sought by Hitler was eluding him—on the results of a German defeat.

### What Hagen Doesn't See

The Nazis are aided in this propaganda by all the speeches of the Roosevelts, the Churchills and the Stalins, who refuse to draw any distinction between the masses and the Nazi scoundrels. Hagen sees clearly that this is a terrible blunder, but he shuts his eyes to the real reasons for it. He will not analyze why the Allies refuse to even consider a European Federation of Nations. The book makes an appeal against the post-war program projected by the democratic imperialists on the ground that the German masses are held back from revolutionary action when they see that all they can expect from the victorious United Nations is a treble-vicious Versailles Treaty.

We agree completely with Hagen that it is the German working class that will lead the German Revolution against Hitler. There is no other force in Germany to accomplish this task. But Hagen refuses to draw the proper conclusion from this fact. He refuses to see that this places the "democracies" in a terrible dilemma. They cannot call on the German masses to revolt against Hitler, because they know very well that this revolt could take no other form than proletarian revolution. This they dread more than they fear Hitler. They see as their only solution a quick march into a defeated Germany in order to thwart the aims of the German workers. The same reason holds for their refusal to give assent to a European Federation. Such a Federation, freely arrived at, could mean only one thing—the Socialist United States of Europe.

Hagen thinks he favors a socialist workers' republic for the future Germany. But the cause he supports stands directly in the path of those who would accomplish such a worthy aim.

—Reviewed by A. Roland

## For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Living Costs

## Can't Save USSR By Supporting Program Of The Imperialists

By ANTHONY MASSINI

A worker, to whom I have been sending THE MILITANT for the past few months, recently wrote asking me a question which I would like to answer here. In part, he said:

"You say that the only way to defend the Soviet Union is by continuing the struggle for socialism and the establishment of Workers' and Farmers' Governments which will call on and aid the German workers to overthrow Hitler and join with the Soviet Union and world masses in a world socialist federation."

"As I get it, the Trotskyists say that the democratic imperialists are not interested in saving the Soviet Union but would prefer the mutual exhaustion of the Soviet Union and Germany so that when they are ready they will be able to both defeat Hitler and subject the Soviet Union to their rule by destroying the economic foundations of the workers' state and opening it to capitalist exploitation."

"On the whole, I think you have a correct position in principle. I agree that only world socialism in the final analysis can save the Soviet Union and do away with imperialist war. But I do not think that yours is a practical program in the immediate sense."

"After all, the Soviet Union is in terrible danger NOW. Unless it is helped now, it may not exist by the time that the workers of Germany get around to making their revolution. I am not asking that you give up your principles. But don't you agree that it would be in the interests of the Soviet Union, and therefore of the world working class, if, while continuing your struggle for socialism and maintaining your political opposition to the capitalists, you advocated the opening of a second front which even if it wouldn't solve all of the problems of the Soviet Union, at least would enable it to have a breathing spell and to be in existence when the world revolution comes?"

### Can't Do Both at Same Time

This is my answer to that question: No, it would not be in the interests of the workers anywhere for the revolutionary socialists to attempt to follow such a course as my friend proposes. Furthermore, it is impossible for anyone to follow such a course. It is impossible to fight against the capitalists, for socialism and at the same time to support those capitalists in an imperialist war. If you support capitalists in such a war, you cannot fight for socialism. You do either one or the other, not both. You can't eat your cake and have it on the table too.

What is implied by advocating a second front? It means wanting victory of the imperialists on that front. It means that in the factory you must support the speed-up, you must oppose any militant action by the workers in defense of their rights and conditions, it means that you must ask the workers not to fight against the chiseling of the bosses because that might interfere with the production of material needed for victory on that second front.

Supporting victory on a second front also means supporting all the fronts of the imperialists. If workers come and ask you if they should strike because the boss is chiseling on them and speeding them up beyond endurance, can you tell them, "Yes, strike if you are making war material for a first front, but don't strike if you are making material for the second front?" Obviously, you can't; for one thing, you can never tell where the materials will be used; support of one part of the imperialist war logically means support of all its parts.

That is what advocating a second front means in practice. But can anyone, while seriously following such a policy, at the same time consistently fight for socialism? You can't tell the workers to accept "national unity," that is, subordination of their interests to those of the capitalists, and at the same time organize them to fight against the capitalists for a Workers' and Farmers' Government.

### Which Is the Practical Policy?

My friend says that he agrees with us "in principle" that only the struggle for socialism and the German revolution will save the USSR. Nevertheless he wants us to advocate an imperialist second front which, he also agrees, will be opened only to serve the imperialists' interests, one of which is to destroy the workers' state. For this — because it might give the Soviet Union a breathing spell — he wants us to abandon the only policy which can save the workers' state. But what good is a policy which, while it might afford the USSR a breathing spell for a very short time, will mean its certain doom because it closes the door on the only real defense of the USSR? Is that what is meant by "practical" politics?

We are already acquainted with this kind of "practical" politics. The Stalinists have employed it for quite some time — and they have brought the Soviet Union nothing but defeats because in return for a few crumbs from the imperialists, they turned their backs on the only correct policy, the policy of mobilizing the real allies of the Soviet Union, the revolutionary workers of Germany, Europe and the world. We don't want any part of such "practical" politics.

### Our Program Is Practical

It is only our program, we insist, that is practical. This program is not a new one — it has been tried before, and been proved effective in practice. If not for this program — the program of Lenin and Trotsky — the Soviet Union would have been crushed more than 20 years ago.

In those days, during the Civil War of 1918-20 and the imperialist intervention, the program of revolutionary warfare and propaganda "worked." It "worked" then because it found allies of the Soviet Union in the ranks of the armies sent to destroy the Soviet Union, and because it turned those allies — the workers and peasants — into struggle against their own capitalist masters.

It can work again today too. Despite the terrible defeats of the last 15 months, it is not yet too late to open the second front of revolution. But the class-conscious workers must understand that they cannot open that front if they support the imperialist war.