

Workers Are Most Active Fighters In India Today.

Resistance to British Oppression Is
Strongest In War Production Centers

By Felix Morrow

The sessions of the Central Legislative Assembly of British India, which convened Sept. 14, have constituted a moral defeat for the British government. Virtually no one in the Assembly except government officials has defended, while one speaker after another has condemned, British policy.

This atmosphere is all the more remarkable when it is realized what precautions the British take in limiting the composition of the Assembly. Forty-one of its 145 members are civil service officials and others appointed by the government. The rest are elected under property qualifications which limit the electorate to little more than one million voters — about four-tenths of one per cent of the 300 million population of British India. Moreover the elections take place on a "communal basis," which reserves seats for landlords (7), commerce and industry (4), Europeans i. e., the British (9), Moslems (30). Even this hamstrung body has no powers, any action taken by it being subject to veto by the Viceroy.

Yet, such is the profound depth of the revolutionary ferment in India today, that even this Assembly has become the sounding-board for attacks on the British government and demands for independence.

The men who made these attacks all belong to the extreme right wing in Indian politics. Most of them have long been branded by the nationalists as betrayers of India's struggle for independence and agents of the British. If they now are moved to speak, we can well imagine what a fire is burning underneath them! Here are a few examples:

Statements of Non-Congress Elements

A. C. Neogy, member of the Nationalist Party, a right-wing split-off from the All-India Congress: "Churchill has been an inveterate enemy of India all his life. His latest utterance has alienated more Indians than any other British politician has ever done. Anti-government feeling was never stronger than at present."

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, member of the rabidly anti-Congress Moslem League: "To ignore the Congress is a folly of the first magnitude. The Congress leaders should be released to negotiate with the Moslems. Churchill is a very funny fellow — he says the Congress is a small group of unimportant men and thinks we will believe him."

M. N. Joshi, right wing trade union official: "The demand for independence is not alone a Congress demand, but a demand for the whole country. I am quite certain that every Indian in this assembly will agree that an Indian national government would raise an army of five or ten millions and intensify war production tenfold compared with what is happening now. The British Government has forgotten the lesson of Malaya and Burma."

Sardar Sant Singh, a traditionally pro-British Sikh leader: "Malaya and Burma were the clearest examples of the British attempt to fight on two fronts, one external and the other internal. India will be the same unless the British meet the Indian demand for freedom."

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, former member of the Viceroy's Executive Council and long the butt of Nehru's attacks said, in a statement: "Mr. Churchill's claim that the Congress party does not represent the Indian people is not true. We wonder if it is sufficiently realized that apart from the Congress all other parties in India are now insisting that India's position as a free country should be declared during the war and that she should have a national government with liberty to organize her defense against Japan, with due reservations regarding defense in the interests of the country."

Attitude of the Independent Moslems

An especially important statement was that of the Independent Moslem Conference, which represents nine Moslem parties and groups, including the followers of the Moslem Premiers of Punjab and Sind provinces; the Momins (a religious division within Mohammedanism) who number about 40 millions; another religious division, the Shiahis, who number about 22 millions; and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the organization of Moslem Divines (priests). The cabled dispatches did not carry this statement. (Continued on page 2)

Breitman Analyzes N. J. Primary Vote

Cites Results to Demonstrate Need for
Workers to Form Independent Labor Party

By GEORGE BREITMAN

Socialist Workers Party Candidate for U. S. Senator from
New Jersey.

NEWARK, N. J., Sept. 22. — The New Jersey primary elections were held on Sept. 15, and the Democratic and Republican Parties have nominated their candidates for the 15 Congressional and numerous state legislative posts to be voted on next November 3. The results of only a few of the Congressional primary contests were of interest or importance to New Jersey workers.

The Democratic incumbent, United States Senator William H. Smathers, was unopposed for the Democratic nomination. Smathers is the darling of all factions of the party — the New Deal Roosevelt - Governor Edison group, and the real power of the party, the notoriously corrupt and anti-labor machine of Boss Hague of Hudson County. Although Hague and Edison still are at odds on some issues, they see eye to eye when it comes to the threat of a possible loss of a common source of patronage. The Stalinists are also supporting Smathers.

The Republicans chose for their candidate as U. S. Senator the millionaire capitalist, Albert W. Hawkes, who was national president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce last year and one of Roosevelt's appointees as employer-member of the National War Labor Board. No one has ever accused Hawkes of being even "a friend of labor." Several workers with whom I collaborated five or six years ago briefly described him as "strike-breaker" during a strike in his Congoleum-Nairn plant at that time.

CHARGES OF "BUYING"

The labor fakery and the Stalinists will deny this, but there

is very little difference between these two candidates. On all the important questions of the day they have fundamentally the same attitude. Needless to say, they both insist that the war is not an issue in the elections; neither of them wants a discussion of the paramount issue which determines all others. Consequently their attacks on each other are reduced to mud-slinging and almost desperate efforts to find differences.

Smathers claims that he has proof that Hawkes "bought" the Republican nomination. Since Hawkes spent almost \$50,000 in the primary campaign alone, and most of it his own money, there are others who share this view. But why is Smathers so indignant? Didn't he buy his own nomination last spring by his efforts on behalf of Meany, Hague's candidate for federal judge? Is there some great principled difference between the buying of a Republican nomination with money and the purchase of a Demo-

(Continued on page 3)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI. — No. 39

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

Senate Votes To Freeze Wages

Red Soldiers Fight Back



Through fields of grain, Soviet automatic riflemen are shown fighting back against the German attacks on the Southern front, before the German forces reached Stalingrad. Lower photo shows Red soldiers following tank attack. (Radiophoto for Federated Pictures.)

War Labor Board Undermines Fight For Better Conditions

'Little Steel' Rule Means No Raises For Most Workers

Wm. H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, revealed last week that the "Little Steel" formula pegging purchasing power to the January, 1941 level, means freezing the wages of 75 per cent of the workers to the present levels.

Testifying before the Senate Banking Committee on September 15, Davis stated that if the Congress wrote the "Little Steel" formula into law, it would mean that 75% of wages would go no higher than they are now. "If workers want more pay," he said, explaining how the "Little Steel" formula works, "they must work overtime to get it."

OTHER IMPORTANT FACTORS

The increased cost of living since January 1941 is computed by the government without any consideration for many factors which undermine the purchasing power and living standards of the workers.

The effect of the new taxes on low incomes is not taken into consideration. The fact that commodities, which have not gone up in price, have deteriorated in value and quality has been ignored. It is a well known and widespread practice for manufacturers to sell goods of inferior quality and materials at "ceiling" prices set for goods of higher quality. The constant pressure to buy war bonds has further reduced the workers' purchasing power.

If the WLB formula were really designed to maintain the workers' living standards and purchasing power at the January 1941 level, the workers would be entitled to far more than a 15% wage raise.

The truth is that the "Little Steel" formula...

Grants Less Than One-Third of GM Unions' Demands

The War Labor Board on September 17 rejected the demand of the CIO United Auto Workers for a dollar-a-day wage increase in General Motors, and granted an increase of only 4 cents an hour, less than one-third of the union's original demand.

In a decision affecting over 225,000 GM workers, the WLB flatly rejected the recommendations of the panel on the case. The panel had recommended five cents an hour general increase.

The GM panel had proposed that in line with the WLB's "Little Steel" formula a raise of 1.5 cents an hour be given to cover the difference between the 15% rise in living costs since January 1941, and increases won by GM workers since that time. An additional wage increase of 3.5 cents an hour was recommended to narrow the differential between the Ford and GM workers. The UAW had shown that there was a 6.7 cents differential between GM and Ford wages.

But the War Labor Board turned down these proposals. The Board's decision rejected the principle that wage differentials in an industry should be wiped out. Such a principle would make it necessary to raise the wages of thousands of low-paid garment workers in the South, as well as in many other industries.

"MADE A MISTAKE"

The WLB therefore did not grant the 4 cent an hour increase on the basis of closing the gap between Ford and GM wages. Instead, the WLB stated that the panel had "made a mistake" in estimating that on the basis of the "Little Steel" formula the GM workers were entitled to only 1.5 cents an hour, and ruled that they were entitled to 4 cents instead.

The Chrysler and Ford workers' demands for dollar-a-day wage increases are still pending. It can be seen from the GM decision that these workers will be turned down by the WLB, and will be given very small increases, if any.

The WLB granted the maintenance of membership clause to the UAW in GM, with the employer members dissenting.

'Union Security' Denied Workers Who Go On Strike

Another step to hamstringing the unions was taken on September 19 by the War Labor Board. In the case of the AFL Federal Workers Union of Buffalo, the WLB denied the union any form of "union security" because the workers had gone on strike for a few hours at the General Chemical Company plant last June.

This is a repetition of the Board's rejection last month of a demand for a maintenance of membership clause made by the Monsanto Chemical workers in Everett, Massachusetts, on the grounds that the unions had gone out on strike and had to be penalized.

ARBITRARY RULING

The general policy has been laid down by the WLB that no union which goes out on strike will be given a "union security" clause. This is an arbitrary ruling by the WLB not based on any legal rights. The right to strike has not yet been taken away from the workers by law. But the rulings of the WLB make it illegal in effect, since it punishes unions by refusing union demands no matter how justified they may be.

This ruling will have the effect of encouraging employers to refuse to settle grievances, to ignore union demands in the plants, since any attempt by the union to back up its demand with a strike will result in reprisals by the government.

One of the aims of the War Labor Board in this decision is to force unions to channelize all plant grievances through the mediation machinery of the board. This would further destroy the independent function of the unions, and place them at the mercy of the government, which would rule not only on new contract demands, but on all the plant problems daily confronting the workers. It would, in addition, delay the settlement of such grievances by means of the endless red tape and stalling of governmental agencies.

Authorizes Roosevelt To Fix Wages At Sept. 15 Levels

House of Representatives Also Considers
Legislation to Prevent Increases In Pay

By Joseph Andrews

Sept. 22—Although not all details of the price-control legislation demanded by Roosevelt had been worked out, it was already clear this week that all major Congressional groups—both the supporters and opponents of Roosevelt—are united on the freezing of workers' wages.

The Senate by unanimous vote passed an amendment to the Brown-Wagner resolution on wages and prices, which authorizes and directs Roosevelt to freeze wages, prices and salaries at the September 15, 1942, level. The amendment empowers Roosevelt to do this by executive order.

This amendment, for which all groups voted, stated that Roosevelt must act to freeze wages on or before November 1.

The Brown-Wagner resolution, which is now being discussed in the Senate and will be voted upon shortly, did not make specific provisions for pegging wages at any particular level, but was a general authorization to Roosevelt to act. The amendment makes the September 15 date mandatory.

TWO OTHER AMENDMENTS

Two additional amendments to the Brown-Wagner resolution were passed in the Senate. One amendment provided that the President be empowered to adjust "gross inequities" in wages and prices, thus providing a certain leeway for Roosevelt to allow wages and prices to rise above the September 15 level in some cases.

The actions of the administration thus far, through the decisions of the War Labor Board, have shown that provisions to right "gross inequities" mean very little in action. Only the most minor concessions have been made to this principle, which netted the low-paid workers very little in the way of pay increases. This provision, in the main, is intended to lead the workers into thinking they are going to get a square deal, and is a safety valve against possible protests from low paid workers.

The Senate also passed an amendment giving Roosevelt power to order reduction in salaries over \$5,000 a year or more where "gross inequities"

exist. This amendment is an obvious maneuver by the Senate to toss the hot potato of limits on employers' incomes into Roosevelt's lap. Roosevelt's proposal to limit incomes to \$25,000 received little serious attention. It was clear from Roosevelt's Labor Day speech that no serious action was intended on this point.

THE HOUSE BILL

In the House of Representatives, similar wage-freezing legislation is under discussion. The House Banking committee has approved a bill substantially the same as the Senate resolution. The House bill authorizes Roosevelt to fix wages and prices. It would, however, prohibit wage increases without War Labor Board approval, and instead of setting wages at the September 15 level, adopts the "Little Steel" formula, which freezes wages to 15% above the January 1, 1941 level.

There is little difference between the Senate and House proposals to peg wages. Both bills would freeze the wages of the overwhelming majority of the workers to present levels. The House bill, which applies the "Little Steel" formula, does not provide more leeway for wage increases than the Senate bill. The real significance of the "Little Steel" formula was explained last week, when Chairman William H. Davis stated that the formula would freeze 75% of the wages to present levels.

While there is no important difference of opinion on the question of freezing wages between the House and Senate, or within either house, there are still differences on the question of the pegging of farm prices, with the "farm bloc" holding out for provisions to allow price increases.

EFFECT ON PRICES

It is clear from the bills in-

Government Office Rejects Bargaining Rights for ITU

No employer in the country carries on such flagrantly anti-union activities as the biggest employer of all, the government. This was demonstrated last week when the delegates to the eighty-sixth convention of the International Typographical Union adopted a resolution embodying their grievances against the Government Printing Office.

The resolution charged that the head of the Government Printing Office had denied its employees the legal right of collective bargaining; had "debased conditions" in that Office; had made Sunday a single-price work day in violation of the existing wage agreement; and had shown disregard of obligations to recognize the ITU under pretext of being compelled to grant government printing contracts to the lowest bidder.

"Labor's friend" in the White House has made no comment.

roduced, and from the actions of Congress thus far, that while legislation governing wages will be drastic, prices will not be as effectively pegged.

Congressional spokesmen, according to the N. Y. Times, admit that even, according to the provisions of the Senate resolution, farm prices would undoubtedly go up from 3 to 5% above the September 15 level.

Other loopholes appear in the proposed price-fixing structure. For example, there is no authorization to peg the prices on public utilities, such as electric light and power, and railroads. These prices directly affect the cost of living. But on the grounds that only the states can deal with this problem, Congress has thus far signified that no price fixing will be affected in this field.

In addition, the proposed price fixing measures will not effectively curb the tendency to lower the quality of consumer goods selling at so-called "ceiling prices," which amounts to a disguised rise in prices.

Congress has generally indicated that it will bow to Roosevelt's ultimatum to give him great powers over wages and prices. The primary aim of this power will be to force a greater burden onto the backs of the workers and to slash the living standards of the workers.

London Denies Promise Of Second Front In '42

June Agreements Are Dismissed As Matter Of Poor Phraseology

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

Stalin promised, the Soviet people that one of the chief boons of his diplomacy and his alliance with the "democratic" imperialists would be the opening of the second front in 1942, and that this would safeguard the Soviet Union.

When the Roosevelt-Churchill-Molotov agreement was signed last June, the Kremlin assured the Soviet people that this constituted the greatest defeat yet suffered by Hitler and that Hitler's fate was sealed. The year 1942, boasted Stalin, would be not only the year of the opening of the second front but also the year of the definitive Soviet victory over the Nazis.

It now turns out that the whole business of the second front in 1942 is, after all, only a misunderstanding. It all depends on how one interprets a certain phrase in a diplomatic document. Moscow interprets it wrongly, says London.

In his authoritative dispatches from London Raymond Daniell explains: "Those here who are agitating for the immediate opening of a second front read into it the prom-

ise of an invasion of the Continent this Summer, while those who are less easily swayed by emotions, analyzed it as possibly meaning that the Russians had been convinced that, urgent as the need was, the task was too great."

Daniell goes on to add: "This latter interpretation, however, has been proved wrong by the expressions of disappointment emanating from Moscow because Allied armies have not yet landed in France." (N. Y. Times, September 20.)

A MATTER OF PHRASEOLOGY?

London disclaims all responsibility for the "misunderstanding." According to Daniell, the phrase in question was "coined in the United States and Mr. Churchill, more given to Elizabethan language than Mr. Roosevelt, apparently thought that there was a better way of saying the same thing. It is understood that he telephoned to the White House to suggest what he regarded as more felicitous phraseology..." And so forth and so on.

Meanwhile the Kremlin is insisting more and more openly that it is not a question of felicitous phraseology at all but rather that of a pledge that has not been fulfilled. The same Daniell reports from London that: "There is beginning to creep into Soviet propaganda in the

Stalin Promised the Soviet Masses Help Would Come Now

press and on the radio the suggestion that the Russians have been let down by their allies." (N. Y. Times, September 17.)

Washington has not yet officially entered the controversy. Meanwhile, the N. Y. Times and the metropolitan press in general have sided with the Churchillian "interpretation." The Daily Worker is howling that this is all the work of "appeasers" and "Munich-men," that there can be no possible misunderstanding of what was agreed upon, that the language of the statement is unmistakable, etc. etc. — but not a word about Roosevelt's role in the matter.

REAL ATTITUDE OF DEMOCRACIES

What is the real meaning of this revolting spectacle of secret diplomacy at work?

First of all, it irrefutably demonstrates the real attitude of Stalin's allies to the Soviet Union. They are not concerned with her fate at all. The heroic struggle of the Red Army enters into their strategy only in so far as blows are dealt to their rival, German imperialism. It is no skin off their back if the Soviet Union is exhausted in the course of the struggle. (Continued on page 2)

Masses Fight Against Hitler Oppression

But Struggle of Workers and Peasants Has Nothing in Common With Aims of Allied Imperialist Lackeys

Sabotage, Go On Strike, Conduct Armed War

The power of the mighty and brutal forces of German occupation is being challenged in all parts of conquered Europe. Reports from Luxembourg, Norway, France, Holland and Yugoslavia show that the workers and peasants are using all forms of struggle ranging up to general strike, sabotage and armed revolt.

Protesting against the annexation of Luxembourg into greater Germany and the decree establishing compulsory military service for all the people of Luxembourg, the workers of this small nation went out on a general strike in the first week of September.

On September 18, in a dispatch "from the German frontier" a British news agency announced the execution of leaders of the Luxembourg miners and steel workers for taking a prominent part in the strike.

Later reports reveal the threatened deportation either to Germany or the eastern regions of all in Luxembourg who refuse to bow to the conqueror.

The upper class of Luxembourg, like the ruling classes of all the occupied countries, divided into two groups upon the approach of the German armies. One group hastened to place itself at the service of the invaders, hoping thus to retain a share along with the German capitalists in the exploitation of the workers. Another group, believing either that Hitler will be defeated by his rival imperialists or that the profits they would make under German rule would be too small, threw in their lot with the Allies, and fled from the country to establish the so-called governments-in-exile.

But the masses—the workers and peasants—could neither flee from their countries, nor do they willingly accept the yoke of German imperialism. They are fighting back in every way they can, as the masses of Luxembourg showed.

SIGNS OF RESISTANCE

In Norway Quisling's plan to incorporate the unions into the totalitarian set-up has been countered by the workers' mass resignation from their unions, leaving but a hollow shell of the old organizations.

The people of occupied Holland are also stirring. Reports from that country say that "almost all" farmers rejected membership in the Nazi farmers' organizations. Of the 525,000 organized Dutch workers, only 17,500 have joined the Netherlands Nazi labor front.

Shipments of German arms

have disappeared while being transported in Holland. In all probability they are now in the possession of workers awaiting a favorable opportunity to use them.

The Germans, together with Laval, have ordered mass deportations from France to the mines of Poland and Silesia as reprisal against the rebellious French workers.

Factory and railroad sabotage is reported from Belgium, Norway, Holland, France, Yugoslavia, Albania and other countries.

CONTENDING FORCES IN YUGOSLAVIA

What was once Yugoslavia is the scene of fierce class battles, according to reports from Ankara, Turkey.

German Elite Guard regiments and armored forces have replaced the Italian troops of occupation in Yugoslavia in an effort to suppress the guerrilla attacks of armed workers and peasants.

The opposition to the German forces comes from two main

groups: the forces led by General Draha Mikhailovitch, who seeks to restore the Yugoslav and Allied capitalists to their former privileged positions; and the 30,000 armed workers and peasants whom Mikhailovitch denounces as "communist partisans" and whom he is trying to wipe out.

DIFFERENT AIMS

It is clear from the struggles in occupied Europe that the main resistance to Hitlerite rule comes from the workers and peasants. The toilers are not fighting for the same reason or for the same objectives as the representatives of capitalism.

The masses are not fighting and dying to bring back the miserable conditions under which they lived before the war. They want to rid themselves of all exploitation and oppression. What the masses want will never be achieved by a victory of any imperialist power in the war. What they want—freedom and security and peace—can be achieved only through the Socialist United States of Europe.

Open Fascist Is Welcomed Into DeGaulle Ranks

By MICHAEL CORT

The "Fighting French" got a new recruit in London last week. The "Fighting French," headed by General de Gaulle, is the movement which calls on the masses of France to support the Allied imperialists, including de Gaulle, on the ground that they are fighting for "democracy." The new recruit is Charles Vallin, vice-president of the Croix de Feu, French fascist movement, and until this month a member of the Vichy government.

Vallin did not join the "Fighting French" because he had suddenly repented of his fascist ideas and wanted to embrace democracy. As a matter of fact, he was very careful to set the press straight on this point, declaring upon his arrival in

Britain: "Without giving up or denying any of my ideas or friendships I have come to place myself freely under the leadership of General de Gaulle."

Nor do the de Gaullist propagandists pretend that Vallin has given up his former reactionary ideas. Instead they have seized on his recruitment to try to show that all political tendencies in France are rallying to the banner of the "Fighting French." Vallin's arrival in Britain was carefully timed to coincide with the arrival of Pierre Brossollet, former foreign editor of the Socialist Party newspaper, *Le Populaire*.

The two of them assured a N. Y. Times correspondent that their presence in London after escaping from France together symbolized the unanimity in which all classes and all shades of political opinion in their homeland were united behind General de Gaulle in the struggle for the freedom of France. This can be viewed only as an admission by the de Gaullists that they welcome everybody who will support the war of the Allied imperialists,

including fascists.

The welcome accorded Vallin by the de Gaullists—not surprising to those who recall that de Gaulle himself is a monarchist—throws light on the real aims of the "Fighting French," who talk about democracy because that is the only way they can get any support from the French masses, but whose real program is to regain all the privileges and profits formerly enjoyed by the French capitalists.

Some of them would prefer a French regime under a monarchy, some of them want a fascist dictatorship, and some would even like to go back to the "democracy" of a Daladier or Reynaud.

Vallin is one of those who wants a fascist France. It was on this basis that he supported Petain from the beginning. Petain had promised his supporters that he would (1) keep the French workers in subjection and (2) make a good deal with Hitler on behalf of the French bosses.

Petaim has been able thus far (with the aid of German bayonets) to fulfill the first promise, although no one would pretend that he has eliminated the opposition to his regime. But in the eyes of some sections of the French capitalist class, he did not get a good enough deal with Germany.

WHY VALLIN TURNS TO THE DE GAULLISTS

Vallin virtually admits that this is the reason why he now desires the Vichy government, although he does not give up his reactionary ideas. He told the press that he had discovered there were two Petains—a good one and a bad one. The good one was the French hero of the last war—that is, the leader of the fascist-minded veterans. And the bad one was the man who worked with "collaborators"—that is, the one who leans toward those French forces who are most subservient to Hitler.

Vallin leaves Petain and turns to the "Fighting French" not because he has become a "democrat," but because he now thinks that only de Gaulle can fulfill the second part of Petain's program. However, he believes that the British-American imperialists are going to defeat the German imperialists and of course he wants to be on the winning side.

The kind of "freedom for France" that de Gaulle, Vallin, Brossollet and Co. want, has nothing in common with the aspirations of the French masses. These lackeys of Allied imperialism are as much the enemies of the French workers as Petain, Laval and the other collaborators with Hitler. To win real freedom, the French masses must reject the program and leadership of all supporters of imperialism and extend the present resistance to the forces of Hitler into a struggle for a Workers' and Farmers' Government in France and a Socialist United States of Europe.

Breitman Analyzes N. J. Primary Vote

(Continued from page 1)

cratic nomination by political horse-trading?

Hawkes, on the other hand, has denounced Smathers as a rubber stamp. This too is a view held by many, for Smathers' only claim to fame seems to be his boast that he has always supported whatever the administration has advocated. But while Hawkes thrusts himself forward as an "independent thinker," he has shown — by his reaction to Roosevelt's ultimatum to rule by decree unless Congress grants him the power he demands — that he too would not raise any fundamental objections to the assumption of dictatorial power by Roosevelt.

After attacking Smathers as a rubber-stamp, Hawkes had to make some kind of statement on Roosevelt's Labor Day ultimatum. In the N. Y. Times of Sept. 12, he explained his position: It is the duty of a U. S. Senator, he said, "to do all in his power to support the independence of the three branches of the government." And specifically:

"Where it is necessary for the Congress to grant unusual powers in the hands of the Chief Executive or Administration branch of the government, those powers should be granted promptly, but each of them should have an expiration date in the original grant. When, in the judgment of the Senate and the House, it is necessary to surrender one of their powers to the Executive branch of the government, that power should not be surrendered for a longer term than the current term of office."

In other words, Hawkes is not opposed to Roosevelt getting dic-

tatorial power — all he asks is that Congress warn the president that he can't hold such power for more than four years at a time! And there is nothing surprising about this—the Democrats would act the same way if a Republican administration sat in Washington. Both parties of the ruling class look upon this as a war fought in their interests, and they are ready to subordinate political differences to the winning of this war.

THE HARTLEY CAMPAIGN

There were some interesting developments in the primaries for two of New Jersey's 14 nominations to the House of Representatives. From the Tenth Congressional District, comprising parts of industrial Essex and Hudson Counties, the present Representative is the Republican Fred A. Hartley, Jr. The local leaders of the CIO, who are Stalinists, and the local leaders of the AFL, decided to join forces in an effort to have Hartley defeated in the primary. They campaigned against him on two issues: 1. that he had been an isolationist before Pearl Harbor and therefore couldn't be trusted to help win the war, and 2. that he had a bad labor record. With the Stalinists in a prominent position on the committee, and the workers were called on to nominate Mayor Williams of Belleville.

Hartley was renominated by a hundred or so votes. It is difficult to estimate what part the attacks on his isolationist record played in his victory or the close vote. But there is little reason to believe that his poor labor record lost him many votes. For his

opponent, Williams, whom the Stalinists and labor leaders boosted, is known among the workers in this area primarily for the big part he played in breaking the UE-CIO strike at the Isolantite plant last year. (The Stalinists were in charge of that strike.) Of the two candidates for the nomination, Williams undoubtedly seemed to the workers as a more actively anti-labor element.

Much more important was the development in the Democratic primary for Representative from the Eighth Congressional District. Here Irving Abramson was unopposed for the nomination. He won the nomination, but at the same time he struck a strong blow at the movement for the creation of an independent labor party, which he has himself advocated for a number of years.

Abramson is not one of the ordinary capitalist "friends of labor" who are so rarely found on labor's side except around election time. Abramson is one of the state's most prominent labor leaders, the president of the New Jersey Industrial Union Council, CIO, and one of the labor leaders who enjoys the support of the ranks of the CIO. He has been associated with numerous progressive struggles; he has been a consistent opponent of racial discrimination in employment; even after Pearl Harbor he did not hesitate to publicly speak up in support of the 18 defendants in the Minneapolis "conspiracy" trial, although he himself is a supporter of the war.

But while Abramson has won the respect of many workers, it is nevertheless our duty to state the truth: Whatever his intentions, Abramson's action does not and will not serve the best in-

terests of the labor movement.

For one thing, it weakens the movement for a labor party; he cannot consistently advocate a labor party to oppose the two capitalist parties, their candidates and their program, and at the same time be a candidate of one of those parties. Secondly, it strengthens Hague's party and Hague, who has tried so hard to smash the CIO; for now the Democrats have an attractive labor covering, and they will be able to appeal for votes from the reactionary Democrats on the ground that they are the party supporting the candidacy of the CIO president.

FOR AN INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY

Had Abramson run as a labor candidate on an independent labor party platform, the Socialist Workers Party would have supported him against the other candidates in the elections. But we cannot support any candidate of the reactionary Democratic Party of Hague, Farley, Rankin and Roosevelt.

All recent history, including the primaries, points to the crying need for independent political action by the workers. It is now too late to form such a party to enter its own candidates in the 1942 elections. As spokesman and candidate of the Socialist Workers Party in this election campaign, I shall actively advocate the formation of such a party at the earliest possible time and do everything in my power to clarify the issue so that this will be the last election in which the labor movement will not be represented by a full and complete slate of candidates and a program of its own.

Trotsky's Book On Morals Is Weapon In Workers' Struggle

THEIR MORALS AND OURS, by Leon Trotsky. Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Place, New York City. 48 pages. 20 cents.

When the fact-finding Commission of Inquiry headed by John Dewey brought in its verdict that Leon Trotsky and his son Sedov were innocent of the frame-up charges in the notorious Moscow Trials, the last petty-bourgeois moralists still riding the Stalinist gravy train and still able to think found it suddenly expedient to discontinue their support of Stalin.

Instead of publicly apologizing to Trotsky for their past slanders, however, these moralists chose to fall back to a second line trench of calumny. "Stalinism and Trotskyism are one and the same thing," they announced to the world. The real source of the frame-ups and other horrors perpetrated by the Stalinist regime is to be sought, they argued, not in the degenerating influence of world imperialism upon the isolated workers' state, but in the "amoralism" of Bolshevik politics which led the founders of the Soviet Union into believing that the "end justifies the means."

In defense of Bolshevik politics and the founders of the Soviet Union, Trotsky wrote *Their Morals and Ours* and *The Moralists and Sycophants Against Marxism*, both of which are included in the booklet now issued by Pioneer Publishers under the title of the first article.

In order to answer properly the miserable arguments of the slanderers, Trotsky submitted the entire question of morals in politics to a thoroughgoing Marxist analysis. As a result his work constitutes not only a polemic of immediate interest but an important addition to the classics of Marxism. John Dewey, who considered the pamphlet of such significance that it required him among others to record his disapproval of Bolsheviks utilizing the class struggle in freeing humanity from oppression, remarked by way of explanation that *Their Morals and Ours* is the first "explicit discussion by a consistent Marxian of the relation of means and ends in social action."

Working Class vs. Capitalist Morals

Trotsky's analysis is not difficult for an intel-

ligent worker to follow. The claim that there are certain general moral principles, which all classes alike must follow willy-nilly or suffer the stigma of "amoralism" or "immorality," Trotsky points out, is false. Such a claim, he attempts to prove, is made specifically to further the reactionary interests of the oppressing class, for in every instance the oppressors interpret the alleged moral principles in accordance with their views. Thus in a slave society the slaveholders consider that any slave who strives for freedom thereby violates general moral principles and that it is the highest morality to punish him for his sin.

Trotsky concludes that morality has a class origin, that it develops and is shaped over a period of time to correspond to the economic and political interests of the contending classes.

The working class develops its own morality as opposed to that of the bourgeoisie, Trotsky shows. This morality finds its highest expression in the revolutionary socialist party of the workers. The Bolshevik party, remarks Trotsky, was the most honest party in history. Truth serves as a powerful means in gaining the great end, liberation of mankind. One of the most interesting and fruitful sections of the booklet is that in which Trotsky, pursuing the analytical method of dialectical materialism, dissects the maxim, "the end justifies the means." He shows why it is that those who want a classless society of peace and prosperity and who are seriously interested in the struggle to end class oppression together with its accompanying economic depressions, unemployment, hunger, race prejudice, imperialist war, etc., are forced to develop morals far superior to those of the capitalists. In the morals of the Marxist party, which places the well being and future of humanity above all else, one catches a glimpse of what the morals of the classless society will be like.

Its Place In Trotsky's Last Writings

Besides defending Bolshevik politics and the founders of the Soviet Union, *Their Morals and Ours* has another great end in view. Trotsky did not write a single line that was not specifically intended in one way or another to strengthen and

build the revolutionary socialist party of the world working class. Far from permitting himself an unwarranted excursion into a remote field, Trotsky manifestly designed *Their Morals and Ours* as a foundation stone in the construction of the Marxist party of our period. It interlocks with the key section of one of our most important documents.

The opening sentence of "The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International," the so-called "transition program" which Trotsky wrote the same year as *Their Morals and Ours*, declares: "The world political situation as a whole is chiefly characterized by a historical crisis of the leadership of the proletariat." At present the working class, explains the program, is paralyzed by a leadership that is completely subservient to world capitalism. "As time goes on," concludes the second section of the program, "their desperate efforts to hold back the wheel of history will demonstrate more clearly to the masses that the crisis of the proletarian leadership, having become the crisis in mankind's culture, can be resolved only by the Fourth International."

But world reaction understands this also. Today, as never before in history, it rains all its blows upon this tiny minority party, hoping to extinguish it before the masses can learn its program. Stalin, Hitler, Churchill, Roosevelt — each in his own way strikes at the Trotskyists. The strongest of the strong can survive this hammering. *Their Morals and Ours* was written to help steel the ranks of the vanguard against these blows.

What important role the clear understanding of the class character of morals plays in resolving this question of leadership of the working class is explained in greater detail by Trotsky himself on page 24 of the booklet:

"A Bolshevik is inconceivable, of course, without the materialist method; in the sphere of morality too. But this method serves him not solely for the interpretation of events but rather for the creation of a revolutionary party of the proletariat. It is impossible to accomplish this task without complete independence from the bourge-

oisie and their morality. Yet bourgeois public opinion actually now reigns in full sway over the official workers' movement from William Green in the United States, Leon Blum and Maurice Thorez in France, to Garcia Oliver in Spain. In this fact the reactionary character of the present period reaches its sharpest expression.

"A revolutionary Marxist cannot begin to approach his historical mission without having broken morally from bourgeois public opinion and its agencies in the proletariat. For this, moral courage of a different caliber is required from that of opening wide one's mouth at meetings and yelling, 'Down with Hitler!' 'Down with Franco!' It is precisely this resolute, completely-thought-out, inflexible rupture of the Bolsheviks from conservative moral philosophy not only of the big but of the petty bourgeoisie which morally terrorizes democratic phrase-mongers, drawing-room prophets and lobbying heroes. From this derive their complaints about the 'amoralism' of the Bolsheviks."

Confirmation of Trotsky's Prediction

The printing of *Their Morals and Ours* is particularly timely in the United States today. The petty-bourgeois moralists have confirmed Trotsky's prediction that their abhorrence of Bolshevik morals was but part of their preparation — whether conscious or not — to support the imperialist war. Norman Thomas, for instance, who now supports the imperialist war after raising his hands in holy horror for some years at Bolshevik morals, was destined it would seem to find a niche in history as the living prototype for the following lines on page 41:

"The petty-bourgeois moralist is the younger brother of the bourgeois pacifist who wants to 'humanize' warfare by prohibiting the use of poison gases, the bombardment of unfortified cities, etc. Politically, such programs serve only to deflect the thoughts of the people from revolution as the only method of putting an end to war."

We hope that every class-conscious worker will give *Their Morals and Ours* a place of honor in the well-fingered section of his book-shelf.

Reviewed by Joseph Hansen.

The Capitalist Opponents Of Roosevelt's Ultimatum

By M. Morrison

In connection with the discussion of the subject of government by decree — a discussion that has arisen as a result of Roosevelt's Labor Day speech in which he threatened to override an act of Congress — there are several questions of secondary importance that are interesting and deserving of some comment.

To some militant workers the opposition to Roosevelt's proposal on the part of reactionary Republicans, such as Senator Taft and McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune*, may appear puzzling. Why should these reactionaries object to a proposal which, in the long run, must inevitably be detrimental not to the interests of the capitalist class but of the working class?

Marxism teaches that the government is the executive committee of the ruling capitalist class. But it would indeed be the height of formalism to conclude from this that, at all times, all of the capitalists agree on certain measures and policies calculated to serve the interests of the ruling group.

Very frequently the capitalists disagree among themselves on the best methods to be used in order to protect their interests. The capitalist class is divided into groups based on sectional or industrial interests and the struggle between groups may, at times, assume serious proportions. All capitalists want to defend their interests as against the workers, but not all agree on the best method of doing so.

It is because of this conflict between groups of capitalists that it is possible to have a situation where, for different and opposite reasons, a capitalist party and a revolutionary party oppose a measure proposed by the government.

The isolationists opposed entry of this country into the war; so did the revolutionary Marxists. The former because they were of the opinion that war, at this time, would not serve the interests of the capitalist class; the latter because they are opposed to an imperialist war. The difference between the two groups became clear when war was actually declared. The isolationists support the war, the revolutionary Marxists do not.

When a reactionary newspaper, like the *Chicago Tribune*, violently opposes Roosevelt's threat to override an act of Congress, it does so not because it is opposed in principle to government by decree. As against the workers the *Chicago Tribune* favors measures much more reactionary than those proposed by Roosevelt. What it opposes is the idea of having Roosevelt issue the decrees and not the idea of government by decree.

It so happens that some reactionaries, intransigent in their bitter opposition to Roosevelt as an "appeaser" of labor, will object to almost any measure proposed by him. Outside of the fact that they are firmly convinced that he does not adequately represent the interests of the capitalist class, the reactionary Republicans have the interests of the Republican party at heart. With them opposition to Roosevelt is demagogic. That is, they choose issues which they think will arouse the sentiments of the people against Roosevelt, and not because they are honestly of the opinion that certain measures are detrimental to the interests of the people.

To explain the attitude of the reactionaries one would have to analyze all of the factors involved, beginning with the time Roosevelt became President, and include among them, the temperament and ideas of the leading reactionaries, such as McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune*. The economic factor, though basic in the explanation of any phenomenon, is not the only factor.

It must also be recognized that some representatives of the capitalist class honestly object to rule by decree. As much as possible they would like to follow the democratic traditions of the capi-

talist regime. They prefer democratic to fascist capitalism; they prefer the democratic process to government by decree. Tradition plays an important role in the formation of attitudes and ideas. "Consistent" liberalism is not yet altogether extinct.

But it is only a revolutionary Marxist who takes a principled opposition to government by decree under the capitalist system. For it is only a revolutionary Marxist who recognizes the dangers to the working class inherent in the system of government by decree. Such a system, under capitalism, must of necessity operate against the interests of the working masses. Here and there a decree may be promulgated which benefits the masses but that is nothing to the serious blow dealt the workers by a system which practically deprives the working-class organizations of independence and democracy.

Another question that arises in connection with Roosevelt's threat to violate an act of Congress, is his motives for doing so. The reactionaries picture him as a man anxious to become a dictator and as a shrewd and calculating individual who, step by step, is assuming the powers of a dictator. Roosevelt on the other hand, promises that when the emergency is over he will return the powers that he assumes or are granted to him.

It seems to me that to argue on the basis of an alleged desire on the part of Roosevelt to become a dictator weakens our position. To say the least, it would be extremely difficult to prove such a contention. That he is an exceedingly clever politician, is quite evident but that he aims to become a dictator is not evident.

We are on more solid ground if we attribute his acts not to some desire to become a dictator but to the pressure of capitalism in its epoch of decline, aggravated by the conditions of war. To eliminate Roosevelt's personal character, his intentions and motives and to emphasize the remorseless pressure to which he is subjected by virtue of the fact that his government is based on the capitalist system is a far more solid position to assume in any argument.

As indicated in my article of last week the workers should be taught that the alternative is either capitalism with a dictatorship serving the interests of the capitalist class or socialism with authority, planning and centralization, all derived from and guarded by workers' democracy.

It would be unwise to assume that the workers, at present, are worried about the trend towards government by decree. Certainly we cannot hope to stir them, in the immediate future, into a powerful movement against that trend. They are undoubtedly anxious about the stabilization of wages and the order to freeze workers to their jobs in a few industries in some western states. It is the objective of these decrees, and not the fact that the government has assumed to rule by decree, that is causing them some worry.

As far as Roosevelt's threat to violate an act of Congress is concerned, it is safe to assume that the workers support him in this proposal. Not only because they would like to see a ceiling set on the price of agricultural commodities, but because they consider Roosevelt as liberal and Congress as reactionary.

The workers do not, at present, see the connection between government by decree and their standard of living. It may be much easier to rally the workers for a struggle against the objective of a particular decree directly affecting their livelihood and conditions of work. We shall of course not neglect to point out to the workers the effect of every decree but we shall also try to educate them to the meaning of the trend toward rule by decree. We shall continue to emphasize the idea that it is impossible for them to escape dictatorship and a lower standard of living if they permit capitalism to exist.

BUILD YOUR MARXIST LIBRARY NOW!

A LOW-PRICED SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

FASCISM AND BIG BUSINESS, by Daniel Guerin, 337 pages, paper	\$1.00
REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN, by Felix Morrow, 202 pages, paper50
TOTAL LIST PRICE...\$1.50	
Special Combination Price \$.75	
PIONEER PUBLISHERS	
116 University Place	New York City

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People.

Vol. VI—No. 39 Saturday, September 26, 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. Single copies: 5 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

Entered as second class matter February 13, 1941 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1917.

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.

The Siege Of Stalingrad

After thirty-three days of one of the bloodiest battles in the history of warfare the Volga City is not yet a Nazi citadel. "The fall of Stalingrad," Hitler's *Franfurter Zeitung* admits, "and therewith the final breaking up of the Russian front, has been delayed."

Thirty-three days ago the German armies opened their campaign for the conquest of Stalingrad. They began with at least a million troops, with mastery of the air, with panzer divisions, with parachute troops, with heavy artillery and siege guns. The Germans drove on the city in a three-pronged attack while droves of planes dropped tons of bombs on Stalingrad until it lay in ruins.

Numerically inferior, possessing only a handful of fighter planes that were soon driven from the skies, only a small number of tanks and without adequate equipment, the Soviet workers and soldiers slowed down the mighty momentum of the German army to a slow crawl. The advancing German armies entered the city only over the corpses of thousands of their comrades. Then having finally entered the city, they found that far from having shattered resistance, their most terrible engagements were still ahead of them.

Every building, or more correctly the debris of what once were buildings, had become a Gibraltar of resistance. Withering cross-fire cut down the German infantry as they advanced along the streets, grenades and small bombs blew up or stalled the tanks in their tracks. So great were their losses that the Germans were obliged time and again to withdraw their troops and send their Stukas back over the city to pulverize the defenses by bombing.

Then the troops returned, but enough living Soviet defenders remained to blast back the invaders. The Nazis were finally forced to bring up huge siege guns to shell the city and do what the bombers had failed to do. But the defenses still held and are still holding to this very day. Street by street, block by block, house by house, the Russians give ground only when their last strength to wield a bayonet has left them.

By this time, the fury and heroism of Soviet resistance has been repeated so many times that it is taken as a matter of course. But what must puzzle the workers of this country, watching from the side lines, is why this magnificent army with its superb morale must always be fighting a last ditch battle. Such an army, it must seem, should by this time not only have driven the Germans off Soviet soil, it should be fighting on German territory.

The answer is not lack of equipment alone. Far more important is the fact that for all the deficiencies in armaments, the Soviet army with a bold revolutionary policy could have demoralized the German troops and with a revolutionary military leadership could have at the very least, driven these demoralized troops onto the defensive.

Victory or defeat, the defense of Stalingrad will live in history. But its defeat can only show once again what a fearful price the Soviet workers are paying for the criminal policies and regime of Stalinism.

A Feeler In The Fascist Direction

The Sunday edition of the N. Y. Daily News has a paid circulation in excess of 3,750,000, the largest of any paper in America. Its readers are primarily workers and low-paid salaried employees. For a paper to maintain such a mass reading public it is necessary for its publishers and editors to keep their ears closely attuned to the trends of popular opinion and feeling. But as a gigantic capitalist enterprise whose interests are closely tied up with huge personal fortunes, the publishers of the News demagogically exploit the grievances and prejudices of the masses for their own purposes and against the real needs of the masses.

In "normal," peaceful times this pattern is called "yellow journalism."

But in time of great crisis and war, the demagoguery of the Daily News reeks with the foul stink of fascism.

On Sept. 20 the millions of Daily News readers were presented with a startling editorial and an accompanying cartoon. The cartoon carries the caption "Home on Furlough," showing a young soldier talking to his mother who is seated at a table playing cards with his father:

Mother: "Do you think, Son, the army has any intention of running the country when the war is over?"

Son: "I've talked with a lot of my pals, Mother, and they intend to do just that."

Here is the explanation in the editorial:

After we win the war, says the 'News', "There will . . . be an army of 10,000,000 men coming back, men whom for the most part (if the polls are to be believed), didn't want the war in the first place but were pitchforked into it by Pearl Harbor. . . . We believe that these men who are going through the furnace of war for the rest of us are entitled to a reward; are, in fact, entitled to anything they can get."

What is this reward?

"All the farm lands, all the mines, the oil, the industrial establishments. . . . Who will own all this after the war? There will be vast upsets. . . . Control of our resources can change hands in the process. . . . Maybe none of the money men—the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Astors or any of those names that stand for \$—will be any longer on top of the pile. But the real wealth will still be there. The returning army should get it for itself, for its wives and children."

How will the soldiers get this tremendous "reward?"

"We think the country owes it to the warriors and we think the warriors will take it this time. Whether you like it or not, boys and girls, that's the prospect."

This is the pattern of fascism—cleverly and cautiously drawn. The appeal of the News is not directed to the industrial workers and the farm laborers calling upon them to organize their own independent organizations—trade unions, labor party, workers' councils—to confiscate the means of production now held by a few monopolists to the detriment of the great masses. Nor are the soldiers told to make common cause with the workers in a struggle against the Sixty Families whose economic and political rule is responsible for the suffering of workers and soldiers alike. Not at all! This appeal is aimed exclusively at the soldiers and by implication therefore is aimed against the workers. The Daily News is seeking to exploit the prejudices of backward soldiers who are inclined to blame the unions and the organized workers for their failure to get jobs when the war is over. Just as Hitler did in Germany and Mussolini in Italy.

The editors of the News have ably studied the experience of Europe and carefully steer away from the pitfalls that other reactionary papers fall into: they do not directly blame the workers but on the contrary make a vague, demagogic reference to "the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Astors."

The News tells the soldiers to "TAKE" their "deserved slice of the wealth at home." Thus here for the first time is an appeal to the soldiers to leave the traditional methods of parties, elections and all the so-called democratic methods and to seize power by direct, extra-parliamentary action. It is highly significant that a large metropolitan daily which has year in, year out backed the candidate of one or another of the big capitalist parties in the elections, should now be talking the language of the fascist Coup d'Etat.

But those who speak the language of fascism in this country vehemently deny that they are fascists; fascism has an ugly face to the majority of the American people. Thus the News in answer to charges that a previous editorial along the same line aroused, denies the charge of nazism or fascism by saying that "We expect to win this war," whereas "Nazism was the product of defeat" and the "defeated feeling formed one of the foundations of fascism."

The alibi is threadbare: it was not the defeat of Germany nor the deal Italy got after the last war that gave rise to fascism, it was the terrible suffering, and despair of the war aggravated by the defeat that gave rise to fascism in those countries. Win or lose—these conditions will prevail in the U. S. after the war. The Daily News knows this, but it also remembers Huey Long's famous remark that the fascist party of the United States will insist it is "Anti-Nazi" and "Anti-Fascist."

It would be false to label the News a fascist paper; but it would be equally criminal not to tag this editorial as a feeler in the direction of fascism. It is not important to speculate on whether or not the News will eventually turn fascist. But it is important to understand that the millions of discontented and disillusioned soldiers will be the audience that fascist demagogues in this country will break their necks to reach.

The demagoguery of the News and of the open fascists later on cannot be counteracted by rhetoric about the "glories of democracy." Only the program of the socialist revolution that will unite the organized workers with the soldiers for the expropriation of the monopolies and the "money men" on the "top of the pile," for the purpose of building a society without exploitation—only that program will drive the fascist rats back into their holes.

More than that: the program of socialist revolution will organize workers and soldiers to conquer what is rightly theirs.

Carl Palmer

1919-1942

By JOAN WAKEFIELD

"I'm going down to Buenos Aires on the S. S. . . . a rust bucket." That was the last heard from Carl Palmer, 23 years old, seaman and revolutionist. A few months later, the authorities notified his family that Carl Palmer was "lost at sea due to enemy action."

Carl Palmer was an oiler and a member of the West Coast Marine Firemen's union, MPOW. But above all he was an idealist and revolutionist, his brief career a shining example for his generation.

Known as a good track man in high school, Carl got an NYA job and went to Fresno State college in California, where he met an ex-railroad worker who first acquainted him with the ideas of Trotskyism. Palmer was working for a degree in English, but his interest soon went over to the study of Marxism. He read thoroughly, became

an active organizer of the Young People's Socialist League on the campus and then went into the ranks of the Socialist Workers Party. He mimeographed leaflets and gave weekly noon-hour lectures.

When the agricultural workers of the valley struggled for organization, he was there helping them fight the oppression of the reactionary Associated Farmers. He was there when the Madera cotton strikers fought tear gas and he was there on the strike committee when the union's Farm Workers' Association tried to keep trucks of imported scabs out of the prune ranches.

Carl came from the working class and he understood the class struggle. At the same time he had a wide cultural interest. This interest, however, did not lead him in a false search for an ivory tower where he could develop these in-

terests alone. He understood that there could be no hope for the flowering of literature and art under the capitalist system where the masses are tortured by war and debased by poverty and where all cultural development is stultified.

After two years of college, Carl left to ship out through the MPOW as a wiper. He liked shipping. He liked working with the black gang and fighting with them when there was a beef about shipping conditions. On several ships he was the choice of the black gang for delegate.

His body under the waves of the Atlantic, we cannot part from Carl with the revolutionary honors he so deeply deserves. But we who are Carl's comrades will conquer our grief and carry on the fight for socialism in which he was a stalwart soldier.

Cripps Answered His Own Foul Alibis In 1940

Today Sir Stafford Cripps claims that India cannot be granted independence because of the differences between the Hindus and Moslems; he also pretends now that the reactionary Moslem League represents the whole Moslem community. But only two years ago, Cripps himself gave the lie to his present alibis for denying Indian freedom. In his biography, he is quoted as saying upon his return from India in 1940:

"The controllers of the Moslem League are drawn almost entirely from the professional, landlord or industrialist class of well-to-do Moslems, whose interests are quite different from that of the Moslem masses. By aggravating religious passions these leaders can bring in behind them a large bulk of the 80,000,000 Moslems who inhabit India. The Moslem League would like to see

the return of the Moslem domination of India, to which they look back with pride and longing, but as this is impossible they have regarded the continuation of British rule as on the whole the lesser of two evil alternatives. The other is the government of India by the peasants and workers through adult suffrage and a democratic Indian constitution. The Moslem League fear this alternative even more than they dislike British rule. It is for this reason that they have refused to support the demands of Congress.

"We must ask ourselves whether the 250 million Hindus are to be denied self-government in a United India because 80 million Moslems are afraid of it or put forward an impractical suggestion for the division of India in order to prevent the Indian peasants and workers from obtaining the control of their own country. "In truth, if the 80 million Mos-

lems were left to make their own political decision without any injection of communal animosity, the great majority of them would support the Congress Party's program. In fact, many of them do today. Actually the President of the Congress is himself a Moslem and there are many Moslem organizations which oppose the Moslem League and support Congress in its demands.

"The attitude that is being adopted today by the British Government is that they can and will do nothing further until the Hindus and the Moslems settle their differences. This gives the reactionary leaders of the Moslem League the power to prevent the people of India getting self-government almost indefinitely.

"It is this attitude that the British Government is in fact encouraging, whether consciously or unconsciously." (Stafford Cripps: *Prophetic Rebel*, 1941, by Erick Estorick.)

Franco Remains In Power Because Of Outside Aid

By GRANDIZO MUNIS

MEXICO (By Mail). — Since the end of the Spanish Civil War a national internal passport system has been established that attempts to make impossible movement without official permission. But the underground revolutionary movement gets around this whenever it pleases. It has at its disposal a counterfeiting service that manufactures internal passports as well as Falangist and government credentials. These forged papers enable them to travel from one part of the peninsula to another and to save many militants from the jails or concentration camps.

A group of militants, with credentials and uniforms of the Falange, present themselves at some camp or jail and in the name of the Falangist Party demand one or another prisoner from the warden. Since this is the method often used by the Falange to take a revolutionary "for a walk" (murder him) when they are not interested in bringing him before the courts, the prison official delivers the prisoner in question who is then hidden in some part of the country or sent abroad if possible. I have been told that the only difficulty in this part of the work of the underground organizations is the lack of money to obtain uniforms and automobiles since it is necessary to work with great speed.

MORE THAN PICTURES IN THE MOVIES

Judging from the Falangist press itself, the moving picture theaters are one of the preferred places for large scale propaganda by the "reds"—the name still given by the press to all opponents of the regime. One of the most influential newspapers of the country, *La Vanguardia Nacionalista* of Barcelona, has asked for the suspension of night performances because "disturbing elements take advantage of the darkness inside to utter shouts and even speeches against the regime and its representatives; when the authorities arrive they are protected by the spectators and find an easy escape in the darkness outside."

The article refers to a case of one of the most elegant theaters in the Catalan capital in which the Falangists and police, hearing the shouts of "Down with Franco! Long live the revolu-

Editor's Note

This is the second and concluding part of an article on the growing opposition of the Spanish masses to the Franco regime—especially interesting today in the light of President Roosevelt's "art and culture" plan to put the fascist Spanish government "on its feet economically."

The first part of the article, printed in last week's MILITANT, explained why the Franco government has little prestige among most sections of the population, and how the revolutionary opponents of the government are able, because of the sympathy of the broad masses, to continue and extend many of their activities.

A PALACE REVOLUTION?

As one can see, only favorable international conditions are lacking for the Franco dictatorship to disappear like a punctured balloon. In order to protect itself from greater, basic revolutionary changes, a section of the capitalist class without doubt would like to try to carry out a change in the regime if it had some substitute for the present government and if it felt certain that it would be able to satisfy the masses with merely a simple change in the government. But what governmental apparatus can replace Franco? Where would a movement for his overthrow inevitably lead to, limited though it might be at the start?

The Spanish capitalist class has learned that one cannot play with fire. Therefore it tries to establish a separation between Franco and the Falange so as to give the country the impression that the repression, the hunger and barbarousness are products of the Falange and not of the "Caudillo." And when the N. Y. Times, mouthpiece of the very democratic American capitalists, informs its readers that there really exists much discontent in Spain—not against Franco but against Falange, Serrano Suner and similar birds of feather—it reveals that the aim of Anglo-American imperialism is to save the Franco dictatorship, by cleaning out of it the sympathizers of German imperialism repre-

sented especially by Serrano Suner and leading organs of the Falange. Thus its aims coincide with those of the Spanish capitalists and a part of the army officers.

These also would like to do away with the Falange in order to save their rule threatened by the growing discontent and the danger of a collapse. For different reasons, the Spanish capitalists and the democratic imperialists can agree on the objective of retaining the oppression but changing its color. The opposition of some generals to the Falange was disclosed by a recent dispatch from Madrid, referring to the confinement (limited imprisonment) in certain cities of generals who previously had helped Franco a great deal. Among these are Queipo de Llano, the wine-guzzling wind-bag of "Radio Seville," Aranda, who defended Oviedo from the attacks by the miners, and others.

A QUESTION WITHOUT IMPORTANCE TO MASSES

But one can say in advance that neither the generals nor the democratic imperialists intend anything serious against Franco, unless it is to save the basis of the regime when the popular offensive threatens to wipe it out. This is not the case just now. The squabbles between Franco and his fellows reduce themselves to the question of whether to draw closer to Berlin or to London. That is a question without any importance for the poorer masses.

What is of importance for the American and world working class so far as Spain is concerned is the fact that proletarian Spain is beginning to stir, to sharpen its weapons and to resist more and more vigorously. When the revolutionary volcano of Europe erupts—and this perhaps will not be long in coming—Spain will not be any longer at the mercy of fascism. The Spanish masses will once more enter upon the road of socialist revolution with more energy and foresight than in the past.

August, 1942.

IN DOWNTOWN NEWARK

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

Hoare Asks Action To Block Post-War Workers' Revolts

By A. ROLAND

Common Fear of the Imperialists

There is one dread held in common by the Hitlers and the Churchills. That is the fear of working class revolution. Both imperialists conduct the war with this in mind at every stage. Each looks to his defenses against revolution both at home and abroad. The effects of mass revolt anywhere in Europe would be felt everywhere. Europe is a vast tinder-box through which revolution would spread like wildfire.

This fear is openly expressed again and again. The latest warning was given only last week by the English arch-reactionary, Sir Samuel Hoare, British Ambassador to Spain. His speech to his "constituents" in Chelsea attributes the nightmare—naturally!—to people abroad, especially in the neutral countries. There could be no such happening in good old England, of course. Particularly if the Labor Party remains under its present leadership.

Hoare does not intend to be ironic in his speech. He merely uses the phrases of capitalism, the labels of its propaganda. He speaks of the danger of "anarchy" following the ending of the war. The present state of affairs—how would he name it? No doubt, "this unfortunate war." It would hardly be in good taste for Sir Samuel Hoare to talk in terms of the "defense of democracy against fascism." Not the perpetrator of the repudiated Hoare-Laval pact! However, we need not expect even such a trifling matter as good taste from a die-hard British imperialist.

If he could be pressed to the wall, Hoare might admit that the present state of affairs is anarchy of a sort, but of course he would insist that it is due to the machinations of Hitler. The English capitalists—God bless them!—are always interested in preventing anarchy and saving civilization. Not only in Europe, but in India too. Churchill has told us that without English rule in India, that sub-continent would fall into anarchy and the Indian races would be at each others' throats. The British devote themselves unselfishly to the prevention of such a calamity.

Anarchy On A World Scale

Sherman said that war was hell. But he had in mind a really puny kind of war, fought primarily on battlefields by armies. Twentieth century totalitarian war places everybody potentially on the battle front. This imperialist war is the worst form of anarchy that the world has ever known. It undermines civilization at a fearful rate. It lays waste whole countries and reduces their peoples to the level of barbarism. Humanity threatens to be consumed by its own engines of destruction.

The war represents the most gigantic breakdown of capitalist society. It is this form of society that, having reached the stage of monopoly and imperialism, breaks down periodically into anarchy. The Hoares have no remedy for this, for there is no remedy while the form of society which they uphold and represent, remains in existence. Hoare's speech is in reality the clearest kind of admission that these imperialist hacks see no possibility of solution for the disease of capitalism. His friends in Madrid—one may be quite sure they are not workers—express great concern as to what will happen after—victory! Hoare confesses that victory for England will bring a great crisis, a great danger. It is against this danger—after victory, mind you—that Hoare wishes to prepare very carefully in advance, right now.

In his speech last week, he said: "Particularly when the war develops in our favor it will be necessary to make it plain day after day that we have food ready and garrisons equally ready to prevent anarchy. We must have stores and ships earmarked. Europe pays no attention to generalities or resounding purposes. When men and women are up against famine and murder they will only be convinced by hard facts."

Use of Food and Garrisons

The hard facts Hoare has in mind are cold steel for those militant workers who may dream of setting up their own regime—a socialist regime—in Europe. Just as important as victory to Hoare and Churchill, is the ability at the end of the war to impose the will of England on all Europe; that is, to bolster up the capitalist order. England will accumulate food supplies—with the help of lend-lease—to be ready to come to the aid of the capitalist class in the European countries against the "anarchic" workers. England will keep certain troops "ear-marked" to become garrisons in the lands wrested from Hitler. No doubt these troops will be especially selected for their coming duties. They will be handpicked from those elements who are rarin' to go against the working class at all times. Would it be out of place, we wonder, to offer a suggestion to the Ambassador to Franco Spain? Why not release Moseley from his concentration camp to help in the training of these troops?

Again Hoare is unconsciously ironic in his speech when, after his forthright remarks on "garrisons for Europe," he speaks edifyingly of being "particularly careful to avoid by word or deed anything that suggests interference, or still more dictation, in other countries' internal affairs." This is a convenient formula indeed. When reactionaries gain control in any country, the English will not intervene—because this will be interpreted as what the people of that country want. But if workers dare to take things into their own hands—that's anarchy! There the English will see to it that civilization (capitalism) is preserved from harm.

How To Put End To Anarchy

But we feel compelled to remind Hoare and Co. of the old poem by Burns about the "best laid plans of mice and men." The workers of Europe have experienced the hard facts of present anarchy, the real thing. They will refuse to submit once again to a system which breeds nothing but misery and death for the masses while amassing profits for the bosses. The workers will know how to checkmate the designs of British and American imperialism by appealing to their brothers and sisters across the borders. They will know how to put an end to the real anarchy—the anarchy of capitalism—and put in its place the order of socialism. Socialism may well be anarchy to the capitalists, for it destroys their system. But to the workers and toilers it is the only way out of the wilderness, the only road to the future.