

UAW Meets In Midst Of Open Shop Drive

Auto Union Can Lead The Fight For All Labor

Militant Program Will Inspire the Workers And Halt Bosses' UnionSmashing Onslaught

By JOE ANDREWS

The United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers will meet in special convention in Detroit, April 7 and 8. 1200 delegates, veterans of many battles against the auto barons, representing the advance-guard of American unionism, will gather together at a time of crisis for their union and the entire labor movement.

Big business has launched a campaign to weaken the whole edifice of unionism. Each day this anti-union offensive gains momentum, both in the plants and in the halls of Congress.

The top CIO and AFL officials are retreating under this barrage. They are surrendering one by one the most basic union principles. They have relinquished the right to strike and double-time pay; they are pushing the speed-up campaign.

The UAW-CIO convention can call a halt to this retreat by initiating a militant drive to save labor's rights and hard-won conditions. This can be done on the basis of a sound and militant union program.

I. Defend the Right to Strike

The right to strike has been given away by the union officials without consulting the rank and file.

Made bolder by the union leaders' surrender of this basic weapon, the employers and their congressional agents are grasping at this chance to strike heavy blows at the trade union movement.

The bosses refuse to settle grievances in the plants because they know that the unions without the strike weapon have no power to back up their demands.

Congressional leaders are carrying out a systematic campaign of intimidation to wring more concessions from labor. The Smith Slave Labor Bill, after being passed by the House of Representatives, is being held in the Senate Labor Committee as a club to force further surrender of the basic rights of the unions.

Every key demand of labor is now being mired in the bog of arbitration. The union leadership is depending entirely on the War Labor Board to defend the interests of labor. This employer-dominated board can no more be trusted by the workers than the thoroughly discredited National Defense Mediation Board which was its predecessor.

The strike weapon is vital in the fight to defend labor's gains and half the anti-union offensive of the bosses. It must be defended against assault by the enemies of the unions from without and the appeasers from within.

2. Retain Overtime Pay

Once the right to strike was given away, the bosses demanded elimination of overtime pay. The top CIO and AFL officials already are yielding to the demand that

labor relinquish the established wage standards for Saturday, Sunday and holiday work. This is another surrender in the face of administration threats. Donald Nelson, War Production Board head, personally served labor with a 30-day ultimatum to accept this employer demand or face compulsory legislation.

This means a wage-cut for the workers and therefore more profits for the corporations.

The auto barons already have amassed huge profits. General Motors alone netted almost half a billion dollars in 1941. Its war orders guarantee it greater profits in the future.

While the workers are ordered by Nelson and the WPB to sacrifice, President Roosevelt has declared a moratorium on anti-trust prosecutions against the monopoly war profiteers and international cartels. Monopoly violators of the law are assured immunity. But more restrictive laws are proposed against labor.

The attack on the established wage standards for week-ends and holidays is intended to pave the way for the destruction of the principle of overtime pay.

3. Fight for the 40-Hour Week

The anti-labor drive, aided by administration policy, is already viciously attacking the 40-hour week. Speaker Rayburn, a leading administration spokesman in Congress, has demanded the abolition of the 40-hour week in favor of the 48-hour week. The auto barons and other bosses speaking through the *New York Times* and their other papers are echoing this demand.

Labor fought bitterly over many decades for the 40-hour week. Hundreds of union men died to win this standard. To give up this gain is to submit to immediate reduction in the standard of living. The 40-hour week must be vigorously defended.

4. For A Living Wage

The UAW demanded a \$1 a day wage increase, and a 90-day readjustment of wages to meet increased living costs. These just demands are now in negotiations with GM.

The corporation owners, though (Continued on page 2)

CONGRESS 6% PROFITS PROPOSAL IS A FRAUD

The House of Representatives, pausing briefly in its all-out-war on labor, on March 28 passed a measure to "take the profits out of war." This was a provision to limit profits on military and naval contracts to six per cent of their face value. The measure, however, is loaded with jokers.

The evidence brought out by the Truman Senate Investigating Committee and the House Naval Affairs Committee has shown that many shipbuilding corporations, averaging between six and ten per cent profit on their government contracts, actually are raking in a volume of profit equal to 200 and 300 per cent — 800 per cent in one instance — of the value of their entire original capital investment.

James E. Barnes, Washington lobbyist for the Todd Shipbuilding Corp., testified before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on Feb. 5 that his company this year will do \$200,000,000 in government business, realizing \$20,000,000 net profits — after taxes — on a total capital investment of \$40,000,000, from contracts providing "only" ten per cent profit. "I don't care if you put it down to two or three per cent," Barnes cynically admitted, "if you give us any profit at all, with the magnitude of our business and our investment, we will be profiteers."

Just as there are many ways to skin a cat, so the corporations have many ways of concealing profits. They can, and do, pad out their costs with fictitious items, and by figuring their profits on the basis of phony costs conceal

the real amount of their profits. They can, and do, pile their profits into so-called "contingency" and "reserve" funds, which are not counted as profits. For instance, Bethlehem Steel put aside into "special" reserve funds \$25,000,000 in 1941, which enabled them to show a profit of only \$34,500,000 instead of their real profits of \$59,500,000.

IT'S A GIFT!

Actually, if the big corporations didn't make a cent on their ordinary government contracts, they would still grab billions through the gifts of new plants and equipment being given them by the government — but which are not reported as profits.

Jesse Jones, head of the government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Defense Plants Corporation, on March 21 reported that up to March 7 his agencies had authorized or made expenditures for new plants and plant expansion to the amount of \$11,494,439,962. This is an outright gift to the big corporations.

These are the facts which show up the fraud of Congressional talk about "profits limitations" on government contracts — whether six per cent, two per cent or no per cent at all.

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 14

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1942

247

FIVE (5) CENTS

STANDARD OIL-NAZI DEAL EXPOSES BOSS PATRIOTISM

India Congress Heads Reject Cripps' Plan

"Dominion Status" Offer Is Fraudulent; Would Leave British Rulers In Control

By ANTHONY MASSINI

April 1. — British imperialism's hope that its offer of dominion status for India after the war would succeed in mobilizing the Indian masses for support of Britain's war appeared to be dashed to the ground today by reports that the All-India Congress Party and other Indian groups would reject the plan presented by Sir Stafford Cripps on behalf of the British War Cabinet.

Dispatches from India indicated that the Congress Party objected chiefly to the demand in Cripps' plan for Britain to "retain control and direction of the defense of India." It may be that the Congress leaders themselves have little confidence in the kind of war that Britain would conduct. But undoubtedly their decision was influenced primarily by the unyielding attitude of the Indian masses who are so embittered by British rule that even the prospect of a change in masters has not induced them to want to fight for Britain.

The Congress leadership, which represents the interests of the Indian capitalist class, has shown by its compromises and capitulations in the past that it cannot be depended on to lead the struggle against the imperialists. In fact, the Congress leaders, while they desire the opportunity to replace the British as the dominant force in India, fear more than anything else the independent steps that the Indian masses will try to take to solve their economic and political problems once the British yoke is removed.

PRESSURE FROM MASSES

The rejection of Cripps' plan by the Congress leaders, therefore, must be viewed as the expression of tremendous pressure on them from the masses. These leaders realize that they would be thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the peasants and workers if they accepted the plan. As Jawaharlal Nehru put it in an interview with Leland Stowe (*New York Post*, March 28): "Suppose we did come to an agreement with Britain, short of independence. Various political groups (Nehru means the masses) would immediately say that the Congress was selling out."

The completely anti-democratic character of the whole British plan, symbolized by the undemocratic manner in which the proposal was discussed, is another sign of the attitude of the masses. Churchill and Cripps presented their plan to the Indian leaders, — with whom there was at least a chance of acceptance. The 400,000,000 Indian people — whose fate is at stake — were not consulted at all. But that is not surprising — British imperialism knows what their answer would be.

For the last few weeks editorials in the American press have been singing songs about how "the old type of British imperialism is forever gone," but the plan brought by Cripps — designed to frustrate independence for India — is a sign that British imperialism, while weaker than it was three years ago, is just as reactionary as ever.

ANOTHER PROMISE

The plan, so carefully concocted and so ballyhooed as the sign of a new era, turned out to be the same as the offers of the past — a promise of "dominion status" for the future, after the war. For the present, from now until after the war, it offered India nothing,

absolutely nothing. In essence, it was a repetition of the same "dominion status" promise that Britain made India in 1917 — and never kept.

This time, of course, the promise was freshened up by the addition of a few "precise and clear" details. But an analysis of these details shows that fundamentally Cripps' offer was as fraudulent as those made by Britain in the past.

The plan called for the creation after the war of "an elected body" to be "charged with the task of framing a new constitution" for a "new Indian Union" which would receive the status of a dominion in the British Empire.

On the surface, this may appear to be similar to the demand raised by the Indian masses for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly by universal suffrage. Actually, it is an evasion of that demand, twisted around by certain "provisions" to achieve not a free India, but an India so divided that whatever its formal status, it would still remain in (Continued on page 4)

St. Louis CIO Council Endorses Work Of CRDC

Calls On Affiliates To Give Support to Defendants

After a report by V. R. Dunne, outstanding northwest labor leader and one of the 18 convicted in the Minneapolis case, the St. Louis CIO Industrial Union Council voted to endorse the work of the Civil Rights Defense Committee in appealing the convictions. The Council also voted to request all affiliated locals to support the case financially.

The St. Louis CIO Council officially invited Dunne to speak at the meeting on March 25, upon the request of the Civil Rights Defense Committee. The meeting was attended by 125 delegates from affiliated CIO locals.

Speaking at the meeting in the course of his nation-wide tour sponsored by the CRDC, Dunne explained the meaning to labor of the convictions of the 18 leaders of Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party under provisions of the vicious anti-labor Smith "Gag" Law. Stressing the significance to the labor movement of the use of government agencies, at Daniel J. Tobin's request, to attack Local 544 for joining the CIO, Dunne

pointed out that such a precedent endangered labor's fundamental democratic rights.

He also spoke on the great importance of the fight to test the constitutionality of the Smith "Gag" Law, by appealing the Minneapolis convictions to the Supreme Court. The fight of the CRDC in this case, he stated, is a fight on behalf of the rights of all labor.

One of the first responses to Dunne's talk came in the form of a donation to the Civil Rights Defense Committee from the St. Louis Joint Advisory Council of the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees, CIO.

While in St. Louis, Dunne also spoke at a meeting of colored hotel workers who received his report very favorably.

From St. Louis, Dunne visited unionists in Southern Illinois and appealed for help to the Minneapolis defense. After a brief rest in the Twin Cities, he will proceed on the Western half of his tour. He will speak at Fargo, Plentywood, Mont., Spokane, Tacoma, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Los Angeles. Local CRDC branches in those cities report plans have been made for Dunne to speak at open meetings, as well as before union groups.

Stalin's Policy Brings USSR Little Outside Aid

C. P. Press Silent On Lag In Allied Aid; USSR Isolated Before Nazi Spring Drive

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

With the advent of Spring the USSR confronts once again the full might of the Nazi murder machine which has been stalled since last December. What has Stalin's foreign policy accomplished in the way of providing aid to the heroic Soviet soldiers, workers and peasants in their life-and-death struggle against German imperialism? It can now be established beyond dispute that Stalin's "allies" have failed even to provide the quantity of materials and supplies they had originally promised.

According to a recent statement by Shinwell in the House of Commons, which has remained unchallenged, not even a thousand tanks, planes or guns have been sent to Russia by Churchill. "This paltry trickle of aid — less than 170 of each of these vital instruments of war per month — is on par with the much lauded 'aid' rendered by the RAF wing in Russia which succeeded in bringing down 15 German planes in six months! In the Battle for Britain 172 planes were brought down in a single day" (*Socialist Appeal*, English Trotskyist organ, Feb. 1942).

"BAD LAG"

On March 2, the American News-weekly *Time* reported a "bad lag in the actual movement of U. S. war material to Russia." This lag, according to *Time*, has been caused by a conflict among the ruling tops in Washington. "The President, seeing the Lend-Lease clearance papers, takes it for granted that the goods have

Switzerland as well as here in Washington, pointing up our failure to deliver promised quantities of Lend-Lease goods to Russia, in accordance with the provisions of the protocol arranged at the time of the Harrison-Batt mission" (*Common Sense*, April 1942).

The Washington correspondents of *Common Sense* add caustically: "There is some evidence that these stories were inspired by the Soviets themselves." There has been no refutation from Moscow of the stories emanating from Switzerland and Washington.

It is not hard to understand why Stalin prefers not to broach the issue openly even in the pages of the *Daily Worker*. This would embarrass and compromise not only London and Washington whose favor the Stalinists are currying, but also Stalin himself. The Kremlin's official silence is an annihilating commentary on the bankruptcy of Stalin's "realistic" policy. It is with such aid that the Soviet Union has to meet the full brunt of the impending Nazi offensive. Stalin's policies of relying on the "democracies" have resulted only in isolating the Soviet masses from their real allies, the revolutionary workers of Europe.

It is still not too late to mobilize those real allies — in Germany, in the occupied countries — to give powerful aid to the USSR by attacking Hitler from the rear. To achieve this, however, the reactionary policies of Stalinism must be abandoned and replaced by the policies pursued by the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky.

Monopolies Put Profits Before Everything Else

Conspiracy With German Chemical Trust Led to Rubber Shortage, Crippled Production

By ART PREIS

Standard Oil's conspiracy with the German chemical trust, I. G. Farbenindustrie, to share between them world control of the chemical and petroleum industries, is a devastating indictment of American monopoly capitalism.

This conspiracy, which blocked American synthetic rubber production and seriously crippled all of American industry, proves that the American bosses place their profits and monopoly advantages before everything else, in war as in peace, and that their patriotism is a hypocritical cloak for self-interest.

Standard's conspiracy reflects practices and policies pursued by all the great trusts. It was a conspiracy known for years to the government, which did nothing about it until the rubber shortage threatened to cripple the whole war production program. And even now, the government's exposure has been served up with a liberal coating of whitewash.

The main fact of this conspiracy, as related by Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold last week to the Truman Senate Investigating Committee, is that the Rockefeller interests, by an arrangement first concluded in Nov. 1929, have agreed with I. G. Farben to give the latter exclusive world rights to the chemical processes developed by Standard, which include the cheapest and best methods for the production of synthetic rubber. In return, Standard has obtained from its German capitalist colleagues exclusive rights in "any patents or discoveries which directly concerned oil production, including synthetic gasoline," according to Arnold's report.

Additional Agreement

At the outbreak of the war in September 1939, an additional agreement was made to ensure the continuance of this arrangement throughout the war and thereafter, regardless of which group of powers won. A letter, dated October 12, 1939, from the Standard official in charge of the negotiations with I. G. Farben, states: "They (I. G. Farben) delivered to me assignments of some 2000 foreign patents, and we did our best to work out complete plans for a modus vivendi arrangement

Who Impedes Production?

"Throughout my testimony I have tried to emphasize the fact that this case (Standard Oil's conspiracy to block synthetic rubber production) is not unique. I do not think it is an extreme statement to say that in most of the basic war materials we find similar cartel agreements. . . It is obvious that this kind of practice on an extended scale throughout industry has been one of the causes why we are short of basic materials. If it continues it will contribute to inefficiency of production throughout the war. . . From an economic point of view such restrictions lower the standard of living and on a wide scale create an irreducible minimum of unemployment." — Assistant Attorney-General Arnold.

Rockefeller Discusses War

On the very day when Assistant Attorney-General Arnold was giving the details before the Truman Committee of the Standard Oil's conspiracy to block synthetic rubber production, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was delivering an address in New York's Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in his capacity as honorary chairman of the USO's fund campaign.

Among other beautiful thoughts expressed by the chief of Standard Oil was: "This war is fundamentally a death struggle between the material and spiritual forces in the world. Materialism has run rampant. . . Surely, it is not for things, but for ideals that such sacrifices are made; not for the material, but for the spiritual."

for working together, which would operate through the terms of the war, whether or not the U. S. came in."

Standard's modus vivendi included aiding the German capitalists in the construction of their synthetic gasoline and high octane aviation gas industries. As late as in August 1941, Standard sought to turn over its Hungarian plants to the Nazis for \$24,000,000 gold. After the defeat of France, at the suggestion of I. G. Farben, Standard sought to make a mutually beneficial arrangement for the control of hydrogeneration patents in Occupied France.

Standard's modus vivendi operated even after Pearl Harbor and the Far East defeats. Up to last week, Standard refused government requests that it release its patents for manufacturing Butyl rubber, although it had given these patents to I. G. Farben to use for the Nazi war machine and had agreed to their use by an Italian corporation.

"Standard's activities thus frustrated the creation of an American synthetic-rubber industry," declared Arnold. The practical results of the conspiracy were to confront American industry with a crippling rubber famine, strike a damaging blow at all production and force drastic curtailment of essential consumers goods.

Why Deal Was Made

Why did Standard make such a deal with I. G. Farben? "These arrangements were (Continued on page 3)

Stalinists Try To Suppress Union Militancy, Speed Up Workers, 'Finger' All Opponents And 'Appease' Bosses

Bridges Wants The Unions To Act As Speed-Up Agents

Blames Union for Axis Victories, Urges Workers Not to Worry About Profiteers

By PHILIP BLAKE

The strongest epithet of the Communist Party today is "appeaser." Yet there is no force in the labor movement which is more ready than the Stalinists to knife the interests of the labor movement in the back for the purpose of "appeasing" the bosses and thus securing the "national unity" to which Stalinism in the United States has de-

icated its efforts. No section of the labor movement spends less time than the Stalinists in attacking or criticizing the bosses who are responsible for lags in production; no group spends more time than they do in trying to speed-up the workers.

Their policy of "appeasing" the bosses has led them in recent weeks to such treacherous practices as attempts to break strikes (Western Electric plant in Kearny, N. J.); support of boss-inspired attacks on union militants who try to protect the workers' interests (Alcoa plant in Cleveland); campaigns to speed the workers up to an extent which not even the bosses dare as yet to demand (UE proposal for 15% speed-up), etc.

MURRAY COMPLAINS

The Stalinists are even more ready than the trade union bureaucrats to "appease" the bosses by giving up labor's rights. This was demonstrated at the Extraordinary Conference of the CIO in Washington last week, of which the newspaper PM reported on March 25:

"Murray and CIO left-wingers (Stalinists) clashed briefly for the first time since the Nazi-Soviet war began. The dispute arose over a speech by Harry Bridges, West Coast longshore leader, who charged, it is understood, that the CIO has not fashioned an adequate war program."

"Bridges is said to have deprecated agitation over current anti-labor legislation and labor's economic status, demanding greater emphasis on production."

"Interpreting this and a couple of other speeches as excessive 'appeasement' of anti-labor forces, Murray vigorously reiterated his conviction that labor could not afford to yield all along the line during the war era. With reference to the changed attitude of the left-wingers, he said bitterly:

"I've been supporting this war for 18 months."

Bridges expresses the Stalinist trade union policy in action. The remarks he made in Washington express only the outlines of this policy; but an examination of the speech he made to the San Francisco CIO Council shortly before the Washington conference shows just exactly what the Stalinists mean by "an adequate war program." An account of the speech is made in Bridges' own paper, the Stalinist-controlled

of the working people of America...

Since Bridges believes that production is the responsibility of the bosses and the government, and the unions must spend the majority of their time speeding up the workers, it is not surprising that he cautions the unions against devoting time to the question of boss profiteering, etc.:

"To be handled at the proper time and the proper place, Bridges briefly noted such factors as exorbitant corporation profits... "But now is not the time to worry about ultimate rewards. When our way of life is menaced by Axis enslavement it is enough to save what we have—even the present grievances."

Let us not worry about the "ultimate rewards," says Bridges; let the bosses have their profits—the workers should not worry when they can preserve "even the present grievances."

And what about those who disagree with the Bridges policy, let alone those who want to oppose it?

"Those who don't see this are not Americans—are not loyal," said Bridges. "We've got to finger them. We can't take time to explain—we've got to go around 'em or roll over 'em."

Murray "bitterly" reminded the Stalinists at the Washington conference that they were Johnny-come-latelies so far as support of the war is concerned. But it is clear that they have more than made up for lost time since last June when they were denouncing the war as imperialist—and that they have already far out-distanced even the Murrays and Greens. No trade unionist who sees the Stalinist trade union line in action can fail to understand that part of his struggle against the boss offensive to undermine union conditions must be a determined struggle against Stalinist "appeasement" of the bosses.

"If we place stress on hours and wages so that we interfere with the fighting, we're slackers and selling out our unions and country."

"When you recall that only a few months ago executive meetings like this in Norway and France were saying, 'We shouldn't be doing it all; the employers should do their share,' you understand why the unions should become instruments of speed-up now."

In other words, when the bosses try to use the pretext of the war to lower wages and raise hours, the unions should not resist or they may "interfere with the fighting" and "sell out the unions."

"NOW NOT TIME TO WORRY"

Bridges is not content to accuse the trade unionists of France and Norway of responsibility for Hitler's victories. He goes on to explain to the workers that it is not their responsibility to worry about production—the government and the bosses have charge of that. All that they have to worry about increasing is the speed-up.

"The majority of the time of officers, of grievance committees, of the unions as a whole must go to winning the war."

"How? Production. I'd rather say speed-up, and I mean speed-up. The term production covers the boss, the government and so on. But speed-up covers the workers—the people who suffer from speed-up are the workers."

"To put it bluntly, I mean your unions today must become instruments of speed-up

C. P. Helps WLB Fire 4 Cleveland Union Leaders

Their Only Crime Was That They Tried to Protect Members From Alcoa Speed-Up Drive

CLEVELAND, March 30. — Acting in line with Harry Bridge's recent call for union leaders to "finger" union militants for the bosses, Stalinist officials of the CIO Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers on March 26 publicly endorsed a War Labor Board decision upholding the firing of four union shop stewards for allegedly "instigating a slow-down" in the Aluminum Corporation of America's plant here.

Before the local union membership had time to act on the case, Edward Cheyfitz, national executive secretary of the IUMMSW, and Alex Balint, Cleveland regional director, both well-known Stalinists, and Frank Grady, president of Local 55, issued a public statement which declared that they "fully supported" the WLB decision and that "the men responsible for stoppages must go."

The fired union militants, by the admission of the union officials themselves, had resisted company attempts to institute a vicious speed-up and pay-cutting system in their division, Plant S, which employs mostly Negro workers. All four of the fired shop stewards were Negroes.

The most damning part of the Stalinist leaders' actions in this case is their own admission, put out in a statement in the name of the local union, that reprisal against the four militant job stewards "is the result of an investigation which was originally requested by the union"—that is, the Stalinist officials.

Another statement, issued by the president and vice-president of Local 55 and Balint and his assistant, Peter Zvara, stated that "we called upon the Federal Government to send in a special investigator to really get to the bottom of this problem. This investigator is on the job now... Let the guilty pay!"

This same statement, however, admits that the workers' resistance "started when the Company insisted on starting a new bonus system in S plant. It started when working crews were reduced on certain operations in the smelter plant. For this the Company bears full responsibility."... But the union job stewards and the workers are the ones who suffer!

This new bonus system has resulted in a reduction of the average weekly bonus from \$18 to \$6. In addition, the crews in the Smelter plant were reduced from five to three, with the three men being required to do as much work as the previous crew of five.

As a further move to intimidate the workers, and enforce the company's speed-up and pay-slashing drive, the Stalinist leaders have called a union meeting where they intend to engineer the expulsion of the fired job stewards from the union.

The stool pigeon and pro-boss role of the Stalinist union leaders has created tremendous resentment in the union rank-and-file, and particularly among the Negro workers who form one-fourth of the workers in the entire plant.

Considerable opposition was

Try To Halt Distribution Of Militant

What Stalinist Demand for 15% Speed-Up Means

The Stalinists in control of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, have shown that they are not kidding about speeding up the workers.

When they ask for a 15% increase in production by their members, they mean just that: "this increase shall be by the direct additional expenditure of energy and effort, over and above such increases as will be effected through improved methods or techniques instituted by our war production councils."

It is estimated that this 15% increase would result in a speed-up greater and more intensive than the bosses were able to put through in the old days of the industry before the workers had organized their unions.

Other papers included in this Stalinist ban on a free press and free speech for working-class political opponents of Stalinism are *Labor Action* and the *Socialist Party Call*. These, like THE MILITANT, have attacked Stalinist treachery in the union movement.

The action was taken on one of four similar and simultaneous resolutions initiated by well-known Stalinist leaders of local unions.

Chief target of the Stalinist attack, was, of course, the Trotskyists. It is no coincidence that the Stalinists combine an attack on "trade unionism as usual," that is, militant defense of the workers' rights and standards, and an onslaught against the Trotskyists. The Trotskyists are known to be outspoken defenders of the union workers' rights and conditions in war as in peace.

Considerable opposition was

What Stalinist Demand for 15% Speed-Up Means

The Stalinists in control of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, have shown that they are not kidding about speeding up the workers.

When they ask for a 15% increase in production by their members, they mean just that: "this increase shall be by the direct additional expenditure of energy and effort, over and above such increases as will be effected through improved methods or techniques instituted by our war production councils."

It is estimated that this 15% increase would result in a speed-up greater and more intensive than the bosses were able to put through in the old days of the industry before the workers had organized their unions.

Other papers included in this Stalinist ban on a free press and free speech for working-class political opponents of Stalinism are *Labor Action* and the *Socialist Party Call*. These, like THE MILITANT, have attacked Stalinist treachery in the union movement.

The action was taken on one of four similar and simultaneous resolutions initiated by well-known Stalinist leaders of local unions.

Chief target of the Stalinist attack, was, of course, the Trotskyists. It is no coincidence that the Stalinists combine an attack on "trade unionism as usual," that is, militant defense of the workers' rights and standards, and an onslaught against the Trotskyists. The Trotskyists are known to be outspoken defenders of the union workers' rights and conditions in war as in peace.

Considerable opposition was

Kearny Workers Label Stalinists As Strikebreakers

KEARNY, N. J. — Since last October the Western Electric Employees Association, an independent union, had been negotiating over wages and the grading system with the management of the Western Electric Company, subsidiary of the giant monopoly American Telephone and Telegraph.

The Association is not very strong or well-organized, and it shows all the weaknesses of independent unions or one-time company unions which have escaped from the domination of the employers who inspired their creation; nevertheless last year by a strike it won some wage gains and other improvements for the workers. Unlike the AFL and CIO leaders, it has not declared its intention of giving up the right to strike.

The company, which employs 20,000 workers and supplies the vast network of the Bell Telephone System with its communication and replacement system, has become very "tough" toward the Association since it began to receive war orders and the war broke out. It offered a wholly inadequate wage offer, refused to consider the demands of the Association, stalled on all proposals and refused to arbitrate.

Finally at the end of February the Association voted to give the management a month to resume negotiations or agree to arbitration; it threatened a strike by March 28 if the company remained adamant.

STALINISTS INTERVENE

As the deadline grew closer, with the management still standing firm, the Stalinist-dominated leadership of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, which has some members in the plant, saw a chance to advance the cause of "national unity."

A day or two before the date set for the strike, the Stalinists came out with a leaflet in front of the plant and huge advertisements in the local newspapers. They denounced the Association for daring to "threaten" to strike — they did not denounce the company management in any way. They called on the workers to "disassociate" themselves from the "irresponsible threat" to strike — they did not in any way attack the bosses for refusing to negotiate further or even arbitrate.

Finally, the threat to strike compelled certification of the dispute to the War Labor Board, and the strike was called off.

WORKERS INCENSED

Reports from workers in the plant indicate that large numbers of them — including non-Association workers and CIO sympathizers — were greatly incensed by the Stalinist leaflets and articles, denouncing them as "nothing more than strikebreakers" and "stooges for the bosses."

All labor looks to the auto workers to give them a lead. The UAW convention has the prestige and the power to inspire the labor movement to a militant course that will maintain the living standards, organizations and rights of the American workers. Defeat the anti-labor drive!

Subscribe to the "Fourth International"

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

JUST OUT

IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM

by Albert Goldman

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

100 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

ALREADY A FAVORITE

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

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

116 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

Order from:

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK

Subscribe to the "Fourth International"

UAW Meets In The Midst Of Open Shop Offensive

(Continued from page 1)

fatter than ever with profits, have refused to grant these demands. They are stalling the negotiations. They have indicated in advance that they will finally shove these demands into the lap of the War Labor Board, where there will be more stalling, as in the case of the steel workers' demands.

With prices skyrocketing, a general wage increase and provisions for a rising scale of wages adjusted to meet price rises are immediately needed. By organizing militant union pressure, against both the corporation and the War Labor Board the UAW can win its demands. Such a policy was required before the war. It is doubly necessary now.

7. Against Jim Crow Practices In The Industry

The corporations have increased discriminatory practices against the Negro workers, attempting to pit white against colored workers and inciting race riots in the auto centers in order to disrupt the unions. The companies follow a deliberate policy of forcing the worst jobs on the Negroes, segregating them from the other workers, etc. The UAW must put up an effective and uncompromising fight against any and every form of Jim Crow.

8. Demand the Steward System

The UAW has been demanding the steward system in its current negotiations, just as it has since 1937. General Motors has replied by proposing to cut committeeman representation in half, and thereby weaken the shop bargaining procedure.

With grievances piling up, shop problems can best be handled by the steward system. The answer to the corporations' scheme is to stand fast for the steward system, the most democratic and effective means of representation.

9. For Expropriation of All Auto Plants and Operation Under Workers' Control

The only way to insure efficient operation of the plants, secure continuity of employment, and stop profiteering and mismanagement, is to take the plants out of the hands of the duPonts, Fords and other coupon clippers, and operate them under the control of the workers.

10. Build A Labor Party

Democrats and Republicans alike are laying down an anti-union barrage in Congress. The workers have no representation in the political arena. The unions are reduced to begging favors from boss politicians. A Labor Party is more than ever a necessity for the labor movement in order to defend itself against the union wreckers in Washington.

6. No Wage Cuts In Transfer to War Work

The method employed by the companies in converting the plants, which resulted in widespread unemployment, was deliberately calculated to create an opportunity for wage-slashing. In the process of rehiring after the mass layoffs, men are being reclassified at lower rates of pay in the converted plants. Without specific contractual provision that no worker shall suffer a reduction in wages as a result of transfer to war production or in the process of reemployment after a layoff, the whole wage structure is endangered. The restoration of original wage classifications and repayment of all back wages due as a result of this wage-cut

UAW Meets In The Midst Of Open Shop Offensive

(Continued from page 1)

fatter than ever with profits, have refused to grant these demands. They are stalling the negotiations. They have indicated in advance that they will finally shove these demands into the lap of the War Labor Board, where there will be more stalling, as in the case of the steel workers' demands.

With prices skyrocketing, a general wage increase and provisions for a rising scale of wages adjusted to meet price rises are immediately needed. By organizing militant union pressure, against both the corporation and the War Labor Board the UAW can win its demands. Such a policy was required before the war. It is doubly necessary now.

7. Against Jim Crow Practices In The Industry

The corporations have increased discriminatory practices against the Negro workers, attempting to pit white against colored workers and inciting race riots in the auto centers in order to disrupt the unions. The companies follow a deliberate policy of forcing the worst jobs on the Negroes, segregating them from the other workers, etc. The UAW must put up an effective and uncompromising fight against any and every form of Jim Crow.

8. Demand the Steward System

The UAW has been demanding the steward system in its current negotiations, just as it has since 1937. General Motors has replied by proposing to cut committeeman representation in half, and thereby weaken the shop bargaining procedure.

With grievances piling up, shop problems can best be handled by the steward system. The answer to the corporations' scheme is to stand fast for the steward system, the most democratic and effective means of representation.

9. For Expropriation of All Auto Plants and Operation Under Workers' Control

The only way to insure efficient operation of the plants, secure continuity of employment, and stop profiteering and mismanagement, is to take the plants out of the hands of the duPonts, Fords and other coupon clippers, and operate them under the control of the workers.

10. Build A Labor Party

Democrats and Republicans alike are laying down an anti-union barrage in Congress. The workers have no representation in the political arena. The unions are reduced to begging favors from boss politicians. A Labor Party is more than ever a necessity for the labor movement in order to defend itself against the union wreckers in Washington.

6. No Wage Cuts In Transfer to War Work

The method employed by the companies in converting the plants, which resulted in widespread unemployment, was deliberately calculated to create an opportunity for wage-slashing. In the process of rehiring after the mass layoffs, men are being reclassified at lower rates of pay in the converted plants. Without specific contractual provision that no worker shall suffer a reduction in wages as a result of transfer to war production or in the process of reemployment after a layoff, the whole wage structure is endangered. The restoration of original wage classifications and repayment of all back wages due as a result of this wage-cut

THE BILL OF RIGHTS IN DANGER!

The Meaning of the Minneapolis Convictions by GEORGE E. NOVACK foreword by JAMES T. FARRELL Author of "Studs Lonigan," etc.

5 Cents Order from

CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE 160 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 14 Saturday, April 4, 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: 2 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

Reentered as second class matter February 13, 1934 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1919.

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.

Stalinist Drive Against Militants

To understand the lynch campaign which the Communist Party is trying to incite against the militants in the labor movement, it is necessary only to read the account on Page 2 of this paper of some of the most recent activities of the Stalinists in the trade unions.

As Harry Bridges made clear in his recent speech before the San Francisco CIO Council, the Stalinists are bent on completely perverting the character and function of the trade union movement. From independent organizations created to protect and improve the conditions of the workers, the Stalinists want to change the unions into servile adjuncts of the war machine and instruments for speeding up the workers. This is their way of repaying the American capitalists for the trickle of aid which the government has sent the Soviet Union.

The steps which the Stalinists have taken in recent weeks are only the beginning; they intend to go much further along this path. At the CIO conference in Washington last week, *PM* reports that "Bridges is said to have deprecated agitation over current anti-labor legislation and labor's economic status, demanding greater emphasis on production." The Stalinists are not satisfied with the step-by-step capitulations of the official union bureaucracy, which is still trying to make a pretense of protecting the workers' conditions; they want to speed up the process and get the union bureaucrats to go all-out all-at-once in the drive to shackle the unions.

But before the Stalinists can completely achieve these objectives, they have to dispose of the opposition to their treacherous policies.

They seek to beat down and silence the trade union militants who want to preserve the unions' gains and rights. Undoubtedly this is what the Stalinist union leaders had in mind when they publicly and demonstratively endorsed the dismissal of four union stewards at the Cleveland Alcoa plant for resisting an admittedly provocative company move to speed up the workers in violation of the agreement with the union. They hope that actions of this nature will serve as object lessons to terrorize other union militants into not fighting back against boss attacks.

Above all, the Stalinists want to suppress the Trotskyists who, although small in numbers, are the most articulate and consistent opponents of Stalinist betrayals. The Communist Party cannot answer the argument of the Trotskyists. That is why it slanders and tries to frame up and incite mob violence against them.

Read what Bridges had to say about those who oppose his program to speed up the workers and "appease" the bosses:

"Those who don't see this are not Americans — are not loyal. We've got to finger them. We can't take time to explain — we've got to go around 'em or roll over 'em."

In these three sentences, reduced to its most reactionary essentials, is contained the formula of the Stalinists for framing up their opponents. Here is the basis for their charges that the Trotskyists

are "Hitler's agents." Here is the Stalinist directive to act as "finger men" against the union militants. Don't try to "explain" what the Trotskyists stand for and why the Stalinists want them out of the way — "roll over 'em", slander them, denounce them, suppress them, slug them, frame them up, prevent the distribution of their paper, as the Stalinists tried to do in Los Angeles — and in this way, incidentally, prove how "American" and "loyal" the Stalinists are.

Workers! Trade unionists! Fight back against the Stalinist slanders, provocations, frame-ups. The Stalinist lynch campaign is part of the drive to destroy your unions and rights. Fight back against it if you want your unions to express your interests and not those of the bosses.

They Feel At Home With The Fascists

Standard Oil's conspiracy with the German I. G. Farbenindustrie shows that the leading representatives of American monopoly capitalism find nothing in the ideology of Nazism which prevents them from "doing business with Hitler." They feel perfectly at home around the international conference tables with the heads of the German trusts. The I. G. Farben representatives may be Nazis, and the Standard Oil men may be "democrats", but their way of life, their outlook, their objectives — profits and monopoly — are identical. They are class brothers.

It is no secret that the American capitalists have always found much to admire in Hitler's "internal" regime, above all, the "efficiency" with which the Nazi terror machine smashed the German workers' organizations and delivered the masses over to capitalist super-exploitation.

Today, American monopoly capitalism is having some "unpleasantness" with German capitalism. That, however, has nothing to do with ideologies. That is a business conflict. And business competitors — when they find it mutually advantageous — can always come to some "understanding", just as Standard Oil came to an "understanding" with I. G. Farben.

Standard's conspiracy proves conclusively that American big business is not interested in a war for democracy against fascism. It is interested in one thing only — profits. Tomorrow, when they think it essential to their interests, the American capitalists will tear a leaf from the notebook of German capitalism and try to establish a fascist dictatorship in America.

Yet, it is these same monopolists who run and control the war production program and whose spokesmen dominate the government war agencies. It is Standard Oil and the other big corporations which hold the economic and political power in this country today.

If Roosevelt were really concerned about waging a war to destroy fascism, his first move would be to destroy the power of America's own monopoly capitalists. He would remove the war production program from their control. He would take over the basic war industries and place them under the control and management of the workers, the only class able to run industry in the interests of the masses, and the class most truly concerned with defending democracy and destroying fascism.

The administration's treatment of Standard Oil, however, shows where Roosevelt really stands.

An ordinary espionage agent caught with the stolen plan of a new automatic pencil would be shot or given long-term imprisonment. Standard Oil gave the Nazis indispensable industrial processes worth whole armies. Standard's "patriotism" helped cripple American war production. But the Standard officials were let off with a total of \$50,000 in fines — a drop in the ocean to them — and the government withdrew its charges. Standard, and all the rest of the monopolies, are free to continue business as usual. Their agents continue to exercise just as much power as ever on the War Production Board and other government agencies.

In fact, immediately after the exposure of Standard's conspiracy, the administration hastened to assure the monopolies that anti-trust prosecutions which "interfered with war production" would be postponed until after the war.

The Standard case has shown the compatibility of the American monopolists with fascism, and the real nature of their "patriotism." But Assistant Attorney-General Arnold took pains to represent the Standard officials as merely "commercially simple-minded" but fundamentally "patriotic." His basic conclusion? "We need Standard Oil..."

But we don't need the "Standard Oil" that Arnold refers to. We don't need the Rockefellers and Teagles, all of whose efforts are in the realm of financial and political manipulation to gain greater corporate wealth and profits. Without these monopolists, all that is essential to production would still remain — the plants, facilities, raw materials, technical skills, and, above all, the workers.

When the workers have control of the basic industries and can operate them in the interests of the American masses, then they will be able and eager to fight a genuine war for democracy that will never be halted until fascism and all its works are wiped from the face of the earth.

BOUND VOLUMES OF
**NEW INTERNATIONAL and
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**
for
1940 and 1941
Price \$3.00
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place New York City

Bethlehem Steel To Get \$50,000,000 Plant Gift

Far Cry From \$100,000,000 Proposed To Aid 165,000 Small Business Firms

Last week Congress made a gesture in the direction of the tens of thousands of small-business men who are being shoved to the wall by the big monopolies which have hogged most of the war orders. The Senate Banking Committee on March 25 approved an administration-sponsored measure to establish a \$100,000,000 fund to aid those small-business men lucky enough to secure war orders.

Just how "generous" this proposal actually is can be judged by comparing it with the single plant expansion contract which the government's Defense Plant Corporation secretly signed recently with the Bethlehem Steel Co., as revealed on March 19 by the New York newspaper, *P.M.*

That contract, whose terms when originally disclosed to the Truman Senate Investigating Committee were called "outrageous," would provide Bethlehem Steel with a government-financed plant costing \$50,000,000 — one-

half of the total sum being talked about for aiding some 165,000 small firms in this country.

How Bethlehem got this contract is a sufficient commentary on the extent of the government's concern about aiding small business and curbing the monopolies.

For a year and a half before the war, the big steel corporations issued reports, cited approvingly by Roosevelt himself, that they already had ample capacity to meet the steel needs in time of war. The steel barons did not wish to invest their monumental profits in plant expansion.

CONTRACT DENOUNCED BY GOV'T COUNSEL

Even when the steel shortage became very acute, they held out against expansion in order to get free plants from the government. Last summer, Bethlehem began to negotiate with the government for a \$50,000,000 plant to be built on its Sparrows Point, Maryland,

property. The contract, as drawn up by Bethlehem and approved by the OPM, gave the company a 35 year lease. The government could cancel this lease only if production during a five year period averaged less than 25 per cent capacity, and then the government had the right only to move the plant off Bethlehem's land — at government expense.

The counsel for the Defense Plant Corporation reported that "either Bethlehem did not desire to expand and has therefore submitted a proposal which it believed would be rejected, or Bethlehem was using the defense program to obtain at government expense, modern facilities which would have a material value in peace-time operations."

Signing of this contract was held up a few weeks because of the repercussions of the Truman committee disclosures. The original contract was "modified" — that is, even worse features were added — and was finally signed last month — on the quiet — by the Defense Plant Corporation. A \$50,000,000 contract with Bethlehem Steel — and it's all gravy!

India Congress Heads Reject Cripps' Plan

(Continued from page 1)
effect a colony of Britain.

MASSES WOULD HAVE NO VOICE IN CONSTITUTION

The plan provided for the election of only part of the "constitution-making body" — but even that part was not to be elected by the masses. The masses were asked to die in the war in return for a constitution to be drawn up by a body which the masses were not to be permitted to elect.

One part of this body was to be elected by the members of the lower houses of the legislatures of the 11 provinces of British India — who themselves are elected under limited suffrage — on the basis of proportional representation for various political groupings. The constitution-making body would thus be twice removed from the control of the voters, and in this case the voters would by no means be synonymous with the masses.

In this country United States Senators used to be elected by state legislatures; the experience always was that such Senators were far to the right of Senators elected directly, because they were further removed from the control of the voters.

STRONG REPRESENTATION FOR BRITISH PARTNERS

The second part of the constitution-making body was to be chosen to represent the Indian native states, which constitute from one-fourth to one-third of the total population of India. These representatives would not be elected — they would be appointed by the despotic native princes and feudal lords. The exploited peasant masses were to have nothing at all to say about who would represent these states. It can be taken for granted that this large section of the population would not have had its interests represented when the constitution was drawn up.

These native princes are the agents and partners of British imperialism; they remain in power only by the support of Britain and realize that without the aid of British bayonets they would be overthrown by the peasant masses. As recently as March 22, a New York Times story from Bombay reported that "The Princes fear that if the British-Indian link is broken, they will ultimately be swept away."

Thus, in the person of the princes' representatives and the representatives of reactionary minorities in some of the provinces, Britain was providing for itself a strong minority of British agents in the constitution-making body.

THE CLUB OF A WALK-OUT THREAT

This was not all. Cripps' plan contained an even stronger club to force the writing of a constitution which would be acceptable to British capitalist interests. And that was the provision that any of the provinces or native states which did not like the constitution after it was drawn up, could withdraw from the "new Indian Union" and be granted by Britain the "same full status as the Indian Union."

What would this mean? That Britain's most direct agents in the constitution-making body would be able to walk out of it if they didn't get what they wanted for themselves and for Britain.

The result would have been in

effect the establishment of a number of Indian Ulsters. Such a set-up would have placed Britain in the position where it could maintain its rule in an India divided into two or more parts; it could play one part against the other, and use the British-inspired demands of a minority to thwart the will of the majority as they do in Ireland.

The mere threat of such a step by Britain's agents in the constitution-making body would have strengthened their influence there all out of proportion to their size, and undoubtedly would have resulted in the adoption of various provisions — subservience to British capital, maintenance of feudal regimes, etc. — which British imperialism and the most reactionary elements in India would want adopted.

ALSO DEMANDED SIGNING OF TREATY

Reactionary and anti-democratic as these features of the plan were, British imperialism was not willing to stake its future on the effectiveness of them alone. It further demanded the "signing of a treaty which shall be negotiated between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making body."

This treaty would "make provisions in accordance with undertakings given by His Majesty's Government for the protection of racial and religious minorities." That is, Britain intended to use its tools who represented only a minority of a minority — the Moslem League, for example, does not represent the majority of the Moslems — to maintain its hold on India.

Through this treaty and through the provisions permitting the partition of India, Britain would have retained what amounted to veto power. In this way British imperialism expected to preserve its power to exploit India and to guarantee the continuance of the whole present economic structure of India.

The Indian masses are concerned with solving their own social, economic and political problems — not with winning the war for a Britain which refuses to grant them the democracy in whose name they are expected to fight and die. They will not be satisfied with any fraudulent plan — whether it comes from Cripps or Nehru — they will not be satisfied with anything short of the immediate convocation of a constituent assembly, directly elected by universal suffrage.

A Timely Political Document!

IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

(A Compilation — 1927-1937)

10 CENTS

By LEON TROTSKY

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK

The New York School Of Social Science

announces

a new series of lectures

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

25c for single lectures All classes held at

LABOR TEMPLE

242 East 14th Street, New York

IS EVERYBODY HAPPY?

The Soviet Union and Its Democratic Allies
By M. STEIN

New Attitude Toward the Red Army

The racket of cashing in on somebody else's success is a very old one. Ask any prize-fighter who had the good fortune of rising to the top. He is an unknown, trading punches with his opponents, pretty lonely while on his upward climb. While he's receiving and meting out punishment, there are very few friends rooting for him in his corner. But as soon as he is proclaimed champion, he is surrounded by all sorts of would-be friends, seeking to bask in his reflected glory. The people who had no use for him, and had no hope that he would ever amount to anything, are the very ones who become the loudest in their praise, the ones who say, "I always knew he had it in him."

The Red Army won the championship in the early winter on the longest continuous battle line in the history of warfare. Against great odds the Red Army maintained this championship throughout the winter. Not only did this heroic Red Army fight a powerful, well-equipped enemy, but it was at the same time burdened with an incompetent General Staff, which was responsible for the early and very costly defeats. This army was furthermore weakened by the policies of a corrupt regime in the country — a regime which systematically exterminated all the leaders and inspirers of the revolution who made the Red Army possible.

The Red Army's climb to championship has been a very difficult one indeed. Many were the times when it looked down-and-out, and many were the people who said it would never come up before the count of ten.

Everybody Seems Happy

How different everything is today. Everybody is a friend of the Red Army! Everybody seems happy at its successes!

Is the Conservative Mr. Churchill happy? Why, certainly. He above all! This most class conscious opponent of the Soviet Union is not averse to cashing in on the successes of the Red Army. When the storm broke loose over the inglorious defeat of Singapore, Mr. Churchill was quick to run for cover under the victorious banner of the Red Army. His words drip with honey in the message on the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Red Army, which he says "is being celebrated today after eight months of a campaign which has reflected the greatest glory on its officers and men and has enshrined its deeds in history for all time." (New York Times, Feb. 24).

And our own President does not merely join in the sentiments of the Prime Minister at the successes of the Red Army — his is a greater mission. His is the heavier responsibility. He speaks not in his own name alone, not in the name of his country alone: "... all the United Nations salute the superb Russian Army as it celebrates the twenty-fourth anniversary of its first assembly." (New York Times, Feb. 24).

Yes, how much water has run over the dam since "its assembly." We even remember the circumstances under which it occurred. We recall the dispatch of American troops in Siberia to cooperate with the Japanese troops and to coordinate their efforts with the British troops in Archangel and the French in Odessa — all there to help in "its first assembly."

Mr. Roosevelt has the distinction of setting political style, just as the Duchess of Windsor at one time had the distinction of setting the fashion for ladies' hairdos and dresses. It is no wonder then that the President's apparent enthusiasm for the Red Army should become the fashion. The Red Army is hailed in the most unexpected circles. Everybody seems to be for the champ; businessmen, industrialists, army dignitaries, clergymen, and even the so-called labor leaders, the Greens and the Woils.

Stalinist Business Booms

There is, of course, in addition, that gang which has been exploiting the prestige of the Soviet Union as a profession. For them business is truly booming. All the pent-houses which since the Stalin-Hitler Pact had shut their door in the face of the Stalinists, have been opened wider than ever. What a chance to rub shoulders with the elite of society and to drink toasts of oldest champagne to the Red Army soldiers and the guerrilla fighters who know of no limits in their sacrifices. After a few toasts intermingled, naturally, with toasts for the President or the Prime Minister or Sir Stafford Cripps, one gets perhaps the feeling of being a participant on the far flung Russian battle field.

In the midst of all the cheers for the Red Army, there are nevertheless some people who insist on bringing in a sour note. We refer here to none others than the Soviet Ambassadors in Washington and London. Mr. Litvinov made a speech at the Hotel Astor in New York on March 16; Mr. Maisky echoed his remarks in London on March 25th. The two ambassadors keep on harping on one thing, they ask for a diversion, such as the opening of a western front, and they want this done immediately. Says Maisky, "The decisive moment is 1942."

A reading of the text of these two speeches gives one the feeling that the Ambassadors are polemizing against somebody. And then it occurs to us that Mr. Churchill after his Washington conference with the President was the one who spoke about decisive action in 1943 and not 1942. Would it be too impudent to inquire what is the difference between the two dates? Is it merely a difference in temperament, a tendency towards restlessness and impatience on the part of the Soviet representatives? Or is it purely a question of strategy?

But here too our memory serves us in good stead. We remember an address made by Wendell Willkie, unofficial ambassador of Wall Street, who sometimes speaks out what others dare not say. Said Willkie at the Conference of Mayors (New York Times, January 14): "But democracy cannot be saved by the armies of Russia. Democracy must be saved by the democracies themselves."

So you see, while they are cheering for the champ and their hearts, yes and their purses, are with the new contender for the championship, they are now in the process of training. This is the meaning of the different dates. The question of who is to defeat Germany is to them the decisive one.