

**FOR A RISING SCALE
OF WAGES TO MEET
INCREASED PRICES!**

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI—No. 18

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1942

FIVE (5) CENTS

FDR PLAN HITS WORKERS HARDEST

Communist Press Whitewashes Nazi-U. S. Business Patent Pools

An Analysis Of The Stalinist 'National Unity' Defense Of The Monopolies

By ART PREIS

As a duty to the working class, every member and sympathizer of the Communist Party should examine carefully the policy of the Communist Party organ, the *Daily Worker*, toward the American monopolies and their patent-pools with Nazi corporations.

The revelations about these pools have forced their way into front-page headlines of every newspaper in the country. Despite the efforts of the corporation-dominated press to distort, conceal and minimize the evidence against Standard Oil, duPont, Aluminum Company of America, General Electric, etc., etc., the damning facts keep spilling over into the columns of the daily press. And it goes without saying that the trade union press has had much to say about them.

One would think that any paper which claims to speak for the workers would be duty-bound to publicize these disclosures in flaming headlines and denounce the monopolies in searing editorials.

But what did the *Daily Worker* do? Examine this paper which claims that it is the vanguard paper of the American working class. Read what it has had to say about the greatest series of Big Business scandals that has ever shocked this or any other nation. Read it—if you can find it in the *Daily Worker*!

By an exhaustive search, we have unearthed every word the *Daily Worker* has carried on these Nazi-U.S. trust exposés. Our search has revealed the following:

1. From March 21 until April 25, during the height of the exposures, the *Daily Worker* carried exactly five news items about the Nazi-U. S. corporations. Added together, these items would fill less than two columns of type on an eight-column page.

2. Although the *Daily Worker* has its own press bureau in Washington, four of the five items that did appear in the *Daily Worker* were parts of United Press dispatches which were as favorable as possible to the corporations.

That's all the *Daily Worker* had to say! Thus the *Daily Worker* deliberately and systematically concealed from its readers the facts which Standard Oil, General Electric and the rest of the trusts are spending millions to hide and suppress.

What the "Daily Worker" Did Write

Now let us see what it wrote in the five meager items it did print.

Item 1: On March 28, the *Daily Worker* carried a seven-paragraph UP dispatch, on the bottom of page four, reporting Thurman Arnold's statement on the Standard Oil-Nazi I. G. Farbenindustrie monopoly of the synthetic rubber industry. Half of this brief story was given over to the statement of W. S. Farish, president of Standard Oil of New Jersey, denying the charges.

Item 2: On April 1, at the bottom of page one, appeared a half-column UP dispatch — entirely devoted to quoting the lying denials of Farish before the Truman Committee.

Item 3: On April 16 — after two weeks' silence — on the bottom of page two in the *Daily Worker* there is buried a four paragraph UP dispatch about the government's suit against the Aluminum Corporation of America to release the Nazi-ALCOA patents on magnesium.

But the *Daily Worker* editors had carefully cut from this story all mention of the most important fact; that ALCOA's monopoly policies are part of a patent-pooling agreement with the Nazi chemical trust.

Why this deliberate cover-up of ALCOA? Because just at this time the Stalinist leadership of the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers had publicly endorsed ALCOA's firing of four Negro union job stewards who had resisted company provocations, discrimination and speedup at the Cleveland plant. Then the Stalinists had expelled these four workers from the union. Had the *Daily Worker* readers read the truth about ALCOA side by side with the stories commending the frameup of the four union job stewards, the Communist Party leaders would have stood exposed as stool pigeons and boss agents.

Item 4: On April 16, the *Daily Worker* published a six-inch story in an inconspicuous position on page four, reporting the Department of Justice suit against General Electric for release of the Nazi-GE tungsten-carbide patents.

Here again, not only did the *Daily Worker* not print most of the salient facts, but it suppressed altogether the very core of the government's case: that GE is carrying out its monopoly in conformity with a cartel agreement with Krupp, the Nazi steel trust.

Covering Up the G. E.-Nazi Combine

This story, incidentally, was the only one written by a *Daily Worker* correspondent. For even the mild and dry-cleaned UP dispatch on GE said too much to make it "fit" for the *Daily Worker*.

Why this *Daily Worker* censorship? Because the Stalinist leadership of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers was in the midst of a campaign to get the UE workers to give up standard double-time pay for week-ends and holidays and accept a "voluntary" 15 per cent speedup. The UE leaders had put forth their infamous proposals in huge ads in the capitalist press. This campaign was being directed primarily at the General Electric workers, a key group in the UE. That is why the *Daily Worker* tried to suppress the facts about the GE-Nazi connections!

Item 5: On April 18, buried at the bottom of page three, the *Daily Worker* carried a six paragraph UP dispatch about the Remington Arms conspiracy with I. G. Farbenindustrie which

prevented the sale to the American and British armies of tetra-cene, the best and cheapest ammunition priming.

Among other vital facts blue-penciled by the *Daily Worker* editors was one which every capitalist paper mentioned — that Remington is a subsidiary of the duPont interests. The duPonts, through their chemical and munitions trust and their control over such corporations as General Motors, are getting probably the largest slice of war orders of any financial group in the country. The *Daily Worker* editors "left out" any mention of the duPont control of Remington because the Stalinists didn't want their readers to ponder over the fact that the financial group which is profiting most from the "war for democracy" is still continuing to do a little business on the side with Hitler.

These five items are all — absolutely all — the *Daily Worker* had to say during the six weeks in which the series of exposures about the American-Nazi trust conspiracies rocked the nation.

The "Daily Worker" Explains Its Silence

The reason for this policy of suppression and silence was finally expressed in the *Daily Worker*, April 24. On that date the *Daily Worker* broke its previous editorial silence, publishing a big double-column lead editorial, in bold face and extra-size type, called "American Monopolies and the War."

That editorial is a whitewash of the trusts and an attack on those liberal papers which have devoted much space to the exposures.

Every sympathizer of the Communist Party should go and read, study and re-study that editorial. For it is nothing less than a declaration that the Communist Party stands with the monopolies in "national unity" against the enemies of the monopolies — i.e., against the working class.

The editorial pays a brief lip-service to the obvious facts, admitting that the Nazi-U.S. deals "certainly were not and are not in the interests of the country." It immediately modifies even this, however, by stating that this is "particularly true" if these deals "were made after, or continued after, the Pearl Harbor attack." The *Daily Worker* thus presumably considers such monopoly practices to be O. K. before Dec. 7, 1941, and after the war is over. It sees nothing significant in the fact that America's Sixty Families and the Nazi capitalists are able to get along

(Continued on page 3)

Freezes Wages But Lets Bosses Get Off Easy

Program Does Not Establish Equality of Sacrifice; Union Leaders Are 'Dismayed'

President Roosevelt's long-awaited war economy program, revealed in his message to Congress last Monday and elaborated in his Tuesday night radio address, is not an "equality of sacrifice" program. On the contrary, it is a program to keep the full burden of the war on the masses while enabling the bankers and industrialists to continue to profit from the war and live in luxury.

The American workers, farmers and lower middle class were stunned and shocked as Roosevelt's words brought home to them the realization that he has given the signal for a new offensive against their living standards.

The national leaders of the trade unions are reported as "dismayed" and "overwhelmed" by the implications of the Roosevelt program. They understand that it is a blunt veto of the unions' demands for general wage increases to close the gap between the soaring prices of the past months and the fixed wages which have generally prevailed since the union leaders agreed to surrender the right to strike.

The fact that Roosevelt's program contains a general and immediate price-fixing provision does not offset the disastrous effects of the wage freezing order because it fails to strike at the roots of price inflation, scarcity of commodities, and because the effective enforcement of even this provision is generally considered to be impossible and is not even promised by the government.

WAGE FREEZING AND PRESENT WAGES
The first of these measures, wage-freezing, a term which Roosevelt cleverly avoided, will not require special legislation "under present circumstances," he stated, but will be carried out by the War Labor Board machinery. This is a direct mandate to the Board to turn down any union requests for general wage increases.

He sought to take the curse off this general policy, which is bound to arouse great hostility among the workers, by paying lip-service to "due consideration to inequalities and the elimination of sub-standards of living."

But the truth is that if this were to be followed, it would call for an immediate big boost in the incomes of the workers. For eighty per cent of the working population of the country exists at a level of mere subsistence, or lower.

Figures of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, published two weeks ago, show that in December, 1941, over 25 per cent of all industrial workers were making less than \$20 a week; over 50 per cent, less than \$30; only 13 per cent (Continued on page 2)

Kelly Postal Convicted For Abiding By Union's Vote

By JACK RANGER

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., April 28. — Under open pressure of the instructions of Judge Arthur W. Selover, a district court jury Friday night returned a verdict of guilty against Kelly Postal, secretary-treasurer of Local 544-CIO, who was charged with "first degree grand larceny" in a case growing out of the revolt of the Minneapolis drivers against the dictatorship of President Tobin of the AFL Teamsters. Sentence will be handed down on May 1.

Postal was charged with "embezzling" \$5,000 from Tobin. The \$5,000 is part of the local union treasury which the Local 544 membership unanimously instructed Postal to turn over to the Union Defense Committee last June in order to defend it from Tobin and other enemies of the union when it voted to disaffiliate from the AFL and joined the CIO.

This is the second "embezzle- (Continued on page 2)

Who Creates Race Bias In the Army?

"A recent incident at Fort Bragg in North Carolina throws an interesting sidelight on army race relations. Several hundred white troops were gathered to hear a lecture on venereal infection by a camp chaplain. The same lecture was scheduled to be delivered to a Negro contingent at a later hour. But shortly after the talk for whites had begun, an officer interrupted the meeting to announce that the Negroes had by some mistake arrived outside the hall. He said that the hall would hold both groups but that he personally objected to a mixed audience and that if one other soldier shared his sentiments, he would order the Negroes to await their turn. Not one soldier objected. The officer reluctantly admitted the Negroes but seated them at the rear with four empty rows to separate them from the whites." (From the column, "In the Wind," in the April 24 Nation.)

Meetings, Radio Talks Wind Up Carlson Campaign

St. Paul Voters Were Offered a Fighting Socialist Program

ST. PAUL, Minn., April 28 — The election campaign of Grace Carlson, Socialist Workers Party candidate for mayor of St. Paul, ended last night with a vigorous speech by the Trotskyist candidate over Station WMIN. Voters went to the polls today, but the number of votes cast for Carlson, a write-in candidate, will not be tabulated.

The Carlson campaign was one of the most active ever waged by a minority party candidate in this city. In the last few weeks alone, several thousand pieces of campaign literature, including 10,000 copies of a special edition of THE MILITANT, were distributed in working class neighborhoods.

In addition to Carlson's radio speech, the campaign committee arranged a radio speech by Albert Goldman, attorney for the Socialist Workers Party and like Grace Carlson, one of the 18 Trotskyist and CIO members convicted in Minneapolis last December for violating the Smith "Gag Act." Both Goldman and Carlson were the main speakers at an open campaign rally last week.

Grace Carlson had the disadvantage of having to run as a write-in candidate because of the city's law that the names of only the two highest mayoralty candidates in the primaries shall be printed on the ballot for the final election.

Despite this disadvantage, the encouraging response shown by workers during the primary campaign induced the Carlson Campaign Committee to run the candidate on a write-in basis, so that workers would have the chance of voting for a clear-cut socialist program in the final election.

War Shipping Board Hits Again At Seamen

Proposes New Merchant Fleet Regulations Permitting Abrogation of Union Contracts

Moving ever closer to a final showdown with the maritime labor unions, the War Shipping Administration has thrown into the faces of the union representatives gathered in Washington a series of new proposed merchant shipping regulations that would result in the virtual destruction of collective bargaining rights and maritime union conditions.

The new rules would: 1. Give any captain of an American flag ship authority to reject any seaman for his crew; 2. Give the War Shipping Administration power to fix wages and working conditions without regard for existing union contracts.

The first provision would result in the abrogation in practice of all union shop and security provisions of the union contracts. The second would permit the government to whittle away the wages and conditions won by maritime labor through long years of union struggle.

These new proposals are the first fruits of the government's assumption last week of control over the operation of the U. S. merchant fleet. The War Shipping Admin. which drew up these new regulations is the bureau of the Maritime Commission which carried out the merchant fleet "requisitioning." Under the new setup, the shipowners act nominally as the "managing agents" for the government and are, of course, still assured of their profits. The principal effect of the change is to transfer to the government the direct responsibility for the job of undermining union conditions and security.

The latest War Shipping Administration proposals are a substitute for those which it pressed last week in conjunction with the Stalinist leadership of the National Maritime Union. This previous program had called for the pooling of all seamen and their placement on ships through government "manning boards" instead of the present union hiring halls. This program, as the present one, would have eliminated the maritime union shop, but it did give lip-service to the unions and made a pretense of guaranteeing their security. The new regulations do away with all such pretense.

With the exception of the National Maritime Union, all the seafaring unions have united in opposition to these new proposals. This united line-up includes the Atlantic and Gulf District of the Seafarers International Union, AFL, and the SIU's West Coast affiliate, the Sailors Union of the Pacific; the Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO; the Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders & Wipers, unaffiliated; and the Masters, Mates & Pilots, AFL.

In the face of this union opposition, the War Shipping Administration is proceeding cautiously, hesitating to come to final grips with the unions, and has not as yet put the new regulations into effect. These proposals will most likely be used as bargaining points, and will be shoved through if the unions make a strong stand.

The shipowners and government hope, at least, to use the threat of these drastic regulations to force the unions to accept some "reasonable" compromise which will rob the workers of some of their previous gains and make them more vulnerable

to the next advance in the offensive against their wages and conditions.

The composition of the War Shipping Administration reveals its pro-shipowner character and why it is being used as the spearhead in the maritime anti-union campaign. Chairman of the WSA is Robson, former president of the labor-mating United Fruit Lines. He is "on leave" from his company to serve in his present job. His colleagues on the government board include such notoriously anti-labor ship-operators as Wilcox of the United Fruit Lines, Knight of the unorganized Isthmian Line, Bradley of the Matson Steamship Company and Cushing of the American-Hawaiian Line.

These men, under the cloak of government authority and with patriotic phrases on their lips, are out to smash the maritime unions, at this one stroke if possible, or piece meal if necessary.

NEED FIGHTING UNITED FRONT

The officials of the maritime unions, with the exception of the NMU, are mobilized in Washington to fight the imposition of the new regulations. On the degree to which they also will mobilize their rank and file members on the water fronts for a militant stand, depends the final outcome of the fight.

Whatever the results of the immediate conferences between the War Shipping Administration and the union leadership, a final union showdown, with the shipowners likely to "come soon." This showdown will result in a union victory only if the unions forge a fighting united front of all maritime labor, a united front which will speak to the shipowners in the only language they understand — a united front that will proclaim in militant terms, "No more retreats!"



"AFTER ALL, STANDARD OIL IS AN INTERNATIONAL COMPANY."

—W. S. Farish, President, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, testifying before the Truman Senate Committee.

Dunne Reaches West Coast On CRDC Tour

Montana Groups Form Committees To Carry On Work

The first reports on the western half of V. R. Dunne's tour in behalf of the Civil Rights Defense Committee are extremely encouraging. The tour is being conducted to arouse public and union support for the C. R. D. C.'s campaign appealing the conviction of 18 Socialist Workers Party and CIO members convicted in Minneapolis last December for violating the Smith Gag Act.

After a very successful meeting in Plentywood, Montana, Dunne went on to Helena. There, together with friends of the Committee, he was able to lay out broad plans for work in that section of the country.

With committees being started in Helena, Butte, Great Falls and Missoula, the projected plan is to set up a Western Montana Civil Rights Defense Committee. Wide interest has already been created by Dunne's tour among

labor and liberal circles, and those working for the Committee are confident that excellent results will be obtained.

From Montana Dunne went on to the West Coast. Two public meetings were arranged in Seattle and another in Everett, Washington. Many new trade union contacts have been made in Tacoma and in Portland, Oregon. Tacoma is also organizing a committee to help carry on the work of the defense. A report on the tour shows that there are almost unlimited possibilities in that part of Washington for the expansion of this work.

From Seattle, Dunne is going on to Los Angeles, where two affairs have been planned for him. The chairman of the Los Angeles Branch has written that the members there are certain Dunne's visit will provide a great stimulus to the local committee and make its future work more profitable.

Such enthusiastic reports on the tour point to greater effort in behalf of the 18 defendants than ever before from both the new and the already established committees.

Dunne plans to complete his tour by returning to visit the newly created branches of the committees.

Secures Support Of Liberals and Unions In Seattle

SEATTLE, Wash. — Highlighting a successful three day stay here V. R. Dunne presented a stirring account of the Minneapolis trial to an enthusiastic Sunday forum in the Church of the People at Independence Hall.

Situated in the University district and supervised by Rev. Fred W. Shorter, this church is unique in both its composition and its activity. Its membership includes labor minded persons, workers, and a wide grouping of educators and liberals. The subjects usually discussed are related to social and labor questions.

After Dunne's factual and inspiring presentation, the pastor took up a collection for the defense of the Minneapolis labor leaders. In an audience of over a hundred, \$40 was collected and many people stopped to chat with Dunne after the meeting was over.

During the discussion period one of the local Stalinist leaders attempted to disrupt the meeting by getting a stooge to ask Dunne to define the difference between the Stalinist and Trotskyist position.

Dunne stated that he would be very happy to comply with this request under different auspices. But speaking as a guest of the forum and under the sponsorship of the C.R.D.C. his main object was to present the case for the Minneapolis defendants. He challenged one Stalinist to meet him on an open platform to discuss the political questions.

Saturday afternoon Dunne attended a meeting of union militants, including members of the International Woodworkers, CIO. He spoke at length on the Minneapolis case and showed why it was necessary for all of labor to see that the trial of the Minneapolis defendants received wide publicity and support.

Saturday evening Dunne addressed a downtown public meeting at which a collection was also taken.

Although Dunne's arrival was upon very short notice, the Seattle C.R.D.C. was able to arrange many meetings for him with both CIO and AFL labor leaders. His appearances at both private and public meetings were so well received that Dunne intends making a return trip to Seattle after he completes his California tour.

FDR Program Hits Workers The Hardest

(Continued from page 1)

cent, including supervisory and executive employees, made as much as \$50 a week, the income required according to the government's own figures for a minimum decency level of living at 1932 prices.

In addition, Roosevelt's mandate puts the seal of approval on the 25 per cent indirect cut in wages which the average worker already has suffered because of past price rises.

His radio speech made abundantly clear where the emphasis on wages would be. He stated flatly:

"Do you work for wages? You will have to forego higher wages for your particular job for the duration of the war."

WAR BONDS AND CREDIT ELIMINATION

On the matter of war bonds, Roosevelt made it plain that the government is going to put on an immediate pressure campaign to get every worker to give up ten per cent of his income for bonds, and that if the response is not forthcoming, compulsion will be used. This would be another reduction in income, especially harsh when wages are frozen.

The elimination of credit and installment buying and the forced payment of debts will strike a particularly heavy blow at the masses. Naturally, those with big incomes can pay full cash for everything and do not need to run into debt. But the workers and low-income earners, lacking credit, will not be able to buy anything priced above a few dollars.

PRICE FIXING

To appear to compensate in part for these severe direct slashes in the workers' purchasing power, Roosevelt offers a price-fixing program, based on an over-all ceiling on prices fixed at the high average March levels.

To begin with, even if prices are fixed, the scarcity of commodities will limit the workers' living standards. You can't eat or wear what you can't get, no matter what the price.

But it is this very scarcity, which Roosevelt does not contemplate eliminating, which determines prices, not any arbitrary limits placed from on top. What will happen here, as has happened in England and throughout Europe, will be the growth of a Black Market, to which necessities will be diverted, and where the workers will have to go and pay tremendously inflated profiteering prices.

Immediately following Roosevelt's speeches, a general price-fixing order was issued. But the enforcement of this is to depend on the "good-will" of the manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers. Although certain small penalties are threatened for price violations, actually the task of policing prices is so monumental that the government does not even contemplate it seriously.

Price Administrator Henderson admitted to the press on Tuesday that little thought has been given to "figuring out means for putting people in the hoosegow" and that a "whole army of people searching for violations will not be an important part of the picture."

WHAT WILL THE BOSSES HAVE TO SACRIFICE?

But what "equality of sacrifice" does Roosevelt demand of the bankers and industrialists?

He proposes that personal incomes be fixed at a yearly maximum of \$25,000 "after taxes"—the workers, naturally, will have their wages fixed before taxes.

Even if this were put into effect, there is no equality of sacrifice where one man is permitted to live on the luxurious income of \$25,000 clear of taxes and another is forced to subsist on a \$1,000 a year, and pay taxes to boot.

And while Roosevelt's order to the War Labor Board will put wage-freezing into effect at once, he knows that the corporation-minded Congressmen will undoubtedly delay and haggle over his proposed legislation on limiting the bosses' incomes to \$25,000, and will set a more "reasonable"—that is higher—figure in the end.

Insofar as profits limitations are concerned, Roosevelt did not give any clear definition of "reasonable" profits. He calls for higher corporate profits taxes, but whatever he might suggest—and he has not gone beyond the Treasury's modest program—would not prevent the bosses from sinking their profits into new fixed assets, non-taxable "contingency" and reserve funds, faked costs, etc. They would be able to live off their present huge bank accounts during the war, and claim their accumulated profits after the war.

The reaction of the union lead-

WLB Finally Hands Down Ruling In Long-Delayed Shipyard Case

Grants Maintenance of Membership Clause Which Gives No Genuine Union Security

After nine months of government failure to enforce the previous decision of the discredited and defunct National Defense Mediation Board, its successor, the National War Labor Board, in an eight to four vote on April 25, reaffirmed the NDMB ruling by granting a "maintenance of membership" clause to the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, CIO, at U. S. Steel's Federal Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company plant in Kearny, New Jersey.

The four corporation members of the Board fought to the end against the decision, despite the fact that it gives the union very little genuine security, and is a far cry from the union or closed shop which the union movement is seeking, in a number of other cases before the WLB.

The administration hopes to establish some sort of weak and ineffective "maintenance of membership" set-up as a precedent for future cases where unions demand genuine union security. It is in effect a trial balloon; the administration wants to see what the reaction of the workers will be.

2. The administration hopes to establish some sort of weak and ineffective "maintenance of membership" set-up as a precedent for future cases where unions demand genuine union security. It is in effect a trial balloon; the administration wants to see what the reaction of the workers will be.

3. Furthermore, the administration knows that it will have to face a good deal of opposition from the union ranks in the coming period when the War Labor Board tries to carry out Roosevelt's order to freeze wages. It is seeking by this ruling to show the union leaders that it will help them to keep some kind of base together, if in return the union leaders will assist them to put over the wage freezing program by policing the unions for the employers, blocking strikes and other union militant actions, and soft-pedaling the demands of the workers.

The opinion cites the low-level of strikes since the no-strike agreement was made by the CIO and AFL national leaders and states that "mainly responsible for this amazing record are the labor leaders of America who courageously stand guard day and night over the keeping of this agreement."

It then points out that many employers are beginning to recognize the value to them of a maintenance of membership clause as a means of keeping the union members under the thumb of a "responsible leadership" which will stifle their militancy.

"Too often members of unions do not maintain their membership because they resent the discipline of a responsible leadership. A rival but less responsible leadership feels the pull of the temptation to obtain and maintain leadership by relaxing discipline, by refusing to cooperate with the company, and sometimes with unfair and demagogic agitation and attacks on the company. It is in the interest of management, these business leaders have found, to cooperate with the unions for the maintenance

THREE REASONS

The administration, in opposing the stand of the employer members of the board, was undoubtedly motivated by the following considerations:

1. Given the who's background of the Federal Shipbuilding case and the previous decision of the NDMB, it would have been difficult for the War Labor Board to make any other decision than it did without completely discrediting itself in the eyes of the masses as an even worse body than the NDMB, and arousing

of a more stable, responsible leadership."

In short, the Board hopes to utilize the maintenance of membership clause as a means of keeping the workers under the control of union leaders who will "cooperate with the company."

IF U. S. STEEL REJECTS

But the issue still stands where it did nine months ago. The Board may make a decision—but will the U. S. Steel corporation abide by it?

The company through its legal counsel has already intimated that it may continue to oppose the decision as "illegal." It fears that anything the workers may regard as a concession to their demands will invite further demands.

The present ruling, in reviewing the history of the case, shows what happened the last time the company refused to accept the decision:

"When the United States Steel Corporation refused to comply with the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board, the shipyard was taken over by the government. At that time the government assured the union that the maintenance of membership clause would be in effect unless the shipyard be converted into a government shipyard. The Kearny shipyard

was not converted into a Navy yard. The clause was, as a matter of equity, in effect even though unenforced by the Navy Department."

The consequences of the government control in this instance was that "during all this time of uncertainty there was trouble with the newly organized local independent union (Company union), there was an increase in the number of grievances and there was consequently a relative loss in the number of members in the union in good standing..."

With this record of government enforcement in mind, the company may choose to defy the decision, invite the government to take over the Federal Shipbuilding plant once more, and continue to draw down its profits with the assurance the workers will still fail to achieve any kind of union security.

Should the company accept the WLB decision, the workers will have won little more than a moral victory. Should the company reject the decision, the workers may still lose out in the long run.

It would be a serious mistake for the workers to regard the Federal Shipbuilding case decision as any major concession to labor, or as any solution of the problem of union security.

KELLY POSTAL CONVICTED

(Continued from page 1)

ment" trial Postal has undergone. Last January a similar charge against Postal was thrown out of court by Judge Hall. Judge Hall had before him the same witnesses and the same testimony that appeared in the second trial. The Tobin case was so raw that Judge Hall threw it out of court.

Selover, and he instructed them that if Kelly Postal and the union membership had violated Tobin's constitution, they must find Postal guilty.

Under pressure of such instructions, the jurors retired and came in with a verdict of guilty. Postal faces a prison term of from one to ten years.

HOW JUDGE WAS PICKED

But then the Tobin forces in Minneapolis became desperate as Local 544-CIO began to forge ahead, winning the first labor board election it was given the opportunity to participate in, and signing a union contract at a wage scale of 10c-20c an hour higher than the Tobin sell-out contracts. Tobin's receivers here pressed the county attorney to send Postal to trial again. No judge could be found, however, who would accept the case. After a bit of behind-the-scenes maneuvering by Tobin and local politicians, an out-of-town judge was brought to Minneapolis and assigned the case. However, Local 544-CIO attorneys filed an affidavit of prejudice against the judge. Finally, Judge Selover, the most reactionary judge in district court, saw fit to accept the second "embezzlement" case against Postal.

"CONSPIRACY" FRAME-UP PREPARED

Both assistant county attorney William Compton and Judge Selover conducted the case in such a manner as to lay the basis for a "conspiracy" charge which can be applied to every officer and active member of Local 544-CIO. Already pending are trials of Miles Dunne and Moe Hork, president and organizer for Local 544-CIO, on "embezzlement" charges. It is probable that Tobin will now try to obtain new indictments from the grand jury against many more Local 544-CIO leaders.

If Judge Selover had been on Tobin's payroll, he couldn't have made a more fervent defense of union dictatorship against trade union democracy. Selover argued that Tobin's constitution provides that a local union could not dissolve so long as seven members dissented from "secession," and that therefore the overwhelming majority of the Local 544 membership had no right to do anything but submit to Tobin's dictatorship.

If Judge Selover's dry legal formulas mirrored real life, the whole CIO movement would never have come into existence—for does not the AFL constitution prohibit its member unions from withdrawing and forming a rival trade union federation? Selover's charge to the jury, his whole conduct of the case, constituted an apology for the Tobin brand of racketeering and dictatorial unionism.

If means can be found, Local 544-CIO will appeal Brother Postal's case to the state supreme court.

James P. Cannon
Continues his lectures on
THE HISTORY OF TROTSKYISM IN THE U. S.
for Six Weeks On
WEDNESDAY EVENINGS
8 O'CLOCK
New York School of Social Science
LABOR TEMPLE - Main Floor
242 E. 14th STREET
NEW YORK
ADMISSION 25c

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!

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**

Negro Workers Win Job Equality In Flint Plant

Work On GM War Production Machines At the Same Rate of Pay As White Workers

By JEFF THORNE

FLINT, Mich. — Real headway against racial discrimination in the factories is now being made in this stronghold of General Motors, and Negroes have begun to work on war production machines, shoulder to shoulder with their white brothers in the UAW-CIO and at the same rates of pay, \$1.10 an hour to start.

This first victory of its kind here, won through union militancy, has inspired not only the 8,000 colored people of Flint, but also their white brothers. As soon as the first half-dozen Negroes went to work at Chevrolet division of GM, Buick workers took the cue and began a fight to achieve the same kind of victory over industrial Jim Crow.

Only the organized and militant action of Negro leaders in the union, with much white support, made this forward step possible. The Negro militants in Chevrolet refused to sit idly by and wait for justice. In other plants, where the Negroes waited, they're still waiting, or working only as laborers, if they are working at all.

MILITANTS ORGANIZED

As soon as Roosevelt's executive order against discrimination was issued last June 25, the Chevrolet Negro militants began to organize to enforce it. When the corporation had failed to place any Negroes on machine jobs by July 2, the militants set out to file a discrimination grievance against the management.

Against the opposition of the bosses, and despite the weak and vacillating behavior of some of the white union leaders, the fight was continued until it was won. It took eight months before an agreement was reached with the management, and two months more before it was put into effect,

not to take the papers, a big box was placed at the building entrance and monitors stationed to stop the members and tell them to put the papers unread into the box, etc.

Last night, however, the distribution went through uneventfully, most of the workers taking the papers and putting them in their pockets. Only five papers were left in the elaborate wastepaper box, which is the local Stalinist substitute for Nazi book-burning.

After a delay of three weeks, the letter of the American Civil Liberties Union protesting against the violations of free speech and press initiated by the Communist Party last night was finally placed before the CIO Council delegates and read, despite the scattered howls of the Stalinists.

The letter specifically asked the Council members whether they "condemned or condoned" the cowardly lynch tactics used by the Stalinists against the MILITANT and Labor Action sales people.

The Executive Board introduced a motion asking that a sub-committee be set up to meet with the local ACLU officials to discuss the matter. An amendment to this motion was then offered to condemn any interference with literature distribution in front of the meeting hall.

A sharp hour-long debate ensued on the amendment, but the Stalinist machine rounded up its mechanical vote and defeated it, although a good third of the delegates voted in favor of the amendment. The Executive Board recommendation was passed.

There was a noticeable division and confusion among the Stalinist delegates during the debate until one of their leaders "put them straight" with a long speech.

A growing reaction against the Stalinist lynch campaign is becoming quite apparent. In the end, this latest attempt to violate the traditions of workers' democracy is going to boom heavily against the Communist Party.

For ten months, since Roosevelt's order, the corporation has been claiming that there was no discrimination in production. But during those ten months, Negroes were still limited to laboring and porter jobs at 85 and 90 cents an hour. Now, as the new jobs open, the Negro militants watch the seniority list daily to see that no worker is denied his right to any job he can handle and at the higher pay rates. The first three Negroes were put into these better-paying jobs on April 15.

REAL SOLIDARITY

For many years the corporation had justified its policy of discrimination on the grounds that to grant job equality would create trouble among the workers. This argument is still raised in some plants, but it was proved completely false at Chevrolet. Whites and Negroes who went to work together for the first time greeted each other with handshaking, backslapping and hearty congratulations, despite the fact that more than 40 per cent of the workers in Chevrolet are southerners and foreign-born. Extra police held in eager readiness by the management could find no pretext to win it.

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

Tennessee CIO Miners Fight Boss Jim Crowism In Union

Two encouraging news items in the press this week indicate the growing solidarity of white workers toward Negro workers...

In Rockwood, Tennessee, Local 579 of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, CIO, which has a closed shop contract with the Tennessee Products Company, was responsible for the discharge of an anti-union and Negro-baiting employee named Nichols...

The members of the union, about half of whom are colored, the other half white, had already learned while they were building the union that this kind of prejudice helps the bosses to keep down the wages and conditions of workers of all races...

Remember, this happened in Tennessee, in the deep south. That's what makes it all the more significant. There are still plenty of men like Nichols down there, workers who are misled and misguided by ruling class propaganda...

The other labor news story is about the Red Caps' union, the United Transport Service Employees of America, which has been an independent organization. Its president, W. S. Townsend, announced last week that the UTSEA is now engaged in negotiations to affiliate with the CIO...

William Pickens, former "radical" and branch director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has been doing pretty well for himself since he took on the Treasury Department job of trying to sell war bonds and stamps to the impoverished and Jim-Crowed Negro people...

"Slavery" has been abolished in the British Empire, but "forced labor" remains and is to be extended. It is not clear what the difference is between the two.

"All Africans in Kenya between 18 and 50 are required under a new Colonial Office Order to perform compulsory labor. The minimum period of 'forced labor' is to be 84 days and the maximum twelve months.

"After that the African can return to work for a time in his village, but he will soon be recalled. He will be exempted only for one quarter of the period he has served.

"Anyone who resists the call-up may be fined £5 or imprisoned for two months, or both.

"The Africans in Kenya, who have been driven off the best land to provide farms for European coffee-growers, who have no democratic rights, and whose native organizations have been suppressed and their leaders imprisoned or deported, are not likely to be enthusiastic about this new manifestation of the 'freedom' for which their British masters are fighting."

The People's Voice reports this week how three Negro soldiers, on their way from Washington to a new post, were taken off a bus in Alexandria, Va., and thrown into jail because they wouldn't get out of their seats and move to the back of the bus when the driver ordered them to.

After they've served the 30 days in the guard house, we suppose they'll be allowed to go back to work and train some more to fight in the "war for democracy."

BOUND VOLUMES OF THE MILITANT FOR 1941 Now Available at \$3.00 each

Limited Supply-Order Immediately from THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION 116 University Place—New York City

They Still Do Business With Hitler

FDR Seizure Threat Will Not End Patent Monopolies

Because of the continued blocking of American production by the monopolies which still refuse to release the patents they control jointly with Nazi trusts, President Roosevelt last week — almost five months after Pearl Harbor — finally issued an order for the seizure of all Nazi-U. S. patents deemed necessary for war purposes.

The belatedness of this action, which will affect only those patents that can be directly traced to joint Nazi-U. S. ownership, indicates the tremendous pressure which the American trusts have been able to exert on the administration to prevent the breaking of their grip on vital industrial processes.

In issuing his order, Roosevelt pointed to his war-time powers which permit him to seize any property, including patents, which is deemed essential for the war effort. He stated that he expects the Alien Property Custodian to seize some 25,000 patents in the next few months.

Another Local Is Against Giving Up Overtime Wages

DETROIT — The members of Hudson Local 154 of the United Auto Workers, CIO, voted last week by a four-to-one majority to reject the recommendation of the recent national UAW conference favoring the surrender of the established pay rates for week-end and holiday work.

The Hudson local, which has a membership of more than 5,000, was until recently a stronghold of the Walter Reuther faction in the UAW. But despite the pleas of some of the local's officers, the members of the local felt that there was no good reason for them to give up their hard-earned rights, and they voted decisively against the conference recommendation.

The Hudson local is the third important body of the union since the conference to take this step. Others are the Buffalo Bell Aircraft Local 501 and the Flint Buick Local 599. At the conference 150 delegates, from unions representing 100,000 members, also opposed any surrender of labor's rights.

A NOTE ON LIEBKNECHT

In my article, "How the Spirit of May Day Flamed in World War I", published in the April 25 issue of THE MILITANT there is contained a badly formulated sentence which gives a wrong and unjust impression of the position Karl Liebknecht took toward the war when the German Social-Democratic Party Reichstag majority voted to support the war in August 1914.

The article reported that Liebknecht, the most outspoken and courageous of the German socialist anti-war fighters, had voted against the majority of the Social-Democratic Reichstag, fraction, which agreed to support the war credits in the Reichstag, but that when the declaration of the majority was made in the Reichstag, Liebknecht had maintained party discipline and remained silent.

Then followed my incorrect statement, "He, too, was momentarily unable to stand up to the wave of chauvinism that spread throughout the Second (Socialist) International."

The facts are that Liebknecht did resist the wave of chauvinism, never once compromising on his revolutionary opposition to the war. His mistake, the mistake of the German Left in general, was in continuing to carry out the discipline of a party which had betrayed the German working class on the war issue. Thus, on this single occasion Liebknecht had permitted the fetish of party unity to outweigh the question of principle. But he at the first opportunity corrected his mistake, and publicly opposed the war in violation of party discipline.

During the war, Liebknecht worked to establish a Marxist revolutionary party which helped in the overthrow of the monarchy and fought a heroic but unsuccessful battle to establish workers' power in Germany. Liebknecht stands as one of the titans of the international socialist movement, one whose historic struggle against imperialist war is an enduring inspiration to the class-conscious workers of the world.

ART PREIS

war, without the President using the "seizure" powers which he exercised against striking workers at the North American Aviation Corporation plant in California during early June, 1941, just six months before Pearl Harbor.

MORE IMPORTANT QUESTION The emphasis on the seizure of so-called enemy patents has obscured the more important and decisive general problem of monopoly patent control and monopoly practices as a whole.

The major portion of patents is controlled entirely by American corporations. It is primarily through the control of these patents, which are unaffected by the President's seizure order, that the monopolies have been able and are still able to run production according to their own interests and to continue their policies of blocking competitive production.

Even if Congress passes specific legislation compelling the registration of internationally owned patents and the regulation of their use, as there is some talk of doing, this will not materially change present practices. Just as there has been wholesale evasion of the anti-trust laws, implemented by the reluctance and inability of the government to enforce them, so there will be evasion and non-enforcement of the patent regulations.

The only effective way to break the monopoly stranglehold on production is to break the entire control of the private monopolists. That calls for the government expropriation of the basic industries and their operation under the control of the workers.

WHY NOT BEFORE?

The admission that the President has the power to seize such patents without any implementing legislation or court action, raises the question of why this was not done to date against Standard Oil, duPont, General Electric, Aluminum Company of America, etc.

It is known that the evidence against these companies was in the hands of the Department of Justice more than a year ago. It is also known that such international cartel agreements and patent-pools have been standard practice for decades, and constituted a problem in the last world war.

In spite of these facts, the big corporations were permitted to retain their patents for months after American entry into the

ALCOA BEATS RAP FOR NAZI DEALS

Admitting that the patent-pool deal between the Aluminum Company of America and the Nazi I. G. Farbenindustrie was the "worst" of all the notorious international cartel agreements which helped block American production, Assistant Attorney-General Arnold last week confessed to the Senate Patents Committee that ALCOA was able to get off with an even more favorable consent decree than Standard Oil.

Arnold's admission that the trusts have been able to avoid the penalty for their violations of the anti-trust laws through consent decrees on virtually their own terms, was part of his argument for the passage of more stringent patent regulation laws, which he claimed would stop the "abuse of the patent privilege" responsible for "most of our present shortage of basic materials for the war."

Revealing the power of the monopolies' influence on the government, Arnold stated that the ALCOA case, for instance, involving the monopoly on magnesium, there was no question but that the government could have obtained a conviction if the case had gone to trial.

CONSCIOUS VIOLATIONS

Because the monopolies have been able to get consent decrees with the government dropping its charges, they "have attempted to give the public the impression that they had been engaged in some immaterial and technical violations of law on account of which they felt no personal guilt whatever." Arnold added: "I am willing to leave it to the

common sense of the public that defendants do not pay fines, both corporate and individual, without knowing that they have been fined for an actual violation of law of which they were conscious." He also stated that the big monopolies do not accept a consent decree settlement "if they have a chance to fight it."

Among additional facts about the ALCOA-Nazi tieup which Arnold disclosed last week were:

ALCOA, which holds a world monopoly on aluminum, was able through its monopoly agreement with the Nazi chemical trust to keep the price of the competitive metal magnesium one-third higher than aluminum, although magnesium is much cheaper to produce.

The Dow Chemical Company, which had better magnesium patents than the German trust, was nevertheless forced by ALCOA into a patent-pooling deal with the Nazis and ALCOA, through which ALCOA was able to block the production and fabrication of magnesium and thus maintain the monopoly price on aluminum. Even after the government started its magnesium expansion program in March, 1941, it had to continue to pay royalties on all production to ALCOA.

C. P. PRESS WHITEWASHES TRUSTS

(Continued from page 1)

so well together. Then the editorial gets down to cases.

A Stalinist Guarantee of Big Business Patriotism

First it assures its readers that "the large American corporations and their leading personnel" are patriotic and although "traitorous individuals may remain in leading corporation posts," they don't really represent the corporations. The editorial goes on:

"It is true that certain American monopolies did pursue an earlier policy of pro-fascist appeasement. . . . But the peril it created for the very existence of the whole country, including these monopoly corporations, did result in a transformation into an opposite policy."

By this crooked formula, the editorial conceals the fact that virtually every big corporation in America — Standard Oil, duPont, General Motors, Ford, International Harvester, Aluminum Company, General Electric, Westinghouse Electric, and over 100 other of the largest ruling corporations — is still maintaining cartel agreements with Nazi trusts.

They made their agreements with the Nazis, as revealed in the Standard Oil and other cases, to continue right through the war "whether or not the U. S. came in." These agreements include the post-war payment of profits to German corporations for American war supplies produced under Nazi-American joint patents.

Furthermore, four months after Pearl Harbor, all the corporations still refused to give up their patents until the government started suits. Then these corporations succeeded in getting from the government consent decrees which, as Thurman Arnold has confessed, still permit the corporations to retain their monopolies and their agreements with the Nazi corporations.

"National Unity" With the Labor-Haters

What is the Communist Party driving at by its whitewash of Big Business? The next statement in the editorial discloses the Stalinist goal:

"So that today, even though they may not always be the most dependable forces within the anti-Axis camp and retain characteristics inherent in finance capital, nevertheless these large corporations are as a whole part of the camp of national unity for the defense of the country and the defeat of the Axis."

The editorial states further on in the same vein: "It is no new discovery that finance capital engages in cartels and patent deals with firms of other countries. . . . But it is also necessary not to forget the more essential fact that national unity includes these large corporations."

What the Communist Party is here telling the working class is that it must preserve "national unity" with the vilest and most reactionary enemies of labor — those, in fact, who are today fomenting and financing the anti-labor drive in Congress.

Having thus whitewashed the trusts, having defended them as "part of the camp of national unity", the Daily Worker proceeds to denounce the liberals who have attacked the trusts. The Stalinist editorial says:

"A certain kind of naive 'trust-busting,' which fails to examine the political situation as a whole, and which therefore falls into the error of denouncing all American large-scale corporations as being on Hitler's side because of this or that admittedly evil financial action — such a naive attitude, expressed by the New Republic and Nation, for example, can be dangerous."

The Communist Party says it is against "naive trust-busting." Is it for any other kind of trust-busting? The answer is that it is against any kind of action against the trusts. When the Daily Worker disapproves of attacks on the trusts which "fail to examine the political situation as a whole," it simply means that Big Business must have its way for the sake of "national unity."

While it appeases the trusts, the Communist Party attempts to blackmail into silence all those who expose the trusts. Some of the liberal papers, like those which the Daily Worker attacks, are worried that the activities of the trusts may disillusion the workers about the "war for democracy." Likewise, the trade union press must attack the trusts in deference to the workers' resentment against Big Business. But such considerations do not trouble the editors of the Daily Worker, who, thanks to the totalitarian regime in the Communist Party, have no fear of outraging the sentiments of their members. The Communist Party, therefore, appeases not the workers but the corporation enemies of the workers.

So the Communist Party warns those who persist in attacking the trusts that they'd better shut up or be labeled "agents of Hitler." It says to them:

"We remind certain of our friends in the pro-victory camp that 'trust-busting' propaganda is not always necessarily associated with progressivism; Hitler did not hesitate to use 'anti-monopoly' demagoguery when he needed it, and Charles E. Coughlin also knows this trick."

Therefore, the editorial implies, anyone who attacks the monopolies will be accused of imitating the demagoguery of Hitler and Coughlin.

The Stalinist Pro-Trust Program

The pay-off of this Stalinist whitewash of the trusts is the program which the Communist Party tacks on to the end of its editorial. This program can only be characterized as an attempt to side-track the growing demand of the workers for some real action against the monopolies.

The Communist Party appropriates the only program it dares to support, the program of the administration.

First, it proposes that "the Government needs to take action (as it has already begun to do) to place all patents at the service of the nation, of war industry and of the United Nations."

But this conceals the fact that even the government officials have admitted that seizure of patents will not enable other companies to produce, because the monopolies retain the "know-how", the developed industrial techniques which are essential to the proper utilization of the patents.

Secondly, the editorial proposes: "There should be firm action against any individuals (!) in such firms as Standard Oil of New Jersey who continue to aid the enemy after December 7."

The Daily Worker fails to state what kind of "firm action" it wants. It knows very well that actions taken against a few scape-goat individuals would not change the basic character of the monopolies or alter their international policies. These are policies which are inherent in the very nature of these monopolies, and can be changed only by eliminating the system of monopoly capitalism — a step which the Communist Party opposes in the name of "national unity."

And finally, the Communist Party suggests that the administration's management-labor speedup committees shall be extended to include "engineers and scientists."

Just how this would stop the patent-pools, the editorial does not explain.

It is obvious that this proposal is completely senseless. The administration has made clear that the management-labor committees have no power whatever to tell the bosses how to conduct production. They have no power to examine the books and records and documents of the corporations. How could these speedup committees then "stand guard over all such vital industrial matters", as the Daily Worker claims?

Wall Street's Ablest Attorney

This editorial reveals the Communist Party as an agent of the worst labor-baiting corporations.

This editorial is the voucher which the Communist Party is giving the most reactionary finance capitalists to assure them that it will protect their interests.

To prevent the workers from learning the truth about this "war against fascism", the Communist Party is going all-out in defense of American monopoly capitalism. That is why the Communist Party is preparing to slander and frame-up every worker, every liberal and trade unionist, who dares to voice the truth about the monopolies.

We charge the leaders of the Communist Party with acting as the conscious attorneys for the corporations against the labor movement. We charge them with thereby paving the way for the union-smashing drive of the capitalist reactionaries.

To organized labor as a whole we issue this warning: The American labor movement must immunize itself against this most deadly infection, Stalinism. The Stalinist plague which rotted the labor movement of Germany, Spain and France and enabled fascism to rise to power in all Europe, must not be permitted to destroy American labor.

Fellow workers! Show this analysis of the Stalinist pro-corporation line to those of your shop mates who have Stalinist sympathies. Insist that they read it and that they then go to the Communist Party leaders and demand an answer to our charges. They will then learn that there can be no answer to our unassailable facts.

ROLE OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE IN THE INDIAN STRUGGLE

By A. ROLAND

Deceit As a Weapon of War

Deceit is a powerful weapon both in the wars between nations and in the class struggle. Imperialism resorts to deceit in its propaganda when it tries to win to its support the masses over whom it rules in the mother country, and the colonial slaves whose wishes and opinions count only when one imperialism threatens to oust another from the colony. This is most emphatically the case today in India.

British imperialism resorts to the myth that modern "democratic" imperialism is something entirely different from the old, dead form of the nineteenth century. Wrongs were committed in the past, but the present is quite another thing. Yes, imperialism of the past tried to use the colonies solely to enrich the masters, no matter how. But the Britain of today is enlightened and seeks only the welfare of the Hindus and Moslems. It is most touching indeed to witness the sweetly reasonable, paternal attitude taken by the English statesmen towards those poor benighted Hindus who do not understand what is really closest to the hearts of the Churchills and the Crippses. Why, all these kindly gentlemen want is to see that no harm befalls their ward, India. They wish to see India steered into the right channels to assure India's future. They want a "free" India — inside the British Empire. Beg pardon, the British Commonwealth of Nations, I should say.

The Indian masses are far from being taken in by this fraud. They feel the lash of imperialism every moment of their lives. They reject sweet words from the master who suddenly feels his power in mortal danger.

The Role Played by Gandhi

Whoever aids in the attempt to have the masses accept the deceit in lieu of good coin of the realm, performs a service for imperialism and strikes a blow against freedom for the slaves. That is precisely the role played by Gandhi in India. He performs this role in two ways. First of all, he praises the British democracy which has given India precisely nothing and has taken all from her. He expresses friendship for a Britain that has kept India a backward nation, that has subjected India's teeming millions to unbelievable wretchedness and suffering. True, Gandhi is opposed to accepting the plan whereby Churchill proposed to postpone the question of Indian freedom till after the war. But even in his opposition Gandhi is careful not to act in any manner that will set the Indian masses in motion against the British Raj.

This involves a second contribution by Gandhi to British imperialism. He preaches non-violence and complete pacifism. In the modern world, torn apart by the march of armies and the firing of guns, such non-violence on the part of an entire nation would mean that the people who practice it will have no say whatsoever concerning their fate. They place themselves at the mercy of alien forces contending for mastery over them.

British imperialism has learned to look upon Gandhi as one of its greatest assets and mainstays in India. He keeps the Indian masses quiet under the yoke of the oppressor. He holds in check a force so tremendous that it would be irresistible once aroused, the force of hundreds of millions of people. And if tomorrow the Japanese should oust the English from India, Gandhi would help to fasten the new imperialist yoke on the necks of the Indian masses. To follow the policy of passive resistance is to submit to defeat in advance. Next to outright welcome of the Japanese into India, the Mikado's generals would like nothing better than to have the Indian people offer passive resistance only. They would take the same attitude towards Gandhi as the British previously. They would exploit the myth that he is a saint for their own ends.

The Call on Gandhi's Role

It was never so clear as today that the fate of India must be and will be decided finally by the Indians themselves. To think that the British will free India is to think that the cat will let go of the mouse, its natural prey. The philosophy of non-resistance is reactionary to the core. It serves to lull the masses into passivity at the very moment when their fate hangs in the balance. It weakens them instead of strengthening them. It introduces despair and not hope into the hearts and minds of the masses, for it must inevitably make them feel that they cannot be masters of their own fate. But it is only the Indian people themselves who can solve the desperate problems of life and death which now confront them.

Whoever supports the Gandhis plays similarly into the hands of imperialism and reaction. The Socialist Party's Call in true Norman Thomas style sings the praise of the figure who would bring nothing but disaster to his countrymen. Says this organ that neither sees nor brings any light to the world: "Gandhi remains consistent in standing by his principle of non-violent resistance to Japan. He will not force it upon his own people undemocratically. If he does persuade them to it such are India's circumstances that the saint who accomplished so much by his methods against British tyranny, might change the face of human affairs by making them succeed against Japan." (Call, April 18.)

This saint far from accomplishing anything, has stood in the way of the struggle of the Indian masses against British tyranny. The British, as Norman Thomas well knows, have long recognized the services of Gandhi to England. The Indian masses are beginning to understand the true role of Gandhi. Events are pushing the Indian masses upon the arena of history. Their action will ultimately sweep aside all imperialism and all its henchmen.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 18 Saturday, May 2, 1942

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

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

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, but under control of the trade unions. Special officers' training camps, financed by the government but controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
2. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
3. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces and the war industries—Down with Jim Crowism everywhere.
4. Confiscation of all war profits. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. For a rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living.
6. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
7. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
8. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.

Roosevelt's 'Attack' On Native Fascists

Attorney-General Biddle has taken steps to ban Coughlin's *Social Justice* and some other fascist sheets from the mails. The liberals and Stalinists are hailing this as proof that the Roosevelt administration is out to destroy the native fascist movement.

We have fought the native fascists and their allies, not only in our press but also in physical combat. Our experiences in this struggle serve to estimate the precise significance of Biddle's present actions. We limit ourselves to but a few examples.

In New York the high point of fascist activity came when the Nazi Bund and its Coughlinite allies provocatively staged a huge demonstration in Madison Sq. Garden on Feb. 21, 1939. Roosevelt's good friend, Mayor LaGuardia, not only permitted that fascist gathering, but protected it with the largest police mobilization in the city's history, and turned down the liberal and Stalinist pleas to stop the fascist affair. But the Socialist Workers Party issued a call to the workers of New York to gather in counter-demonstration around the Garden, and when the fascists met they were surrounded by over 50,000 grim determined workers. LaGuardia's cops tried to break up the workers' ranks, but failed. Only those cops saved the Nazis and Coughlinites from the workers' anger. Even so many a fascist felt the weight of labor's hand that night. Scrambling home between the rows of cops, the fascists knew their provocative gathering had failed. The “democratic” press the next day praised the cops for protecting the fascists and LaGuardia for protecting “free speech.”

Six months later came the next big attempt of the fascists to overawe the workers. The Coughlinite Christian Mobilizers announced that on August 19 they would march from Columbus Circle to Union Square, the traditional gathering-place of radical workers. Although this was an obvious provocation against the radicals and the Jews, LaGuardia not only granted the fascists a permit to march but issued orders for a big mobilization of cops to protect them. Again it was the Socialist Workers Party that alone took real action against the fascists, calling the workers to rally in Union Square on August 19 in counter-demonstration and urging all workers' organizations to unite for this action. So vigorous was the response of the workers throughout the city, thanks to the lesson of the Trotskyist-led counter-demonstration at Madison Square Garden, that a few days before the scheduled fascist march Coughlin himself got his followers to call off their march!

Throughout the country the Trotskyist movement called on the workers and the unions to organize Workers' Defense Guards against the fascists. That call was answered in Minneapolis by the famous motor transport workers union, Local 544, which in the spring of 1938 organized a Union Defense Guard to halt the Silver Shirts who were threatening Minneapolis labor. The

resolute action of the union drove the local fascists into hiding and disintegration.

These anti-fascist activities of the Socialist Workers Party next turned up — in the indictment drawn up by the U. S. Department of Justice against the 28 Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO members in the Minneapolis “sedition” trial. The Union Defense Guard which stopped the Silver Shirts was branded by the government as an “armed force” organized on Trotsky's orders and designed to overthrow the government. The charge against the Union Defense Guard was the government's frameup device to convince the jury that the case was not merely an attempt to throttle the free speech of the advance guard of the labor movement. Fortunately this particular count in the indictment was thrown out by the jury; but it undoubtedly played a role in leading the jury, as a “compromise,” to convict 18 defendants on the second count of *advocating* violence. The defendants are now appealing the case to the higher courts.

In the light of these facts, judge the present “anti-fascist” activities of the Roosevelt administration. It is clear that the fascist sheets are now being banned from the mails merely as a wartime measure and as “proof” that the government is not only hitting at the revolutionary left but also at the fascist rightists. The steps taken by Biddle will no more crush the native fascists than did the similar steps taken by Hitler's predecessors in Germany and Austria, the “democratic” government of Italy that preceded Mussolini, etc., etc. No capitalist government can be depended on to destroy the fascists because today's “democratic” capitalists will be ready tomorrow to back the fascists in order to crush the labor movement. Big Business did that in Italy and Germany. Big Business will try to do the same thing here when it thinks the hour is ripe.

Therefore the workers can only depend on themselves, on their own workers' organizations, on their own Workers Defense Guards, to crush the fascists. No capitalist law or administration step can break up the fascists; only the workers' might can do that. For Fascism is based on the glorification of violence against the workers and can be driven back only when the working class is prepared to defend itself to the death against the fascist gangs.

These, in brief, are the lessons of the workers' struggle against fascism during the last twenty years. Those lessons must become part of the consciousness of the American working class. Above all, no illusions about the real character of the “anti-fascist” activities of the Department of Justice!

Some Minor Items

The workers are being squeezed dry to pay for the war. It is not enough that workers in uniform are doing the fighting and dying. At home, their relatives and dependents stagger under new burdens of wage freezing, mounting prices and taxes, scarcity.

So far, the big corporation owners, however, have been getting away with murder.

But has the government tapped the corporations to pay the costs of the war? Not on your life.

We'd like to cite a couple of minor and incidental sources from which hundreds of millions and billions can be secured to pay for the war.

In the past few weeks, for instance, corporations like General Electric, Standard Oil, etc., have been splurging huge sums on newspaper and magazine advertisements to whitewash their monopoly practices and Nazi dealings recently exposed before Senate Committees and in anti-trust suits.

Where is this money coming from? Is it, perhaps, coming out of the profits of the corporations? No indeed.

Advertising comes under the heading of costs, just as wages and raw materials do. When the government pays a corporation for war orders, it compensates the corporation for such “legitimate” costs as advertising to whitewash their notorious activities. Simply by eliminating this “cost,” the government could get millions in additional revenues.

But even this is mere chicken-feed, compared to the millions from another source which the government has passed up in the last few months.

We cite, for example, the instance of the Elkins Act oil pipe-line case, in which the government sued the major oil corporations for \$1,800,000,000 for their violations of the law against collecting rebates on delivery of oil through monopoly-controlled pipe-lines.

It was a clean-cut case. The government had the goods on the companies. But what happened? The oil corporations were permitted last December 23 to secure the usual “consent decree,” whereby they agreed not to fight the case, and the Department of Justice considerably waived suit for penalties amounting to over a billion and a half dollars. It was all done on the quiet, and the facts have just leaked out.

As Senator Gillette was moved to remark on this case: “An army of 6,000,000 men could be paid for a year with the amount the government threw away.”

Yes, and the government could have doubled the pay of the soldiers on the amount that it “threw away” in the Standard Oil, General Electric, Aluminum Company, and all the other cases it has settled by corporation-dictated consent decrees. These decrees have enabled the companies to evade their just penalties and get away with a few thousand dollars in fines — all, we may be sure, duly included under costs in determining what the government is to pay them for war orders.

As long as the government permits the corporations to get away with things like these, it will have a tough time convincing the workers that they should make any more sacrifices.

The Stalinist I. L. D. And The Minneapolis Trial

By FELIX MORROW

As we have previously informed our readers, the Stalinist press, here and abroad (especially abroad, where the lie cannot be checked so easily), is asserting that the 18 Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO defendants convicted in the Minneapolis “sedition” case were “proved” to have Nazi connections.

Further along the same line, Stalinists in various unions are opposing the voting of union donations to the Civil Rights Defense Committee which is appealing the Minneapolis sentences to the higher courts.

But this Stalinist line has very definite limits. It does not extend to all Stalinist-controlled institutions; for example, it does not extend to the International Labor Defense!

Two well-known Stalinists, Anna Damon and Sasha Small, are respectively Secretary and Editor of the International Labor Defense, and publish a small quarterly entitled “Equal Justice.”

In the Winter, 1942, issue of “Equal Justice,” there appear two main items. One is a compilation for the year 1941 on “subversive activity,” covering activities of Nazis, fascists, anti-Semites, etc. The Minneapolis “sedition” case is not mentioned among these.

The other item in “Equal Justice” is entitled “Case History, 1941,” and compiles all cases in which labor has been prosecuted during the year, and under “Minneapolis,” it carries (page 10) the following paragraph:

“Minneapolis cases — 17 men and 1 woman were convicted and sentenced to 12-16 months imprisonment under the Smith Act of 1940, by a federal court in Minneapolis, Dec. 2, on charges of advocating force and violence against the U. S. government. 5 of the original 22 defendants were free on directed verdicts at the conclusion of the government's case. 5 more were acquitted by the trial jury. The 18 themselves were acquitted of a conspiracy charge on which all were indicted. All those sentenced (case now on appeal) are members of the Socialist Workers Party.”

Thus, according to the International Labor Defense, the Minneapolis convictions are a labor case and hence, by implication, the appeal is worthy of the support of the labor movement.

But while comrades Sasha Small and Anna Damon thus endorse the Minneapolis case as a

labor case, their comrades who edit the Daily Worker, Freiheit, New Masses, etc., etc., say it is not a labor case but that the defendants are Nazi agents whose agency was “proved” in court.

A Difference of Opinion

How could there be such a difference within the Communist Party, which is deservedly notorious for its monolithic unity? Moreover, on a very important question — the stand toward Trotskyists. Are comrades Small and Damon concealed Trotskyists? Or are they unable to bring themselves to the point of smearing labor defendants who are being persecuted by the class enemy?

The explanation is quite simple. Comrades Small and Damon are quite capable of crimes far beyond that of aiding the class enemy against labor defendants—Anna Damon has worse crimes than that already on her record. They are acting in this, as in everything else, under orders from the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The International Labor Defense does not admit that it is a creature of the Communist Party. It pretends to be non-partisan within the labor movement. It is compelled, therefore, to reckon with certain facts; that scores of CIO unions are backing the Minneapolis defendants, that the entire labor movement understands that this is a labor case, that the American Civil Liberties Union and other liberal groups are backing the defendants, etc., etc. No doubt the Stalinist heads of the International Labor Defense would have liked to remain silent, since they dared not attack the Minneapolis defendants. But the pressure of the broad movement on behalf of the defendants forced the I. L. D. to go through the formality of recognizing the case as a labor case.

In doing so, comrades Small and Damon have willy nilly also passed judgment on the lies of the Stalinist press, branding as deliberate falsehoods the stories of their comrades who edit the Daily Worker and the rest.

To the many times in which the Stalin School of Falsification has been exposed, this latest is an interesting addition: this time two authoritative members of that School have been compelled by the situation of the I. L. D. to give the lie to their own gang!

Low-Paid Women Welcomed By Industry

By LYDIA BEIDEL

Much more rapidly than the workers do the owners of industry sense the fact that the induction of large numbers of women into mass production will effect changes in the relationship between the working class and themselves, and they move with greedy swiftness to insure their profits. Operating on the fine old principle that the best defensive is an offensive, they make an assault upon the labor conditions of women workers even before the change of composition in the labor force from male toward female has got well under way.

Prior to United States entrance into the war — when the draft began to take its first toll

from the mass of industrial workers — seventeen national corporations formally entered a plea with the U. S. Department of Labor asking for the elimination of legal restrictions (where they exist) against hiring women for a seven-day week; the abrogation of the 40- or 48-hour work-week; and permission to work women after 10 P. M. (i. e., for night-shift employment).

Many employers, in instances where the law did not stand in their way, immediately proceeded to overrule or override any special conditions of employment which women workers had won through the struggle of the trade unions for maintenance of general labor conditions. Today in thousands of plants women are worked up to ten hours a day, seven days a week, on the graveyard shift along with the men.

THE DANGER FROM INEQUALITY IN WAGES

The real rub comes, however, when the matter of wages is looked into. Here a long-standing international custom comes in handy for the employers. Since the beginning of the mass production system women workers have regularly been paid less than men for the same operations. The trade union movement, though it has in a number of instances fought valiantly against this practice, has never fully realized how serious a menace it is to the position of the working class as a whole.

So obvious is this wage differential that even the Gallup poll devoted attention to it recently. Setting his elaborate statistical machinery into motion, Gallup found that here — as in every other capitalist country — women are paid 10 to 40 per cent less than men on the same jobs.

The poll revealed that 78 per cent of the population favored equal pay for equal work.

Some people may feel that this discrimination against women in war industry is temporary. We need only look to those countries which have been at war for al-

most three years to see what will happen here. A Canadian machine-gun factory, employing 2000 women in a total force of 4500, gives 35c. to women for jobs paying men 55c. Germany offers the most illuminating picture, since it has entirely integrated its economy into war production.

Working hours for German women — 9,500,000 of them in war production today — have risen from 8 to 10-15, and women are used on all shifts in every industry. Wages run from 20 per cent to 40 per cent lower than those of men doing the same work, and if a woman receives a government allowance for the services of her husband at the front, a downward adjustment is made in her wage rate.

Discipline of the female labor force in Germany is administered through the conscription of women and the enforcing of a “labor year.” The fact that, despite all disciplinary measures, the issue of equal pay for equal work has been loudly raised by women as well as men indicates the degree of pressure upon the women workers and their stubborn resistance to it.

The employing class is not reluctant to hire women. Indeed, there are many reasons why for the moment female labor might ease things up for the bosses, aside from the lower wage scale. Most of the women now going into industry have had no trade union experience and work at first as individuals with little class feeling of mutual defense; and long experience has proven that women in general learn new techniques more quickly than men.

The manager of the Canadian machine-gun plant cited above has this to say: “The quality of their (women's) work is excellent. We are more satisfied with the women than with the men. They are never sick, never fuss, are conscientious and always on time.”

But women workers learn. Germany, being a little further along in its cultivation of a large female proletariat, has no complaint to make against the industrial efficiency of women but is very much worried about their “moral.” The *National Zeitung* of Essen, for instance, complains bitterly that “it is always the women who make things more difficult for their families and the German State. They pass like a hungry swarm of bees from one shop to another showing such a lack of discipline that the authorities will be compelled to take action against them.”

Experience in parts of the world where a war economy has had time to incubate the beginnings of a class-conscious female proletariat indicates that women, though they enter industry at a disadvantage, quickly learn — from the accumulated class experience of workers since the first trade union began its struggle — that the fight to keep alive is a struggle and a class struggle.

BRITISH DATA SHOWS WAR HAS NOT HALTED THE CLASS STRUGGLE

By EDITH KANE

British workers are today being displayed as models for American workers to imitate. “Look at those fellows,” the bosses hint, through their press and stooges; “they don't strike, work long hours cheerfully, and cooperate with the management.” And the American worker, who has staunchly defended his hard-won union conditions despite the increasing anti-labor ballyhoo, is expected to burst into tears and promise to mend his ways.

Let us, however, examine the record of British labor since the outbreak of war. According to William Green, all antagonism between workers and owners has ceased in Great Britain. With obvious approval he says, “Since May, 1940, strikes have virtually ceased. The time lost since then is one day per man in 15 years — a situation which could only have been achieved by common consent of employer and employee.” (*Amer. Federationist*, April, 1942.) He neglects to tell you just how this peace pact was arrived at. The implication is that both recognized the error of their ways, kissed, and made up. The *New York Times* on April 20 gives a different version of the labor situation. In fact, it flatly contradicts the idyllic scene pictured by the president of the AFL.

“British industry,” writes Craig Thompson from London, “has had its full and continuing share of strikes. During 1940 there were 850 strikes involving 284,000 persons in the loss of 890,000 work days. In 1941 the figures rose to 1,162 strikes involving 334,800 persons in the loss of 1,034,000 days.” And, he adds, “1942 shows no diminution of labor stoppages. . .”

Legal Strike Outlawing Fails

In an effort to combat the steadily increasing strike situations in Britain, a bill outlawing strikes was passed. Although at first widely hailed, it was quietly dropped after very little application and is now admitted to have been a dismal failure. “Jailed workers produce nothing,” the London reporter observes. In a renewed effort to step up war production and cut down strikes, referred to by the reporter as “labor difficulties,” which have caused according to the same article “an average loss of 2,122 work-days every day since the war began” — attention, Mr. Green! — the plan of joint work councils is being initiated wherever possible.

The works councils are somewhat like the joint management-labor committees being initiated in this country by Donald Nelson, head of the WPB.

Composition of Councils

They are composed of an equal number of representatives of workers and owners who sit around a table and thrash out the problems of “their” plant. Such matters as how to increase production, the use of new methods or equipment to save time, devices for safeguarding the health of workers, complaints about food and service — are discussed. And the word “discussed” is used advisedly, for that is just about the extent to which workers actually participate in this set-up.

“The role of the council is purely advisory,” the writer quickly adds, fearing perhaps that someone might confuse these councils with the councils (Soviets) of workers introduced by the Bolsheviks. “Its value lies in continuous promotion of a greater degree of understanding between the workers and their bosses.” The *New York Times* reader who might have begun to imagine that workers were running factories and that private ownership was topping in England is thus reassured. Workers are permitted to blow off steam and, incidentally, contribute valuable practical suggestions to help increase production — and the bosses' profits. Nowhere is the subject of wages or hours mentioned. How, one wonders, do the councils function when such delicate matters are raised? Since they possess no powers of enforcement — even supposing that the workers did win over enough owners' representatives to support their demands for overtime pay, better conditions, etc. — the ultimate decision still has to be solved the same old way. When the boss says “No!” the workers have but one resource — the strike — with which to enforce their demands.

The joint work councils will solve no labor problems for the bosses. It will prove no more effective than the outlawing of strikes. The British bosses, like their class-brothers here, refuse to change their accustomed routine of squeezing profits from labor, war or no war. They are attempting to load on to the backs of the workers, in addition to their normal peace-time load of exploitation, the extra costs of the war.

British Trade Unions Real Protection

The British workers have years of glorious union tradition behind them and will not permit anyone to reduce them to the level of cooie labor. The British factory owners and big business have found that out. Failing to subdue the workers by outlawing strikes, they now try the subtler, softer measure of joint councils. But their bloody, grasping claws are all too obvious. They can't save their profits and they can't save their hides! Everyday they expose themselves as the useless antiques they actually are. The workers of England are learning, along with the workers everywhere, that the chief obstacles to production, to efficiency, to a fair work day, and a full life are the owners and the profit system that allows them to rule.

British workers will continue to struggle and strike for the right to live as men and not slaves — no matter what frantic schemes the bosses may devise to stop them. And they will not long remain content to ask only for more money or better working conditions — the day is not far off when they will demand their rightful heritage, a world of peace and plenty for themselves and their children.

Due to unavoidable circumstances M. Stein's column has been temporarily discontinued. It will be resumed in two weeks.

New York May Day Rally

Speakers:

JOE ANDREWS

LYDIA BEIDEL

WERDERMAN'S HALL

160 3rd Avenue, corner 16th Street

Friday, May 1, 8:00 P. M.

Admission 25 Cents

Auspices: Local New York, Socialist Workers Party