

Fight Against Deportation Of Harry Bridges!

Biddle Ruling Is Blow At Whole Labor Movement

Deportation Order Is Part of Long Range Govt.-Boss Plan to Housebreak the Unions

By FELIX MORROW

The government order to deport Harry Bridges is a blow against the entire labor movement. Every class-conscious worker, as an elementary class duty, must defend Bridges against deportation. Success in the struggle to prevent his deportation would be a step forward in smashing deportation and other administrative and judicial anti-labor weapons.

In order to win, such a struggle requires the utmost clarity. Who struck this blow against labor? Was it Biddle alone? Who stood back of Biddle? What was Roosevelt's role? Who sponsored and who endorsed the ultra-reactionary law under which Bridges is ordered deported? These questions must be answered correctly if we are to know whom we are fighting when we fight against the deportation of Bridges.

Roosevelt and the 1940 Smith Gag Act

In the first place, how was it possible again to order Bridges deported, after James M. Landis' December 28, 1939 decision that Bridges was not subject to deportation? As the law then stood (requiring proof of present membership in a subversive organization), Bridges could not be deported. So — the law was changed, with Roosevelt's approval.

At that time reactionaries in Congress, led by the notorious Howard (Poll Tax) Smith of Virginia, were writing what became known as the "Omnibus Gag" bill, which the N. Y. Times characterized as "a compendium of the anti-labor legislation proposed during the last twenty years." The chief provision of the bill made it a criminal offense to "advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence" or to belong to an organization advocating it. After the Landis decision, the bill's sponsors added another provision, making deportable any alien who advocated such overthrow of the government or who belonged to such an organization at any time during his residence in this country. (The previous law, as interpreted by the courts, required proof of membership at the time deportation proceedings began.)

Many such ultra-reactionary laws had been proposed in Congress previously, but without success. Now, however, it was June 1940, the World War was on, American entry was only a matter of time, and "national unity" between the New Dealers and the ultra-reactionaries was being cemented. During the hearings on the Smith Gag Bill, it was revealed that the Navy Department had collaborated in writing the key sections of the bill.

In the Congressional debate it was clearly brought out that the provisions of the Smith Bill if passed would be the most reactionary sections in the U. S. Code.

Rep. Geyer of California said: "This bill is an attempt to put an end to real democracy. It is an attempt to break the labor movement." "It is enough to make Jefferson turn over in his grave," said Rep. Martin of Colorado, "it is without precedent in the history of labor legislation. It is an invention of intolerance contrary to every principle of democracy."

Nevertheless, New Dealers joined with reactionaries to pass the bill on June 28, 1940.

The American Civil Liberties Union pleaded with President Roosevelt to veto the Smith Act, predicting that it "would become an instrument of oppression against unpopular minorities and organized labor." The AFL and CIO were opposed to the Act.

Nevertheless, on June 29, 1940, rejecting all appeals for a veto, President Roosevelt attached his signature to it, making it the law of the land. No one can pretend, after all that had gone before, that Roosevelt did not know the full reactionary significance of his endorsement of the Smith Omnibus Gag Act.

The first use of the deportation provisions of the Smith Act was against Bridges, the Immigration Service (now transferred from the Labor to the Justice Department) arresting him on February 14, 1941. The first use of the other provisions of the Smith Act was against the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO, 29 members being indicted on July 15, 1941, for "advocating overthrow", eighteen being convicted in the famous Minneapolis "sedition" trial.

The same provision used against Bridges is also being used (Continued on page 2)

See Editorial, "Biddle and the Stalinists", On Page 4.

British Workers' Discontent Shown At Labor Party Parley

Political Truce Maintained by Slim Majority

The growing dissatisfaction of the British workers with the Churchill-Labor Party government and its war policies was reflected with surprising strength when a motion to maintain the war-time political truce passed by only the narrowest margin at the three-day annual British Labor Party conference, which closed May 27.

The National Executive Committee motion, committing the party in Parliamentary by-elections to support candidates belonging to the party which held the seat before the vacancy, was adopted by the close vote of 1,275,000 to 1,209,000. It is expected that the closeness of the vote will lead some Labor candidates in coming by-elections to violate the decision and run against Tory and Liberal candidates. Successes and big votes for independent candidates in recent by-elections, have indicated mass dissatisfaction with the government coalition.

Another index of opposition to the policy of the ruling clique

in the Labor Party was passage of a resolution calling on the government to lift the ban on the Daily Worker, Communist party organ, which was suppressed Jan. 1940.

The vote for restoration of the paper was very close, 1,244,000 to 1,231,000 against.

A proposal of the National Executive Committee that school children, between the ages of 12 and 14, should be ordered by the government to work twenty half-days this summer on farms, was voted down by a vote of 1,447,000 to 980,000.

These three votes are far more significant than the successes of the machine on other questions. Carrying the convention despite the full pressure of the machine, they indicate the coming revolt of British labor against its treacherous leaders.

Trotskyist Press Has Big Sale At Labor Party Meet

Huge sales of the Trotskyist newspaper, *Socialist Appeal*, to the delegates and visitors at the British Labor Party annual

VOL. VI—No. 23

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1942

FIVE (5) CENTS

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

REAL PRICES KEEP RISING

Standard Oil Officials Lied About Nazi Deals

Arnold's Statement to Truman Committee Nails False Claims Made By Oil Trust

By WALTER FREEMAN

The Truman Senate Investigating Committee last Monday received from Assistant Attorney-General Thurman Arnold a point-by-point documented answer to Standard Oil's lying claim that its patents-pool with the Nazi I. G. Farbenindustrie has not impeded American production.

particularly of synthetic rubber. Referring to Standard's assertion that its patents-pool was designed to make German synthetic rubber processes available to this country and that it had not withheld information from the American government or impeded production, Arnold submitted contrary evidence from Standard's own files, and stated:

"Standard prevented independent development of synthetic rubber by conducting false negotiations with the rubber companies. Standard did not reveal the process for manufacturing this new synthetic rubber (butyl, the best and lowest cost synthetic

rubber) to the American government or to American companies, although it did give full information to its cartel partner, I. G. Farben.

Standard officials had claimed that the agreement with I. G. Farben had been made in order to get the German company's processes for synthetic gasoline. Arnold showed that these processes were secured by Standard in 1927, two years before the patents-pool arrangement was first concluded.

RELATIONSHIP WITH ARMY AIR CORPS

To the assertion of Frank Howard, vice-president of Standard Oil of New Jersey, that the Standard-Nazi cartel had not prevented the American trust from cooperating with the American government, Arnold answered by asking if "he (Howard) had forgotten the memorandum which he sent to Teagle (chairman of Standard's board) and Parish (Standard's president) on Mar. 29, 1935, outlining the extent to which the 1929 cartel agreement might hamper Standard from giving to our own Army Air Corps 'superior fuels which would put them far ahead of the rest of the world

as regards performance of their fighting equipment."

Howard's 1935 letter had stated in part that such cooperation with the Army Air Corps "bristles with difficulties and sacrifices from our standpoint . . . we shall have to violate our agreements and perhaps forfeit the confidence of our associates, both American and foreign . . ." (principally I. G. Farben).

Standard officials claim that the continuing war-time agreement with I. G. is a "simple question of money payments" subject to government control. Arnold answered this on two scores. He cited the letter of Howard, written in October 1939, setting forth the need of a "modus vivendi" for maintaining the cartel arrangement with I. G. throughout the war "whether or not the U. S. came in." Arnold also quoted from a Standard memorandum indicating that Standard had received an offer from I. G. to purchase Standard's German subsidiary in order to "safeguard Jersey's interest for the duration."

THE REAL MOTIVE

Arnold recalled his original testimony last March, and emphasized the point that he had been "careful" to show that there was "no alliance with German interests from unparliamentary motives." Standard's "sole motives," he declared, are "to get a protected market . . . restrict world production . . . eliminate independent competition."

In short, Standard was just following typical monopoly "good business" policies.

Dutch Cops Kill 18 Chinese for Asking Pay Rise

Eighteen Chinese sailors were killed and 54 wounded early last week by the "democratic" police at Curacao, Netherlands West Indies, according to a UP dispatch of May 25.

The dispatch stated that the dead and wounded were all members of Royal Dutch Shell Company tanker crews. The "crime" for which they paid with their lives and blood was a demand for war-risk insurance and wage increases.

Dutch "democracy" may not be able to secure the support of the colonial people in the Far East war against the Japanese, but they are certainly at least as expert as the Japanese when it comes to smothering the colonial people in blood.

Local 544 Fights To Keep Kelly Postal From Jail

Union Secretary Was 'Guilty' of Obeying Members' Directives

By JACK RANGER

MINNEAPOLIS — Local 544-CIO is engaged in a fund-raising campaign to secure the \$1,500 required to appeal Kelly Postal's case to the State Supreme Court.

Postal was given a 60-day stay of sentence May 15 for purposes of appeal. On April 24 Postal, secretary-treasurer of Local 544-CIO, was found guilty by a district court jury of "first degree grand larceny" because he had carried out the instructions given him by the overwhelming majority of the Minneapolis drivers union which was engaged in a fight against the dictatorship of President Daniel Tobin of the AFL Teamsters.

The jury acted under pressure of instructions from Judge Selover, who ruled that a union membership has no right to determine what union they want to belong to and how their union funds should be expended.

Scores of Minneapolis drivers have responded to a letter from Local 544-CIO's Recording Secretary, Ray Rainbolt, appealing for funds to finance Postal's appeal. Several unions, both AFL and CIO, have contributed to the appeal fund, but several hundred dollars is still needed.

The crooked Blair decision of last September, denying state labor board elections to the Minneapolis drivers, was upheld late in May by District Judge McNally, who agreed with Governor Stassen and his state labor conciliator that Minneapolis drivers should not be permitted to decide by democratic vote which union they wish to belong to. At the same time the state unemployment division rejected the appeal of officers and staff members of Local 544-CIO that they be paid the unemployment compensation to which they are entitled.

Both anti-labor decisions were rendered immediately after Governor Stassen had returned to the capital from a naval station where he was undergoing a 30-day training period as lieutenant-commander in the U. S. Navy. The anti-labor governor recently received his officer's commission in the navy, though he had no previous naval experience.

Inasmuch as the Blair decision will only hold for one year, until September, 1942, it is doubtful if Local 544-CIO will appeal the crooked ruling to the State Supreme Court.

Next September the whole issue will automatically be reopened, and Local 544-CIO is laying plans for that day.

Despite Price-Fixing Bosses Get More For Their Products

Lowered Quality and New Labels Cut Down Living Standards of the Working Class

By ANTHONY MASSINI

Despite the price-fixing order which went into effect on May 19, every working class family knows that the cost of living is still going up, and that therefore 'wage stabilization' and 'ceilings on wage raises' are resulting in a general lowering of their living standards.

Ceilings on the prices of most consumers' commodities have been fixed at their highest March, 1942 level. But the price regulations are full of loopholes, and there is no real policing of prices. As a result, many manufacturers are getting away with murder, and the consumers are finding that they have to pay more in real prices for certain commodities than they did in March.

Bread Prices Are Boosted By Monopolies

Bread is called the "staff of life." For the masses of low income earners, bread has always been the chief diet mainstay. In recent months, bread prices have risen drastically everywhere.

Reactionary interests have been trying to blame these price increases on the farmers, claiming that the prices the farmers are getting for wheat have caused a precipitate rise in bread costs.

Actually, the price the farmer gets for his wheat constitutes only a tiny fraction of the cost of a loaf of bread usually less than 5%. The wheat speculators, freight interests, grain elevator operators and flour mills all add their big share to the cost of a loaf of bread. But finally, it is the monopoly baking interests which really boost bread prices sky-high.

An example is contained in the indictment handed down by a federal grand jury in Boston on May 28 against 20 baking corporations in the New England and New York areas. It was disclosed that these corporations, controlling the bread supply of 13,000,000 people and doing an aggregate annual business of \$185,000,000, had arbitrarily boosted prices by secret agreement, fixed and maintained a high minimum of monopoly prices, and used illegal methods to eliminate all independent competition.

Among the indicted companies are such giant national corporations as National Biscuit, General Baking, Ward Baking and Continental Baking.

Negro Columnist Recommends "4th Intl." Article

George S. Schuyler, most widely read Negro columnist in the country, last week warmly recommended an article by Albert Parker on the Negro March-on-Washington movement printed in the May issue of the monthly magazine, *Fourth International*.

In his column, front page in the May 30 Pittsburgh Courier, Schuyler declared: "Best critique of Randolph's March-on-Washington movement appears in the magazine 'Fourth International' (20 cents), published at 116 University Place, New York. The caustic comments of the author, Albert Parker, and his sound logic should provoke considerable thought in colored America about the eminent labor leader and Spingarn Medallist."

One of the most important loopholes in the price regulations is the failure to do anything to prevent deterioration in the quality of commodities produced. The *Wall Street Journal* of May 28 points out that in some cases "the quality of the article is not up to that of a few months ago, although the price is left unchanged." As Harold Mager says in the May 30 issue of *The Nation*: "If prices remain the same while product deterioration sets in, is this not tantamount to a price rise?"

'PRODUCT DETERIORATION' Mager asserts that "product deterioration has been going on for some time. Consumers have been getting less for their money not only because prices have been on the rise but even because where prices have not risen the quantity or quality of the goods has been reduced. Cakes and loaves of bread are smaller; cotton shirts have a large admixture of rayon; many packaged foods have lessened content; some soft drinks have lost their zip."

Since the original price regulations on April 27 Price Administrator Leon Henderson has issued additional decisions, some of which relate to reductions in quantity. On May 14 he ruled that "the maximum price must be reduced in the same proportion as the reduction in size, number and quantity." Under this ruling, those manufacturers who reduce the quantity of commodities without reducing the price paid in March are guilty of violating the regulations.

But while Henderson made a special point of the question of quantity, he had nothing to say about QUALITY. The only order affecting quality so far is that of May 25, an Office of Price Administration regulation on prices for 1942 fall style women's, girls' and children's cloth outerwear garments, requiring the same "workmanship and quality" which were put into these garments in the period from July to September, 1941.

This is the only order affecting quality thus far. The door is therefore wide open for deterioration of quality in all other fields while the same prices must be paid. Many of the manufacturers who have been reducing the quality of their products for the last year or two will feel perfectly free to continue with these practices which hit the consumers just as hard as price rises would.

WHY HENDERSON LEFT THIS OUT Mager in *The Nation* wonders why the price regulations had nothing to say about product deterioration, and suggests two reasons: "This may have been because the problem is infinitely more delicate and complex than price control itself, or because the authorities recognized that the diversion of materials to more essential uses might compel the employment of substitutes."

In other words, the OPA has not tackled this problem because first of all it would be practical (Continued on page 2)

Biddle Rushes To Defense of The Monopolies

On the very day, May 28, that Attorney-General Biddle issued his deportation order against Harry Bridges, CIO Longshoremen's leader, he launched another campaign in the interests of the reactionary owning class.

Biddle urged a Senate Judiciary subcommittee to initiate legislation specifically forbidding anti-trust law prosecutions against monopolies engaged in war production in compliance with the directions of the War Production Board. With one hand, this representative of the Roosevelt administration strikes a blow at the rights of American labor. With the other, he tenders a signed blank check to the monopoly corporations.

PHILA. CIO COUNCIL BACKS BUDD STRIKERS

Strike Started After Lock-Out of Welders Protesting Pay Cut

PHILADELPHIA, June 2.—The CIO Industrial Union Council here has voted unanimously to support the strike of Local 813, United Automobile Workers, at the big Budd plant, popularly known as "the slaughterhouse." A resolution passed by the Council calls on all its affiliated local unions to give full moral and material aid to the strikers, who are completing the second week of their militant struggle to bring genuine unionism to the company-union Budd plant.

The immediate cause of the strike was the physical ejection from the plant by Budd's Service Department thugs of a group of union welders, who had dared to protest against a 25 cent an hour wage cut, from 85 cents an hour to the low plant minimum of 60 cents.

This lock-out, enforced by company violence, aroused a protest demonstration in the plant, which quickly developed into a general plant-wide strike.

REAL CAUSE OF STRIKE The lock-out of the welders was just the spark. The real cause of the strike is the conditions at Budd, which are notoriously among the worst of any plants in this city.

Wages are the lowest in the industry. The top hourly rate for skilled welders and machine operators is 80 cents, in comparison to the \$1.25 rates paid in Budd's unionized Detroit plant. The minimum rate in the Detroit plant, 88 cents for unskilled labor, is higher than what most

of the skilled workers get at the plant here.

The minimum hourly rate is 60 cents as compared with the guaranteed 90 cent minimum at Ford's Chester, Pa., plant where a UAW contract is in force. There are, in fact no set wage scales and classifications, and Budd pays whatever he can get away with.

NO JOB SECURITY OR SET WAGE SCALES

Seniority and job security do not exist at Budd's. Workers are fired on the mere whim of the management. Favoritism is rife, as the company gives special privileges to its stooges in order to use them against the majority of the workers.

There is no genuine machinery for adjusting grievances. All grievances are referred to the company's Employees Representation Association, where they are promptly buried. The ERP has already been declared a company union by the local NLRB, but Budd is appealing this decision.

MANAGEMENT RAISES RACIAL ISSUES

Through the ERA, the company has been trying to break the strike, spreading every kind of slander and false rumor in an effort to discourage the strikers and confuse the issue. The management is also attempting to divide the workers by raising a race issue, handing its Negro workers the same kind of propaganda that the Negro workers in Ford's repudiated so decisively.

The dispute is to go to the War Labor Board this week, but the picket line continues. The strikers are asking for the rehiring of all strikers without discrimination, an NLRB election, and an increase in the minimum wages.

Trotskyist Paper Faces Suppression In England

MP Asks Ban Because Publication Exposed Atrocities On Both Sides In the Far East

LONDON, England (By Mail) — The *Socialist Appeal*, organ of the Workers International League, affiliate of the Fourth International, was attacked by Sir J. Lucas in the House of Commons on April 30, with a request that Herbert Morrison, Minister of Home Security, ban the paper.

Sir J. Lucas raised the question on the ground that the *Socialist Appeal* had published a photograph of 16 Burmese headed by the British, with the following caption: "16 Burmese patriots beheaded by the British in Tharrawady in 1931, and publicly exhibited to terrify the rest of the population. Is it surprising that in this district the Japanese are succeeding in gaining a large measure of aid from the population?" Sir J. Lucas did not tell that side by side with this picture from Burma was published another of Chinese beheaded by the Japanese, with the caption: "A group of Chinese soldiers, their heads severed from their bodies by the Japanese in Manchuria. Why did the British capitalists not protest then?"

LUCAS ASKS FOR SUPPRESSION OF PAPER

The incident in the House of Commons is reported as follows by "Hansard," the official record: "Sir J. Lucas (by Private Notice) asked the Home Secretary whether he has studied a monthly publication, a copy of which has been sent to him, and in particular an illustration under a caption 'British Atrocity in Burma,' and the contents of a leading article contained therein, and what action he intends taking in the matter by way of suspending or warning the paper?"

"Mr. H. Morrison: My hon. and gallant friend was good enough to send me yesterday a copy of the publication to which he refers. I am considering the matter, but I am not in a position to make any further statement at the present time.

"Mr. Garro Jones: Can my right hon. friend give the name of this paper?"

"Mr. Morrison: It is a paper called 'Socialist Appeal.'"

"Sir J. Lucas: In view of the fact that this paper attacks our Allies and war aims and is entirely subversive, can the right hon. gentleman state any good reason for allowing it to continue?"

"Mr. Morrison: The House knows that these matters require a great deal of careful consideration, and I think it would be best that I should consider all the circumstances before intimating any decision."

What may come after Morrison's "careful consideration" is indicated by the fact that the "Daily Worker" is still prohibited, and that many papers have been muzzled by threats of suspension.

In view of this threat to the *Socialist Appeal*, the Workers International League issued for widespread distribution a four-page leaflet republishing the article and photographs in question. In an introduction to the article, the WIL says:

CRIMES ON BOTH SIDES

"The authenticity of these facts cannot be denied; what causes the issue to be raised is the repercussion among the British workers at the exposure of the crimes of British imperialism in the colonies, these crimes being the fundamental cause for the defeats in the Far East."

The article reprinted from the April *Socialist Appeal* is titled: "Remember Hong Kong and All This Too." "The tales of the atrocities committed by the Japanese Army upon British soldiers at Hong Kong," it reports, "have aroused the British masses as no atrocity story has done since the outbreak of the war." It then recalls the Japanese imperialist record in Manchuria — and its British imperialist apologists:

"We publish here a photograph of the heads of a group of Chinese, severed from their bodies by the Japanese imperialists during the conquest of Manchuria. It was the left wing of the working class movement which published these pictures and tried to rouse the masses of the world against this. But what were the journals of British imperialism saying? They were not interested in rousing the masses then! They were apologists for Japanese imperialism and were justifying their actions! Each successive Government of British capitalism covered up the atrocities of their Japanese class brothers and official British spokesmen tried to minimize what was taking place, or even directly claimed that the Japanese were carrying civilization into China.

ENGLAND AIDED JAPAN
"Only a few months ago Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons admitted that the British Government had closed the Burma Road at the instigation of

mese and Chinese as well as all the other colonial slaves for the past 100 years and more."

CALL FOR END OF IMPERIALISM

The rest of the leaflet is a list of outstanding repressions of colonial peoples by the British imperialists. It concludes: "The working people really want to see an end to these vile and inhuman actions. By taking the reigns of government into our own hands, and freeing the colonial people from the slavery of British oppression, by ending British imperialism — only then can we ensure that we have contributed something to the wiping out of atrocities. Only then can we wipe out the hatred from the minds of the colonial peoples upon whom the British imperialists have perpetrated such vile acts. That is how to strike at the Japanese imperialists; that is the way to remember Hong Kong!"

"Least any workers be swayed by the feigned horror of the British bosses, lest any workers believe that the British are incapable of doing these things, let us say right now that the worst atrocity committed by the Japanese is but a pale reflection of what British imperialism has carried out upon the Indians, Bur-

the Japanese Government. In this way they materially assisted the Japanese imperialists in extending their conquest of China and are therefore responsible for the consequent atrocities. . . .

"Every imperialist government indulges in vile atrocities against the conquered peoples. The manuals of the British army, of the American army, of the German army, as well as of the Japanese army, contain special sections dealing with the problem of arousing the blood lust and hatred of the common troopers for the enemy. . . .

"Least any workers be swayed by the feigned horror of the British bosses, lest any workers believe that the British are incapable of doing these things, let us say right now that the worst atrocity committed by the Japanese is but a pale reflection of what British imperialism has carried out upon the Indians, Bur-

More Unions Vote Aid to 18 Defendants

Four UAW Locals Act to Help Work of CRDC

NEW YORK, June 3. — Locals of the CIO United Auto Workers in four different states voted last week to support the defense movement in behalf of the 18 Trotskyist and CIO members convicted in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial, the Civil Rights Defense Committee reported today.

Locals whose contributions have already been received at the national office of the CRDC, 160 Fifth Ave., New York City, are: Local 82 of Racine, Wisconsin. Local 663 of Anderson, Indiana. Local 263 of Cleveland, Ohio. In addition, General Motors Local 216 of Los Angeles, California, sent a letter expressing support for the work of the CRDC, and promising to take up a collection for the 18 when their members return to work.

Other locals which sent money to the CRDC last week were: Knitgoods Workers Local 155, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, of New York City. Local 182 of the United Rubber Workers, CIO, of Rahway, N. J.

Farm-Labor Leaders Act To Join With Democrats

Both Conservative and Stalinist Wings Want to Put End to Independent Action

ST. PAUL, Minn., May 29. — Manifest in every resolution and declaration made in the Farmer-Labor Party Conference, which concluded its two-day session here late this afternoon, is the identity of outlook, program and policy of the dominant factions fighting for control of the machinery of the Farmer-Labor Party.

The opportunist trade unionists politicians of the so-called right wing and the equally opportunist Stalinists, mis-called the left wing, clashed several times over inconsequential issues in their attempts to gerrymander the conference. But on the central question of delivering the Farmer-Labor movement into the hands of Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, there wasn't a whisper of a difference.

The Conference was called by the conservatives in a last desperate effort to shake off the Stalinists who have controlled the machinery of the Farmer-Labor Association for almost six years. But these unrealistic politicians discovered to their embarrassment that a score or more of Stalinist delegates were in attendance. Led by well-known Stalinist functionaries and supporters, these delegates outdid the so-called right wing in their insistence upon a conservative platform and program for all-out support of the war.

KEYNOTE SPEECH

Keynoting the Conference, Democratic Congressman John M. Coffee of Washington called for unity among "progressives" in the Republican, Democratic and Farmer-Labor parties in support of Roosevelt and his program. Congressman Coffee listed among his supporters AFL and CIO unions as well as the railroad brotherhoods. In addition, he boasted of the fact that he had the wholehearted support of Chambers of Commerce and the power interests in his home state. Although obviously embarrassed by Congressman Coffee's boasts and reactionary formulations, speaker after speaker took the floor to give enthusiastic support to the main proposition of the keynote address.

Former Governor Elmer A. Benson, invited by the Conference to speak, managed to get through a 20 minute discourse without making a positive organizational proposal.

Railroad and Warehouse Commissioner Hjalmer Petersen, likewise a former Governor, was also invited to speak. Petersen's speech bristled with charges that Minnesota is in the grip of the W. K. Stassen machine financed by the monopolies and huge mining companies of the state.

Especially noteworthy was the speech of Paul A. Rassmussen. He spoke in the Conference with the authority of a representative of the Democratic National Committee. Proposing a coalition ticket of Democrats and Farmer-Laborites for the fall election, he made a virtual nomination speech for Hjalmer Petersen as the candidate for Governor on this ticket.

A "LEFT" PROGRAM

Knowing that the thoroughly reactionary proposal of a coalition ticket must be camouflaged if the support of the workers and farmers of Minnesota is to be won, the leaders of the Conference permitted the adoption of a "left" program. Some outstanding points of this program are: That property as well as persons should be drafted for the war; that the government take over the war plants and operate them without profit to the owners; that there be fixed parity farm prices; that the jobs of dollar-a-year men be abolished; that the competitive price system be ended and that all goods and

commodities be sold to consumers at the cost of production. The once powerful Farmer-Labor Association, the organizational dues-paying set-up for the Farmer-Labor Party, to which the economic organizations of the workers and farmers are formally affiliated, has been reduced by Stalinist manipulations to the shadow of its former self. The Association meets in convention in Minneapolis on June 27. Before this date, a committee of 21 named by the Farmer-Labor Party Conference, has been instructed to meet with a similar committee from the Association. The combined committee of 42 will have virtually full power to put across the program of coalition with the Democrats.

Whether or not this reactionary plot can be carried out at the June 27 convention, will be determined by the attitude of the trade unions and farm organizations which have now been instructed by the Farmer-Labor Party Conference to reaffiliate to the Farmer-Labor Association, so long in the strangle-hold of the Stalinists.

WORKERS' FORUM

The Speedup

Editor: In an effort to popularize the speedup now being introduced in the local shipyards, the local press last week featured a race by two gangs of riveters at the Los Angeles Shipbuilding Corp. Using a \$25 purse as bait, and establishing ideal working conditions in advance, they made it possible for over 1400 rivets to be driven by one gang in one day. Immediately, the daily quota for riveters was raised from 250 to 400.

Despite the patriotic declarations attributed to the rival teams in the capitalist press, the majority of the riveters understood in advance the speedup character of the race, and expressed their indignation by remarks such as "the son of a b— oughta have his union card pulled." No one has dared to propose a race since the last one, and the attitude of the workers is, "If they want to build these boats in a hurry, well and good — but why don't they stop fooling around and hire some more men?"

This week the same trick was pulled on the drillers. To make it look like a popular idea, everyone was asked to come to the foreman's shack at lunch time. Before anyone knew what was happening, he was being asked to chip in for a pot for a drillers' race. This was the only way the drillers could be trapped into supporting a race — the intimidating pressure of the big shot in the office. The resentment was so great that the race was called off for a day or two. Then it was held primarily because the more backward workers wanted a

pot, amounting to about \$50.

The workers are not being fooled by these baited snares. Throughout the yard discussions about the swindling practices of the corporation are resulting in indignant demands that production be increased by hiring MORE men, not by greuing speedups.

N. L. San Diego, Calif.

A Stalinist On National Unity

Editor: On May 10 the Illinois State Industrial Union Council of the CIO held a conference on War and Production in Chicago. There were at least 300 delegates present, many of them from strong and important unions.

The speakers were the usual assortment of army, navy and government board representatives, making the usual plans. Nevertheless, the high point in patriotic fervor was not reached by them, but by Ernest De Maio, a UE functionary who is well known as a Stalinist. Perhaps you will be interested in some of his remarks which I copied down:

"There is one lesson which we

who work in the factories have not yet learned. President Roosevelt has called for national unity. Some workers think this means unity of the labor movement. However, it does not mean unity of labor to beat the companies. It does not mean unity of the companies to beat labor. It does not mean the unity of farmers to beat both the companies and labor. That would be national disruption, a divided nation like we have now. National unity means unity with the companies.

"Why? The Chicago Tribune recently ran a series of articles called 'You Can't Do Business With Hitler.' They showed what would happen to American companies if Hitler wins. They would lose their industries. So, if Hitler wins, they have something to lose; we have something to lose. We both have something to lose. That means that we can unite together and fight so that we don't both lose.

"I know that it is hard for workers to realize that they must unite with their bosses. But that is what must be done now and we must sharpen our approach to this problem."

Every time the speakers talked about victory over Hitler and fascism, the workers applauded vigorously. They even applauded a little when De Maio said that those who interfere with production "must be sought out, exposed as fifth columnists, treated like traitors, and — yes — shot!" But there was no applause at all when De Maio instructed us to unite with our bosses.

A. F. Chicago, Ill.

REAL PRICES ARE STILL GOING UP

(Continued from page 1) ly impossible by its methods to police the manufacture of the thousands of different commodities and the untold numbers of different brands of these commodities, and secondly because the authorities, hiding behind the pretext of war production needs, are reconciling themselves to the idea of "substitute" materials, that is, of actual price rises.

Needless to say, where manufacturers use substitutes that cost less than the original, they will ask for the same prices; and where the substitute materials cost more, they will ask, and the OPA will authorize, higher prices.

There are in addition numerous other practices of manufacturers and sellers which raise the real prices of commodities. Some of these the OPA has characterized as illegal; others it recognizes and permits.

OTHER DEVICES
For example, a manufacturer puts out a brand of canned tomatoes which sold for 10 cents in March. Today he withdraws this brand of tomatoes from the market and puts out a new brand under another label, and sells it for 15 cents. The OPA frowns on this practice, but everyone knows that it is going on.

Then there are many cases where a manufacturer has been putting out two brands of toma-

atoes, which are exactly or almost the same in quality and quantity. Brand A he sells for 10 cents; brand B he sells for 15 cents. He now withdraws brand A from the market, and the consumer can buy only brand B.

In connection with this, Henderson's statement on May 14 said the following: "Q—How will price ceilings be determined where identical articles have been sold under different brand names at different prices? A—The seller cannot sell the lower-priced brand at the price for the higher brand. Different brands are different commodities." And further, "Whether brand A is dropped or continued at 10 cents is immaterial. If the manufacturer merely rebrands his article, a sale at a higher price is a violation."

In other words, it is illegal to sell brand A for the price of brand B, but it is perfectly all right to stop manufacturing brand A and to sell brand B only.

The May 28 Wall Street Journal describes another trick now being resorted to: "Another violation is to make a slight change in specifications, and then up the price of an article. Only yesterday the OPA was confronted with a rug manufacturer that changed its popular sized '9 by 12' rugs to 9 by 13 feet one inch, in order to command a 'cut order price,' 17 per cent higher than the old price. OPA said this practice was a violation of the price regulations."

But when the same trick is used a little more subtly, the OPA raises no objections, as for example when coffee formerly sold in "loose" containers is removed from the market, and sold thereafter only in cans, which considerably raises the price of coffee by the pound.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

These devices to raise real prices to the consumer are only the beginning. When conversion of industry to war production reaches a more advanced stage and when shortages in consumers' commodities become really acute, the tendency will be for the manufacturers to divert a large portion of their products off the open market, and to sell them at greatly increased, illegal, prices.

This illegal sale of commodities in great demand is known as the "black market" in Europe; and it operates something like the sale of liquor did in the United States during prohibition days. The effect of this bootleg market is to swell the pockets of the war profiteers and to sharply reduce the living standards of the masses, who are forced against their will to patronize the bootleg market because they cannot get the products they need anywhere else.

The price rises already in effect since May 19 and the threat of a bootleg market make it more necessary than ever for the labor movement to launch a struggle: 1. Against governmental moves to freeze wages! 2. For a rising scale of wages to meet increased living costs! 3. For the creation of democratic committees of consumers to control prices and rationing!

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Living Costs

Fight Against Bridges' Deportation!

(Continued from page 1) against one of the eighteen, Carl Skoglund, against whom deportation proceedings are now pending.

Roosevelt's Connection With the Bridges Ruling

In the Minneapolis trial, there were apologists for Roosevelt who tried to claim that he had no responsibility for that anti-labor prosecution, that Biddle did it on his own initiative. But those apologists could not explain away the direct appeal of Teamsters' President Daniel J. Tobin to Roosevelt for aid against the Local 544-CIO "secessionists", Roosevelt's public support of Tobin against Local 544-CIO, and Roosevelt's threat that "the appropriate government agencies" had been told to act.

Likewise now, apologists are trying to cover up Roosevelt. The New York newspaper, PM, for example, says that "Biddle made his decision absolutely on his own — without consultation with the President or with any of his fellow Cabinet members. . . . No national policy is involved in Biddle's ruling." The Stalinists also are trying to absolve Roosevelt.

But the idea of Biddle acting on his own is preposterous. Judge Sears' order of September 26, 1941 for Bridges' deportation had been reversed and cancelled on January 3, 1942 by a higher body, the Board of Immigration Appeals, which accepted Bridges' denial of C. P. membership at any time. Ordinarily, the Attorney General would abide by such a decision of the higher body. Furthermore, Biddle and everyone else knew in advance that the entire CIO would back Bridges, the elected head of the CIO's Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. Furthermore, who is Biddle? He is not a powerful politician with his own following. On the contrary, he is one of the weakest political figures ever to sit in a Cabinet, a man without power in the Democratic Party, who could hardly get himself elected as a Congressman. He is one of the many puppets, utterly subservient to his master's will, with whom Roosevelt has surrounded himself. It is preposterous to think that such a man acted in such a matter without the explicit approval of Roosevelt. This blow against the labor movement comes, not from an accidental figure in the Cabinet, but from Roosevelt himself.

The Anti-Labor Doctrine of Biddle's Ruling

Every worker should carefully read the text of Biddle's ruling against Bridges. He should see for himself how the ruling attempts to outlaw the main ideas which have been held by the vanguard of the labor movement for a hundred years. Point by point, this deportation ruling repeats the main argument

made by the Department of Justice in the indictment it wrote for the Minneapolis trial against the Trotskyists. We cite but two main points:

1. Bridges allegedly belonged to an organization which "advocates and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the government of the United States." This is "proved," in the Bridges ruling as in the Minneapolis trial, by twisted quotations from the famous Communist Manifesto of 1848 of Marx and Engels, and citations from Lenin — in the trial there were also quotations from Trotsky. Thus the Roosevelt Administration openly moves to outlaw the theoretical heritage of a hundred years of Marxist thought. In the Minneapolis trial we showed that the Marxists do not advocate force and violence against the government; that the Marxists, learning from the terrible lessons of history, know that the capitalists and their political agents use force and violence against the labor movement as the working class moves toward socialism; that the Marxists, therefore, warn the workers to prepare to defend themselves against capitalist force and violence. The Roosevelt formula of pinning the advocacy of "force and violence" on the Trotskyists, Bridges and others is an attempt to crush the vanguard of the labor movement.

2. As in the Minneapolis trial, Bridges is accused of adhering to organizations which "advocated the class struggle," and "penetration into trade unions. . . . and conversion of their members by constant agitation and propaganda." As in the Minneapolis trial where all the officers of Local 544-CIO were indicted because Trotskyists were among the leaders, so Biddle now says that Bridges' "affiliation with the Marine Workers Industrial Union was grounds for deportation."

Thus belief in the class struggle — militant struggle against the bosses — is a crime in the eyes of Roosevelt. And for a union to elect leaders believing in the class struggle makes the entire union suspect! This is a brazen attempt by the government to tell the unions what their policy should be, what kind of leaders they can have, and to behave any union which follows a militant policy! If the government gets away with this, it means that the capitalist class and its political agents have a veto power over union policies and union elections.

On the basis of our foregoing analysis, we can place the ruling against Bridges in its proper setting. Like the Minneapolis trial, it is part of the long-range government-capitalist plan to regiment Labor, house-break the union, take away their most potent weapons, and leave them at the mercy of the government and its various boards. Nor is this plan merely a war-

time "emergency" scheme. It started long before the war, it will be carried out even more ruthlessly after the war — if the capitalists and their government have their way.

The Question of the Soviet Union

Many of those who understand the long-range government plan may ask: But why did they pick on Bridges? No one today more vociferously supports Roosevelt's policies, including speed-up of the longshoremen, subordination of the unions to government boards, etc. Bridges is practicing class-collaboration beyond the bounds of the usual labor-faker. He is one of the most useful lieutenants that the government has in the labor movement. Even after this blow, Bridges is licking the hand that smites him. Why, then, Bridges?

One reason suggested is that, having let Browder out, Roosevelt is now conciliating the ultra-reactionaries by smiting Bridges, just to show the government's "impartiality." If this were so, the score is decidedly to the advantage of the reactionaries. Browder is a nonentity, easily replaceable by the Stalinists; whereas Bridges is the elected head of a powerful trade union. And that Roosevelt proceeds by conciliating the reactionaries is an ominous warning to the labor movement.

Washington does not want any friends of the Soviet Union in positions of power in the labor movement. The fundamental antagonism between the capitalist "democracies" and the workers' state has been played by the war alliances and Stalin's reactionary policies, but that basic antagonism remains, to flare up at any moment. There can be no lasting peace between capitalist economy and the nationalized property of the Soviet Union. Washington knows that very well and does not cease preparing for an eventual conflict. Part of those preparations is the crushing of all defenders of the Soviet Union, including among them defenders of the Kremlin bureaucracy.

Whatever the immediate motivation of the government's blow at Bridges, it is clear that it is reactionary to the core and must be fought by the labor movement.

While doing all they can to defend Bridges against deportation, the revolutionists and all class-conscious workers must at the same time condemn Bridges and the Stalinists for their whitewashing of Roosevelt, their reactionary aid to Roosevelt in hamstringing the unions, and the harm they are doing the Soviet Union by such class-collaboration.

The militant fight for the independence of the labor movement is also the only real way to help the Soviet Union. Irreconcilable class struggle against the capitalist world — that is the only road for the future of labor.

The Negro Struggle

"LABOR WITH A WHITE SKIN CANNOT EMANCIPATE ITSELF WHERE LABOR WITH A BLACK SKIN IS BRANDED" - KARL MARX

By Albert Parker

The Right to Vote, the Southern Democrats and the Communist Party

Recently this column reported the unsuccessful move of a small group of southern Democrats to get their party in South Carolina to permit Negroes to vote in the primaries. That is the state where the present Democratic Party rules for primary voting require a Negro to be 87 years old and to have voted the straight Democratic ticket for 66 years.

Shortly after this a friend of ours who happened to be passing through South Carolina sent us a letter and some newspaper clippings which indicated that the motives of these white Southern Democrats in seeking to open the primaries to Negroes were not exactly motives which most Negroes would applaud.

DAILY WORKER'S STORY

Before we had a chance to print this information, the Stalinist Daily Worker appeared on May 21 with a story that was greatly at variance with the information we had received. We therefore held up on printing this information from our friend until we could check further.

This week the Associated Negro Press ran a story printed in many Negro newspapers, which cleared up the question and which proved definitely that the Communist Party is guilty of whitewashing the reactionary southern Democrats who look down on the mass of Negroes as "inferior" and who for their own benefit are trying to open the Democratic primary polls to a limited number of Negroes.

The headlines on the Daily Worker's story read as follows: "Carolina Democrats Ask Negro Poll Rights. 21 South Carolina Leaders Push Fight for Full Political Equality in State." The second head is false from beginning to end. An examination of the Stalinist story with the ANP story proves that the last thing in the world these 21 "leaders" were asking for was "full political equality" for the Negro people.

It is only by comparing the two stories side by side that one can fully appreciate the treachery and duplicity of the Stalinists. In the main the two stories are based on the same document — a resolution submitted to the state Democratic convention by 21 white Democrats. The only difference is that the Stalinists left certain important parts of the resolution out, while the ANP story printed the resolution in full.

The resolution started as follows: "The undersigned white citizens of South Carolina believe that the time has come when steps should be taken toward recognizing the political rights of the Negroes of this state. The following considerations prompt us in this view:" The Daily Worker printed this paragraph.

WHAT THE CP LEFT OUT

The next paragraph of the resolution read as follows: "1. Many of our Negro citizens are keenly desirous of exercising their rights of citizenship. We believe they are now fitted by education and experience to assume the responsibilities of citizenship."

What does this mean? It means that the 21 who signed this resolution imply that up until now the disfranchisement of the Negroes was justified because they weren't ready to "assume the responsibilities of citizenship." Every word in this paragraph stinks of smug "white superiority." The Daily Worker story solved this unpleasant problem by leaving out the first two words of the first sentence in that paragraph, thus changing its meaning, and by leaving out the whole second sentence!

The next paragraph was printed in full by the Daily Worker: "2. The Constitution of the United States gives them these rights in theory, but they have been denied them by political devices within the Southern States. These devices cannot continue to stand and are certain to be destroyed by the courts of this country."

But then the Daily Worker completely eliminated the following two paragraphs, explaining the motives of the 21 and the methods suggested by them. These important paragraphs read as follows:

"3. We believe that an understanding and sympathetic approach to this problem by the white people of South Carolina will result in making our Negro citizens friendly and coopera-

tive and that they will join good white people in seeking good government. There is in this an opportunity for the whites and blacks to develop a mutual respect and good feeling. If the problem is to be attacked by the Negro with the aid from outside sources, we believe that both the whites and Negroes will lose in the process.

"4. We do not believe it is either necessary or advisable that the Democratic Party be thrown open to Negroes indiscriminately. Nor do we believe that anything but good would come from establishing minor educational and character qualifications for membership of whites in the party. We believe that carefully considered qualifications of this kind, applied to whites and blacks, might result in a definite improvement in our political institutions."

No wonder the Stalinists left these two paragraphs out! For they reveal that these 21 men are not friends but shrewd enemies of the Negro masses.

WHAT THE 21 DEMOCRATS REALLY WANT

What does this resolution show? It shows that these 21 men believe that sooner or later the Negro will win his rights, and they feel that in the long run it would benefit the Democratic Party to begin now to appear as a "friend" of the Negro. They are afraid that if the problem is solved by the militant action of the Negro with aid from "outside sources," meaning the labor movement, that the southern Democrats will lose all their power. What they are worried about is saving the Democratic Party before it is too late.

The resolution also shows that these 21 men are not proposing that all Negroes be given the right to vote. On the contrary, they propose by "educational and character qualifications" to keep both Negroes and whites from voting. This educational requirement is an old gag in the south; a clerk can always find a question that even a college graduate couldn't answer to the clerk's "satisfaction," and the same clerk can always accept as correct the answers of illiterates. With the aid of "character qualifications" the political big shots could always bar any Negro (or white) who might think about organizing a union or a militant political group.

And these are the people who the Daily Worker claims are pushing a "fight for full political equality!"

WHY THE STALINISTS WRITE SUCH LIES

Some of our readers may be confused by all this, may wonder why the Communist Party goes out of its way to whitewash people like these.

To understand this, you must know how the Stalinist movement functions. Every couple of years the Stalinist attitude toward the Negro struggle (and almost every other question) undergoes a sharp change. These changes in line do not depend on changes in the objective situation, but on what the Stalin bureaucracy in the Soviet Union thinks is best to protect its own interests. A year ago for example the Stalinists talked very radical about both the war and Jim Crow. Then Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, and the Communist Party in this country became a supporter of the war and tried to hush down the Negro struggle.

Today they believe the struggle against Jim Crow is secondary — that what comes first is the war against Hitler, and that everything else must be subordinated to the war. Today they call for "national unity," that is, unity of the worker with the boss who exploits him, unity of the Negro with the Jim Crow ruling class that oppresses him; and they denounce as "Nazi agents" those who expose the character of this "national unity."

Naturally, the Stalinists do not dare to come out openly all the way and tell the Negro to stop fighting for his rights, for this would result in the destruction of whatever little influence the Stalinists still wield among Negroes. They therefore continue to call for "equal rights" — always adding apologetically that equal rights are a necessity for winning the war — but at the same time they do everything they can to discourage an

Portrait Head Of Leon Trotsky Now Available

Pioneer to Reproduce Head Sculptured by Famous U. S. Artist

Pioneer Publishers announces that it has secured a portrait head of Leon Trotsky, sculptured by the well-known American sculptor, Duncan Ferguson. By arrangement with the sculptor, Pioneer Publishers may reproduce plaster casts of the head for sale.

The portrait head stands 18 inches in height — slightly over life-size. The material is hard plaster, colored to resemble bronze; this is a permanent material and will last indefinitely indoors if given reasonable care. It weighs about 40 pounds when boxed for shipment. The price is \$25, boxed for shipment from New York (freight charge to be paid by purchaser.)

Duncan Ferguson is one of the foremost American sculptors. His work is represented in the permanent collections of sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art, the Whitney Museum of American Art, etc. The major galleries have exhibited his work during the past fifteen years. Mr. Ferguson was until recently Professor of Sculpture at the Louisiana State University.

Pioneer Publishers' arrangements make it possible to provide this splendid head at a nominal price to all interested groups and individuals. Pioneer's address is 116 University Place, New York City.

Portrait Head Recently Finished



Red Caps Vote to Affiliate to CIO

The third convention of the Red Caps union, United Transport Service Employees of America, independent, voted unanimously last week in Cincinnati to become an international affiliate of the CIO.

It is regarded as certain that the CIO will accept their application for affiliation.

The convention also voted to undertake an organizational campaign among dining car waiters, train porters, firemen and maintenance rail workers who have been unorganized or discriminated against by other unions because they are Negroes.

They Look the Nazis Frankly In the Eye. . .

De National Socialist, a Nazi controlled paper published in Flemish in Ghent, Belgium, published on April 11 extracts from a letter received last winter from a Belgian fascist volunteer in the German Army in Russia:

"Among the Russian partisans are young fellows of 16 and 17 years of age, and even women. When they are caught they are shot immediately, but they look you frankly in the eyes or laugh at you. War is terribly brutal and without being here one cannot imagine it."

actual struggle against Jim Crow.

One of their means for achieving this is to keep reminding the Negro people that "conditions are improving" and that "progress is being made." They continually sing the praises of Roosevelt and of every faker like Knox who offers "concessions" which are intended to quiet the dissatisfaction of the Negro without granting his demands for equality.

That is why they whitewashed the 21 Democrats — because they want the Negro people to believe that things are changing for the better and that gradually, through the benevolence of such people, equality will be achieved.

But the treacherous deceptions practiced by the Stalinists do not change the facts — the Negro people will not achieve their full rights without a militant struggle against the capitalist system that breeds Jim Crowism, fascism, war and unemployment. And in this struggle their allies will be the working class which is also exploited by the ruling class, not the fake liberals who have nothing but contempt for the Negro masses and hatred for the revolutionary methods of struggle.

Welles Lays Groundwork For Another Versailles

By A. ROLAND

The Memorial Day speech of Sumner Welles should be carefully read by every worker. It expresses the aims of the United States in the war in terms of the domination of the post-war world by the United Nations. One need only remember that the United States is the giant-like senior partner of these nations to understand that this means domination of the whole world by the United States, with the aid of England which will be reduced considerably in rank as a world power after the war.

According to Welles, the defeated nations are to be disarmed and placed completely at the mercy of the victors. The United Nations will send military "police" forces into all the countries of Europe (except Russia) until governments suitable to the victorious Allies have been firmly set up. The armies abroad will be maintained "until a permanent system of general security is established."

This clause is interpreted as meaning that no European government will be recognized and permitted to exist that "may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers." One might suppose that this applies to fascist elements that might attempt to continue in power in Germany, Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc. This interpretation is entirely too narrow. True, most of those who have led these countries in the present war will be ousted. But there is more than this intended. Much is quite a difference between this view and that of Wilson in the last war. Wilson told the Germans then that he would not treat with the Kaiser's government. He did not say, however, that he would intervene directly in Germany to set up a government that would suit him. The German people did this themselves when they set up the Weimar Republic.

WHAT WELLES FEARS The reason for the new formulation and the new state of affairs is not far to seek. The first imperialist war ended in the first stage of the proletarian revolution in Russia. Welles and the other representatives of the governments of the United Nations (and this does not exclude Stalin) mean to see to it that there shall be no second stage of the change from capitalism to socialism with the ending of the second World War. Any such attempt in Germany or France or anywhere else will be fiercely resisted by the armed forces of the victorious nations. Welles gives assurance that the United States will arrange the world in conformity with the interests of the present social system in this country. The Atlantic Charter will not repeat

abolition in the post-war world of the "selfishness of small groups." We too are for national and individual liberty. But the meaning we give these terms and the meaning given them by Welles are as far apart as the two poles. By individual liberty, the Under-Secretary means the right of the capitalist to continue to exploit the worker, the right to private property in the means of production. He means the right of the individual (and the monopoly corporation) to invest his money abroad and to earn dividends.

But those are the very rights that have brought on the present war. They are the foundations of imperialism. The great mass of "individuals" cannot have liberty so long as the few have the right to own the nation's and the world's wealth. The nations cannot have liberty so long as the most advanced ones can exploit the backward ones through their powerful means of production and their privately-controlled wealth. When Welles grandiloquently declares that the age of imperialism has ended, all that he means is that the old imperialism is ended. A new imperialism has come on the world scene, that of the United States. The bases of the new world laid down by Welles, cannot possibly bring any permanent peace, any more than did the Versailles Treaty. They can only prepare the ground for a third and more devastating world war that will engulf all civilization.

The "unenlightened selfishness" of those who caused the country to turn its back on the opportunity to share in maintaining "world peace" is blamed today for the course of events after the last war. This time that will not return. The victor's peace will be guaranteed with the armed forces of the United States.

"If this war is in fact a war for the liberation of peoples, it must assure the sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world, as well as in the world of the Americas. Our victory must bring in its train the liberation of all peoples. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, creed or color must be abolished. The age of imperialism is ended."

This sounds most gratifying indeed. If the Negroes of this country remain unimpressed, it will be due merely to the every day reality of their existence. Perhaps Welles meant his words as a rebuke to one of the English generals, General Alexander. That military leader — they are usually more blunt and less suave — made it clear in a talk to correspondents in India that of course he would return to Burma and retake it with new forces. Was it not part of the British Empire? The fact that the Burmese might not desire to be part of that empire troubled the General not the slightest.

WELLES' MEANING — AND OURS Like Welles we too are for the

Hitler Explodes Basic Theory Of Stalinism

By M. MORRISON

Because of the great number of controversial subjects that necessarily arise between us and the Stalinists there is some danger that we fall to stress sufficiently the one subject upon which the Stalinists must be as silent as the tomb, for the simple reason that they are unable to present any valid argument in its favor. And this subject happens to be the basic theory of Stalinism, the theory of socialism in one country.

For the basic Stalinist theory has been so completely shattered by events that not even Stalinist falsehoods and subterfuges can succeed in reviving it.

It is significant that the Stalinists rarely, if ever, mention their basic theory, at the present time. And for the very good reason that there is nothing for them to say about it. And it is for that reason that we must press the point.

CREATING CONFUSION

The Stalinist theoreticians and leaders are concentrating their attention on the resistance of the Red Army because it is on that question that they can best create confusion. In the fierce resistance offered by the Red Army to the invasion of the German imperialist forces the Stalinists, as well as other hypocrites and fools, see, or presume to see, justification of the policies of Stalin, especially his execution of the Red Army leaders.

That resistance came after the executions and this proves that the resistance is the result of the executions and this in turn proves that the executed builders and leaders of the Red Army were "fifth columnists." This reasoning is exactly like the reasoning of the savages who attribute the coming of rain to the medicine man because the rain came the day or the week or the month after the holy man's magic.

WHY SUCH DEFEATISM?

Behind the absurd proposition that the resistance of the Red Army is due to the execution of the leading generals is the assumption that the best the Red Army could possibly do is to offer fierce resistance, lose battles and enormous territory. Why such terrible defeatism? Why not assume that under the leadership of the experienced and brilliant generalship of Tukachevsky and the others who were executed, the Red Army could and would have defeated Hitler's armies? Or at least would have stopped the German armies long before they took the Ukraine and destroyed the richest agricultural and industrial section of the Soviet Union?

If the leading figures of an engineering firm are murdered and the firm continues to exist with third and fourth raters at the head, steadily losing ground to competitors, does it mean that the continued existence of the firm is a result of the murder of the leading engineers? Is it not rather the loss of ground that is to be attributed to the murders? It is, of course, impossible to prove what the firm would have done had the leading engineers not been murdered, but the fact remains that without them the firm is retreating and not advancing.

It must be recognized that the defeats or the resistance of the Red Army cannot be utilized as an argument to prove either that the executed generals were or were not "fifth columnists." That fact can be proved only by their personal histories and the circumstances surrounding their murders. Since the trials and executions were shrouded in secrecy and nobody knows what evidence, if any, was produced, we must base our judgment on the character of the men executed and the circumstances under which they were executed. These, together with the fact that the men trials held of leading Bolsheviks, were proved frame-ups, can lead to one conclusion — that the builders and leaders of the Red Army were executed because Stalin was afraid of their actual or possible opposition.

While it is impossible to say with absolute certainty that, had the executed Red Army leaders lived, Hitler would never have gained the successes he has achieved within the Soviet Union, the probability is very great that such would be the case. At any rate to ascribe the resistance of the Red Army to the execution of the leading generals is possible only on the part of scoundrels or nit-wits.

It must be recognized, however, that on such a question as the reasons for the resistance of the Red Army the Stalinist leaders, with the help of other

hypocrites, are in a position to create great confusion. While we must be alert to nail every lie and answer every false argument, it is useless to deny that the Stalinists will have great success on this question, especially if Hitler is defeated. Most people will not go to the trouble of investigating and analyzing all the facts and circumstances of the executions. The ignorance of the masses is what the Stalinist leaders and the capitalists depend upon.

At the present, it is not so easy for the Stalinist theoreticians to confuse people on their basic position that socialism can be, and in fact has already been, built in the Soviet Union. It is this theory that has been completely annihilated by Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union and the terrible destruction that has resulted from that attack.

REACTION TO OUR BASIC ARGUMENTS

Up to now our arguments against the Stalinist theory of building socialism in one country were theoretical in nature and it must be admitted that they did not succeed in convincing many people. The Stalinists could and did point to the huge area and rich resources of the Soviet Union, and, they claimed, that contrary to our theory, socialism was being built in the Soviet Union. The less intelligent Stalinists maintained, on the basis of Stalin's speeches, that socialism already existed; the more intelligent were satisfied with the contention that socialism will come with the complete industrialization of the Soviet Union.

We could and did point to the many crying contradictions existing in the Soviet Union — to the poverty, the lack of democracy, etc. The more intelligent Stalinists would answer: These will disappear with time.

But what answer can be given now, when before our very eyes the horrible picture is presented of the destruction, within those areas invaded by Hitler, of everything that was built in the last fifteen years? Socialism is based on factories, on power, on mines and railroads, and these have been ruined.

The fact that the Soviet Union has to appeal for material aid to capitalists of the United States and of England shows that socialism is far from having been achieved in the Soviet Union. For the productive capacity of a huge country like the Soviet Union, under socialism, would be infinitely greater than the productive capacity of any capitalist country. No socialist country would ever require food, tanks and planes from a capitalist country.

UNDENIABLE FACTS

We need not, however, resort to theoretical arguments. The undeniable fact stares us in the face, that Hitler has either destroyed the socialism that the Stalinists said existed in the Soviet Union or he has at least prevented its being completed. What other proof is necessary to convince intelligent and honest people of the correctness of the Trotskyist arguments against the possibility of realizing socialism in one country alone? Need we present any further arguments that socialism is impossible unless the proletarian revolution is extended to the advanced countries of the world?

I can hear some Stalinist say that when Hitler is beaten socialism will once more be erected in the Soviet Union. But even if he is defeated, as we hope he will be, will that not mean to build socialism once more with the possibility of having it destroyed by another Hitler?

To retain the theory of socialism in one country means to ask the working masses of the Soviet Union to sacrifice and build socialism only to see it destroyed by some Hitler. What a wonderful Stalinist perspective!

It would be naive for us to expect all intelligent and honest Stalinists to be won over to Trotskyism on the basis of any argument, no matter how sound or irrefutable. But it is necessary, without ignoring any other arguments, to emphasize our main theory which has been so tragically confirmed by events.

Join the Socialist Workers Party

NEW YORK PICNIC

Sunday, June 9th

Clove Lake Park on Staten Island

(Take Staten Island Ferry, then

Bus No. 6 on Staten Island, to Clove Lake Park)

Games - Boating - Hiking

Auspices: SWP Central Branch

New York City

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 23 Saturday, June 6, 1942

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

Editor:
GEORGE BREITMAN

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

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

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

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

Biddle And The Stalinists

The day that Biddle ordered the deportation of Bridges, the Stalinist *Daily Worker* approvingly published a story that the executive board of Local 475, UE-CIO, had asked Biddle to “investigate the fifth-column activities of the Trotskyists in vital Brooklyn war plants” and to “take immediate steps to halt the sale and distribution of THE MILITANT and ‘Labor Action.’”

It is typical of Stalinist methods in the trade unions that this foully reactionary proposal to Biddle was made by the Stalinist-controlled executive board of the union, without giving the 6,000 members of the union a chance to pass on the question. Perhaps the Stalinists feared that the union membership would stand by the principle of working class solidarity.

THE MILITANT is a working class paper. It defends the democratic rights of the *Daily Worker*, Browder, Bridges and the Stalinists because they are part of the labor movement, and the labor movement as a whole must stand together against persecution by the capitalist class and its political agents. No matter how fundamental our disagreement with the Stalinists, or with any other section of the labor movement, we defend them against the class enemy. That is the principle of class solidarity.

This principle is systematically violated by the Stalinists. Wherever they can in the unions, they are sabotaging support to the 18 Local 544-CIO and Socialist Workers Party members convicted in the Minneapolis “sedition” trial — a conviction secured by Biddle under the same Smith Gag Act of 1940 under which Biddle has now ordered Bridges deported. Every union voice raised against the Smith Act prosecution in Minneapolis would have made it that much harder for Biddle to go through with the Smith Act deportation of Bridges. Instead, the Stalinists preferred to back Biddle against the Trotskyists in Minneapolis, even at the cost of further blows against labor. Now they ask Biddle to halt the sale of THE MILITANT — a precedent which would endanger every working class paper in the country. (To this day the *Daily Worker* of England remains under the ban of the Churchill government.)

The coincidence that this latest Stalinist appeal for government action against the Trotskyists was made public the same day that Biddle struck at Bridges should bring home to workers under Stalinist influence the starkly reactionary character of the Stalinist policy. The Communist Party betrays the interests of the working class as a whole in its unprincipled attempts to advance Stalinist interests.

Appealing to Biddle for aid against the labor opponents of the Communist Party, the Stalinists are unable to explain why Biddle pursues anti-labor policies. *The Worker* of May 31 brilliantly hits on the idea that in ordering Bridges' deportation Biddle succumbed to the pressure of the Trotskyists! This “explanation” is supposed to do two things: conceal the fact that the Trotskyists are defending Bridges against Biddle, and also cover up the fact that Biddle is simply carrying out Roosevelt's orders. If we took the Stalinist explain-

ation at face value, it means that the Stalinists are appealing to Biddle to persecute the Trotskyists at the same moment that Biddle is doing the bidding of the Trotskyists. Such is the mad world of Stalinist “explanations.”

The Attack On Heydrich

Of considerable significance is the successful attack on Heydrich, No. 2 man of the Gestapo. If it was carried out by Czechs, it indicates not only the widespread hostility of the Czech people — that was already clear, as is the universal hostility of the masses in the occupied countries against the Nazis — but also the weakening of the Nazi apparatus of repression. Heydrich was, next to Hitler and Himmler, perhaps the most carefully guarded Nazi official. To waylay him must have required an elaborate plan involving considerable resources in manpower and equipment. For Czechs to have such resources indicates great holes in the Nazi armor.

The only other possibility is that oppositional elements within the German machine — most likely the army officers corps — put Heydrich out of the way.

In either case, Heydrich's assassination is a significant index of the weakening of Nazi rule in occupied Europe.

Mexico At War

Mexico's rulers have taken it into the war. Mexico is a semi-colonial country and we are for its national independence from imperialist domination. The Fourth International has correctly inscribed in its program the support of all colonial and semi-colonial countries against imperialist aggression. For that reason we support China against Japan, India against Britain. It should be clear, however, that this principle is not involved in Mexico's declaration of war against the Axis imperialists.

Mexico's declaration represents a capitulation to the pressure of American imperialism. The main enemy of Mexico is the gang of big capitalists which has a death-grip on Mexico's natural resources and industrial economy, preventing the independent national development of the country — and that gang has its headquarters in the United States. It is in the service of that gang that the subservient bourgeoisie of Mexico has entered the war. Mexico is fighting solely as the agent of American imperialism against its rival imperialisms. In no way is this a fight for the independence of Mexico.

Arguments On Soldiers' Pay

The Army-Navy pay bill to raise the pay to a minimum of \$42 a month (the Senate proposal) or \$50 a month (the House proposal) is still being kicked around by the House-Senate conference committee. Months have passed since the bill was first introduced — not to speak of the preceding months of widespread demand for the pay raise. The government spokesmen, holding out for the lower figure, appear to be just as well pleased to drag the matter out interminably.

What possible argument can they advance to justify not adopting the \$50 a month figure? Certainly they can't pretend the soldiers and their families don't need the money! Well, as Samuel Johnson said, patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel; so too with the opponents of the higher pay rate. Listen to Congressman May, spouting away in the House on May 27:

“The soldiers are not asking for bonuses or bounties at the hands of Congress, because they are fighting for the defense of their country from wholly patriotic motives and they must not be put in the position of demanding a price for their loyalty to the country. I am sure that if they were permitted to express their feelings on the question, 95 per cent of them would resent this proposal (for the higher pay figure).”

We'd like to see-Congressman May's bluff called. Yes, just put it up to the men what pay they should get for marching into the valley of death! If America's Sixty Families can pile up astronomical war profits and still be called patriots, then, we are certain, the worker-soldiers and sailors won't “resent” not only the \$50 a month figure, but also the equivalent of union wages for all men in the armed forces.

Incidentally, a fact unreported in the press, but mentioned in the May 27 discussion in Congress, is that the conferees have quietly written into the bill “an increase in allowances for officers for subsistence and quarters amounting to as much as \$50 per month.” (Congressional Record, May 27, p. 4771.)

Endless haggling over a total of \$50 per month for a private, but complete agreement on giving officers \$50 per month extra — that is the picture of the government's attitude toward the rank and file of the armed forces.

A Timely Political Document! IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

By LEON TROTSKY

(A Compilation — 1927-1937)

10 CENTS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK

Effects Of The Speedup On The Workers' Health

Union Contracts Should Have Provisions To Protect Workers Under War Conditions

By GRACE CARLSON

In a recent address before the American Industrial Hygiene Association, Dr. Harold Habein warned businessmen against high-speed work and expressed concern over the effect which the strain created by the war would have on the health of business executives.

“The average executive,” Dr. Habein said, “is likely to have had working, recreational, eating, smoking and drinking habits. He is frequently nervously and physically fatigued and emotionally tense. His working hours are not governed by union rules but by an inward drive which we call ambition and intense competition. . . Now, because of the national emergency, speed must be increased even more. That this is going to have a deleterious effect on health in high places can hardly be doubted.”

Now, it is undoubtedly true that businessmen die, as do the members of other sections of the population. It is probably true that the strain of making profits and of keeping these profits away from the workers whom they exploit may drive some of them into early graves — the victims of high blood pressure, hardening of the arteries, coronary thrombosis and other diseases of the heart and circulatory system.

Not so worried about the health problems of the wealthy, however, Dr. Walter Alvarez, a colleague of Dr. Habein's at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota, believes that the possession of wealth is the best way to guarantee good health and a long life. In fact, he told the International Medical Assembly a few months ago that if the average man with stomach ulcers were left an income of \$250 per month for the rest of his life, he would soon be cured and would never have ulcers again.

Worry and fear are the leading causes of stomach and intestinal disorders, Dr. Alvarez said. Between 60 and 75 per cent of a group of cases examined showed no physical causes of the disorders. Practically all of these cases were brought on by fear, frustration, worry, anger, nervousness and mental exhaustion, and

these in turn, were due to the terrific speed-up of modern industry and to the terrifying problems with which the war confronts the American people, he added.

T B DEATH RATE RISING

War conditions — the speed-up, as well as the lengthened hours of work — have reversed the downward trend of the tuberculosis death rate. This dread disease, which up until 1912 was the leading cause of death in the United States, has now dropped to seventh place in the list. But for the first time since the end of World War I, public health officials are noting a steady rise in the tuberculosis death rate, as well as in the number of new cases of tuberculosis in the large cities.

Godias Drolet, statistician for the New York Tuberculosis Association, reported recently that the death rate from tuberculosis had risen in 19 cities in 1940 — chiefly industrial centers affected by the rapidly expanding war production. The tuberculosis death rate rose 5% in Philadelphia; 20% in Baltimore; 21% in Cincinnati; 13% in Newark; 27% in Akron; 30% in Omaha.

In New York City, Mr. Drolet reports, a 2% increase in new cases of tuberculosis in 1941 over 1940. Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit and Philadelphia also showed increases in the number of new cases in 1941 over 1940 — in varying amounts up to 23%.

The alarming trend continues with the latest report from New York City that in the first 7 weeks of 1942 there had been a 4% increase in new cases over the corresponding period in 1941. Warning employers that these are danger signals which must be heeded, Mr. Drolet said, “Increas-

ed activities, longer hours of work and associated war stresses should be paralleled by a corresponding increase of anti-tuberculosis activities if an unnecessary toll of lives is not to be paid.”

UNIONS MUST TAKE ACTION

Summing up the findings of these and many other medical investigators, United States Surgeon General Thomas Parran has issued a sharp warning about the seriousness of the workers' health problems. The health of industrial workers, under the best conditions, is never as good as that of the rest of the population, he points out in an article in the May issue of the National Tuberculosis Association Bulletin. Death rates are two and three times as high as in non-industrial groups during the active working years of life. Exposure to harmful dusts, metals, gases, vapors and other injurious substances, excessive heat, humidity, sudden changes of temperature, defective lighting, intense noise have serious effects on the health of the worker and shortens his life span.

The speed-up and the lengthened hours demanded in war production create a further serious hazard to industrial workers' health. Trade unionists would do well to consider the recommendations which Dr. Parran makes and to incorporate them into contracts. Shifts should not be rotated more often than once every 2 or 3 months, he warns. At least one day in seven should be reserved for rest and recreation; organized rest periods during the work day should be introduced; paid vacations of at least one or two weeks a year should be given to workers; high standards of lighting and ventilation should be maintained, he further recommends.

Despite the grave warnings of medical men as to the dangers to the health of industrial workers which are inherent in the speed-up system of the war industries, profit-hungry monopolists do not guard their workers effectively. Only the militant action of the trade unions can protect the health of industrial workers in this emergency.

Anti-Labor Propaganda Makes Progress In Army

Soldier's Letter Shows Even Unionists Are Being Turned Against Labor Movement

By DAVID WARNER

Last week we discussed the anti-labor campaign of the bosses in the armed forces, the conscious attempts of the capitalist class to utilize all their instruments to poison the minds of the soldiers and sailors against the labor movement and everything that it represents.

A letter printed in the *N. Y. Times* of May 2, by David H. Campbell, a former active trade unionist now in the army, furnishes us with significant evidence of the extent to which this drive has already succeeded in turning many workers now in the army against the unions.

Campbell's letter repeats many of the anti-labor charges of the boss press and is in the nature of a rebuke to the unions. Campbell pretends his attack by giving his credentials: “Before entering military service I was active in the labor movement and held the following offices in Local 260, CIO: Shop Steward, member Contract Committee, member Seniority Committee, member Wages and Hours Committee, member Wage Adjustment Committee, member Grievance Committee, chairman Election Committee, chairman Membership Committee, editor Local paper.”

Brother Campbell refers to the work of the trade unions today as “squabbling about petty grievances, less work and more pay, slowing up production.” He presents the army as a model for the trade unions where, “Not much time is spent in foolishness . . . (or) through agitation for shorter hours and higher pay. You see, we don't think of working hours. What I thought was hard work while in private employ would be child's play now. ‘Grievances’ do not exist. If there are any, they are called courts martial. The Army is excellent proof of the theory that when a man does what he is supposed to, there is no need for grievances.”

Such words are fitting indeed when they come from the pen of a Westbrook Pegler, an open and avowed enemy of the labor movement. But the fact that they come from a former active trade unionist is convincing proof that it is an immediate

necessity for the labor movement to effectively answer these charges and combat the campaign of lies and slanders that have permitted them to gain ground.

Although Campbell presents his letter as a plea to the trade unions and implies that he is for the preservation and growth of the unions, his program would only mean the complete destruction of the trade union movement. His theory that “when a man does what he is supposed to, there is no need for grievances,” is outspoken enough for the most reactionary employer.

HAVE THEY NO GRIEVANCES?

Does Campbell mean that the workers have no grievances? For after all, never let it be said of the bosses that they are not always willing to tell the worker what he is “supposed” to do. Campbell knows that his theory is fantastic — because he spent years in the trade union movement fighting precisely for those “grievances” which he now denies exist!

And similarly the theory that the soldiers have no grievances is also false. The public hardly ever hears of them, it is true, but that is because the army bureaucracy uses all of its powers to suppress the knowledge of their existence and is quick to use the court-martial against any soldier who dares to express a grievance.

The trouble with the trade unions is not that they fight for adequate wage scales and decent living conditions — which will preserve the standards of the workers in uniform when the war is over — but that they have neglected to fight for the present justified demands and grievances of the rank and file soldiers and sailors. Does Campbell really think that the men in the service have no grievances? The seasoned

politicians in Washington know better. For the last month, they have been debating over how large a pay increase to give to the men in the army.

The Congressmen know that the low pay of the rank and file soldiers and sailors has long been a source of discontent. They hasten today to raise the wage scales only because they are afraid of any open manifestation of this discontent. Another and not unimportant reason for their sudden rush to get on the bandwagon is the knowledge of the attitude of the families and friends of the drafted men at the next election if they do not vote now for the pay raises.

TASKS OF THE UNIONS

On this one issue alone, what an effective answer it would have been to the lies and slanders of the capitalist press if the unions had conducted a serious campaign for trade union wages for the soldiers and sailors! More than anything else, it would have convinced the thousands of new recruits in the armed forces that only the working class organizations have their interests truly at heart.

It is not yet too late for the union movement to win the workers in the armed forces over to their side and away from the influence of the anti-democratic forces trying to indoctrinate the servicemen with fascist ideas. The soldiers and sailors have plenty of other grievances besides the wage issue. Later in this series we shall discuss some of the more important of these grievances in detail.

Trotsky's Last Work
MANIFESTO OF THE
FOURTH, INTERNATIONAL
on the
IMPERIALIST WAR
and the
PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION
48 pages 5 cents per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place

How The Liberals Argue Against The Ruling On Bridges

By M. STEIN

The Concept of Wicked Counselors

The dynasty of the Romanovs ruled Russia for over three centuries not by terror alone. The Russian masses had the illusion that the Czar, “the little father,” could do no wrong, that their bitter lot was to be blamed only on the wicked counselors of the Czar. This illusion of the Russian masses was dramatized most vividly in the bloody events of January 9, 1905 when they marched in great numbers under the leadership of Father Gapon to the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg to petition the Czar against the abuses of his counselors. The rest of it is history. Those of the marchers who survived the massacre at the hands of the Czar's guard learned the bitter lesson that not only the Czar's counselors, but the Czar as well, were part of one and the same machine of brutal, murderous oppression and exploitation. The whole event was a fitting prelude to the 1905 Revolution.

We have no Romanov here. But there is a deliberate and concerted attempt to foster the concept of Roosevelt as “the little father” in the White House. In Russia the concept of the little father was rooted deep among the backward masses, and there the liberals joined hands with the socialists to break it down. Here, however, in this classical country of machine politics, the liberal journalists have taken it upon themselves to single out individual departmental administrators as those responsible for the particularly raw acts of the Roosevelt administration.

Who was responsible, for example, for Washington's pro-Vichy policies? Secretary Hull and the Vichy men in his administration, of course. The Nation, the New Republic, Samuel Grafton on the New York Post, and many others of their stripe wrote reams upon reams to prove this.

Now comes Biddle's ruling on the deportation of Bridges. Ralph Ingersoll, who is trying to make a profession of liberalism, burst forth with a two page editorial in the May 29 PM. The title of the PM editorial is: “Once a Biddle, Always a Biddle — Or What is a Biddle?” The theme of the editorial is: “Biddle made his decision absolutely on his own — without consultation with the President. . .”

How a Liberal Defends Bridges

Time was when the mark of a liberal was his moral courage to fight on the principal ground of free speech against such deportation rulings as the one directed against Bridges. But you will look for it in vain in Ingersoll's long editorial. His task above all else was to absolve the President of responsibility for the Biddle decision. To have opposed the Bridges deportation order on the grounds of free speech would have also committed Ingersoll and PM to a defense of revolutionary socialists when they are persecuted for their views as they were, for example, in last year's Minneapolis “sedition” trial. Ingersoll does not conceive of this as the mission of liberals in war time. Under normal, peace conditions, perhaps, but not now — now, you see, it's different.

Ingersoll's defense of Bridges is based exclusively on Bridges' all-out war effort, on the fact that “he has continued to advise his men to waive all kinds of advantages — won from their employers over a long period of years — so that they might get on with the job of loading ships for the battle of the Southwest Pacific.” But suppose that Bridges had advised his men to hold fast to their working conditions, suppose that he had advised them to demand wage increases to meet the rising cost of living? Would Ingersoll then oppose the Biddle ruling? The implication of the whole article is that he would not. Says Ingersoll: “Harry Bridges in this country — at this writing — is a valuable man.” (Ingersoll's own emphasis.)

The Complaint Dwindles

Ingersoll, who starts his editorial with a lot of sound and fury directed ostensibly at Biddle, in reality reduces his differences with Biddle to the question of the timeliness of the deportation order. And then, as if frightened by the boldness of even this stand, he hastens to narrow the point down still further:

“Biddle,” says Ingersoll, “must at least have sensed this, for he made pointed reference to the fact that Bridges might appeal and that it would take a year for his case to go through the courts. So this useful man, Bridges, is to spend the very year when he can be most useful to us — in conference with his lawyers, under the strain of going through court after court!”

Tiny indeed is Ingersoll's complaint against Biddle. It is so tiny that it would not justify even a PM editorial, were it not for Ingersoll's great anxiety to absolve the little father in the White House of responsibility for a deportation order which is so sweeping that it jeopardizes every militant worker who happens to be an alien, and consequently is a blow against every other worker as well. Speaking through this deportation order is not Biddle alone, but the President and the whole ruling class, and they say in essence: “Bridges, your services in smashing the living standards of the West Coast longshoremen, a service in which you are presently engaged, we appreciate. We hope to be able to use you for at least another year while you appeal to the courts. But your militant past we can neither forget nor forgive. We must make an example of you so as to discourage militancy, so as to crush any spirit of resistance there may be among workers.”

For our part, we are fighting Biddle's deportation order not because Bridges' treachery to the cause of the working class. We are fighting it because we see the ruling class behind it, and we see the working class at whom it is directed.

Against Governmental Moves

To Freeze Wages!