

Biddle's New Pretext For Prosecuting Us

By FELIX MORROW

— SEE PAGE 3 —

THE MILITANT

Official Weekly Organ of the Socialist Workers Party

VOL. V—No. 38

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1941



FIVE (5) CENTS

TRIAL OF 29 SET FOR OCTOBER 20

The Government Is Railroading The 29 To Jail

Let There Be No Illusions About This Case;
Biddle And Roosevelt Are Going Through
With Their Vile Frameup Against SWP

An Editorial

On October 20, just one month from today, the 29 defendants in the government's "seditious conspiracy" prosecution of the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO go on trial in the federal courtroom in Minneapolis.

This date was set by Federal Judge Matthew M. Joyce last Thursday, after he had upheld the indictment drawn up by the Department of Justice against the defendants. After hearing a day and a half of argument on the indictment, Judge Joyce took ten minutes to decide to uphold it. He gave little more consideration to the defense plea for three months to prepare the case.

The government is determined to rush this case to trial and is having its way. The government is determined to go through with this frameup and railroad the defendants to jail. If there were any illusions on this question, they are ended by Attorney-General Biddle's letter to the ACLU (See page 3).

When the Department of Justice drew up the indictment and had it approved by a federal grand jury on July 15, its immediate purpose was to come to the aid of AFL Teamsters Chief Daniel J. Tobin. On June 13 Tobin had appealed directly to Roosevelt for aid against the Minneapolis motor transport workers, Local 544, which on June 9 had disaffiliated from the AFL and joined the CIO.

The 'radical Trotsky' organization 'must be in some way prevented from pursuing this dangerous course,' appealed Tobin to Roosevelt. Roosevelt responded to this appeal, the same day, with a statement denouncing the CIO and Local 544, and the President's Secretary, Stephen Early announced that Roosevelt "asked me to immediately have the government departments and agencies interested in this matter notified." (New York Times, June 14). They were notified — and the indictment followed.

If Biddle and Tobin thought that the indictment would demoralize Local 544-CIO, they have been proved wrong. In spite of the federal prosecution, in spite of Tobin's thugs, in spite of the open aid to Tobin by the state administration of Republican Governor Stassen, the membership of Local 544-CIO has remained firm in its solidarity with the indicted leaders. And the success of Local 544-CIO in leaving Tobin's set-up has inspired a wave of teamsters' union revolts against Tobin.

All the more necessary, therefore, is it for Biddle and Tobin to rush the trials and railroad the union leaders to jail. Only by beholding the union can they hope to force the motor transport workers of Minneapolis into Tobin's "union."

After a careful investigation, the American Civil Liberties Union has come to the conclusion that in this case "the government injected itself into an inter-union controversy in order to promote the interests of the one side (Tobin) which supported the administration's foreign and domestic policies." Roosevelt is today more than ever in need of the support of the Tobins and of crushing the militant anti-war sentiment represented by the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO.

The difficulties that Roosevelt is having in putting over his war program are indicated by the fact that he did not dare seek Congressional endorsement for the "shooting war" which he has decreed in the Atlantic. In March, 1917, for a much less decisive step — arming of merchantmen to repel submarine attacks — Wilson secured Congressional endorsement. Today Roosevelt cannot even approximate the "democracy" of Wilson! And if he does not have a majority in Congress for war, Roosevelt has far less backing for war in the American people.

All the more necessary to the administration, therefore, is a speedy conviction of the 29 defendants. It would be a serious blow against the most militant and anti-war section of the CIO. And the conviction of the Socialist Workers Party leaders would constitute a precedent, both legal and political, for further prosecutions against all anti-war groups and militant unionists.

The government is going through with this frameup. Only the widest possible support of the defendants by the labor movement, only the broadest protests against the prosecution, can save the defendants from conviction and long prison terms.

Grain For The Soviet Front



Soviet collective farmers do their bit in defense of the Soviet Union by bringing in their harvests to a grain center as a contribution to the fight against the Nazi imperialists. Their banner reads: "All the harvest for the front."

Stalinists Declare War Against John L. Lewis

The Stalinists have declared open war against John L. Lewis in the union movement because he will not declare his support of the Roosevelt war program. In an editorial on September 16, the *Daily Worker* says:

"The unity of labor against Hitler would also be hindered by any illusions that in spite of Mr. Lewis' opposition to the foreign policies of the administration, he could continue to have a progressive policy on other questions. But the person whose policies help Hitler, cannot help labor to fight on other issues. Those who may doubt this, are due for a rude awakening."

The occasion for this statement of policy on Lewis by the *Daily Worker* was the issuance on Sept. 14 by General Robert E. Wood, national chairman of the American First Committee, of a statement signed by an "independent group" of 58 people. These 58 included Lewis' daughter, Kathryn, and the statement is therefore regarded as an expression of his views as well.

Like most of Lewis' other statements on the war, it is a typical isolationist document. It criticizes Roosevelt's September 11 "shoot on sight" speech — not because it is a step in the government's imperialist war plans, but because Roosevelt took this step without first consulting Congress. It does not oppose imperialist war as such, but merely some of Roosevelt's methods in leading the country into the war. As such, it in no way serves the interests of the struggle against war and is no more acceptable to the genuine anti-war forces than it is to the warmongers.

But the important thing about the Sept. 16 *Daily Worker* editorial is not merely that it attacks Lewis' position on the war. For the first time the Stalinists state that not only will they fight against his position on the war, but they will fight him on all questions. When this is added to the fact that the editorial has no word of criticism of Hillman, Knudsen's office boy, the future direction of the Stalinists is plainly indicated. At the same time there has been evidence that the Hillmanites are not averse to accepting the aid of the Stalinists in the fight to seize control of the CIO and subordinate it to the administration.

In a long editorial bemoaning the defeat of James B. Carey at the recent UE convention, made possible only because a large number of Hillmanites at the convention were willing to unite forces with the Stalinists, the Sept. 13 *New Leader*, organ of the Social Democrats, warns that the Hillmanites are considering making an alliance with the Stalinists. The *New Leader* says: "We speak frankly because we

know that new alliances with the Communists are in the making, involving men prominent in the labor movement and close to the administration." Thus the scene is being laid for a Stalinist-Hillmanite united front at the coming national CIO convention not only against Lewis' position on the war, but also against those progressive union policies with which his group has been associated up to now. Class conscious workers will find nothing to choose between the Lewis position and the Hillmanite-Stalinist position on the war. But they will find disputed between these groups other important questions that will determine the future of the CIO as the progressive industrial union movement in this country. The Hillmanites - Stalinists stand for support of and collaboration with the government in its efforts to hogtie the unions while the Lewis forces seek the independence of the CIO. The Hillmanites-Stalinists cover up and glorify the National Defense Mediation Board and Roosevelt's strike breaking, while the Lewis forces attack and condemn them. The Hillmanites-Stalinists are headed in the direction of unity with the AFL at the expense of the gains of industrial unionism, while the Lewis forces insist on extending and building the CIO so that industrial unionism will

SIU Strikes East Coast For War Bonus

BULLETIN

NEW YORK, Sept. 17.—Telegram received at SIU strike headquarters: "Members of SUP in meetings on a coast-wide scale, went on record to back you up 100% in your just action for high-bonuses." (Signed) Harry Lundberg, Secretary-Treasurer, Sailors Union of the Pacific.

NEW YORK, Sept. 16.—Indications that the Seafarers International Union (AFL) East Coast strike for higher war bonus and insurance payments, would be extended to the West Coast, were seen today when the Strike Committee sent telegrams to the Sailors Union of the Pacific, West Coast affiliate, to take action in support of the strike.

The striking seamen are demanding from the shipowners an increase in the present war bonus of \$60 per month above the basic pay, an increase in the \$5,000 war risk insurance, and the extension of the bonus and insurance payments to West Indies and South American runs. At present South American runs pay no bonus or insurance benefits. The prospect of unrestricted sea warfare in all parts of the Atlantic prompted the seamen to make these demands.

The East Coast strike has already tied up seven ships of the Alcoa line as well as ships belonging to the Calmar Steamship Company and the Waterman line. Picket lines have been thrown around the ships in New York, Mobile, New Orleans and Boston. The strike will affect scores of other ships as they reach Atlantic and Gulf ports.

The militant strikers are carrying placards which read: "American ships sunk by Nazis: S.S. City of Rayville, S.S. Charles Pratt, S.S. Robin Moore, S.S. Steel Seafarer, S.S. Sessa. How many more lives before the shipowners grant adequate war risk insurance and bonus?"

not be endangered when the labor movement is reunited.

These are life-and-death questions for the CIO. Militant workers, without conceding a single one of Lewis' false ideas on the war, will have no choice in the struggle over these questions but to side with the Lewis forces against the Hillmanite-Stalinist united front which not only wants to drag the workers into the war, but is willing to weaken and wipe out the gains of the CIO for the last 6 years to do it.

necessary in the coming three to four months.

b. The question of the distribution of defense orders, their geographical location, their plant allocation, as well as the question of the geographical location of new defense plants shall NO LONGER BE DECIDED BY INDUSTRIAL MANAGERS ALONE, but shall be decided by joint committees of the UAW and the auto manufacturers with the purpose that men shall not be forced to hunt jobs in various cities, but that jobs be brought to cities which the demands of labor indicate.

c. Specifically for Flint, the union shall demand that the Buick plant being built in Chicago be used for some other purpose, and the assembly of (Continued on page 2)

Demurrers Not Granted SWP, 544-CIO Leaders

Judge Overrules Charge of Defendants
That Basis for Indictments Is False

MINNEAPOLIS, Sept. 12.—Overruling demurrers to an indictment charging 29 men and women, including leaders of the Socialist Workers Party and of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union Local 544-CIO with "seditious conspiracy", Federal Judge Matthew M. Joyce today set the trial of the 29 for October 20th.

His action was taken immediately after a day and a half of argument by defense attorneys that the indictments were faulty because they failed to give sufficient detail about the alleged "conspiracy". The constitutionality of the Smith Act, passed in June, 1940, which constitutes the basis for one of the counts against the defendants, was also attacked.

Opening the argument for the defendants, former Judge Arthur LeSueur charged that the indictment contained nothing but the "conclusions of the prosecutor" that the defendants were planning "to bring about the overthrow by force of the government of the United States". No detail about the steps by which this alleged overthrow of the government was to be brought about were included in the indictment and therefore "it is improper and unlawful to send defendants to trial under such an indictment," LeSueur insisted.

Opinions of liberal jurists were cited to prove that indictments which contained only general and undefined charges of crimes are faulty, and that criminal charges against defendants

must be made directly in the indictment and not inferentially. Referring to the indictment drawn up by the Department of Justice and voted July 15 by a Federal Grand Jury in St. Paul against the 29 defendants, LeSueur said that its charges were

"in words only, and were not backed up by one single allegation of a criminal act." Moreover, he pointed out, there was no record in the indictment of the role of individual defendants. (Continued on page 2)

NOTED FIGURES SIGN FUND APPEAL FOR 29

NEW YORK, Sept. 15.—The Civil Rights Defense Committee, an organization rallying support to the 29 defendants who will go on trial in St. Paul on October 20 to face charges of "seditious conspiracy" to overthrow the government, today released an "Emergency Appeal" signed by James T. Farrell, Carlo Tresca, John Dos Passos, Margaret De Silver and Charles Rufford Walker. The appeal has also been endorsed by the American Civil Liberties Union.

The signers of the Appeal characterize the indictment of the 29 members of the Socialist Workers Party and of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union, 544-CIO as "the most sweeping attack upon civil liberties and labor's rights in many years," cite the need for funds to pay for bail, legal expense and publicity, and urge prompt and generous contributions to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, 160 Fifth Ave., New York City.

The full text of the Appeal follows:

Emergency Appeal!
"The most sweeping attack upon civil liberties and labor's rights in many years is the Federal indictment in Minnesota of 29 people — members of the Socialist Workers Party and the leaders of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union, Local 544-CIO.
"This prosecution is doubly unprecedented. Never before in peace-time has the Government invoked statutes punishing the mere expression of opinion as it is doing with the Socialist Workers Party. Nor have the Federal authorities ever so flagrantly intervened in a trade union dispute by instituting criminal proceedings against the members of one labor organization, the CIO, on behalf of another, the AFL.
"The indictment mentions no overt act to substantiate its charge of 'seditious conspiracy' except the ridiculous assertion that a Union Defense Guard, or-

UAW Adopts Plan To Save Jobs

FLINT, Mich., Sept. 15, 1941 — The Chevrolet, Buick and Fisher Body locals in this center of the UAW, have launched a militant and vigorous campaign against the threat of priorities unemployment, and this week laid the groundwork for the mobilization of the auto workers around a fighting program which will give the lead to all workers in the automotive industry, and provide a solution for all CIO workers who are faced with similar problems.

Taking the program of the International Executive Board of the UAW as a starting point, the Flint locals have proposed to enlarge and expand that program towards a real solution. The UAW top committee in charge of the unemployment problem brought about by defense priorities has already reached an agreement with the Automobile Manufacturers Association to transfer UAW men on a preferred basis to defense plants on a seniority basis.

The Flint plan, as initiated in the Chevrolet local, and now fully endorsed by the Buick and Fisher Body locals, proposes first of all the setting up of rank and file committees representative of the various departments in each plant to mobilize the rank and file and lead the fight. In addition the Flint plan demands the

following:

1. All workers covered by UAW agreements shall be transferred to and have preference in defense industry on a seniority basis (already agreed to).

2. All UAW workers shall receive the same rate of pay on defense jobs to which they are transferred as they now receive in the auto plants.

3. In order to effect this program and avoid unemployment, and to AVOID THE NECESSITY OF GROUPS OF WORKERS LEAVING THEIR RESPECTIVE TOWNS to distant localities, the following supplementary points shall be instituted.

a. All production schedules in auto shall be compressed to be carried out in the first months of the year to the end that no mass-layoffs shall be

Trial Of 29 Defendants Set For October 20th

Demurrers Not Granted of SWP, 544-CIO Leaders

(Continued from page 1) ants. The charges in the indictment are made as a blanket indictment of all 29 defendants. This was done despite the accepted legal rule that persons must be apprised individually of the crimes with which they are charged, he continued.

"The vague and indefinite nature of the charges of the indictment against these defendants, the complete lack of any factual evidence as to the nature of the 'conspiracy' and the means by which it was to be carried out makes one question whether these defendants are being prosecuted for a criminal offense or persecuted for their opinion," Mr. Le Sueur said.

NO OVERT ACTS CITED

Albert Goldman, another attorney for the defense and himself one of the 29 indicted, continued the attack on the indictment. Taking up the paragraphs of the indictment one by one, he showed that the prosecutor had failed to include any overt acts by the defendants against the government nor even an allegation of fact as to the means by which the "conspiracy" to overthrow the government was to be effected.

He showed, in fact, from the charge in paragraph 3 of Count

"Said armed revolution would be brought about and joined in by the workers and laborers and farmers of the United

States, or as many of them as said defendants and their co-conspirators could procure and induce to engage therein" that here no crime was charged against the defendants but rather "against the workers and laborers and farmers of the United States."

In regard to Paragraph 10 of Count 1, dealing with the formation of Workers Defense Guards by Local 544, he pointed out that it was entirely proper and legal for a union to organize defense guards for its protection and that the prosecutor had falsely drawn the conclusion that these guards, in the words of the indictment, "were in truth and in fact, designed and intended to be used ultimately to overthrow, destroy, and put down by force the duly constituted, constitutional Government of the United States."

Reviewing the history of Section 6, Title 18 of the United States Code, which constitutes the basis for Count 1 of the indictment, Goldman showed that this law, passed in 1861, was directed at the armed counter-revolution of Southern slave-holders. This law, directed against Southern rebels who plotted directly and immediately against the United States Government, was never intended as a weapon against those who advocated revolutionary ideas, he maintained.

Inasmuch as no facts were alleged by the prosecutor as to a direct conspiracy to overthrow the Government, Count 1 of the indictment, based on an alleged violation of Section 6, should be stricken, Goldman argued.

Count 2 of the indictment, based on violation of the Smith Act of 1940, alleges advocacy of proposals to overthrow the Government by force and violence. "This Act is a clear violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution which states very definitely that 'Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances,'" Goldman asserted.

ACLU REPRESENTATIVE ATTACKS SMITH ACT

Vincent Johnson, representing the American Civil Liberties Union, continued the attack on the constitutionality of the Smith Act. Citing the 1900 cases of persecution for holding an unpopular opinion which occurred during the first World War, he said that unless the Smith Act were found unconstitutional there would be "a repetition of those tragic and terrible days of 1917-1920."

Concurring in the argument of the lawyers for the defense that the indictment was poorly drawn, vague, indefinite and lacking specific allegations of crime, the ACLU attorney asked that the indictment be squashed.

U. S. District Attorney Victor Anderson defended the indictment against the charges of the defense attorneys by denying their claim that a detailed recitation of facts is necessary in an indictment. "The Government will bring out in the trial all the facts which are necessary to prove that a 'seditious conspiracy' existed," he maintained.

He contended that the Smith Act was constitutional. "Legislatures have the right to protect the public from seditious utterances," he said. "Rights of free speech, etc., are qualified rights and must yield in matters involving the public interest," he went on to say.

GOLDMAN'S REBUTTAL

In the rebuttal, Goldman charged that the lack of factual evidence of crime in the indictment was itself evidence of a lack of any definite proof of crime against the defendants and demonstrated that the Government was motivated by a desire to serve AFL Teamsters Chief Tobin and the AFL in its fight against the CIO rather than to prosecute for seditious conspiracy. This conspiracy act has been on the books since 1861, he pointed out. "Why were no indictments issued before the leaders of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union went over to the CIO?" he asked.

In overruling the demurrers to the indictment by the defense attorneys, Judge Joyce said that the defense could not make too rigid demands on the prosecutor in the preparation of the indictment. He contended that the facts can be determined only by trial, and that although the indictment might have been more detailed, he regarded it as valid.

He upheld the constitutionality of the Smith Act by saying that "Government to preserve itself must abridge the right of free speech."

Further motions to be made by the defense — for a bill of particulars, for a separation of the cases, etc. — were ordered filed by September 23rd. A request of Goldman that three months be allowed for preparation was turned down and the trial was set for October 20th.

Gilbert Carlson and D. J. Shama, attorneys for the 16 defendants who are members of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union Local 544-CIO, associated themselves with the arguments of attorneys LeSueur, Goldman and Meyer, the attorneys for the other 13 defendants. They pointed out that the press of work necessary on the large number of indictments issued against leaders of 544-CIO by the state court had made it impossible for them to take part in the oral argument on the demurrers. This same press of work also made it desirable to have a three or four month delay in the "seditious conspiracy" trial, they argued. Their request likewise was turned down by Judge Joyce, however.

READ THE MILITANT EVERY WEEK—SUBSCRIBE!

RACIAL BIAS BARS YOUTH IN CHICAGO

Jews, Negroes and Italians Refused Jobs At New Buick Plant

CHICAGO, Ill., Sept. 2. — The only thing the government has done so far about discrimination against minority groups in industry was to set up a powerless board and issue a weak executive order requesting of industry that it act in a less obviously discriminatory manner. But the request of the government is not even being followed in the new factories being set up with government funds to produce war equipment.

A flagrant example of this policy of discrimination against Jews, Negroes and Italians took place here in Chicago on August 25. The executives of the Buick plant, now being built on the outskirts of Chicago to make airplane engines, frankly told the Negroes they were not wanted, and less frankly rejected 99% of all Jewish and Italian applicants without any statement.

Ten weeks ago a group of 1,000 students were drawn into the Illinois Institute of Technology (Armour and Lewis Institutes) division of the Engineer Defense Training program. They were promised that at the end of a stiff ten weeks' course they could all be expected to be rewarded with jobs at the Buick plant. During the ten weeks they were told again and again that there was room for everybody taking the course, and more, in this plant which was going to hire 10,000 workers.

PROMISES BROKEN

At the end of the course when the students were expecting jobs in return for the hard work they had put in, they found that everybody was being hired but the 3 Negroes, 12 Italians and 150 Jews. The only Jews hired were one friend of the school personnel director and three more who registered as Unitarian, Methodist and Assyrian.

When the students found this out, a storm of protest broke out. All those discriminated against got together. They had the whole-hearted sympathy of their fellow students to disprove the Buick argument that they were rejected only because the workers would not co-operate with Jews and Negroes. All the students met in the assembly to take up this problem.

The militant and bitter speeches of the students demanded immediate action. They sent a delegation to the CIO and to Jewish, Negro and Italian organizations. The CIO cooperated without

Training for Soviet Defense



Members of one of Moscow's self-defense squads, worker-detachments organized to aid in the defense of the Soviet Union's chief city, learn how to use gas masks in anticipation of the use of poison gas by the Nazis.

St. Paul Poll Goes Anti-War

State Fair Poll of Farmer-Labor Association Reveals Popular Opposition

ST. PAUL, Sept. 6. — The anti-war sentiments of the farmers and workers of Minnesota were emphasized this week through an opinion poll conducted by the Farmer-Labor Association at the State Fair. In reply to the question, "Do you agree with the Roosevelt-Willkie foreign policy?", 5,590 Fair visitors voted yes, 13,873 voted no.

These opinions were collected through ballots handed out to visitors on the most heavily traveled portion of the Fair grounds and reached a typical cross section of both city and country workers. Not only did they overwhelmingly repudiate the Roosevelt war program, but when asked

any reservations, by giving funds, press releases and much needed advice. They protested to the OPM Fair Employment Practices Committee and have demanded a local OPM investigation.

ONLY THE CIO ACTED

So far a week has elapsed and nothing has been done by the government. The interventionist Jewish press has ignored the story as it might embarrass the warmongers. The Negro press has so far been silent too, making the mistake of looking upon it as a Jewish question.

Thus far only the CIO has come through with more than empty words of sympathy.

The experience has shown many young workers that the only force really willing to fight discrimination is the union movement. It has also started a lot of them thinking about what this so-called war for democracy really is.

N. Y. Campaign Committee Asks Day's Pay Donations

The petition campaign is coming to a close. The Socialist Workers Party, Local New York, has already accomplished the gratifying feat of collecting 13,000 signatures from New York workers. The Party is geared for a final spurt that will take us over the 15,000 mark by Sept. 27th. On that day the more positive side of our campaign will get under way.

At the same time that our legal staff is preparing to meet any challenge to our petitions, we are concluding organizational preparations for the biggest propaganda campaign in our history. Among the things we are ordering is a sound truck, hundreds of thousand of leaflets in two

colors (the first was issued this week), new and more modern types of street platforms and a special tabloid edition of the MILITANT. These propaganda weapons will start us off.

But this means money and lots of it. That's why we've started our Campaign Fund and ask every friend of the party to contribute a day's wage before October 1st.

Are you going to do your part? Will you help us spread the voice of working class opposition to war?

Send your money immediately to Robert Chester, Chairman, Cannon Campaign Committee, 116 University Place, New York City.



Write to us—tell us what's going on in your part of the labor movement—what are the workers thinking about—tell us what the bosses are up to—and the G-men and the local cops—and the Stalinists—send us that story the capitalist press didn't print and that story they buried or distorted—our pages are open to you. Letters must carry name and address, but indicate if you do not want your name printed.

Walgreen Porters Strike Weakened by Craft Set-up

DEAR EDITOR:

For two weeks a small but militant band of colored porters have been on strike and picketing before the Chicago Walgreen Drug Stores. Strike literature tells of 60 long hours of work for \$18 a week. Rapidly rising food costs have made this wage completely unacceptable to these men who have known for a long time only long hours and low pay. Today they are demanding a minimum of \$24.75 for a 48 hour week.

Unfortunately, this group of porters, solid and militant as they are within their own local union (Drug Store Porters Union, Local No. 132) are isolated by the craft nature of the AFL from the other employees in Walgreen's.

Many of the crafts in past years have struck Walgreen's and made only small gains. The warehousemen, the retail clerks, the window trimmers, each in turn have fought this labor-hating management and each in turn have been dealt with. As a result it has been easy for Walgreen's management to play one craft off against another. When one craft struck, it was possible for Walgreen to keep his stores open by substituting strike-breakers. Mayor Kelly's police have always been ready to restrict strike activity for

the Walgreen family.

This appears to be happening again. And yet the strikers are carrying on. So bad are their wages, so big are the profits of boss Walgreen that they may yet win some concessions. They have appealed to Roosevelt and Steelman's conciliation service has been brought into the picture.

Negotiations with the management are being conducted by rank-and-file leaders, Milton B. Olive, chairman of the strike committee, Booker Adams, president and Odell Anderson, secretary treasurer. Milton Webster, international vice-president of the Sleeping Car Porters, AFL, has also given valuable assistance in negotiations.

The strike leaders are doing a good job of publicity and learning how to direct victories for labor. They will learn, as they go farther, that to win real worthwhile gains it is best to organize the union on a basis as inclusive as the jurisdiction of the boss they are fighting. And that to combat the forces such as Mayor Kelly's machine which is used by the bosses against labor, it is necessary to turn toward independent political action by labor, toward the formation of an independent labor party.

Meanwhile this strike deserves the support of every worker and every union in Chicago.

H. S.



The press of the Socialist Workers Party is certain to play the most important role in acquainting the workers of the United States with the issues involved in the frame-up of the twenty-nine political and trade union defendants who will go to trial in St. Paul in a month.

The task of reaching constantly larger circles of working class readers is taken seriously by all of our comrades. City after city writes in to seek advice and assistance of the MILITANT staff in penetrating new sections of the population. Detroit, for example, recently almost doubled its circulation of the paper; Youngstown increased the size of its bundle; Buffalo is clearing its path for an extension of its work.

The value of the paper in the education of organized workers is to be seen in dramatic clarity by the report sent us from our comrades in Minneapolis: "The Minneapolis Central Labor Union (AFL) had its regular semi-monthly meeting the evening of September 3rd. As usual our comrades and friends were outside the hall selling the MILITANT.

"That issue of the paper had the story about the pending purge of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union by the AFL committee headed by Matthew Woll.

"Inside the hall more delegates were absorbed in reading about

the AFL 'purge' in the MILITANT than were listening to the meeting. Finally one delegate rose and asked what the organization was going to do about the Woll committee.

"This precipitated a lengthy debate, with several delegates defending themselves against the AFL executive committee charges. It was well understood that Tobin was behind this latest move, he and his agents having beefed about the refusal of the AFL unions here to join in trying to smash Local 544-CIO.

"The MILITANT gained many new readers as a result of its story on the pending 'purge' and added respect from its old readers."

Buy the MILITANT IN MINNEAPOLIS at:
Shinders News Co., 6th St. & Hennepin Av.
Morris Kroman, 4th St. & Nicollet Av.
Pioneer News Co., 238 Second Av., South
A. Peterson News Stand, Washington Av. & B'way N.
Labor Book store, 919 Marquette Av.

The MILITANT and The FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in conjunction with PIONEER PUBLISHERS announce an EXTRAORDINARY SUBSCRIPTION OFFER to run from Sept. 1 until Nov. 7, 1941! One pamphlet or book will be given free with each subscription either to the MILITANT or to the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL: For each 6-month subscription of \$1.00 one of the following:

- War and the Fourth International.....(10¢)
- In Defense of the Soviet Union.....(10¢)
- Stalinism and Bolshevism.....(10¢)
- Leon Sedov.....(10¢)

For each 1-year subscription of \$2.00 one of the following:

- The Case of Leon Trotsky (paper).....(75¢)
- Lessons of October (paper).....(50¢)
- Whither France (paper).....(50¢)
- From Lenin to Stalin.....(50¢)

For each 1-year combination subscription of \$3.00 one of the following:

- World Revolution 1917-1936.....(\$2.75)
- Russia Twenty Years After.....(\$1.50)
- The Third International After Lenin.....(\$1.25)

*List prices for the publications.

Mail your subscription money and the name of the pamphlet or book you wish to: THE MILITANT, 116 University Place, New York City

UAW Locals Adopt Plan

(Continued from page 1) Pratt and Whitney engines be brought to Flint where there is ample space and ample labor to do the job.

d. A public works program shall be instituted for the purpose of training men in defense industry jobs in line with the previous agreement of the Buffalo plan. This program will take care of those men who are forced to wait for jobs and face unemployment prior to transfer to defense jobs. These men shall be paid a minimum of \$25 a week and shall at the same time not be deprived of state unemployment benefits.

e. The UAW shall use all its economic and legislative strength to see that this program is put into effect.

The above program has swept like a prairie fire through the plants in Flint. It has aroused enthusiasm, and given hope to the 20,000 men who face priorities unemployment here. The rank and file committees elected to work with the Regional committees of the UAW, are already in the process of formation, and are working out concrete steps to be taken to carry out the program. A press release was issued on the program, printed prominently in the local papers. The General Motors Corporation is holding

an exhibit of its military work, and C. E. Wilson, GM President is in Flint.

Upon seeing the union program, and feeling the pressure of the aroused workers who face unemployment because of the failure of the corporation to plan a program of production to take care of the workers and because of GM's plan to take its defense work to Chicago where cheap labor is available. Wilson made a press statement that 50% of the Pratt and Whitney work would be brought to Flint.

The fact that Wilson made this statement means little as far as practical questions are concerned. He didn't say when. But it reveals that he and the GM corporation are already beginning to bend under the pressure of the Flint workers.

The leading militants in Flint who proposed the union program, have proposed that a huge publicity campaign be carried out on the priorities unemployment question with public hearings to be arranged in cooperation with the city administration, who are very concerned that Flint may become a ghost town as a result of the unemployment crisis.

Union officials estimate that in the next three to four months 250,000 auto workers will be

thrown out of jobs as a result of priorities choking off steel and aluminum supplies to civilian production. In Flint 20,000 workers at least face a winter of unemployment, relief, hunger. This problem was known to be threatening for some months. The union leadership hoped that some miracle would intervene to prevent the crisis, and now that the problem is upon them, they have taken the first steps. But the aroused rank and file will push the leadership to take far more effective action than they have thus far planned.

It is a well known fact that General Motors has been planning to decentralize its defense work, to build the defense plants in open shop out-of-the-way localities. This would undermine the UAW and at the same time assure the corporation of huge profits.

The Flint workers, however, will not allow this plot to be put over on them.

The locals are preparing to formally present the program in the form of demands to the corporation. Depending on what the corporation replies, the union will take the steps necessary to defend and protect the interests, the jobs, and the living standards of its members.

Biddle's New Pretext For Prosecuting Us

Biddle Finally Chooses Basis For Frameup

By FELIX MORROW

The American Civil Liberties Union has just released to the press the texts of a letter to Attorney-General Biddle, and his reply. We publish these texts below.

The letter of the American Civil Liberties Union is an annihilating indictment of the Department of Justice's "case" against the Socialist Workers Party and Local 544-CIO. As our readers know, the ACLU is an extremely cautious body of middle class liberals, whose attitude toward defense of the democratic rights of the working class has often been none too bold. Before it will defend a workers' organization against prosecution, the ACLU makes a long and exhaustive investigation. There have been not a few cases in which the ACLU has come to the conclusion that prosecution for labor activity is not a violation of civil liberties. All the more impressive in this case, therefore, are the conclusions of the ACLU:

1. That the prosecution is clearly one against our opinions, and therefore violates the Bill of Rights which guarantees free speech.

2. That the one "overt act" charged, the formation of the Union Defense Guard by Local 544, was a legitimate union activity.

3. That "it is reasonable to conclude" that the prosecution "arose from the President's reaction to Mr. Tobin's request" of June 13 to Roosevelt for government aid against Local 544-CIO.

These conclusions of the ACLU will be of great value in securing a wide public hearing to our side of the case.

The ACLU letter has also served to draw from Biddle an indication of how he plans to conduct his frameup against the SWP. Biddle's letter shows that he has finally decided that his best move is to use the Union Defense Guard of Local 544 as the basis for his frameup.

I say "finally," because the fact is that the Roosevelt administration has been thrashing around, seeking the most plausible basis for the frameup against us, ever since its June 27, 1941 raids on the Minneapolis and St. Paul headquarters of the SWP.

In his letter Biddle says that "the investigation of the case began early in 1940." He dare not be more specific in claiming that the "investigation" began prior to AFL teamster chief Tobin's appeal of June 13 to Roosevelt for aid against Local 544, which on June 9 had disaffiliated from the AFL and accepted a charter from the CIO. Undoubtedly for many months prior to that the Department of Justice had been collecting material for eventual use against all anti-war organizations and militant unionists. But it is easily demonstrable that the Department of Justice began to proceed against the SWP and Local 544-CIO three months ago, in response to Tobin's call for aid, without any idea of what the government's specific case was going to be. Here are the facts.

The Government's Previous Frameup Lines

On June 27, the day that agents of the Department of Justice raided the SWP offices in Minneapolis and St. Paul. TWO "crimes" were attributed to the SWP by Department of Justice officials, neither of which appeared in the July 15 indictment and neither of which are now referred to by Biddle's letter:

1. Henry Schweinhaut, Assistant U. S. Attorney-General, who was in Minneapolis to conduct the raids, informed the press that it was his understanding that the case against the SWP would be based on the Voorhis Act which requires registration with the Attorney-General's office by any foreign-controlled organization or one which advocates violent overthrow of the government. Here is what he told the press at that time:

"Henry Schweinhaut, assistant U. S. attorney general, said the procedure would be based on a new law making it mandatory for all organizations, foreign-controlled, or advocating overthrow of the government by force, to register with the attorney general's office.

"The Socialist Workers' party has not complied with this, it was declared, and efforts will be made to show it falls within that category." (Minneapolis Times, June 28, 1941).

2. While Schweinhaut was making this statement in Minneapolis, in Washington Attorney-General Francis Biddle was making a very different kind of a charge. As soon as he had been notified of the carrying out of the raids in Minneapolis and St. Paul, Biddle issued a written statement at 6 P. M., Friday, June 27, which is quoted by the press as follows:

"This prosecution is brought under the criminal code of the United States against persons who have been engaged in criminal seditious activities, and who are leaders of the Socialist Workers Party, and have gained control of a legitimate labor union in order to use it for illegitimate purposes."

"Principal basis of the action, the justice department announced, is found in a Declaration of Principles adopted by the Socialist Workers party at its foundation convention, held in January, 1938.

"The pertinent phrases in this declaration were given by the Acting Attorney-General Biddle as follows:

"If, in spite of the efforts of the revolutionists and the militant workers, the U. S. government enters a new war, the SWP will not, under any circumstances, support that war but will, on the contrary, fight against it." (Minneapolis Star Journal, June 28).

Thus, on June 27, Assistant Attorney-General Schweinhaut was saying we were going to be prosecuted under the Voorhis Act, while Acting Attorney-General Biddle was saying that we were going to be prosecuted under the Smith Act for our anti-war program and for our alleged "illegitimate use" of Local 544 for our anti-war program. Roosevelt's subordinates were in such indecent haste to carry out his promise of aid to Tobin that they didn't even have one story in common!

The first government mention of the Union Defense Guard

of Local 544 came in the indictment drawn up by the Department of Justice and handed down by the Federal Grand Jury on July 15; and there the Union Defense Guard was but one of many things mentioned.

Now, from Biddle's letter, it is clear that Biddle is thinking of concentrating his entire case around the Union Defense Guard.

The government, in other words, went on a fishing expedition and has finally turned up with what it considers its best case.

From this account it is clear how correct the American Civil Liberties Union is when it charges, in its letter to Biddle, that the case "arose from the President's reaction to Mr. Tobin's request" and that it "seems more reasonable to conclude that the government injected itself into an inter-union controversy in order to promote the interests of the one side which supported the administration's foreign and domestic policies."

The government's decision to abandon the use of the Voorhis Act against us undoubtedly was taken with the realization that it would be extremely difficult to make out a case against us under this act. It would be easy for us to prove that Congress voted for this act on the understanding that it applied only to organizations like the Nazi and Communist parties.

Even more obvious is the reason why Biddle no longer repeats his June 27 attack on our anti-war program. It was a blunder for him to make that statement then. In the face of the growing anti-war sentiment in this country, the government could scarcely find a more unpopular issue on which to prosecute us than our anti-war program.

And so, by a process of elimination, Biddle now resorts to the question of the Union Defense Guard. It is not a very good issue, as we can easily demonstrate. But Biddle has nothing better and does as much as he can with the materials at his disposal.

He dare not explicitly rest his case against us on our ideas. It is a settled principle of democracy that no one shall be prosecuted for his ideas. This principle has, of course, been systematically violated by the bourgeois "democrats." But the Roosevelt administration must pretend not to be violating this principle at a time when it is claiming to be conducting a war for democracy. Hence Biddle's letter implicitly concedes to the ACLU that we must not be prosecuted for our opinions and seizes upon the "overt act" of the formation of the Union Defense Guard.

Ignoring the actual purposes for which the Union Defense

Guard of Local 544 was formed, Biddle calls it "arming workers to carry out the purpose to which the utterances (of the SWP) are addressed." Here is the syllogism which Biddle thereby constructs:

The SWP works for revolution;
The SWP members initiated the formation of the Union Defense Guard;
Therefore, the Union Defense Guard works for the revolution.

The fallacy of which Biddle is guilty in this syllogism is one known to every sophomore in the beginning class in logic. Its name in the logic textbooks is "the fallacy of the undistributed middle." That is, there is an illegitimate identification between the SWP and the Union Defense Guard, as if they were one and the same thing.

This fallacy is scarcely a "mistake" by Biddle. He knows very well what he is doing. But he needs that illegitimate identification for the purposes of his frameup.

The Union Defense Guard of Local 544 was organized in August, 1938 for the specific purpose of combating the fascist Silver Shirts of the Twin Cities who were then openly threatening to attack the union headquarters of Local 544. Roy Zachary, National Silver Shirt Organizer, came to Minneapolis and in Silver Shirt meetings on July 29 and August 2 he openly called for fascist gangster bands to raid the teamster hall. These are matters of record which will be easily established at the trial.

At the height of the organization of the struggle against the Silver Shirts, the Union Defense Guard numbered about 500 members. The workers of the Guard knew just what they were organizing for. Yet Biddle now asserts that, presumably without the knowledge of the members of the Union Defense Guard, they were really serving a conspiracy to overthrow the government. Biddle's logic is on the same level as that of the Nazis, who outlaw unions because they are led by "Marxists," on the grounds that the unions are really subversive organizations.

The show of strength of the Union Defense Guard during August-December, 1938 drove the Silver Shirts into hiding and eventual dissolution, whereupon the activities of the Union Defense Guard were confined to social functions and acting as ushers at the union's picnics and affairs. The name "Union Defense Guard" was continued as insurance against new anti-labor gangs arising.

In this change in the functions of the Union Defense Guard

after the Silver Shirts folded up, is expressed the fact that the Guard's original purpose was to combat the fascist gangs.

All this will be established conclusively at the trial. All this is well enough known to Biddle and the other figures in the Roosevelt administration who are directly in charge of the prosecution against us. But it does not serve their purpose to stick to the facts. On the contrary they must at all costs distort the facts in order to railroad the 29 defendants to prison.

What The Government's Real Purpose Is

The real assumption on which Biddle is acting, and which he no doubt holds quite sincerely, is that it is "illegitimate" for members of a workers' party to play the leading role in a trade union. For a member of the Democratic National Committee like Tobin to rule a union; for a Republican National Committee member like Hutchinson to rule the carpenters; this is legitimate to Biddle. But for members of a workers' party to win the confidence of the members of a union — that is a crime. In short, the trade union movement is "legitimate" for the bourgeois "democrats" only when the unions are under the control of the agents of the bourgeoisie. So long as the agents of the Republican and Democratic parties are in control, the Roosevelt administration can be assured of subordinating the trade unions to Roosevelt's war program. But when the unions will be under the influence of a leadership which is independent of the bourgeois parties, then Roosevelt's war program will be in jeopardy.

Such is the real logic which is motivating the Roosevelt administration in this prosecution. And, from the point of view of perpetuation of the capitalist class, their logic is absolutely correct. A hundred unions like Local 544, under the leadership of men independent of the bourgeois parties, under the leadership of men irreconcilably opposed to Roosevelt's imperialist war, would be a serious obstacle to the war-mongers. As a preventive measure, to nip in the bud such a revolutionary development, this prosecution is undertaken against us.

But of course the Roosevelt administration dare not reveal the real logic of its case against us. It could not hope to railroad us to jail if the labor movement of this country understood why the government wants us in jail. Hence Biddle must resort to this fake logic of identifying the Union Defense Guard and the SWP. Hence he must cover up his original blunder of referring to our anti-war program as our crime. In short, he cannot conveniently put us into jail for our real opinions and activities. He must put us in jail under other pretexts. He must, therefore, organize a frameup against us.

ACLU Asks That Prosecution Be Dropped

Civil Liberties Union Tells Biddle Why It Opposes The St. Paul Indictments

(Below is printed the full text of the letter sent by the American Civil Liberties Union to the Attorney-General explaining why the ACLU believes the prosecution against the 29 defendants of the SWP and Local 544-CIO should be dismissed).
August 20, 1941.

Hon. Francis Biddle,
Acting Attorney-General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Attorney-General:

The indictment of twenty-nine persons in Minneapolis, allegedly members of the Socialist Workers Party, raises important issues of civil liberties. The indictments charge a conspiracy to (1) overthrow the United States government by force and violence; (2) spread disaffection among the armed forces; (3) engage in private military training with arms for the purpose of overthrowing the government.

All of the charges in the indictment except one deal with utterances or publications whose intent is construed to constitute the offenses. The only overt act charged is the formation of a workers defense corps by members of the Teamsters Union in Minneapolis in 1938.

The American Civil Liberties Union has examined the character of the evidence on which the indictment rests and has come to these conclusions:

1. That the charges clearly raise issues of civil liberties in attacking utterances or publications in the absence of any overt acts or even of any "clear and present dangers" with the sole exception of the charge concerning the organization of the workers defense corps.

2. That the facts in regard to the workers

defense corps show that there was no intent of the Teamsters Union, which was admittedly under the leadership of members of the Socialist Workers Party, to do more than protect union property against threats of vigilante violence. Its activities were entirely public and covered only the few months when apprehension of attack was acute.

3. That the indictments rest upon two new statutes not previously applied, both of them having been incorporated in the Alien Registration Act of 1940 — one of them penalizing advocacy of the overthrow of government by force, and the other incitement of disaffection in the armed forces. In our judgment both statutes violate the First Amendment of the Constitution; and even if upheld could not be applied to this set of facts under the "clear and present danger" rule.

In the light of these considerations it is obviously mandatory on the Civil Liberties Union to engage in the defense with a view to testing in the Supreme Court, if necessary, the constitutionality of the laws and their application to this set of facts.

But quite aside from the legal questions, we desire to call the government's attention to a series of circumstances which appear to indicate a gross impropriety on the part of government officials in securing the indictment.

It appears that on June 13 Daniel Tobin, president of the International Teamsters Union, telegraphed the President from Indianapolis appealing for federal action against the Truck Drivers Union, Local 544 in Minneapolis, sixteen of whose members are included in the indictment. Mr. Tobin's action followed a long controversy with the local, in part resting upon the union's dis-

agreement with Mr. Tobin as to national policy in relation to the war. Mr. Tobin supported the President, and the local opposed the administration's foreign policies. This led to a request by Mr. Tobin for the appointment of a representative to take over the local's affairs with power to expel any member. Naturally the local rejected it. The result was that on June 9 the 4,000 members of the union, by an almost unanimous vote, decided to disaffiliate from the Teamsters Union and to join the CIO.

Mr. Tobin's telegram said in part: "The withdrawal from the International Union by the truck-drivers union, Local 544 and one other small union in Minneapolis, and their affiliations with the CIO is indeed a regrettable and dangerous condition. The officers of this local union... were requested to disassociate themselves from the radical Trotsky organization... we feel that while our country is in dangerous position, those disturbers who believe in the policies of foreign, radical governments, must be in some way prevented from pursuing this dangerous course..."

Stephen Early, the President's secretary, immediately issued the following statement from the White House: "Mr. Tobin telegraphed from Indianapolis that it is apparent to him and to the other executives of his organization that because they have been and will continue to stand squarely behind the government, all subversive organizations and all enemies of our government, including Bundists, Trotskyists and Stalinists are opposed to them and seeking to destroy loyal trade unions which are supporting democracy."

"Mr. Tobin goes into considerable detail and states that he is going to issue a statement from the Indianapolis office of the teamsters union. When I advised the President of Tobin's representations this morning, he asked me to immediately have the Government departments and agencies interested in this matter notified, and to point out that this is no time, in his opinion, for

labor unions, local or national, to begin raiding one another for the purpose of getting memberships or for similar reasons."

It is reasonable to conclude that the action thereafter taken by the government arose from the President's reaction to Mr. Tobin's request. The government's attitude was expressed in a statement from the Attorney-General's office to the effect that "the principal Socialist Workers Party leaders, against whom prosecution is being brought, are also leaders of Local 544-CIO in Minneapolis... who have been engaged in criminal seditious activities... and have gained control of a legitimate labor union to use it for illegitimate purposes."

It may be argued that Mr. Tobin merely called the government's attention to a situation which in itself warranted federal action. But it seems more reasonable to conclude that the government injected itself into an inter-union controversy in order to promote the interests of the one side which supported the administration's foreign and domestic policies. In our judgment, this is a highly improper use of the criminal law. Our conclusion is reinforced by the fact that it has been a matter of common knowledge for some years that the Socialist Workers Party, an insignificant little group of extremists, has been strongly represented in the Minneapolis labor movement — alone in any city in the country. Nothing charged in the indictment is of recent origin. The situation in Minneapolis is no different now from that obtaining over the past five or ten years.

In the light of these facts, we urge a reconsideration by the Department of Justice of this prosecution with a view to its dismissal.

Signed by:

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
Chairman of the Board
ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYES
General Counsel
ROGER BALDWIN
Director.

Biddle's Answer To The Civil Liberties Union

(The following is the complete text of the reply of Attorney-General Biddle to the August 20, 1941 letter sent him by the American Civil Liberties Union).

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Washington, D. C.

Sept. 4, 1941.

Dear Mr. Hayes:

Careful consideration has been given to the letter of August 20, 1941, signed by Dr. Holmes, Chairman of the Board of the American Civil Liberties Union, by Roger Baldwin as Director, and by yourself as General Counsel. The letter protests against the Government's action in prosecuting 29 persons in Minneapolis, allegedly members of the Socialist Workers Party.

You state from your examination of the "character of the evidence on which the indictment rests" that the charges attack utterances or publications,

and include only one overt act — the organization of the workers in a defense corps. This overt act, however, — arming workers to carry out the purpose to which the utterances are addressed — is clearly sufficient to remove the case from one involving expression of opinion, even if the utterances went no further than that, which they do. You suggest that the facts show the intent was merely to protect union property against threats of violence. But the indictment specifically alleges otherwise, and I am confident that it will be supported in the evidence. You conclude that the statutes under which the indictments are brought will be held unconstitutional. I do not agree; but in any event such a doubt should not deter this office from taking action on facts coming under the scope of the statutes. The Courts will determine the question of constitutionality.

You state that the Civil Liberties Union will engage in defense of the case with a view of testing the constitutionality of the laws and their application to the set of facts. I am delighted to hear that. You add that a series of circumstances suggests the conclusion "that the government injected itself into an inter-union controversy in order to promote the interests of one side which supported the administration's foreign and domestic policies." That conclusion is completely unwarranted. The investigation of the case began early in 1940; and had continued without interruption ever since. The prosecution came in due course; it was not requested by anyone in or out of the government, or undertaken for the benefit of any person or group. You are at liberty to make this letter public if you wish to.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) FRANCIS BIDDLE
Acting Attorney-General.

HELP FIGHT THE INDICTMENTS

29 people—members of the Socialist Workers Party and the leaders of Motor Transport and Allied Workers Industrial Union, Local 544-CIO have been indicted in Minnesota on charges of "conspiring to overthrow the government."

This sweeping attack upon civil liberties and labor's rights must be repelled! The job of defending the victims of this prosecution is up to the workers themselves. Roosevelt's administration isn't subsidizing this defense project.

Aid the defendants by giving promptly and generously to their Defense Fund.

SEND YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE
Room 809, 160 Fifth Ave., New York City
I enclose..... for your Defense Fund
Name
Address

The Government prosecution has been condemned by the
CIO
LABOR'S NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE
UNITED AUTO WORKERS
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
NATION
NEW REPUBLIC
and other labor and liberal spokesmen

For the truth about how Negroes are treated by the Jim Crow Officer caste,
READ
'The Negro and the U. S. Army'
By EUGENE VARLIN
29 page pamphlet . . . 5c
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place New York, N. Y.
Also obtainable through all Branch literature agents of the Socialist Workers Party.

'Priorities Unemployment' -- Menace To Labor

Millions Of Workers Hit In Steel, Auto, Rubber, Silk

Priorities unemployment is the latest serious threat to the security of the American workers. Some two to three million workers are facing the ominous prospect of being thrown out of jobs in the next few months; hundreds of thousands already have been reduced to 2 or 3 days employment per week.

No less than 250,000 auto workers' jobs are to be sacrificed to the greed of the big monopolies, as plans for the curtailment of auto production now call for the reduction of auto output in 1942 by a minimum of fifty percent, with no alternative production being offered to maintain employment.

Priorities restrictions threaten to produce whole new "ghost towns." Productions of radio, refrigerator and other electrical home appliances is to be drastically curtailed. Priorities unemployment was the major problem confronting the United Radio, Electrical and Machine Workers (CIQ) convention two weeks ago.

It is estimated that some 150,000 silk textile workers will be out of jobs shortly; many are already on part time work. All up and down the line of the consumers goods industries, it is the same story.

This new type of unemployment — at a time when production has reached peaks never before attained in American history — is the result of the war-time dislocation of production, a dislocation deliberately induced by the big monopoly corporations.

These monopolies, aided and abetted by the Roosevelt administration, have fought every attempt to expand production facilities or increase supplies of raw materials.

The OPM, acting through U. S. Steel's Stettinius, worked hand in glove with the Aluminum Corporation of America to prevent the expansion of aluminum production facilities, in order to permit ALCOA to maintain its monopoly prices and keep competitive firms from invading the domain of ALCOA's absolute monopoly.

Roosevelt himself endorsed the Dunne report on steel capacity which gave the completely false impression that there was sufficient capacity for steel production to meet both war and civilian needs. On September 11, the OPM finally announced plans to expand steel capacity by 20 per cent. The New York Times, September 12, reports, however, that "some defense officials... doubt that any expansion... will be authorized unless all of the steel required for this increase in capacity is taken from civilian supplies."

Just as in aluminum and steel, the OPM put forth completely false reports on the available rubber supply. Today the shortage of crude rubber threatens a major crisis in the production not only of civilian goods but of tanks and other military supplies. But synthetic rubber, superior and cheaper than the natural product, can fully replace crude rubber. But there's the rub.

The big rubber corporations, like Goodyear, Goodrich and Firestone, have huge investments in rubber plantations in the Far East, which they don't intend to give up. Moreover, synthetic rubber would knock down the prices considerably. Thus, the rubber monopolies resist all efforts to expand into synthetic rubber production; and the government, through the OPM, defends these monopolies.

Here, then, is the reason why millions of American workers are being threatened with loss of their jobs. "Defense" to the ruling class means defense of their monopoly interests first and foremost. And that is what it means to the Roosevelt administration which has put the monopolies in complete control of the war production program.

Unions Offer Own Plans For Handling 'Priorities'

By C. CHARLES

Alarmed by the obvious capitalist mismanagement of industrial production, various unions have endorsed plans to do away with priorities unemployment.

The plans aim to increase production in their respective industries or propose a method of shifting workers from civilian to military production without any loss of employment.

Every one of the plans so far proposed is based on the formation of a government-management-labor council in each industry.

The "CIO Plan for Strengthening the National Defense Program" was the first plan presented. It was drawn up in December, 1940, by Philip Murray, chairman of the CIO.

THE MURRAY PLAN

According to this plan, the labor-management-government council would:

1. Ascertain the military and non-military "requirements" of each respective industry to coordinate the production of each industry to meet these requirements speedily and accurately and to expand production facilities where they are inadequate...

2. Reemploy unemployed workers in each respective industry and in the communities and regions in which the industry operates as quickly as the accelerated pace of the industry permits, fill the labor requirements of the industry from the available supply and train workers for those occupations in which the council finds a shortage.

3. Achieve the greatest possible output as quickly as possible by bringing into full use all the production facilities in each respective industry. This covers the granting and re-allocating of armament contracts, fulfilling in advance known do-

estic requirements so as to clear the way for the peak in armament production and eliminating bottlenecks created by one concern having a disproportionate amount for armament contracts that it can not complete within the necessary limit of time, and other bottlenecks caused by contractual or technical factors.

Murray also presented a specific plan along these lines for the steel industry.

THE REUTHER PLAN

Another plan is that of Walter Reuther, a member of the executive board of the United Auto Workers (CIO), and one of the supporters of Hillman.

Reuther in his plan proposed to alleviate the intensely seasonal character of auto work and avoid mass layoffs when the steel would be rationed for the auto industry. He hoped to achieve this by producing 500 planes daily within the present auto plants and machinery. The auto workers would man the defense plants.

The Reuther plan consists essentially of the following ideas:

1. That a survey of the automotive industry around Detroit be made to show the plant and machine capacity was available

Auto Workers Discuss Priorities Problems

UAW Members Ask Equal Voice in Making Decisions, Seniority And Same Rate of Pay

By JOE ANDREWS

FLINT, Sept. 8.—Overshadowing all other immediate problems of the auto workers is the menace of priorities unemployment because of curtailed auto production due to shortages of steel, aluminum and other raw materials.

The magazine *Business Week*, August 30, reports: "Supplies (for automotive production) are generally considered adequate for the next 8 weeks; after that the big reductions and the big lay-offs are expected. Just what the labor toll will be is hard to estimate—between 90,000 and 200,000 men may be laid off."

This is a low estimate. The actual official figure for the reduction of auto production in 1942 is a minimum of 51 percent. *Fortune* magazine, August 1941, states that "Steel, the product that symbolizes American industry is already short and will become increasingly acute in 1942. Only half a year's supply of rubber, chromite, wool and tin (are available)."

This means that General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, and all the auto and parts manufacturers will lay off at least 50 per cent of their workers.

The auto manufacturers knew all about these shortages in steel, aluminum, etc. For instance Ford, General Motors and the others had eliminated the use of aluminum as much as possible because of the high prices demanded by the Aluminum Corporation's monopoly. General Motors at one time entirely abandoned the use of aluminum because of "Alcoa's arbitrary increase in the price." The Studebaker Corporation did likewise because there was only "one domestic source."

Nevertheless, Knudsen of General Motors, and the other dollar-a-year men representing the auto corporations on the OPM, did their level best to hide the true situation on steel and aluminum. While they had fought ALCOA, and similar monopolies, for their own interests, when it came to publicly exposing these monopolies, Knudsen and the rest protected their class.

The automobile corporations were fully aware of the problem they were facing in keeping auto production going. Nevertheless, they did not expand into the war industries as rapidly as they would have the public believe, although such expansion is essential in order to take up the slack in employments when priorities in steel, etc., auto production.

The auto barons deliberately refrained from converting their plants to war production. The large full page ads of General Motors on what it is sacrificing for "defense" are misleading. In reality, GM and Chrysler are in the "business as usual" caucus in Washington. The profits on automobiles are high. They are sure the market this year will be big.

Therefore, these corporations have expanded into war production only to the extent that the government, through its amortization plan, pays for the building of new plants and new machines, which involves no financial risk for the corporations.

Thus, the new plants, such as the Chrysler tank plant, the Buick plant to assemble Pratt and Whitney engines in Chicago, do not cost the corporations a penny, but they nevertheless operate them and get a guaranteed profit on all production.

The auto corporations wanted to continue to reap the high profits on autos. They do not want to convert their existing plants, to risk re-tooling and other costs, because they know that such investments are profitable only for the duration of the war. They fear the war might not last long enough.

As a result of this fear of the risk involved in converting the plants, there are some 250,000 auto workers, who cannot "do business as usual", facing the dreary prospect of walking the streets for new jobs in Detroit, Flint and other auto centers.

The corporations will suffer little by the priorities on steel, etc. They will still make a handsome profit through the sale, though curtailed, of 1942 automobiles, and the balance of profit will be made up by war orders produced in government paid-for plants.

These new plants are being built in out-of-the-way open shop towns and will be operated by young high school kids, non-union, who will be willing to work for non-union wages. The regular union auto-workers will be forced to wander from town to town looking for jobs.

With only a few weeks to go before the mass layoffs begin in auto, the United Automobile Workers, CIO, has belatedly begun a campaign to find a solution. A committee has been set up by the International Executive Board to negotiate with the corporations and with the governmental agencies. The program of this committee is mainly two points: a demand that more war orders be sent into Detroit and Flint, and a demand that auto workers be transferred on a preferred basis to these defense jobs, with seniority.

But the fact that unemployment is such an immediate threat has resulted in an awakening of the rank-and-file and there is considerable agitation among the International Board not far from union militants, who feel that not only does the program of the enough, but that the methods used, lobbying in Washington, and the like, are not sufficient.

The Chevrolet local in Flint, for example, has set up a committee representative of the various plants to take action on this problem. In a resolution calling for the formation of this committee, it was stated, "in the past it has been proven that satisfac-

(Continued on Page 6)

Greed of Monopolies Sows Widespread Industrial Chaos

Why is there unemployment in the midst of the biggest boom? Why do the monopolies, the "leaders of industry," run their business in such a way that unemployment results even when production is expanding?

The current wave of priorities unemployment, which is caused by the lack of steel, aluminum and other materials, is a direct result of the attempts of the big corporations, acting through the government war agencies, to ensure themselves huge war profits, at the least risk and to maintain their monopolistic stranglehold on American industry.

While Roosevelt, the OPM and the employers bemoan the "costly" strikes and carry through a campaign of union repression under the slogan of "equal sacrifice," the steel, aluminum, auto, and other trusts, working through their dollar-a-year agents in Washington, have fostered so much chaos in the war production program that millions of workers, particularly in the consumers goods industries, are faced with terrible suffering in the next few months.

In describing the "confusion" of the war machine in Washington, *Fortune* magazine, August 1941, states:

"It is now obvious that expansion of productive facilities for steel, electricity, aluminum and other essentials should have been undertaken as soon as the defense emergency was realized. But the advisers closest to the OPM... reflected the fear of their several industries that the creation of vast new plant capacity would present a THREAT OF POST WAR COMPETITION" (our emphasis).

Thus, the Aluminum Corporation of America, U. S. Steel, General Motors, resisted every effort to secure the erection either of government plants or plants that would be operated by

firms not under the domination of the big monopolies.

On the other hand, the monopolies do not want to risk private investment in the expansion of their own plants or in new plants. They want to make all the war profits possible—they have gobbled up the lion's share of the war orders even where they are unable to fulfill these orders for several years—but they will not risk any of their surplus billions in new capital investments.

Behind the scenes in Washington, a "dog-eat-dog" fight is in process between the various sectors of the capitalists, each group jostling for a favorable position and pushing for its own most profitable method of conducting the war production program.

As *Fortune* describes it, "Washington is divided into several factions." There are the "sacrificists" who "are in favor of striking down the civilian economy with no second thought to unemployment and hardships." There is the "business as usual school" which does not want to expand too rapidly into war production. The "expansionists" want "all-out war," the "non-expansionists" fear "what is to happen when the show is over and the nation faces an uncharted future... and a new world with huge capacities and no notion of how to

convert or distribute them."

In this statement, *Fortune* reveals the web of intrigues and counter-intrigues among the capitalists which reduces the productive system to sheer anarchy and makes an absurdity of all the talk of "equal sacrifice." Every capitalist, and every agent of the capitalists in Washington, including the entire Roosevelt administration, acts on the one premise: what is the best way to preserve the privileges and profits of the owning class.

Like the proverbial dog in the manger, the monopolists, who rule Washington, want neither the establishment of new—and potentially competitive—plants, nor the expansion or conversion of their existing plants for war production.

The workers are caught in the midst of the resultant chaos of production. It is they who must pound the streets looking for jobs because of the capitalist-created dislocation of industry.

This dislocation of industry in war-time—when the American ruling class is fighting for its life against its capitalist competitors of the Axis nations—is a perfect proof of the inability of capitalism to plan production, even when its own existence is threatened.

There is but one way in which this anarchy of production can be halted and the workers ensured job security in this period. The war industries must be taken out of the hands of the war profiteers. The planning and organization of all war production must be placed in the hands of the workers themselves. The solution to priorities unemployment is contained in the single slogan:

"Expropriate the war industries and operate them under the control and management of the workers!"

Record Of The OPM: One Year Of Loyal Service To The Bosses

By MICHAEL CORT

The American boss struggle against Hitler is, in reality, an effort to eliminate German competition from the world's markets. To bring this about, the bosses will make practically any sacrifice—but one! They will not allow the struggle against German imperialism to interfere with their profits. Where the two conflict, the war program must give way. The Office of Production Management, under the direction of Knudsen and Hillman, is used by the bosses for the purpose of preventing the needs of the "national emergency" from encroaching upon their privileges and profits.

The history of the first year of the OPM is a history of the traditions of the capitalist system. The bosses lust for a war that will bring them greater power and influence, but shrink from any step that will limit profit in the process.

For several years the boss press and radio have been attempting to whip up a war hysteria. The administration has burdened the people with taxes, attempted to regiment the trade unions and forced the youth into the army—all in the name of the national emergency. The bosses meanwhile have conducted "business as usual"—that is, they produce and sell where the most profit can be realized, regardless of the effect on the war program.

OPM "ACCOMPLISHMENTS"

The OPM made a report of its accomplishments this spring. The people who had been forced to make sacrifices would not have liked the real story of the bosses' concern with profit rather than with "national defense." OPM therefore released its figures of armament production increases, in percentages. Between May 1940 and May 1941, they said production of machine tools had doubled, aircraft had tripled, tanks had sextupled, Garand rifles had gone up 360 percent, powder 1,000 percent, and small arms ammunition 1,200 percent. The figures made one dizzy until the key was found which revealed their true significance.

Buried in the OPM report were figures on the rate of production in May 1940. At that time the daily American output of smokeless powder was enough to enable a single battleship to fire a single round. In other words, the 1,000 percent increase smokeless powder production meant an increase from practically nothing to very little.

Production of tanks had "sexupled". Actually the only kind being built was light tanks, the aluminum to meet the war needs, easiest and cheapest to produce, and they were coming off the line at the rate of 150 a month. No production has been started on medium and heavy tanks. (Germany is reported to be using 50,000 of all sizes on its eastern front alone).

FALSE REPORT ON RAW MATERIALS

Part of OPM's job was to accumulate reserve supplies of the raw materials necessary to supply the war machine. The OPM report stated blandly, "Progress was made during the year in building up stockpiles in most raw materials vital to defense." The reverse was the case.

The OPM report on mica, a basic material for radio and electrical equipment, stated that there was enough "to supply the industry for more than a year." On May 20th, the Metals Reserves Corporation revealed that there was absolutely no stockpile of mica in the United States, but rather a small one in India.

For years it successfully sabotaged all efforts to expand production of this vital metal because it would break down the Alcoa monopoly. In each case the OPM report put a happy face upon the situation so that the public would not know what the bosses were up to.

Aircraft, steel, mineral and rubber plants fought violently against demands for plant expansion to create more war materials. Expanded plant facilities now would mean expanded productive facilities AFTER the war. These additional facilities would then mean more intense competition for the peace time market. This would tend to drive prices down—and would therefore mean less profits to the bosses.

Stettinius, Knudsen and the other "dollar a year men" who temporarily left business to organize the war machine, contrived OPM. Stettinius, buying steel for the government, bargained with U. S. Steel, in which he is a stockholder. Stettinius's interests as a stockholder played an important part in his decision on the price the government paid for steel. The function of the OPM is to conduct a drive for productive expansion but to make certain that immediate profits are not limited in the process.

This tendency of the OPM has become so pronounced that liberal supporters of the war have taken alarm. They fear that the American war machine will never match Germany's.

I. F. Stone, a liberal journalist, has written a book entitled "Business as Usual", in which he reveals the sleight-of-hand being practiced by the OPM. Like most liberals, he embraces the fiction that the government is independent of the bosses and can therefore restrict their activities. Like most supporters of the war, he demands that the government take all steps necessary to whip Germany, and take them immediately.

A "LIBERAL" SOLUTION

Stone's solution to the problem is contained in a chapter entitled "Knudsenism Must Go". He damn the monopolies as the saboteurs of the war effort. He states that the distribution of war orders among the small business men and the forcible allocation of raw materials by the government would speed up the war machine

and enable America to win the war.

When Stone says "Knudsenism Must Go", he means that reformism must come. He would place the OPM under the direction of "good capitalists" and labor leaders whose first concern was the war.

"Our problem," says Stone, "is a production problem." And he calls upon the government to solve it. In other words, Stone requests the servant (the government) to discipline the master (the bosses). With true liberal myopia he fails to see the identity of the two. He believes "his request possible of fulfillment."

But it is not, as Stone puts it, "a production problem". It is a profit problem. The productive capacities are present, it is a question of the use to which they shall be put. At present they are being used to produce the most profitable goods — rather than the goods most needed for the war.

The transfer of war production from big business to small business would, furthermore, reduce the efficiency of war production rather than increase it. Small business men are just as concerned with profit as the big ones, they only have less capacity for it. Should they control OPM they would be subject to the same contradictions that now assail the representatives of big business.

Stone's book is a graphic indictment against capitalism, though he fails to understand that his demand for a planned (war) economy within the framework of capitalism is fantastic. Under certain compulsions the bosses will compromise to the degree necessary to maintain their power, but they will never voluntarily reduce their profits.

Chaos in production will continue so long as the bosses control it. To open the possibilities of planned production aimed at serving the needs of the people, the workers must struggle for their own control of the industries and complete expropriation of the bosses.

DO YOU HAVE A SUBSCRIPTION? LOOK FOR OUR SPECIAL OFFER

The Negro Struggle
By ALBERT PARKER

Fascist Ideas and Jim Crow

In the course of a discussion held in Mexico on April 4, 1939, Leon Trotsky said, "Fascism in the United States will be directed against the Jews and the Negroes, but against the Negroes particularly, and in a most terrible manner. A 'privileged' condition will be created for the American white workers on the back of the Negroes."

In spite of the fact that this country is today preparing in every sphere for an all-out war, directed presumably "against fascism" abroad, the ideas of fascism right here at home in "the arsenal of the democracies" are gaining strength and new supporters with alarming speed.

The speech of that advocate of white supremacy, Lindbergh, attacking the Jewish people last week, is an example of this growing trend. This speech — not yet repudiated by any of his colleagues on the America First Committee — has received much publicity, especially through the efforts of the interventionist war-mongers who are only too pleased with an easy opportunity to win supporters for the war by the cheap expedient of denouncing the racial prejudices of an outstanding isolationist.

But when it comes to Negro baiting and to Jim Crow practices developed in the school of propaganda-by-example, the interventionists have nothing or little to say. The reason is simple: in this field of racial division and the fostering of racial hatred, the warmongering administration takes first place and most of the responsibility.

Only here and there do you read about it — in the workers' and Negro press, and occasionally in a liberal magazine — but at present the Roosevelt administration is doing more by its Jim Crow segregation policies in the armed forces to foster fascist racial ideas among whites than any other agency in the country, including the South.

The anti-labor bureaucratic caste in the army is not only teaching hundreds of thousands of white young men to hate organized labor and to receive and carry out orders given "from above" without thought and without question, but it is also teaching them — by separating Negro soldiers from them everywhere they eat, sleep, train, drill, get recreation, etc. — that they are better than Negroes. Thus the ideas of "white supremacy" and "Negro inferiority" are injected into the minds of young men, many of whom went to school beside Negroes when they were children and never had a trace of chauvinism.

Not every white soldier accepts these ideas, of course. Those especially who have been in unions, worked alongside of Negroes and walked beside them on picket-lines, refuse to accept these ideas. The Negro press carries numerous expressions of sympathy and protest from white workers in southern camps who have been revolted and disgusted by the vicious Jim Crow policies and the MP brutalities practiced against Negroes.

But let us be lulled by these accounts. There has been no authoritative poll on this question, but there is no reason to believe that the racially tolerant white soldiers constitute a majority or much of a majority at best.

For the pressure on the average soldier, all the things said and half-said by his superior officers, is continuous and powerful. In the end many white soldiers who never even thought about Negroes at home, tend to accept that distorted way of thinking which is so frequently encountered in the South: "My own lot is a miserable one, but at least I am better off than the Negroes" and "The Negro is responsible for my conditions."

To those who think this is an exaggeration or an isolated phenomenon, we recommend the reading of an article, "Why The Army Grips" by Harold Lavine, in the August 30 issue of The Nation. The article is all the more significant because this magazine is an ardent supporter of Roosevelt and his war program. When they print this article, it is not because they are trying to spread anti-war propaganda, but because the situation is so acute that they would like to see it corrected or alleviated so that it will not interfere with the war plans.

Lavine's Report

Mr. Lavine interviewed 352 soldiers on leave in New York City and tried to discover what their complaints were. Here is what he reported about the attitude of many of them toward the Negroes:

"The inferiority complex which so many of the recruits have developed is reflected in their attitude toward Negroes. They haven't just the normal anti-Negro prejudice which you find everywhere in the United States, in the North as well as the South. They HATE Negroes, and their hatred seems to be mounting to hysteria. They make sudden, irrelevant remarks: 'Say, I read where Joe Louis is to join the Army. I hope they send him down my way. First dark night I'll shoot the bastard.' They occupy themselves with the problem of whether or not to salute Negro officers. 'They say it's the uniform you salute, not the man,' I said. 'The hell with that, I'd like to shoot them.'"

This is a terrible danger signal to the Negro people and the whole labor movement. Whatever happens in the war, a lot of people are going to get out of the army with strong fascist anti-Negro ideas. Whether the United States wins the war or not, these forces will further divide the Negro and white workers and increase the Jim Crow terror against the Negro people.

If there was no reason before for fighting the war program — and there were a hundred — here is a good one. If there was no reason before for fighting to take control of military training away from the bureaucratic officer caste and struggling for military training under control of the trade unions and of the basis of equality for Negroes — and THE MILITANT has been filled with such reasons — here is an undeniable one.

Churchill and Gallacher

They Mirror The Relations Between The Kremlin and the 'Democracies'

By GEORGE BREITMAN

On September 11 a discussion took place in the House of Commons in London which, brief though it was, shed a lot of light on the Churchill government's attitude toward the Soviet Union and on the relations between the Stalinists and the "democratic" imperialists.

It revolved around the recent charge by Jack Tanner, leader of the Engineers Union, that Colonel J. T. C. Moore-Brabazon, Churchill's Minister of Aircraft Production, had expressed the hope that the Red Army and the German Army would exterminate each other and thus enable British imperialism to regain its dominant position on the continent.

William Gallacher, lone Stalinist member of the House of Commons, asked Prime Minister Churchill if such a statement represented his government's attitude.

Churchill replied that not only did it not reflect his government's attitude, but that the Minister's remarks, made at a "private gathering", did not reflect, as reported, the attitude of Colonel Moore-Brabazon either.

The capitalist press and the Daily Worker have been content to accept this as a denial of the charge that Moore-Brabazon and the Churchill government would like to see the Red Army as well as Hitler's army, destroyed in the war.

CHURCHILL REALLY EVADED THE QUESTION

But actually, as the subsequent discussion showed, Churchill was not denying this charge, he was only evading it. All that he was denying agreement with was a particular statement and the formulation of that statement.

"I happen to know what the views of my right honorable friend are," he continued, "because on the day Hitler attacked Russia I told him on the telephone what line I was going to take, and he enthusiastically assented."

"Moreover, my right honorable friend has been all the while ardently at work sending hundreds of fighter aircraft to Russia."

Stalinist Draft Policy 'Shocks' CP Members

By DON DORE

When the Communist Party publishes a letter condemning the party's policies, that's NEWS.

It's news because such an unprecedented public acknowledgment of differences can be taken only as the reflection of widespread ferment and discontent within the Stalinist ranks.

Such a discontent is revealed in the Daily Worker, September 6, which publishes a sharp letter from a CP rank-and-filer condemning the party's line in extension and an elaborate "answer" by Gil Green, Stalinist youth functionary.

We can take for granted that if the writer of the letter represented the sentiments of a mere handful in the Stalinist ranks, his letter would never have seen the light of day in the Daily Worker. He would have been whisked through a "Moscow Trial," branded a "Fifth Columnist" and "Trotskyist," and summarily booted out of the CP. Perhaps he has been.

Nevertheless, the fact of the publication of the letter and the extensive reply — three times the space of the letter — shows that the Stalinist leaders are confronted with an internal disquiet of some scope. This is an attempt to reply to many who are asking questions — and a warning.

The letter, signed "S. W.," declares: "On the basis of the comments I have heard, I believe that most Communists have been profoundly shocked by the Party's official support of this bill (Draft Extension). This measure has been approved fully by the Party with no examination as to its 'necessity', and despite the fact that it is clearly a breach of faith, a betrayal of the youth of America by the government, as dirty and dishonest a deal as was ever handed to the people in the history of this country."

Citing the tremendous mass resentment — including that of the draftees themselves — at the draft extension, the letter states: "The Communist Party cannot fail to recognize that this feeling of outrage will not be dispelled by assurances that this step was necessary, but rather that the Party will be included among those against whom this feeling is directed."

"Can the Party now range itself on the side of Major George



fail to the general interest" to state exactly what his Minister's statement was? The fact that he does not quote the actual statement made is very significant. The likelihood is that it cannot be repeated without being construed in just the way that Tanner did!

And the maker of this statement which does not bear repetition, remember, "was and is in the fullest accord with this government's policy!"

CHURCHILL'S EVIDENCE

Churchill attempts to make up for not quoting Moore-Brabazon's statement by pointing to what Moore-Brabazon has been doing: that is, he has been at work sending hundreds of planes to the Soviet Union, "many of which have already reached there."

This "material evidence" of what Moore-Brabazon has been doing is cited by Churchill as proof that Moore-Brabazon could not possibly be a supporter of the policy attributed to him. But this is only another and a more artful way of evading the question.

For the sending of aircraft to the Soviet Union is not at all incompatible with the policy of so conducting the war that both the Soviet and the German Armies will be destroyed and Britain left in a position to dictate its own terms after the war.

As a matter of fact, at this stage of the war, it is perfectly compatible. At this stage, where the Soviet Union can use all the aid it gets, the only logical way from the viewpoint of the British imperialists to carry out a policy of fighting the most immediate danger, the Nazi army, and at the same time preventing the Red Army from winning a definite victory, is by giving some aid to the Soviet Union — some aid, enough to continue the war and weaken Germany, but not enough to permit the Soviet Union to win. This is the policy now being carried out by the "democratic" imperialists.

And the great crime of the Stalinists is precisely that they do not expose this policy of Churchill, but hide it and call on the workers to support him because for his own purposes he sends the USSR a little aid.

Gallacher sensed the evasion, though he did not care to expose it, and he asked another question. He asked if Churchill was prepared to "clear out all those in the government who are not 100 per cent behind the Soviet Union."

This was too much for Churchill. He does not intend to give the Stalinists anything but the privilege of supporting his poli-

tion in the CP (why do they bother to publish this letter and reply?), about the source of the mass opposition, about why the Congressmen were forced to vote against the draft extension — all in one paragraph — in the Daily Worker is then forced to lie about the "breach of faith" of the Administration and to cover up its own support of this duplicity.

"We Communists told the country a year ago... that the boys would not be home at the end of their 12 months of service. We knew then as we know now that a modern large-scale army cannot be hammered into shape in the brief span of one year."

The Stalinists called Roosevelt a liar at that time when he promised a one-year term of service not for military-technical reasons, but because they correctly claimed that Roosevelt was dragging the country into an imperialist war, and that the draftees would not be released until that war was ended. They opposed the Conscription Bill and all army service.

"Our hands are therefore free of any taint of deception," the Daily Worker lies. "READY TO DO EVERYTHING"

"Will the Communist Party... now blindly accept any and every step now taken by the government...?" asks S. W. The Daily Worker does not dare to reply. It merely evades by stating: "The armed forces of the nation need many drastic reforms... But these can only be achieved by first isolating and defeating the enemies of the nation..."

ties. This privilege certainly does not extend as far as permitting them to help form those policies. As for this demand of Gallacher — it would mean clearing out the whole government, including Churchill himself, for the only thing that that government is 100 per cent behind is the interests of British imperialism. If those interests include for the time being a little aid to the Soviet Union in return for a breathing spell from Hitler, as well as political support by the Stalinists — all right.

But 100 per cent or even 2 per cent support of the Soviet Union is impossible for the forces represented by Churchill who hates the workers' state as much today as he did 22 years ago when he led the interventionist attacks against it.

CHURCHILL'S REBUFF

So he answered "coldly" and with contempt: "I do not think that I should be prepared to receive guidance in policy or conduct from an honorable gentleman who, it is notorious, has to change his opinions whenever he is ordered to by a body outside this country."

Whereupon Gallacher lost his temper and blurted out some truths about this red-baiter. Demanding a withdrawal of this "insulting remark," he cried out:

"It is a dirty, cowardly, rotten action on the part of the Prime Minister. It is the action of a blackguard. It is a foul and dirty lie."

But when Gallacher had time to think it over, he realized that he had not been following the Stalinist line of supporting and covering up Churchill, so he got down on his knees and ate humble pie.

"After very deep reflection about what occurred this morning," he said, "I want to apologize to you, sir, and to the House for the offensive words I used when I put to you my point of order, and I want to make a complete withdrawal of the offensive remarks made and directed toward the Prime Minister."

In this incident is reflected not only Churchill's, but the Kremlin's political line as well. Churchill hates the Soviet Union and will make no concessions to it that will conflict with the interests of the capitalist class he represents. The Stalinists know this, although they will not admit it to the workers, and in return for the aid and promises of aid which Churchill gives them, they conceal Churchill's role and aims, and call on the British and American workers to support his imperialist war.

Class conscious workers who want to defend the Soviet Union can support the political line of neither. Instead, they must concentrate on continuing the class struggle in their own country and fighting for an independent working class defense of the USSR.

What Program Will Rally The Masses Of Europe?

By JACK WEBER

Groundswell of Unrest in Europe

The war is at a critical stage in Europe. Soviet Russia has shown a power of resistance that has given the greatest encouragement to the workers and the masses of all countries. In a material sense also, the war in Russia has encouraged the masses in the conquered countries to rebel against the Nazi conquerors. That is to say, the Germans have been forced, owing to their miscalculation of the strength of the USSR, to deplete their forces of occupation in France, Norway, Yugoslavia, etc. But at the same time the using up of materials in the Russian campaign has caused the Nazis to apply even stricter measures in the conquered territories to assure necessary supplies for their armies. Everything seems to converge at this time to bring about a wave of rebellion over Europe against Hitler.

It is not easy to judge how far this unrest will go, how high the wave of resistance will rise. Hitler will stop at nothing to maintain his victorious grip on the throats of all the people of Europe. Under the conditions of war, it is not easy for the Frenchmen, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians to obtain arms for a real resistance. However these factors are not the ones to look at for the time being. Rather it is the political angle that deserves thought.

A good deal depends on the further course of the struggle in the Soviet Union, that is perfectly obvious. A series of sweeping defeats of the Red Army, should they occur, would tend to act as a deterrent and bring about a subdued mood of the masses of Western Europe. Naturally defeats suffered by Hitler would heighten the movement for liberation everywhere. Even the holding back of the German forces and their bogging down for the Russian winter will keep the morale of workers everywhere quite high.

But there is far more to the political angle than these elements of the question of liberation. It is hardly any kind of program for the future to base everything on the defeat and the ousting of the fascist conquerors. This aim is common to all shades of opinion except those who bank on profiting by the continued domination of Hitler. The Norwegian and other Quislings would fear to see the Germans depart because it would mean their finish.

Certainly there are many people who think of liberation from the Nazi yoke in terms of national liberations. But just what do they mean by this? Do they mean the restoration of the nation as it existed just prior to occupation by the German armies? In France the old regime moved smoothly and directly into the Petain regime. How many Frenchmen today would fight in order to restore Petain and his adherents to full power over France? Certainly the workers would have no such aim. Would the workers prefer the restoration of power to de Gaulle, the man who says openly that he hopes to establish an authoritarian regime of his own — a pro-allied instead of pro-Hitler kind — after victory? It is unlikely that the workers will become deGaullists on such a program.

The economic phase of "restoration" raises the question of program in even sharper terms. The Nazis have taken over most of the industrial life of the occupied lands. Much of the machinery in these countries has been shipped off to Germany. Goering has used the funds forced out of the treasuries of France to buy up many industries. Shall the workers fight for the restoration of all plants to the former owners? Who is to pay for all this, assuming it could take place?

The moment one begins to ask the meaning of the struggle for national liberation, one finds that in its place the class struggle intervenes. There is only one progressive aspect to the struggle waged in these terms: that is the struggle to defeat the fascists. But to accept the struggle for national liberation in its old terms means virtually to restore national capitalism, to restore national boundaries, — and on the basis of a national instead of a foreign fascism.

The Stalinist Program

All reports from the occupied countries today point to the fact that the masses, aside from their undying opposition to Hitlerism, are apathetic to the political programs of the capitalists of whatever shade. They are just as indifferent to the Stalinist agitation.

For the fact of the matter is that the Stalinists themselves are bankrupt; they can offer no program because they have none. Stalin has already announced agreement to the capitalist program of the eight points, one of which forbids his interference in Western European affairs. For the sake of aid to Russia, we can be sure that Stalin will abide by this point. In fact he showed his readiness to do so in advance by his fear of and incapability of waging a revolutionary war. Newsweek in its latest issue shows what is in the mind of the capitalists so far as pressure on Stalin is concerned as payment for aid. It states that Hopkins got agreement from Stalin to publicly dissolve the CP of the USA as a token of his sincerity in not calling for or aiding revolution anywhere. We do not vouch for the truth of this statement, but we do not ignore it as a straw in the wind. All that the Stalinists have been able to think of, after the attack on Russia, has been the revival of the Popular Front. But the workers have had a thorough experience of this sell-out to the capitalist class.

It follows that what the masses of Europe require more than anything else is leadership. The workers follow no leadership today. A self-confident, firm, clear-headed revolutionary leadership based on a class struggle program to mobilize the working class for the struggle against both foreign and native fascism, has the opportunity today to win the masses in the occupied countries. What such a leadership must show, in all its agitation, is that the struggle against fascism is the struggle against capitalism.

We're Still Waiting!

Three weeks ago, the War Department and the President promised, after country wide demands, to investigate the racial clashes at Fort Bragg, N. C., and Camp Robinson, Ark., and to let the public know the result. WE'RE STILL WAITING TO HEAR!

Three weeks ago, the NAACP, supported by the Negro press and aroused individuals, asked that a civilian or civilian-military board be appointed by the President to investigate the entire military police set-up and to stop abuse of colored soldiers stationed in Southern camps. WE'RE STILL WAITING FOR ACTION!

We want to know how the administration and the War Department can talk about defending democracy when Negro soldiers get Nazi-like treatment.

We want an end to discrimination and segregation in the armed forces. Help us by sending a postcard or letter to the President, the Senators from your state, representatives from your district and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson.

The NAACP
69 Fifth Avenue New York City
(Space for this advertisement donated by THE MILITANT at the request of the NAACP.)

THE MILITANT

Formerly the SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. V.—No. 38 Saturday, September 20, 1941

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

Editor:

FELIX MORROW

Business Manager:

LYDIA BEIDEL

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; 6 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 6 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. A peoples' referendum on any and all wars.
5. Confiscation of all war profits. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
6. For a rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living.
7. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
8. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
9. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.

Lindbergh And The 'Isolationists'

At Des Moines last week Lindbergh showed his utterly reactionary role. The trick he employed of charging the Jews with responsibility for the war crisis, is a device borrowed from the Nazis. Hitler blamed the Jews for German unemployment and depression and thus distracted the people from the fight against capitalism, which is responsible for depressions. Lindbergh blames the Jews for the war and thus tries to distract the masses from the real cause of war, capitalism.

Lindbergh has not yet announced his full program, but everything he says fits into a definite pattern. First his expression of white supremacy and hatred of the colored races, now his Jew-baiting, tomorrow attacks on the labor movement. Lindbergh is an American fascist, as we have often characterized him; he is concerned with utilizing the masses' natural hatred of the war solely for the purpose of building an American fascist movement.

Traditional American "isolationism" is not to be confused with fascism, but nevertheless there is real significance in the fact that none of the leading isolationists have dissociated themselves or in any way criticized Lindbergh's Des Moines speech.

It is not accidental that, at the same time Lindbergh was making his Jew-baiting speech, his America First colleagues in the Senate were engaged in doing a little baiting themselves: Senator Nye, for example, was denouncing the motion picture producers because they were "foreign born."

"Isolationism" and fascism have this in common: their main appeal is to reactionary suspicions and nationalist prejudices. "The Western Hemisphere is ours," they feel, "and only Jews and foreigners are interested in what goes on elsewhere. We are Americans and we have no reason to be concerned with things that don't happen right here."

One thing becomes clearer each day — that the "isolationists" are not a bit better than the warmongers.

The masses hate imperialist war and view the Roosevelt war program with suspicion, and justly so. But they cannot get the answer to the warmongers from the isolationists.

For the isolationists do not lead a struggle against the real cause of war. As a matter of fact, they serve only to distract attention away from the real cause of war, which must be fully understood before war can successfully be opposed. For them, Jews cause the war, or foreigners, or Britons — or anything else but the capitalist system which is really responsible.

They can infuriate and arouse backward and narrow-minded elements against the warmongers with such propaganda, but they can never mobilize them to prevent or end war that way.

The only answer to the war is revolutionary internationalism which preaches the destruction of the cause of war, the capitalist system.

The warmongers say Hitler is responsible for the war, so they are taking the people into an imperialist war against Hitler — but not against the system that produced both Hitler and the war. The "isolationists" say the Jews and the foreigners in this country are responsible for the war program of the government, so they are calling for a struggle against the Jews and the foreigners in this country — but not against the system that

drives the American boss government into the war. Only the internationalists tell the truth about the cause of war and rally the masses for the struggle to destroy it.

Why There Is Unrest In Occupied Europe

Nazi-occupied Europe continues to be convulsed by demonstrations against the conqueror. The waves of mass resistance to Hitler are increasing in frequency and violence despite all the fascist efforts to suppress them.

Long before the appearance of the current wave of unrest, we explained that Hitler would be unable to impose his "New Order" upon the subjugated peoples. His pattern for the pacification of Europe was nothing more than the reduction of all countries to the status of German satellites whose function was to serve the master state politically and economically. This meant the most naked sort of slavery for the masses, a slavery that required for its imposition the presence of a continuous and ever expanding German army of occupation.

Prior to the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, there were only isolated and infrequent manifestations of resistance. Since the invasion, the mass actions have grown in scope and intensity to the point where they constitute a real threat to the stability of the Nazi European order.

Why this sudden increase in sabotage since Hitler's attack upon the Soviet Union? Does it mean that the workers and oppressed middle classes are merely taking advantage of Hitler's first military reverses in order to disorganize his rear? That must remain a large factor — yes.

But there is another factor. These acts of sabotage are manifestations of European worker solidarity with the masses in the Soviet Union. These acts are blows in defense of the workers' state.

The workers of Europe are doing for the Soviet Union what they failed to do for the "democracies," they are voluntarily risking their lives.

When they were called upon to take sides between the "democracies" and the fascists, they found little to choose. In a struggle between the fascists and the workers' state, however, there is the fundamental choice — the workers against the bosses.

And the workers have made this choice through their own understanding of the nature of the opposing forces, not through the program of Stalin. Stalin has failed to clarify the class nature of this struggle. He says nothing that will offend his boss allies in Britain and America. He pictures the struggle of the Soviet masses as but part of the struggle of the "democracies."

It is in spite of Stalin that many European workers understand their stake in the Soviet Union and act correctly.

Were the Soviet Union under the leadership of Bolsheviks instead of the timorous and compromising bureaucracy, if the propaganda emanating from the Soviet Union were revolutionary class propaganda — the response of the European workers would be sufficient to explode the entire continent.

The Issue In The New York Elections

Practically every leading figure in the Republican Party rallied to support of Mayor LaGuardia in the New York primaries last Tuesday, including those politicians whose candidacy LaGuardia has opposed in recent years. There was a good reason for this, although it has been denied by most of those concerned: they united around LaGuardia as the local banner-bearer of Roosevelt's war policy.

The New York Times, which supported LaGuardia, repeated again and again that "(foreign policy) is not, and should not be, an issue in this municipal election." But Wendell Willkie, who also supported LaGuardia, was forced to admit that while he did not like it, the war was the issue. He said, "Our country's foreign policy has no place in a municipal campaign, but Mr. Davies has made it an issue. . . if he is nominated the country and the world will interpret his victory as a repudiation by the Republicans of New York of our country's foreign policy. . . For this reason, particularly, I shall vote for the nomination of LaGuardia."

While it is true that Davies, LaGuardia's opponent in the primaries, did try to take advantage of the masses' opposition to the war, he nevertheless conducted his campaign in such a way as to repel the genuine anti-war sentiments of the people. "I want no war," was his rallying cry before the primaries, "unless Congress votes it."

The war question was a problem at Tammany Hall too, where the Democratic politicians were mightily tempted for a time to run their candidate, O'Dwyer, on an isolationist platform. But in the end they rejected it, preferring to lose some votes rather than lead even a fake opposition to the war.

Thus the boss parties have chosen their candidates and their platforms, both pro-war. They are trying to take the war as an issue out of the campaign. Nevertheless the workers who go to the polls in New York City next November will have both a candidate and a program to express their opposition to the war.

The candidate — James P. Cannon, the Trotskyist Anti-War candidate, now awaiting trial in Minneapolis on October 20, along with 28 other militants, because of his irreconcilable opposition to the imperialist war.

The program — Trotskyism, revolutionary opposition to the war by a program aimed at taking power away from the imperialists and establishing a Workers' and Farmers' Government.

Unions Offer Own Plans For Handling 'Priorities'

(Continued from Page 4)

delous artificial shortages in materials. . ."

THE ALUMINUM PLAN

N. A. Zonarich, president of the Aluminum Workers of America, has proposed a plan for the raising of aluminum production to 3 billion pounds yearly.

The plan urges full priorities in all construction materials for creation of new aluminum plants; the use of the Aluminum Company of America's plants as a training school to supply workers for the new factories; a 500% expansion of the Arkansas bauxite mining operations with the industry council allocating the material to the companies which need it. Non-defense rationed.

From the attitude adopted by the capitalist class to the Reuther Plan we can get a picture of the bosses' attitude toward all these plans. The organ of the machine tool industry, the American Machinist, in its issue of April 2, 1941 says:

"The CIO Reuther (500 planes a day) plan to use Detroit capacity for aircraft has been definitely rejected. It was rejected squarely on its essential features, treatment of the auto industry as one firm with work parcelled out in semi-compulsory fashion, and labor participation in management, rather than on the rather irrelevant arguments as to whether the plan could actually produce 500 planes a day. . ."

According to the capitalist class the question of production of 500 planes a day is "irrele-

vant." (But when an aircraft union walks out on strike, they shout to the high heavens at the lack of patriotism of the workers.)

What is "relevant" to the capitalist class is that it does not in the least want to share its power with the workers.

The fact is that the monopolies do not want even the slightest infringement of their "right" to run the industry as they please. They want to interfere with their "right" to monopoly profits, cost what it may to the masses in unemployment and high prices.

The plan to organize industry as a unit would mean that the monopolies would have to give up some of their backlogs and contracts and profits to other concerns not now getting them.

But suppose these plans were put into practice?

Labor would be outvoted by two to one on the government-labor-industry boards on all the important questions, on all questions where important interests of the bosses would be involved.

The plans are all founded on the illusion that the government represents an independent factor in modern society, above the workers and above the bosses and impartial so far as both are concerned. The truth is that the government represents the capitalist class and is concerned first and foremost with protecting its interests. Labor would be only a prisoner on these boards.

Reuther, Murray, Zonarich and the others who propose these plans of "co-operation," are only blinding the workers to the fact

that to the government and the bosses, "cooperation" means subservience to their profits and interests.

The profit-mad bosses don't want proposals to really plan economy — they want only the right to continuous profits. And even if any of these plans should be formally accepted by them, they would utilize their control of the boards to see to it that there would be no interference with those profits.

Instead of leaving control of industry in the hands of the capitalists, where it now is, and instead of plans to give control of industry to a coalition of capitalists and government representatives, which is what the Murray and other plans propose, the unions must fight for workers' control of industry. In this way alone can they open up the road toward planned production.

While struggling for this, the workers must also demand the sliding scale of hours. All the work on hand should be divided among the available workers. Total wages in this period should not be cut because of the reduction in hours for each worker.

Although the plans described do not answer the problems of production and unemployment, they do show that labor no longer has any respect or confidence in the ability of capitalism to run industry.

What labor needs is a plan to establish planned production on a basis of national ownership of the expropriated war industries, operated under workers' control.

Stalin Moves Against The 'Volga Germans'

The Masses of the Volga German Republic Who Defended The USSR In Civil War Days Are Now Attacked By the Kremlin

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

On September 8, the Kremlin finally made public the text of the ukase which exiles Soviet citizens en masse to Siberia because of their racial origin! This monstrous ukase reads:

"THE PRAESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE USSR HAS FOUND IT NECESSARY TO RESETTLE THE ENTIRE GERMAN POPULATION OF THE VOLGA REGIONS TO OTHER DISTRICTS" (N. Y. Times, September 8).

During the first world war, bloody Czar Nicholas resorted to repressive measures against his subjects of German birth. Toward the end of 1916, the Czarist regime, fanning racial hatreds, began preparations to exile all Volga Germans to Siberia. The date set for this mass expulsion was April, 1917. Here is how Stalin's official "Soviet Encyclopedia", summed up the fate of the Czarist ukase:

"The overthrow of the autocracy prevented the execution of this barbaric measure. When the colonists appealed to the Provisional Government to repeal this law, Kerensky agreed only to 'suspend the execution of this ukase.' This ukase was repealed only by the Great October Socialist Revolution which put an end to national oppression and which opened up the broad highway for the development of national culture, socialist in content and national in form" (Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, vol. 41, p. 595, Moscow 1939).

These lines were printed two years ago in 1939 — the year of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Now Stalin reminds the Volga Germans that the Czar has found an emulator.

Background of the Volga Germans

The German settlements on the Volga date back to the middle of the Eighteenth Century when Catherine the Great invited foreigners to settle there. Deep in the interior of the country, this territory of 28,000 square kilometers, now bordered by Saratov and Stalingrad oblasts (areas), is even further removed today from the arena of military operations than it was in the days of Czar Nicholas. The original settlers predominantly came — between 1764 and 1864 — from Westphalia, Bavaria, Saxony, Swabia, Alsace-Lorraine and Switzerland. The privileges originally granted them were gradually pared away. At the outbreak of the first imperialist slaughter their status was that of another oppressed nationality in what Lenin called "the Czarist prison of nations." The October revolution emancipated them.

The Volga Germans were among the first to be granted autonomy in the federation of the Soviet republics. On October 19, 1918 Lenin signed a decree establishing the autonomous oblast (area) of the Volga Germans. Stalin was then the Commissar for Nationalities. The above-quoted article in the "Soviet Encyclopedia" does not fail to underscore that:

"Comrade Stalin paid from the very beginning great attention to the question of self-determination of the Volga Germans." These descendants of the original colonists fought staunchly against the White Guards. The

extent of their participation in the Civil War may be gauged by the fact that in the last year of the Civil War, the population of this area dropped from 453,000 in 1920 to less than 350,000 in 1921, i. e., a loss of more than 20 per cent. In 1926 the Autonomous Volga German Socialist Republic was formally established.

According to official 1936 figures, the population of this territory numbered about 500,000 of whom a little less than two-thirds (66.4 per cent) were of German origin; 20.4 per cent, Russians and 12 per cent Ukrainians. Today, there are not more than 300,000 German-born inhabitants in this region whose advancement constituted one of the boasts of Stalin's regime.

What the Stalinists Said Yesterday

The German-born Volga peasants were only yesterday hailed as models of collective farming. The Stalinist tales of successes of mechanized agriculture in this area would fill a whole library. Suffice it to quote the stereotyped panegyrics with which the article in the "Soviet Encyclopedia" concludes:

"The further development of the national economy and culture of Volga German Autonomous Socialist Republic and her rapid progress to a better and a still happier life are guaranteed by the Stalinist Constitution, by the firm Stalinist leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and by the boundless devotion of the toilers of the Autonomous Volga German Socialist Republic to the cause of communism."

In 1941, this Autonomous Republic is abolished as a danger to the state. What an admission of bankruptcy!

Today Stalin violates Article 13 of his own "Constitution" which "guarantees" the rights of national minorities. Why? The official explanation reads:

"According to reliable information received by the military authorities, thousands and tens of thousands of diversionists and spies among the German population of the Volga are prepared to cause explosions in these regions at a signal from Germany" (N. Y. Times, September 8).

Let us grant for the moment that the Kremlin, contrary to its custom, is this time telling the truth. Could there be a greater condemnation of Stalin's regime than this admission that after all the "successes" there remain thousands, nay, tens of thousands who await only a signal from the Nazis to rise against the Soviet power? Why should the loyalty of these thousands be swayed so easily? What better material for propaganda could Hitler expect than that now supplied him by the Kremlin?

And this ukase comes on the heels of assurances on the part of all of Stalin's pen prostitutes that his blood purges and his frameups have "rooted out the enemies of the people."

A GPU Confession

The Times dispatch relating to the ukase against the Volga Germans contains the following comment, passed by the Kremlin censors: "No Germans from the Volga have reported the existence of purportedly large

British Bosses Promise To Stop Sales Of 'Lend Lease' Material

By ARTHUR FORD

English Business Victories

When the British capitalists declared war upon their German rivals, the American bosses saw an opportunity to oust both of them from the North and South American markets. The Germans were driven out early in the struggle, but the British have continued to hang on with a determination to conduct "business as usual," war or no war. The increasing bitterness of the struggle has embarrassed the Anglo-American politicians who are conducting a war for the "defense of democracy," and would like to conceal its relation to markets and profits.

According to the N. Y. Times of September 14th, Roosevelt and Churchill have finally succeeded in mediating this dispute and have "reached a comprehensive agreement on the question of Britain's export trade for the duration of the war."

Though no details have been officially released, the Times credits "foreign trade circles" with the information that henceforth English authorities will require a "certificate of necessity" issued by United States defense officials before they will issue an export permit for products in which lend-lease material coming from this country is a component part. This would indicate a substantial victory by American imperialists over their British rivals.

While the British succeeded in inserting a clause in the agreement which rejected the theory that Britain's trade must be crippled due to the fight against Hitler, the fact is that the English are to reduce their exports to the Western Hemisphere by \$400,000,000 annually. This means American trade will be increased by that amount.

The Lend-Lease aid to the British war machine was the principle club used by the American bosses to bludgeon the British into these concessions. Threat to withhold aid was a powerful factor in partially driving British trade out of the Americas.

The American bosses have, for the past year, been sweating their workers in steel, machinery, chemical products, rubber and cloth, to produce for the British government. At the same time the British bosses in these same industries had been producing capital and consumer goods which were being used, not for the war effort, but for export to the Americas at a neat profit. This rankled the American capitalists.

Last July 6th, the Times wrote, "Indignation . . . was generated last week when a manufacturer of hard rubber goods, who has been compelled to curtail a rather extensive export business because of the defense program restrictions on raw materials, received a letter from an English supplier offering to furnish finished rubber goods."

"American exporters who recently returned from Argentina reported seeing pre-fabricated steel pipe stacked up at a plant at Rosario. The Argentine buyers boasted that the order had been placed at a price more than 10 per cent below the lowest quoted by the United States shippers. They reported that the delivered consignment represented the second attempt by the English to fill the order. The ship carrying the first consignment was sunk and the order was duplicated and sent on a later boat."

These incidents were multiplied many times in all lines of business, and finally drove the American exporters to demand of Roosevelt that he withhold Lend-Lease aid to Britain until she stopped such competition.

Reveals Betrayal Of the Workers

This drive for export trade reveals much concerning the internal situation in England. The British workers are regimented in the name of the war but the British bosses are still conducting business as usual in whatever sphere they can realize the most profits. The "most desperate hour of British need" has not imposed many restrictions upon the big manufacturers. While Nazi bombs blasted England's production facilities and the workers were forced to work 70 and 80 hours per week to supply the war machine, the bosses produced steel for export!

The American bosses desire the defeat of the German imperialists first — the British imperialists second. And they will not allow, if they can help it, the defeat of the first to strengthen the second. The British are playing the same game. They, however, are in a bad position strategically to conduct a two front offensive. They are in desperate need of American help in crushing Germany, and they are now paying through the nose for that help.

Despite this trade agreement, Britain retains a sizable trade with both North and South America. During the remainder of the war the American exporters will attempt to whittle her trade down further and further. The real struggle will come, however, if they succeed in disposing of Germany. Then British and American imperialists will really come to grips over the spoils and no holds will be barred.

numbers of dissidents who have been uncovered."

This terse statement is as revealing as the tell-tale formulas of the Kremlin concerning "diversionists" and "spies."

Here we have an official admission that the G. P. U. is uncovering "dissidents" in large numbers. In the language of the Kremlin every dissident, everyone critical of Stalin is a "diversionist and a spy." Today they are being discovered in the Volga region. And tomorrow?

The ukase of August 28 constitutes a "warning" to all dissidents that they will suffer the fate of the Volga Germans. Henceforth, every dissident wherever "discovered" will be officially linked with "diversionists and spies." By the mass expulsion to Siberia of these German-born Volga scape-goats, Stalin seeks to stir up racial hatred and with this as a cover to prepare the ground for similar mass purges in other areas.

But at the same time, the latest ukase of the Kremlin reveals that the opposition to the bureaucratic regime is growing among the population. The Soviet masses are heroically defending the Soviet Union. They are not fighting for the perpetuation of the bureaucrats.