

End British Repressions In India! Support  
The Indian Struggle For Independence!

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI.—No. 36

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1942

267

FIVE (5) CENTS

## Roosevelt Offers Helping Hand To Fascist Franco

By Milton Alvin

Some new light was shed on the character of the second "war for democracy" when President Roosevelt announced last week a plan to strengthen the regime of the fascist dictator of Spain, General Francisco Franco, by "an important step" to put the government "on its feet economically." Along with this spoken pledge of financial aid and blessings to Franco if he remains neutral in the war — the only condition Roosevelt laid down in return for his offer — goes the implied assurance that no efforts will be made by the "democracies" to establish in Spain any of the "freedoms" which Roosevelt so often proclaims and which were abolished by Franco through the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39. Plainly, Roosevelt sees nothing wrong with fascists who are on his side or neutral.

The offer to aid Spanish fascism took the form of "a plan to rehabilitate the art treasures, the manuscripts, literature and famous buildings of Spain and to encourage the movement of tourists from the 21 American republics to Spain after the war," with the money to be raised "by contributions from individuals, groups and foundations within the Americas, under the sponsorship of the individual governments." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 29.) The repairs on the art treasures, etc., should begin soon, Roosevelt added in an obvious bid for a speedy deal with the Spanish fascists.

### Denunciations and Collaboration

Almost every week Roosevelt makes a speech or a statement denouncing the criminal cruelty or inhumanity of the Axis chiefs, but apparently he is quite satisfied to collaborate with a government headed by the butcher of tens of thousands of Spanish workers and many heroic fighters of other lands, including the United States, who went to Spain to help the Loyalists in the Civil War. By his offer of such collaboration, Roosevelt gives the lie to all those of his supporters who have, since the outbreak of the present war in Europe, tried to paint the role of the United States government in the Spanish Civil War as some kind of "mistake."

At that time the government passed special legislation at Roosevelt's request, the so-called Neutrality Act, which prevented the Loyalists from purchasing arms here. Meanwhile Franco was able to obtain all the aid he could use from the Nazis and Fascists. American imperialism was thus a factor in helping Franco strangle the Loyalists and behold the Spanish Revolution. The present plans of Roosevelt can therefore be seen as a direct continuation of his previous policy, which was no mistake of any kind from his point of view. The basic class line of imperialism — which is to seek alliances with all reactionary forces attempting to crush the working class — is the same as it was before, and has not changed because of the war.

### Continuation of Previous Policy

That Roosevelt is not worried by possible protests from his liberal supporters was indicated by his reply to a reporter who asked if his plan might not produce some opposition in this country. He cynically replied that he did not anticipate any opposition because after all, "a very ancient culture, such as that of Spain, transcended the government of any particular period."

This was a warning to the liberals not to begin mumbling in their beards about this matter; that if it is necessary to appease the fascist Franco in order to win his neutrality, it is all in the interests of the "Four Freedoms." Even if the liberals do whine a bit, the government will pay no attention to them whatever, just as it ignored the hue and cry that went up from these gentry when the Loyalists were prevented from buying arms here in 1936. Liberal pretenses for democratic niceties are all very well in their way, but they are "transcended" by the class policy of the imperialists.

The Roosevelt plan to aid Franco can have a further demoralizing effect upon the Spanish workers who fought so bravely to put down the slaveholders' rebellion which he led. This will be especially true if the labor movement here gives one ounce of support to the policies of the government towards Spain. Hundreds of thousands of heroic fighters in the Civil War who were driven out of Spain by a combination of Fascist attack and Stalinist-Social Democratic-Anarchist treachery have suffered for more than three years in French concentration camps. Since the advent of the Pétain regime many of the best elements have been handed over to Franco to be murdered. Despite everything, they still retain the hope that aid will come to them from the workers of the world. The American workers must not let them down! No help to the butcher of the Spanish workers, Franco!

### Whom U. S. Workers Should Support

The American labor movement must support only such a program as will rehabilitate those parts of Spanish "culture" that Roosevelt has not mentioned so far, and which, in fact, he is only too glad to ignore. This includes the great trade unions, political parties and workers' organizations of Spain which have all been destroyed by Franco.

The present American government is not interested in reviving these institutions as their re-birth will guarantee not only the extermination of Franco but make it possible for the Spanish workers to finish the job they set out to do in 1936. Only a Workers' and Farmers' Government in the United States will take a real interest in the fate of the Spanish workers and give them aid in removing their present oppressors. Such a government would concern itself first with the revival of the Spanish working class movement and under no possible circumstances would give the Franco murderers any aid.

The example of Spain in the present war should be a lesson to all sincere anti-fascist workers in the United States. The "democratic" imperialists are not fighting to destroy fascism, they are only fighting to defeat certain fascists who threaten the interests of the "democratic" rulers; that is why they can collaborate with one fascist government while fighting another. Labor should take steps to organize its own party and form its own government here; this alone will guarantee the defeat of fascism.

## U. S. Bosses In Shanghai Still Do 'Business As Usual' With Japanese

### State Department Tried To Suppress Information

By Anthony Massini

American and British businessmen in Japanese-held Shanghai are collaborating in the most friendly fashion with Japanese imperialism, and "business as usual" goes on "to an extent inconceivable to anyone who hasn't been there." This information — together with the fact that the U. S. State Department and the British Foreign Office suppressed the story — was revealed on August 28 by the N. Y. Post reporter, Edward Hunter, after he had interviewed a number of American repatriates arriving here on the S. S. Gripsholm. Chinese officials have charged that American and British business interests are carrying on the same practices in Hong Kong, also captured by the Japanese.

According to Hunter, "Department stores, liquor stores, haberdasheries, textile mills all operate 'normally' with American or British owners or managers, and Japanese supervisors, in charge. 'In the American-owned telephone system, the electric plants and street-car system the American executives and engineers are at their desks, again with Jap supervisors. . . . The police still have American and British inspectors and sergeants, but the heads of the service have been displaced by Japanese. The ousted officials have been given comfortable pensions. . . ."

The American and British "communities of Shanghai take easily to collaboration," Hunter continues. "Many years of cocktails and dancing atop luxurious hotel roofs, while Chinese fought and died within sight and earshot, have made them oblivious to the fact that this concerns them."

### Attitude Of State Department

"Business as usual" goes on with the full knowledge and evident approval of the United States and British governments. Hunter was told, "No disapproval has been expressed by the American consular authorities, or their home offices back in the U. S., for example, to impress on them that

by helping to make life normal for the Japs in an important military center, they are aiding and abetting the enemy."

It was the opinion of one of the informants of Hunter—who was obviously trying to cover up for his friends still in Shanghai—that "If the State Department were to announce that such activities were forbidden, the overwhelming majority would give them up. But with the State Department seeming to follow an appeasement line itself in these matters, they feel that they are doing the only thing possible."

But the only thing that the State Department disapproves is letting out the truth about what is going on. Passengers on the Gripsholm "are still bewildered by the behavior of the State Department and the British Foreign Office at Lourenco Marques, where the vessel first docked. Strict instructions were issued that they keep quiet."

It is not surprising that government officials don't want the American people to have this information. For it conclusively demonstrates what the capitalists are fighting for. Their basic perspective is to continue as exploiters of China, regardless of who wins the war. Naturally, they would prefer to have the United States win, for then American capitalism would be in the number one position as exploiter of China, with British and Japanese capitalists reduced to secondary positions. But even if the United States loses, they figure on remaining members of the consortium of foreign powers which has sucked China dry for so many years. That is why they continue to do "business as usual"—with the permission of the Japanese forces, who realize that their own economic base is too limited to permit them by themselves to organize the exploitation of China and the Far East.

Washington continues to talk about a "war for democracy" and struggle to the death against fascism and imperialism, but the activities of American capitalists are

not determined or affected by such talk. The bosses understand that this talk is for consumption by the masses. As for themselves, their perspective is—as it was before the war, and as it will be after the war—continued participation in the exploitation of the colonies.

### How China Is Treated

Directly paralleling the imperialist outlook of American and British big business firms in Shanghai and Hongkong is the treatment accorded China by the American and British governments.

For despite the war with Japan, China is still regarded as an "inferior," treated not as an equal among equals in the high councils of the "United Nations"—but as a semi-colonial country which is to be tolerated but not given a voice in deciding questions of important policy and strategy, which is to be given a little material aid now and then but never in preference to the imperialist powers.

Although the Chinese have been handed many compliments and promises in recent months, they are thoroughly dissatisfied with the attitude and policy of Washington and London, which they know have not undergone any real change since Pearl Harbor. The Chinese case has been voiced in this country through its unofficial spokesman, Lin Yutang.

China's complaints, as expressed in a letter by Lin Yutang to the N. Y. Times of July 19, fall into two main categories:

1. China is not getting the supplies which it was promised; delivery of these supplies to China is being "sabotaged."

The letter says: "The English and the American public must realize that China is no longer satisfied with bouquets such as those so graciously thrown out to the Chinese nation on the fifth anniversary (of the Sino-Japanese war). The only bouquet that China will appreciate now is to stop (Continued on page 3)

## All India Opposes British Rule, Reporter Admits

### Conservative Elements Find Themselves Forced to Support Independence Demand

By Felix Morrow

That all India is unanimous in demanding independence and opposing the British is revealed by one tiny glimpse provided in the first dispatch of Herbert L. Matthews, just sent there by the N. Y. Times. He writes from Karachi, Sind Province:

"An American entering this gate of India finds himself caught between two fires—British and Indian." Note that he does not say British and Congress, but British and INDIAN.

He goes on:

"Since this is true of Sind Province, which is relatively

remote from the real political agitation, it should be much more so elsewhere. Sind is about three-

quarters Moslem and the All-India Congress has made little progress here." (N. Y. Times, August 29.)

Matthews was able to talk to only one Congressman in Karachi—the rest were in jail and this one was shortly to go there too.

In addition he talked to the Premier of Sind Province, who is a Moslem; to several Indian businessmen and eight Indian newspapermen. And he reports: "Despite the diversity of types all presented virtually identical cases." Or, in plainer English, all India demands immediate independence.

### A SIGNIFICANT STAND

The stand taken for independence by the Premier of Sind, Allah Bakhsh, is especially significant. He took office under particularly reprehensible circumstances. In September 1939, Sind was being governed by a Congress-coalition ministry (it was one of the four provinces in which the Congress did not secure a majority in the elections of 1937). In protest against India's being drawn into the war without the people's consent, the seven Congress provincial ministries resigned and the Congress ministers withdrew from the coalition ministries in Sind and Orissa provinces. Allah Bakhsh insisted on re-establishing a provincial ministry—an act of secession against the nationalist protest. For him now to echo Congress views, therefore, can only mean irresistible pressure from the masses—and this in a predominantly Moslem province.

Matthews quotes the Congress position as ready to "support a complete Moslem government for the duration of the war if it meant Indian independence."

These few facts, testified to by the Times correspondent, constitute an annihilating refutation of the mountains of pro-British lies published by the American press. (Continued on page 2)

### A FIFTH FREEDOM?

In Spartansburg, S. C., Private Albert Carrish, Negro soldier, was "attacked and beaten for going into a drug store to get an ice cream cone last week," according to a recent issue of the Pittsburgh Courier.

After Carrish had been beaten by the white store clerk and other Jim Crow elements standing around, the cops came — and threw Carrish into jail.

The next morning, the Courier story continues, Carrish was tried in police court and sentenced to 30 days on the chain gang or a \$50 fine.

The right of a Negro to get an ice cream cone in a so-called white drug store — that must be the "fifth freedom."

## Meat To Be Rationed As Shortage Continues

The food situation is daily becoming more acute.

Meat will be rationed starting in about four months. This was announced on Sept. 1 by the Food Requirements Committee, which pointed out that the rationing measure was not designed to relieve present meat shortages in certain localities, which arise because the packers are sending the major percentage of their meat to those areas where prices are higher and curtailing the supply to the districts where prices, and profits, are lower.

At the same time food prices are soaring. For example, potatoes are selling at wholesale at the Chicago market at the highest prices of more than a decade. The milk dealers of New York are threatening to halt deliveries unless milk prices will be allowed to rise. Candy manufacturers are pressing for higher prices, etc.

Because the price on raw milk had been raised from \$3.10 to \$3.30 a hundred-weight, the milk distributors of New York City demand the right to pass on this increase to the consumers in the form of higher prices. Prices of

## FDR Speech Will Set New Drastic Wage Controls

### Nature of Plan Is Foreshadowed by Latest Anti-Labor Moves of Government Agencies

By JOSEPH ANDREWS

Sept. 2—Although President Roosevelt was still putting the finishing touches on the "wage control" speech he is scheduled to make on Labor Day, the nature of the main points of his new proposals could already be seen this week from recent statements and actions by the administration and its agencies.

1. At a press conference, after his meeting with William Green and Philip Murray last week, Roosevelt said that "the wage stabilization to be incorporated in his program would be flexible and would not amount to a flat freezing of wages and salaries." (N. Y. Times, Aug. 29.)

It is evident from this that the policy probably agreed to between Roosevelt and the leaders of the AFL and CIO would provide something similar to the "Little Steel" formula, by which wages are "frozen" to the purchasing power of January 1941, but allowed "flexibility" up to that point.

### FORMULA PEGS WAGES TO LOW LEVEL

This formula pegs wages to the low point prevailing before the big strike wave in the spring of 1941; it would mean virtually no wage increases for the great majority of the workers. It is expected that Roosevelt will seek to apply this formula to all cases whether they come before the WLB or not.

2. In the "Big Steel" decision, made on August 25, the WLB automatically applied the "Little Steel" formula, rejecting the steel workers' original demand for the dollar-a-day increase, and granting only a 5½% increase. This gives advance notice of what is coming for the Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler workers who are asking for a dollar-a-day increase.

3. Similarly following the "Little Steel" formula, the WLB flatly rejected the demands of the Reynolds Corporation workers for wage increases, refusing to grant them any increase whatever.

4. The WLB has handed down a decision to punish workers solely because they went on strike. In the case of the Mon-

santo Chemical Company and New England Company workers of Everett, Massachusetts, who staged a five day strike demanding a maintenance of membership clause in their contract, the WLB ruled that it will not grant "a maintenance of membership protection to this or any other union which resorts to economic force." Thus the WLB is now being used to outlaw strikes, although the workers still have the legal right to employ this weapon.

5. After a short strike at the Buick Aluminum Foundry in Flint, Michigan, precipitated by the company's firing of union members, the Army Air Force plant protection office, working with the company, forced two union leaders out of the plant, on the charge that they had appeared on the picket line and that they were "aiding the enemy knowingly." To walk on a picket line, by this reasoning, becomes treason.

### ADMINISTRATION MOVES TO CONTROL UNIONS

With wages to be frozen to the purchasing power level of Jan., 1941, and with the WLB and Army agencies utilized to terrorize and intimidate the unions, the administration is moving rapidly toward drastic control both of the income of the workers, and of their organizations.

The practical outlawing of the right to strike, as indicated by the Flint and Everett, Massachusetts cases, flows from the administration determination to curb and control wages. Roosevelt knows very well that to enforce the "Little Steel" formula, more than promises of "flexibility" is needed to prevent outbreaks of protest from the rank and file of the unions, whose living standards are under attack.

### UNION MOVEMENT IS IN DANGER

The union movement is in danger of having its basic rights destroyed. The top leadership has thus far countenanced the increasingly vicious administration acts of intimidation. After their meeting with Roosevelt, Murray and Green publicly stated that they agreed in principle with Roosevelt's "flexible" wage control proposals. In the Everett case, all labor representatives on the WLB voted with the rest of the board to punish the workers for their strike. No top union official has protested the Army's blacklisting of two union leaders in the Buick plant, for the "crime" of picketing.

Roosevelt's Labor Day speech will undoubtedly stress the "flexibility" of wage control included in his proposals. But the workers must let it be known that they are not deceived by this, and that they will not stand for what amounts to wage freezing in effect and the curtailment and abrogation of the union movement's right to use its economic strength to enforce its demands.

Both the milk distributors and candy companies are placing pressure on the OPA to secure higher prices by using the same weapon that was used by the grocery manufacturers and is now being used by the meat packers.

To secure a rise in the ceiling of some 400 to 500 items, the grocery manufacturers withheld these items from the retail stores and threatened to let the food spoil on the ground unharvested. The OPA surrendered to the manufacturers.

Profits, not the needs of the people, are what interest the bosses.



# What 'Pravda' Reveals:

Soviet Youth Duped by Stalin's Boast of Victory in 1942

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The arrival in this country of issues of *Pravda* for the first part of June makes it clear that the official campaign of boasting about Hitler's defeat in 1942 reached its heights on the very eve of the Nazi drive against Stalingrad and the Caucasus.

As is well known, on May 1 Stalin issued his "Order" claiming, among other things, that Hitler would and could be defeated in 1942. Thereupon the Stalinist press threw all caution to the wind, pretending that this boast was already the reality.

All war time activity was centered around the "fulfillment" of this "world-historic order." Enterprises in industry and the collective farms were set tasks the attainment of which the Soviet people were told would guarantee victory in 1942. It makes gruesome reading to see featured in the columns of *Pravda* reports of successes in precisely those areas which have been since overrun by the Nazis.

One of the high points of this campaign was the convocation on June 7 of the "Anti-Fascist Committee of Soviet Youth." This Committee is one of the hasty wartime creations of the Kremlin, designed primarily to cover up the fact that none of the official Soviet organizations have been permitted to meet since the outbreak of the war.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has not met a single time. Neither has the Komsozol (the Russian YCL), nor the Russian trade unions. The Supreme Council of the Soviets has not held a single session. No elections to this body have been held although they are long overdue. The Communist International and its "helmsman," Dimitroff, have simply disappeared from the scene. The only official gatherings have been those of "committees" of youth, housewives, etc. In this way an appearance of mass activity and agitation is being maintained.

The "Anti-Fascist Committee of Soviet Youth" held its first meeting last September. It issued a "World-Manifesto" which did not contain single word of internationalism nor a single reference to socialism or the defense of the socialist conquests of the Soviet Union. This document, utterly permeated with nationalist demagoguery, has never been referred to again in the Soviet press.

The second gathering of this handicapped body was staged as a "Win the War in 1942" Convention. "The sole topic for the second meeting of the fighting youth organization will be 'How to assure the Defeat of Hitler in 1942.'" (Daily Worker, June 7.) The same dispatch to the Daily

Worker goes on to add: "For two hours the group told foreign correspondents how they expect to defeat the Nazis."

Here is how *Pravda* reported the sessions:

"At the speaker's stand the representatives of Soviet youth took the oath to their people, to their leader, Comrade Stalin, to spare no efforts nor life itself in order to make the year 1942 the year of the annihilation of German Fascist plunderers, the year of emancipation of Soviet land from the Hitlerite scum." (*Pravda*, June 9.)

## THE RITUAL

An extract from a typical speech follows:

"Comrades! The hour of decisive battles has come. To crush the enemy in 1942—this is the task which Comrade Stalin has set before the Red Army, before the whole Soviet people. Let us then swear in the name of the whole Soviet youth to fulfill this order of Comrade Stalin" (idem).

One of the rituals at such meetings is to send a letter to Stalin. The communication addressed to Stalin in this case reads as follows:

"Comrades: The hour of decided the complete destruction of the German Fascist troops and the freeing of Soviet soil from the Hitlerite scum. Comrade Stalin, we swear to you by the shining memory of the great Lenin to fulfill this order" (idem).

At the same time, the second gathering, like the first, issued a "World-Manifesto." The Daily Worker was permitted to reprint only carefully edited sections of this document. The dispatch from Moscow carried in the Daily Worker states: "To the German youth the Conference appealed for refusal to obey the orders of Nazi officers and revolt against the Hitler rule." (Daily Worker, June 9.)

A glance at the text of the Manifesto reveals the reasons for the rigid censorship. It is couched in the language of an arrogant conqueror to a defeated enemy who need expect no mercy and has no recourse other than to surrender unconditionally.

## MONSTROUS STATEMENTS

This monstrous Manifesto begins by declaring:

"In stubborn battles the Red Army has chewed up Hitler's best divisions. Today his army is not the same as it was a year ago. The Fascist army has become weaker; the manpower and material reserves of Hitlerite Germany are on the verge of exhaustion." (*Pravda*, Jan. 9.)

It must be clearly understood that this declaration is not an episodic excess evinced on this particular occasion. No, it represents the official line of the Kremlin in its domestic propaganda since last December.

Thus, on June 8, *Pravda* declared:

"Hitlerite Germany, her army, her rear have become many times weaker than was the case 11 months ago. At the same time our country, our army, our rear

have become better organized and many times stronger."

The Stalinist appeal issued in the "World Manifesto" to the German youth is very brief and its language is pointed and unmistakable. After assuring the German youth that the "Red Army fights not against the German people but against the German occupiers," the Manifesto continues:

"So long as you continue to conduct yourselves like murderers on our soil, so long as you continue to tie your fate to Hitler—death awaits you. The fate of Hitler and his clique has been decided. Why should you perish with them? You can save yourselves." (*Pravda*, January 9, 1942.)

It is on this assumption of victory that the Kremlin does not ask but issues an ultimatum that the German soldiers refuse to fulfill the orders of Hitler and his generals and surrender to the Red Army!

What effect can such propaganda have on the German soldiers? Far from weakening their morale it plays directly into the hands of the Nazis. It is one of the basic reasons for the latest military success of the Nazis against the Red Army. At the same time it can only serve to demoralize the Soviet youth, who have been so deluded with boasts and promises of early victory.

## LENINIST POLICY NEEDED

The only appeal that will meet with a response on the part of the German masses and above all, the German youth, is the kind of appeal that was issued by the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky, namely, a summons to revolutionary struggle for the establishment of socialism and the creation of the Socialist United States of Europe. This is the only policy that can maintain the morale of the Soviet masses and of the Soviet youth.

The continuation of Stalinist policies of which the "World Manifesto" is such a glaring example can lead only to the downfall of the Soviet Union. There is still time to avert disaster—by returning to Bolshevism, to the policies of Lenin and Trotsky which guaranteed victory in October 1917 and enabled the Red Army to defeat the combined onslaught of the White Guards and of the imperialist intervention in the Civil War of 1918-1920.

## Wright Speaks On India at Harlem Workers' Club

NEW YORK — Speaking in defense of India's struggle for independence, John G. Wright addressed a forum of the Harlem Workers Club on Friday, August 28, at 72 West 125th Street.

Wright explained why the present struggle in India must be supported by all workers and oppressed, despite the unreliable Gandhi leadership; and emphasized that India's struggle for independence would bring unfolding fully only when the program of the agrarian revolution was linked up with the overthrow of British rule.

A lengthy and interesting discussion followed.

## DEFENSE

### POLICY

## in the MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL

- 1—A Criticism by Grandizo Munis
- 2—An Answer by James P. Cannon

The policy of the defense in the historic trial of 28 members of the Socialist Workers Party and the CIO is analyzed and discussed from two points of view in this clear and illuminating polemic on Marxist principles and propaganda methods.

This pamphlet will be of especial interest to all who have read the two other Pioneer Pamphlets on the trial — James P. Cannon's "Socialism On Trial" and Albert Goldman's "In Defense of Socialism."

## PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE  
NEW YORK

48 PAGES  
TWENTY CENTS

# WORKERS' FORUM

## Stalinist Stand On Indian Struggle

I notice that articles in THE MILITANT continue to repeat the flat assertion that the Stalinists are opposed to national independence in India. That's true enough, but constitutes no convincing argument for those who merely look at the CP's present slogans for India.

I do not have any files of the Daily Worker on hand but I plainly recall that paper's argument last year that the struggle for national liberation should be deferred; I also recall statements intimating that those who sought to continue the struggle for independence are "fifth columnists," etc. Then last spring the CP supported the Cripps mission and plan, Workers should be reminded of these facts.

In the present situation their position is that they are "for" national independence, but are opposed to all struggle for it. They attack the civil disobedience movement, place the blame on the All-India Congress for "provoking" violence, interfering with the war effort, etc., and at the same time criticize the British Government for using force, but only because it has proved ineffective and is driving the Indian masses further away from support of the Allied war effort.

The August 18 *New Masses* has an editorial which gives a good illustration of the Stalinist position. First it attacks the civil disobedience campaign as "unquestionably unfortunate," playing into the hands of Japan, and asserts "the Congress Party does not represent as much of India as it claims to." Then it adds: "But the fact that remains that the slogan: 'karenges ya marenges' — liberty or death — which is now echoing in front of India's police stations, expresses the deep desire of India's millions for partnership with the democratic countries against the common enemy. It expresses India's desire to help win the war as an equal rather than a servant."

Thus, according to the Stalinists, the struggle in India, so far as the masses are concerned, is not for independence from British imperialism, but to be in a better position to help Anglo-American imperialism win the war.

And the editorial continues: "Now it is all very well for the British spokesmen to say that it would be suicide to turn India over to the Congress leadership. Agreed. Agreed that a provisional government with Gandhi at its head might have negotiated with Japan. But let us be under no illusion that by this show of force the British government is now in position to mobilize India. Will this policy work to win the war? That is the pragmatic yardstick by which to judge it. The answer is that it will not work."

Fundamentally, the Stalinists are absolutely opposed to the struggle for Indian national independence. The best way to demonstrate this is by proving it "out of their own mouths."

J. K.  
Chicago, Ill.

## On the Recent ALP Convention

Editor: I read your recent editorial "What's Wrong With The ALP," with interest and attention. With your attitude toward the ALP I am particularly interested as I have been engaged in active ALP work over a period of time.

My main criticism of your statement is not with the substance of what you say. Rather I would like to call your attention to the significant but little known developments proceeding amongst rank and file ALP members. To be sure such developments do not make the editorial pages of the *N. Y. Times*.

I can frankly say that upstate ALP members were disgusted with the recent party convention. Many of them rejoiced when the Democrats nominated the reactionary Bennett.

Now, said the ALP members,

## DETROIT CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE PICNIC

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 13  
10:00 A. M.

## RIVER ROUGE PARK

Take Joy Road to West Parkway, continue on West Parkway to West Chicago

Games - Entertainment  
Free Lunch - Refreshments

DONATIONS TO CRDC  
FIFTY CENTS

our party will stand on its feet. Weeks in advance we repudiated Bennett; there is but once choice for us, a genuine ALP candidate must be selected.

Delegate after delegate from upstate uttered this theme — now the ALP is independent. As evidence of this sentiment it is interesting to note that the party leadership at a special upstate caucus meeting were forced to bring in their best spell-binders to assure upstate representatives that labor's own candidate would be nominated. Declarations such as this brought forth enthusiastic cheers.

Then came the climax. The dark horse Tammany Democrat, Alfange, was to be our very own candidate. No upstate delegate knew or cared who Alfange was. This Tammany Hall wonder boy was thrust down the throat of the convention by the worst steam-roller tactics. A delegate next to me remarked that while the leadership blared loud against fascism, they never hesitated to practice dictatorial methods in their own conventions!

But upstate delegates from such places as Seneca Falls, Schenectady, Plattsburg, Saratoga, Syracuse and Albany, from rural areas and towns, returned bitterly disappointed. They felt betrayed by the rosy promises of the leadership made the day before. Not a few threatened to bolt the ALP this fall.

Yet I insist that in this feeling of disillusionment lies the hope of the ALP. Once this sentiment is channeled in the correct paths and honest leadership is provided, I believe the ALP can become what so many hoped it would — the nucleus of a national labor party.

To those workers now outside its ranks, I say enter the party and build it. Join forces with those militants now in the ALP and I would be willing to wager that the recent disgraceful convention will not occur again.

D. A.  
Schenectady, N. Y.

# All India Opposes British Rule, Reporter Admits

(Continued from page 1)

They give the lie direct to the alibis of Amery and Cripps.

The British falsehoods may sound plausible to uninformed American readers, but all India knows what really happened in the negotiations with Cripps, and the great masses of India stand with the Congress against the Cripps "offer."

Cripps' latest lying account of the negotiations appeared in the *N. Y. Times* of August 28. Cripps says: "A temporary compromise was necessary. . . . When I speak of compromise I do not refer only or mainly to the agreement between the British government and the various Indian parties, but to accommodation among the Indians themselves." Then he proceeds to "prove" by arithmetic that the Congress is opposed by "more than half the total population."

The *Times* obligingly underlines this alibi with a running head: "Cripps explains the complexity of India's problem in terms of the diversity of the Indian people."

Cripps talks about everything except the real issue on which negotiations broke down: the dictatorial powers of the Viceroy and the India Office in London—powers which were to remain completely untouched under the Cripps "offer."

The 1935 Act under which India is ruled provides the Viceroy with the following sweeping powers:

1. He chooses and dismisses all members of his Executive Council.
2. He presides over it as its Prime Minister.
3. He can, against the will of the entire Executive Council, decree laws in the name of the Government of India.

And whatever powers may not be indicated under these three points can be wielded in addition by Amery in the India Office in London!

All that Cripps proposed to the Indian political parties was that they should agree to have their representatives appointed to the Viceroy's Executive Council. They would be Ministers—but the dictatorial powers of the Viceroy and the India Office would remain as before. In short, they would become puppets of Britain. This is what Cripps tries to palm off as "self-government."

That the Viceroy and the India Office would remain the supreme power in India under the Cripps "Plan" — this fact Cripps and

# Detroit Housing Project Blocked By Auto Bosses

## Workers Given Plenty of Housing Survey But A Place to Live In Is Hard to Find

By LARISSA REED

DETROIT, Mich.—Good weather is slipping away, hour by hour, day by day, week by week, protests the *Detroit Free Press* of August 8, while 96,000 more war workers, drawn from all parts of the country, will be tramping the streets vainly seeking permanent shelter this winter unless immediate action is taken. Commenting ironically on "another survey" made this month by Federal, State and

local officials, this paper says: "That must be great news for thousands of distracted war workers and their families desperately in need of homes NOW. They ask decent places to live. They are given another survey. . . . What our homeless war workers want is not more surveys but more ACTION."

Last fall, long before the present crisis developed, the CIO United Auto Workers presented an excellent program for government-subsidized housing action. It could have been completed by now, and instead of "hot air," the war workers would have had some homes. President Roosevelt, in approving the plan, declared: "I am interested in making this housing proposal a reality." What has happened to it?

It is now evident to everyone that with the passive consent of the President, the big capitalist interests of Detroit, the real-estate owners and operators, the banks and insurance companies, have sabotaged the UAW-CIO and all other public housing projects.

Since last November, the UAW has been given the run-around by government officials on its proposed "Defense City" to be located in Willow Run. Three months after the President approved the plan, R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW, was compelled to request the President to personally intervene in the "confused situation" regarding the Willow Run housing for 75,000 to 100,000 war workers and their families. What was the

source of this sudden "confusion"?

President Roosevelt declared on Feb. 14, "that the trouble at Willow Run to date has been that a half dozen communities, two or three counties, the state government, and various agencies of the Federal government are all involved with no one to pull their work together." He thereupon sent his uncle, Frederick A. Delano, Chairman of the National Parks & Planning Commission, as his personal representative to "coordinate all these agencies and get something started quickly." In line with recommendations of the UAW-CIO, Roosevelt telephoned some 16 Federal housing agencies into one, "streamlining it for efficient wartime action." John B. Blandford, Jr., became administrator of the newly formed National Housing Agency replacing the "inefficient" housing coordinator, Charles F. Palmer. But what kind of "efficient wartime action" has developed?

On March 6 there came the awaited announcement: "The biggest single defense housing program ever undertaken by the Government, involving 15,000 units to be constructed from Federal funds and 30,000 from private funds guaranteed by the Federal Housing Authority, has been approved for the Detroit area by John B. Blandford, Jr., Leon K. Keyserling, Public Housing Commissioner, was authorized to proceed immediately with plans for the first 15,000 units, at a cost of about \$60,000,000, while private funds were solicited through the FHA to build the larger 30,000 unit project at an approximate cost of \$120,000,000."

Everything was set for large-scale action—on paper!

## THE OPPOSITION ACTS

This Federal authorization brought out into the open the undercover struggle of private profit interests headed by Henry Ford who, from the first, had been hostile to this and all other public housing projects.

"Opposition to the construction of a 'bomber city' in Washtenau County, adjacent to the Ford bomber plant at Willow Run grew, to hurricane proportions," reported the *Detroit News* of May 7. All of Ford's henchlings, "two city councils, the county board of supervisors, chamber of commerce, citizen groups and Ford officials" dispatched representatives to Washington to stop the Willow Run housing project.

One Ford stooge, Henry E. Riggs, honorary Professor of Civil Engineering of the University of Michigan, said that the houses would be small and far from adequate. He failed to point out that without them the workers had no houses at all! He said that thousands of men would be required who might better be employed in war work. Obviously, war workers do not need shelter—they can sleep in the rat-infested alleys of Detroit!

Ford and his opposition allies manufactured all kinds of fake excuses for preventing the construction of the bomber city. Chief among them was the complaint that a "ghost city" would be left after the war when "the workers" moved away, and the houses would then become vacant or occupied by "least desirable elements." (Evidently Detroit's capitalists already foresee a post-war depression crisis when hordes of men and their families will be wandering around, not only without homes, but without work.) These "least desirable elements" will be the same workers who are today being urged to double their efforts and sacrifice to the limit for war production. In wartime they are forced to live in shacks, tents, trailers and vacant stores; afterwards they will be forced back into the gutters, if the capitalists have their way.

## UNDERLYING MOTIVES FOR OPPOSITION

The opposition forces are motivated by various reasons. Chairman Nicholas of the UAW-CIO Housing Committee has stated that private real estate corporations and builders are more interested in building houses for sale rather than for rent as this yields them a larger profit. The UAW-CIO government houses are principally for rental. Both sale prices and rentals on the government houses would have been much cheaper than prevailing private construction. Moreover, the government housing, Nicholas declared, would have been more comfortable, livable, better-constructed and easily accessible to the plants. The workers would have benefited enormously from the construction of this project, but the capitalists' pocket-books would have suffered.

Although Henry Ford has been compelled to recognize and deal with the UAW-CIO in his plant, he is fearful of their further encroachment upon his domain. A community of tens of thousands of workers and their families living in a model settlement, built and actually dominated by the workers' own organization, would be a powerful stronghold for the workers in their struggle against the auto barons.

Moreover, such a model community would stand in sharp contrast to the inadequate, remotely located, poorly constructed and expensive houses built for private profit. The conveniences of its parks, recreation rooms, community dining rooms, club rooms, laundries and nurseries would teach the workers the great lesson that a planned way of life under workers' control is not only possible, but easy to attain and costs much less money.

Harry C. Mack, Ford spokesman, condemned the proposed city of Willow Run as "a CIO plan." Some adjacent farm owners lined up behind Ford branded the CIO as "a pressure group" which was pushing the bomber city project because it saw an opportunity to gain political control of Washtenau County. A member of the board of supervisors of Washtenau County, which is directly under Ford's thumb, declared that "dumping 60,000 persons into Washtenau County would make a lot of difference." There is no question that, since the UAW-CIO would control a solid bloc of tens of thousands of votes, it would completely change the political complexion of this county, now controlled by Ford.

Next Week: What happened to the UAW Housing Plan.

## \$1-A-Year Men Resign; Replaced By \$1-A-Year Men

Reese H. Taylor, head of the Steel and Iron Branch of the War Production Board, resigned from that post on August 28. The resignation followed Frederick Libbey's exposure of the domination of the Branch by the large steel corporations.

Libbey, WPB engineering consultant, was fired summarily by Donald Nelson on the ground that his mildly critical report of conditions in the Steel and Iron Branch had been allowed to leak out to a newspaper.

Taylor was a dollar-a-year man. Until 1938 he had been president of the Consolidated Steel Company. At present he is president of the Union Oil Company of California.

On August 31, David F. Austin was appointed successor to Reese Taylor. Like his predecessor, the new head of the Branch comes from a large corporation. He is vice-president of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation.

Another dollar-a-year man, the WPB's director of operations, Amery Houghton, has also resigned. Houghton is a leading official in the Corning Works which was recently convicted of being a trust. Donald Nelson, his superior, accepted the resignation "with regret."

Meanwhile, the WPB policy of concentrating the profitable war orders in the hands of the large corporations and of hampering any expansion not under the control of those corporations, has resulted in a steel shortage which is responsible for many layoffs and the shutdown of such plants as the Higgins Shipyard.

A few notorious agents of the corporations are gone from the WPB, but the appointment of Austin and the regret Nelson expresses at Houghton's resignation indicate that the WPB heads do not intend to change their monopoly policies.

Subscribe to the  
"Fourth International"



## The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

### The Effect of Racial Epithets

A white worker, member of an AFL union, recently told us of an incident in his plant, which we would like to pass along especially for the consideration and benefit of white workers who may read this.

The union is in a plant employing about 200 workers, of whom almost half are Negroes. The union has a fairly good contract with the boss, and until recently practically all the Negroes were good members, paying their dues, attending meetings and supporting their officers in all disputes with the boss. Two Negroes were members of the union executive board, one of them as a vice-president. The Negro union members were generally satisfied with most of the white officers, who handled their grievances on the same basis that they handled those of the white workers.

But recently a number of Negro workers heard one of the minor white officials of the union using the term "nigger." Angered — and with justification — they went to the Negro vice-president of the union and demanded that he make an issue of this, and get action against the official who had used the offensive term. The vice-president did this, but the executive board, while deploring the incident, was not willing to undertake any action.

A bitter dispute followed, and ended with the two Negroes resigning from the executive board. Since then, the Negro workers have stopped attending meetings and paying dues. As a result, the union is in a terribly weakened condition, the boss's hand has been strengthened, and grievances are beginning to pile up instead of being settled as they were previously.

Our friend who told us this story says that he has been trying to convince the Negroes that they have been following the wrong course — that he agrees with them steps must be taken to put an end to the use of offensive racial terms, but that the way to do it is inside the union, as good members, where they will be able to get the support of such white members as our friend.

Lately, he says, some of them have begun to express agreement for this point of view, and he says there is hope that the situation may be corrected, with the result that the justified complaints of the Negroes will be attended to, and the union as a whole preserved as an instrument of all the workers against their common enemy.

Now of course our friend was completely correct in urging this course upon his Negro brothers. But that isn't the point we wish to stress in commenting on this situation, which takes on acute significance today when Negroes are turning in greater numbers than ever before to the labor movement and to a militant program for the solution of their problems.

Here we wish only to try to impress on white members of the labor movement the meaning and effect of the use of such terms as "nigger," "chink," "greaser," etc.

The effect, as our incident shows, can be completely disastrous for the interests of the white workers themselves. In

fact, it can be put down as a rule that anything which tends to weaken the unity of all races in the labor movement hurts the best interests of the working class as a whole.

Only the capitalist ruling class is benefited by practices which divide workers along racial lines. How much stronger the labor movement would be today if it had from the beginning paid attention to the Negro workers and tried to organize them into its ranks! The failure to do so in the past aided only the employers — and was a result of the propaganda of the employers.

And it does not make much difference in the final analysis whether white workers use offensive racial terms deliberately and maliciously or whether they use them "unintentionally." When someone says he used such terms unintentionally, all that he is saying is that he did not mean to speak them out loud. But the very fact that he even thinks such terms shows that he is still under the influence of capitalist propaganda, tradition and education.

Negroes, and advanced white workers who understand the problem, must make their appeal to the average backward white worker first of all on the basis of his own self-interests. The backward white worker must be shown how it is against his own interests to discriminate against Negro workers, or even to use the language of the slaveholders.

But this is not enough. The second step is to really educate him, to get him to understand the nature of the problem. For as long as he thinks in the terms of racial superiority, there is always the danger that he may sometimes act in that way. He must be shown why he was trained to look down on the Negro, and who was behind this training. He must be taught the history of the Negroes, their contributions to society, their part in the labor movement. While this educational campaign is going on, the white worker will also be learning important lessons in the course of the joint struggle with the Negroes against the bosses.

This is an all-important question for every workers' organization, the revolutionary party as well as the trade unions. Negro workers are not going to be attracted to any organization, even with the best and most militant program, if that organization tolerates "white supremacy" expressions on the part of any of its members. Having been tricked and cheated by so many of what they consider "white organizations," it is only natural for them to be skeptical about the sincerity of white workers.

Every workers' organization should always be on the alert to show the Negro people that they practice what they preach. Their members who bring discredit to the organization on this question must be censured, and they must be educated; those who persist in undermining the unity of Negro and white have no place in a workers' organization. Any other course will be suicidal in the long run for those organizations which seek to organize Negro and white workers for action against their exploiters.

themselves whether it is "vicious."

"The conditions of the Negro people are fully as bad as they were a year ago, and the Negro masses are fully aware of the fact. They are ready to take up the militant struggle where it was discontinued a year ago (when the March on Washington was called off.) Their eagerness for action, indeed, is so great that the Negro misleaders dare not openly counsel them to give up the struggle for equal rights, but have to confine themselves to repeating the refrain that 'winning the war must come first, and we must not do anything to interfere with the prosecution of the war.' The Negro masses are not interested in interfering with the prosecution of the war, but for them winning the struggle against Jim Crowism comes 'first' because they know what is going to be their lot if the war against the Axis is won while the war against Jim Crowism is lost."

The Stalinists don't like to have the Negro people told the truth about the Negro leaders who don't dare to come out openly and fully with their Uncle Tom policies. The reason is that the Stalinists belong in the same category as these war-time Uncle Toms.

# The Story Behind A Frameup

## British Coal Kings Sabotage Coal Production; Trotskyists Alone Fight for Miners' Interests

By GEORGE COLLINS

We are now in a position to tell the full story behind the poisonous charges made against British Trotskyists who were accused in July of "sabotaging" the mines and carrying on "subversive" propaganda with the aid of a Nazi subsidy.

Far from substantiating these "charges" the detailed information we have just received from England decisively proves:

1. That British coal kings are deliberately sabotaging production to maintain high rates of profit;

2. That the Churchill government and its Labor Party lackeys are in open alliance with the coal kings;

3. That widespread discontent resulting in sporadic strikes prevails in the minefields;

4. That the "Socialist Appeal" is the only workers' paper to actively support the miners' struggles and provide them with a fighting program: Nationalize the mines and operate them under workers' control!

5. That as a result of the exposures carried by the "Socialist Appeal" a frameup was trumped up against it and widely featured in a campaign by the reactionary press;

6. Stalinists and liberals joined in the frameup campaign; only the ILP has declared solidarity with the "Appeal" which is vigorously continuing the fight against the treacherous miners' leaders and finding support among important sections of miners.

### ARTIFICIAL COAL SHORTAGE

After the fall of France, the British market for coal in Europe disappeared and the best producing pits in South Wales and Durham were closed. Throughout the mine field the coal kings closed up the most productive seams and at the same time sabotaged the proposal to ration coal. They were determined to maintain their profits at all costs.

Stocks of coal which were accumulated during the production peak were eaten up. An artificial shortage was introduced to force the selling price of coal up to the maximum. Their aim was to preserve the same dividends on the basis of lower output.

The government has met the problem of the chaos in the mine industry by proposals that preserve intact the present crisis of capitalist mismanagement and sabotage. Profits are to be maintained at least on their present level.

Coal royalty owners are to be bought out for the sum of 66,450,000 pounds, a gift equivalent to the amount which would be paid out in royalties on the basis of a high level production for the next 15 years!

The White Paper outlining government policy proposes certain restrictions on the present capitalist management but in essence matters are left where they were. Says the White Paper: "It is undesirable that the controllers (the government's representatives) should be burdened with the details of day-to-day management of the pits. This will be left, as it is today in the hands of the managers who will continue to be servants of the owners. . ."

A joint board of miners, government and owners is to be set up to "control" the industry, leaving the miners not only in a minority but represented by trade union leaders who work hand in glove with the mine operators and the government.

### MINERS LOT WORSENER

Meanwhile England's coal diggers have been paying with low wages, unemployment and wretched conditions for capitalist mismanagement and swollen profits to stockholders. Over 100,000 miners were cast on the dole or driven out of the industry. So low are the wages in the coal industry that between April 1940 and April 1941 62,000 young miners joined the armed forces in preference to living on the dole or working in the mines.

Casualties among miners have increased to 1,000 a year since the war began. The government reports admit these dreadful conditions but turn away from them with a shrug: "Nothing can be done."

On the other hand they are enacting measures to fine or imprison miners for taking time off from work as a result of sickness, minor accidents, etc. Yet the government reports are forced to admit that although this so-called "absenteeism" has risen during the war, "there has also been a steady rise in the number of shifts worked per wage earner; and in the last week for which statistics are available the number of shifts worked was 5.66, the highest on record." Of course, no similar measures are being contemplated against the deliberate sabotage and delays

caused by capitalist managers and owners.

### STRIKES IN MINEFIELDS

Throughout the mining areas sporadic walkouts and stoppages have been taking place without sanction of the miners' leaders after the miners' patience was tried to the breaking point. In one three week period a few months ago there were 83 walkouts involving 30,000 miners. In Durham County, for example, 6000 miners downed tools in protest against the imprisonment of two young miners who refused to pay a 5 pound fine.

In Yorkshire the spark was ignited that sent mine owners and labor misleaders, howling for the suppression of the Socialist Appeal. Payment of "dust" money (a bonus paid for over 8 years to those loading trucks at the end of the mechanical coal conveying belt where the coal drops several feet throwing up dense clouds of dust injuring health and causing frequent accidents) was stopped by the mineowners.

After weeks of fruitless negotiations the young miners struck, but after a few days decided to go back to work pending negotiations. The management replied by issuing 1388 summonses and claiming 5 pounds from each worker for breach of contract.

The management later withdrew all but 500 of these summonses. The young miners struck to a man again.

The young miners received no support from Hall and Jones, the leaders of the Yorkshire Miners Association, who branded the strike as "illegal and unconstitutional" and demanded that they return to work. In contrast to the strikebreaking policy of the miners' leaders, the Socialist Appeal, distributed to the young miners, came to their support with friendly advice and support.

**SUPPRESSION DEMANDED**  
Faced for the first time in years with a real challenge to their treacherous policies on the part of a group with a serious program for the miners, Joseph Hall, president of the Yorkshire Miners Association, concocted his frameup against the Socialist Appeal.

Leading articles in all the reactionary and mineowners press took up the fraudulent charges of Hall and Will Lawthor, president of the Miners Union. Reports were sent down to the offices of the Socialist Appeal to "investigate." (They found, of course, only the modest headquarters of a working class organization whose leaders live on the meager salaries provided by workers' contributions.) They played up the fact that the Appeal had purchased so many pounds of newsprint. They reproduced facsimiles of the front page of the Appeal, etc. Scotland Yard sent down a snoopingly party. The WIL leaders met these "curious" gentlemen with an open exposition of their program and

a declared willingness to face any workers' investigation.

### MORRISON GOES HALF-WAY

Reactionary members of the House of Commons questioned Herbert Morrison, Home Secretary and Labor Party leader, "regarding the distribution of subversive literature among Yorkshire miners by young men between the ages of 25 and 30, who were being paid 10 pounds a week to distribute this literature." Morrison replied that there was no information available to prove the charge but later on in answer to a question from Gallacher, Stalinist M.P., said that if the Appeal, which does not "have appreciable influence in the mining industry or elsewhere," becomes a "threat," then "appropriate measures would be taken."

The Stalinists, while demanding that the ban against the "Daily Worker" be lifted, are secretly intriguing with the Tories for the suppression of the Appeal. Along with the pack ran the sickly liberals. The New Statesman and Nation quickly forgot all about democratic rights and accepted all the infamous charges against the Appeal. The Tribune (Cripps' paper) had not a single word to say against the attempted suppression; they could only whine about the "irresponsible" manner in which the capitalist press gave "a small sect of Trotskyist supporters hundreds of pounds of free publicity. . ."

Only

the New Leader, organ of the Independent Labor Party, roundly condemned the frameup campaign against the Socialist Appeal.

**THE WIL FIGHTS BACK**  
The WIL is effectively and vigorously fighting the slanderous charges. A large meeting was held in Holborn Hall in London, at which a representative of the ILP spoke, in protest against the suppression. A leaflet is being widely circulated throughout the minefields, entitled "An Open Letter to the Yorkshire Miners Association; our answer to the slanders of the president, Joseph Hall." The leaflet concludes with the following proposals:

1. That a special investigating committee be set up by the Miners Council; 2. That the investigations be conducted in public; the WIL offers to place all its files and records before this committee; 3. That a report of the investigating committee be made to a mass meeting of Yorkshire miners at which Hall and the editors of the Appeal will speak.

Meanwhile militant miners are taking up the fight against the union bureaucrats. In two sections, Durham and Kent, resolutions have been presented demanding that paid officials come up for election every two years which will eliminate the present system which places the bureaucrats in office for life. These resolutions are meeting with a good reception among other locals.

# U.S. Bosses In Shanghai Still Do Business As Usual with Japanese

(Continued from page 1)

that policy of sabotaging supplies to China, wherever it originates."

### Where The "Sabotage" Originates

Although Lin Yutang diplomatically does not mention names, he clearly implies where the "policy of sabotage" originates: "The greater part of the transport planes sent to China were held up and diverted before they reached China. The few bombers that did reach China and participated in the recent bombing of Hankow were taken out again and diverted 'to Egypt' . . ."

"Unless an immediate order be given to divert planes from India to China, instead of diverting planes from China to India, it will be too late to send American planes to China before the Changsha battle is over. . . The transport planes diverted to India must be immediately diverted back to China. . ."

"There must be an assurance that supplies to China can go through India before there is any use of asking for and sending more help from the United States. . ."

Diverted to Egypt, to India—obviously this is a charge that the "sabotage" of supplies to China can be laid at the doors of the British. But who will believe that the British took such steps without the advance knowledge and approval of the United States officials in charge of supplies?

2. China is not being consulted or informed about the "grand strategy" of the United Nations in the war in the Far East. "Any Allied strategy affecting China's

own vital interests must be planned in consultation with China," Lin Yutang warns.

### "The Mysterious Secrets"

"China must be let into the mysterious secrets of the 'Allied grand strategy' before efficient cooperation on the part of China can bring the most useful results. Chiang Kai-shek must not be kept guessing what the Allied strategists are or are not going to do. There has been exasperating waste of China's strength."

As proof, Lin Yutang refers to the Burmese campaign, in which China wanted to participate so that it might keep the vital Burma Road open, but which it was not permitted to do because the British authorities in Burma refused to supply oil to China's mechanized forces or to let them cross the border until it was too late.

These should not be misconstrued as signs that the American and British imperialists want Japan to win the war in China. The imperialist allies of China want Japan defeated, but they want it done in such a way that their own position in China will not be endangered.

They do not look with favor on the growing spirit of national self-confidence which has been manifest since Pearl Harbor not only in India but also in China. Their policy of keeping China from becoming too independently "strong," and thus perhaps becoming an inspiration for all the oppressed colonial peoples, is not the result of "blundering" but of their coldly calculated desire to run the war in such a way that the Chinese government will become and be

forced to remain wholly subservient to the dictates of the imperialist "democracies."

What the imperialists contemplate for China after this "war for democracy" is over is revealed not only by the news from Shanghai and the complaints from China, but also by an anniversary which was "observed" last week.

August 29 marked the one hundredth anniversary since the Treaty of Nanking, which ended the "Opium War" the British had launched for the purpose of opening China to foreign trade and exploitation. Five ports were opened to foreign trade by this treaty, and out of it too came the system of extra-territorial "rights" in these ports, under which, the N. Y. Times admits, "foreigners (Americans included) have now enjoyed for a full century special rights in China which have been humiliating to that country and destructive to its sovereignty."

On many occasions the Chinese people have demanded an end to extra-territoriality. Since December 7, 1941, these demands have increased. The United States and Britain have promised that they will "negotiate" the question after the war.

The point is that the areas where these "rights" were employed are no longer in the hands of either China or the "democracies." But the British and American governments refuse, even while the Japanese hold these areas, to give up their imperialist privileges in them. What an instructive commentary this is on the Allied claims that they are fighting for the independence of China!

# Only German Revolution Can Save Soviet Union

"If Stalingrad falls," writes the *Daily Worker*, "we will be further away from victory than we have ever been."

The Stalinist sheet tells us what the fall of the city would mean from a military point of view. Hitler will succeed, by capturing the city, "in separating the extreme southern Red Armies from their comrades in the north. He will have cornered

defeated in 1942; they no longer say, however, that he will be defeated this year.

With the passing of each day it becomes ever clearer that the Soviet Union will be saved only by a revolution in Germany.

**WORKERS' STATE WILL NOT BE SAVED BY IMPERIALISM**

Stalin depends upon the armies of Churchill and Roosevelt. He is leaning on a broken reed.

Do we mean that the military might of England and the United States will be unable to defeat Hitler? We do not know the answer to that question. We only know that a military defeat of Hitler by "democratic" imperialists without a workers' revolution in Germany cannot save the Soviet Union in the sense that every revolutionary worker wants it saved, in the sense of saving the foundations of socialism represented by the nationalized property.

The Stalinist leadership is clamoring for a second front to save Stalingrad and achieve vic-

tory. Revolutionary Marxists do not support the war of the imperialist nations and therefore do not support any part of it.

A second front may or may not bring about the defeat of Hitler. But without a workers' revolution in Germany a defeat of Hitler by an imperialist second front cannot save the Soviet Union.

The situation has reached a stage where, because of the vast destruction wrought by the German armies in the Soviet Union, Stalin must depend upon capitalist England and the United States to save him and his bureaucracy. He depends upon them for victory against Hitler; he depends upon them to rebuild the economy of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union cannot and will not be saved by capitalist England and the United States.

The Soviet Union can be saved, but only by a workers' revolution in Germany. The Stalinist bureaucracy is not interested in such a revolution; it is following policies that can only throttle the revolution in Germany. The Stalinist regime is unwilling and incapable of spreading revolutionary socialist propaganda among the German masses.

### NOW AND THE LAST TIME

The Soviet workers are giving everything they have to save the

Soviet Union. In the city of Stalingrad the workers have left their shops and with arms in hand they are prepared to fight desperately to stem the onrushing tide of the German imperialist forces.

Just as the Red Army and the Soviet workers fought in the Civil War to save Tsaritsin—during Lenin's illness Stalin had the name of the city changed to Stalingrad—so will they fight now. With this difference, that in the Civil War they fought under a leadership that pursued a policy based on the struggle for socialism throughout the world while now the Stalinist bureaucracy is anxious only to preserve its own existence.

Heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of the Soviet masses can lead to victory and the saving of the Soviet Union only if the policies followed by their government are those pursued by Lenin and Trotsky in the early days of the Soviet Republic.

The Stalingrad workers together with the whole Soviet population must place the blame for their critical situation where it belongs—on the shoulders of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

To defend the Soviet Union the Soviet masses must at the first favorable opportunity, without endangering the military struggle against imperialism, rid themselves of the bureaucrats responsible for the defeats. They must re-establish their democratic Soviets and just as they did in the Civil War, they must raise the banner of world socialism.

## HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF...

By MILTON ALVIN

The great lessons of history have apparently had no effect upon the British ruling class. Like its predecessors, it refuses to believe that its day has come, that it is time to depart and leave the management of affairs to those who will wield the power in the interests of the toiling majority of humanity.

When the Parisian masses stormed the palace at Versailles, King Louis XVI's queen, Marie Antoinette, is reported to have sarcastically suggested cake in response to their demands for bread. The French court did not take the rebellion seriously in 1789. Just some local rioting, that's all. Spectacular entertainment of the royal courtiers continued. The nobility of France tried not to see the hand-writing on the wall. Everything remained as before for them; it was only necessary to scatter the rioters.

**TWO GREAT REVOLUTIONS**

But the Great French Revolution had begun. The "rioting" of the masses of Paris was the herald of a new day in history. In the next few years the entire structure of the old feudal order was swept out of France, taking with it the rotten regime of the Bourbons. The replacement of feudal society by capitalist society in France was in its time the most progressive act in the history of mankind.

Similarly more than one hundred years later, the Russian Czar Nicholas II heading an absolutist regime based largely upon feudal and semi-feudal privileges, was deaf to the rumbling of revolt. When news of the demonstrations in Petrograd reached him at the front in February 1917, he replied about the weather plus a few words about his disappointment in one of his ministers who was fool enough to bother him with such trifles. But once again, great historical events were on the threshold. Before the year had passed, Russia had gone through two revolutions, the second of which firmly established the workers in power for the first time in history.

History does not repeat itself in exactly the same way but news from India clearly indicates that the British rulers there are playing the parts of the Bourbons and Romanovs of yesterday. Culled from one day's news dispatches in the N. Y. Times (Aug. 30) are the following items: **THEY DANCE AND BET AS THE LIGHTNING SHOTS**

"Stores and hotels are open in Bombay. The Friday night cabaret dance at the fashionable but outmoded Taj Mahal Hotel is so popular that it is necessary to make bookings days in advance to attend. The Poona racing season also is proving one of the most successful of recent years."

And meanwhile: "A government communique today reported that six Indians were killed and thirty-eight injured when officers fired into a disorderly crowd around a police station in Patna Province."

The police today fired at Brindaban, near Lucknow, on a mob that tried to attack the police station there. It was announced tonight. One man was killed and three injured.

"At Benares, a crowd of about a thousand was driven off by the police when they tried to attack railway and police stations. Sixteen people were injured, fourteen of them seriously."

"The Bihar government today issued reports of disturbances in various parts of the province several days ago. On August 21 the police fired on a mob that was wrecking a railway station, killing two. Near the same place crowds trying to wreck a railway embankment were forcibly dispersed. Four persons were killed and three injured. There was one casualty during house searches at Mansi."

"Troops fired on demonstrators surrounding Paru police station on Aug. 23. Two people were killed and three wounded."

"The Exchange Telegraph cancelled today a dispatch from India it had issued earlier declaring 201 persons had been killed and others injured on Friday when police fired on a mob near Gorakhpur." Although changing their story, they do not deny that police shot into Indian gatherings. The N. Y. Times of September 2 blandly captions the story "Casualty List Drops 200."

Things are quieting down in India, say the British rulers. The wish is father to the thought. The people of India are knocking at the door. The British rulers don't hear any better than their predecessors, but the sounds are growing louder, signalling the coming destruction of the despicable rule of imperialism in India and everywhere.

### Stalinist Lies About Our Pamphlet

In Newark, N. J., the Communist Party has been distributing leaflets attacking our recent pamphlet, "The March on Washington—One Year After," which has received a certain amount of interest from Negroes living there.

The purpose of this pamphlet, as all who read it know, was by reviewing the present conditions of the Negro people to show the need for a militant fight against all those who protect and foster Jim Crowism. The Stalinists, however, charge that it was issued because "they (the Trotskyists) hope to have us lose the war." This is what their leaflet says:

"Anyone who separates the fight for Negro rights from the fight against Hitlerism, harms Negro Americans and all Americans. That is what the Trotskyist Albert Parker does. . . Parker is the enemy of the Negro people for he separates the two struggles. . . And as proof of this contention, they quote a part of a sentence from our pamphlet, namely, 'The Negro people have no interest in interfering with the prosecution of the war,' which they call 'a negative half-truth, vicious in its implication.'"

Below is reprinted the full paragraph from which the Stalinists quoted a part. We leave it to our readers to judge for



## THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the  
Working People.

VOL. VI.—No. 36 Saturday, September 5, 1942

Published Weekly by  
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N  
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.  
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-6547

Editor:  
GEORGE BREITMAN

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

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

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

### JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

## A Basic Truth

Every once in a while things slip out. Such was the case with a remark made last May by the British Stalinist hack, Harry Pollitt, and reprinted in this country by James S. Allen in the August 28 *Daily Worker*.

Arguing for a second front, Pollitt blurted out an undeniable truth, namely, that British strategy is confined to "helping Russia to survive."

Thus the Stalinists admit, in an unguarded moment and for their own reasons, a fact which we Trotskyists have been hammering away at ever since the beginning of the German-Soviet war. Churchill does not want a victory of the USSR over Hitler. He wants the workers' state to keep Hitler occupied until the "democratic" imperialists are in position to crush Germany, and he wants the workers' state bled so white in the process that it will be an easy prey for the "democratic" imperialists.

The irreconcilable antagonism between imperialism and the nationalized property of the Soviet Union has not been resolved by the war. The imperialists are as determined as ever to open the territories of the Soviet Union to capitalist exploitation. Only those who understand this are able to really defend the workers' state.

But it is precisely these truths which the Stalinist leaders hide from their members and supporters. In recent weeks our correspondents from New York and Chicago have remarked on a growing feeling of futility and demoralization on the part of rank and file Stalinists. If this is so, it need occasion no surprise. Told over and over that the USSR can be saved only by the "democratic" imperialists, and seeing with their own eyes that the imperialists are not at all interested in saving the USSR, it is no wonder that these rank and file workers are gloomy about the future of the workers' state.

And if American rank and file Stalinists are demoralized by Stalin's policy, is it not reasonable to conclude that this policy has had the same disastrous effects, only multiplied many times, on large sections of the Soviet masses, who are so much more immediately affected by the Kremlin's crimes?

Stalin's course has led only to defeats. In time that course can lead to a general demoralization of the Soviet masses. Such a catastrophe can be prevented only if the Soviet masses are given a different program, which will show them that they have many real and powerful allies, the workers of the world, and which will arouse those allies to save the USSR. That is the program of Trotskyism.

## Vargas-Dictator Ally Of U. S.

The entrance of Brazil into the war was the occasion for an orgy of hypocrisy which has not been matched in many months.

Brazil's action was asserted to have hastened the "victory of freedom over oppression." This was said by President Roosevelt.

In the chorus of acclaim the Stalinist voice

could also be heard. The *Daily Worker* editorially welcomed "the people and government (!) of Brazil as a belligerent ally in the peoples' war of liberation against Axis tyranny."

If Brazil is going to fight for freedom and against oppression and tyranny, an excellent place to start would be right within Brazil, against the dictator Getulio Vargas, who is the government of the country.

In 1930 Vargas became president of Brazil. He has been "president" ever since. He abolished the constitution. He dissolved the Congress. He declared himself president for life. He has even decreed who is to succeed him after his death.

Free speech is non-existent in Brazil; there is no free press; no elections—neither free nor otherwise. Above all, Vargas has crushed the trade union movement and the working class political parties, including the Stalinist party. The movement of the Fourth International, of course, exists under conditions of extreme terror.

Living conditions for the workers are among the worst in the world. An agrarian laborer earns as little as 5 cents a day. An unskilled industrial worker averages between 60 and 75 cents a day. Top wages for skilled workers are less than \$1.20 a day.

It can be easily seen that Brazil is a totalitarian dictatorship, not a democracy in any sense of the word. As a matter of fact, Vargas has the honesty not to call his country a "democracy" as do other South American dictators. He calls it a corporative state. Italy is also a corporative state.

When France fell in June 1940, and when he thought Hitler and Mussolini would be victorious, Vargas made a speech clearly lining himself up with the fascist powers. At the time many who now praise him as a fighter against oppression and tyranny denounced him as a fascist.

But England held out and the United States entered the war. The United States is Brazil's best customer. The United States is the source of huge sums of capital which are now flooding into the country, attracted by the super-profits to be derived from the exploitation of the oppressed Brazilian workers.

The Brazilian ruling class upon the basis of this dollar and cents proposition decided to enter the war on the side of the United Nations.

These economic factors, not ideology, is what is decisive in the line-up of the capitalist powers in the war.

When the government of Brazil, alias Getulio Vargas, entered the war on the side of the Allies on August 23, this was proved once again.

## British Daily Worker Ban Lifted

The British government last week finally lifted the ban on the *Daily Worker*, organ of the British Stalinists.

The paper was suppressed since January, 1941. Since then a considerable number of non-Stalinist trade unionists in Britain protested the ban, and called on the government to lift it. The recent Labor Party convention took the same position. For most of these workers' organizations, it was a question of the freedom of the press, and they raised it in that light.

But for the government — both the Tories and their Labor Party colleagues — no question of freedom of the press was involved. All that interested them was the answer to the simple question: Will our decision in this matter help or hinder our efforts to keep the British masses in line behind our policies?

It was in this spirit alone that the government decided to permit the *Daily Worker* to resume publication, just as it was in this spirit alone that they decided to suppress it last year.

In January 1941 the British Communist Party — following Stalin's line of covering up the crimes of his pact partner, Hitler — was calling on the masses to oppose Britain's imperialist war. Although the Stalinists were largely discredited as a result of their zig-zag policies, they were nevertheless able to crystallize a certain amount of opposition to the anti-labor crimes of the British government. It was for this reason that the ban was imposed.

Since then, since the German attack on the Soviet Union, the Stalinists have become the most servile supporters of Churchill and Co. During the period when the masses as a whole are moving leftward, the Stalinists have assumed the task of maintaining the government's prestige in the labor movement. Whenever militant strikers are to be attacked, whenever reactionary policies are to be defended in the unions, whenever Tory candidates for office need support against working class candidates, the Stalinists can be depended on to do the dirty work. It is for this reason that the ban has been lifted.

The government did not even pretend that its decision last week was motivated by considerations of democratic rights. Instead, it warned the Stalinist lackeys that the ban could be and would be reimposed if they again printed matter attacking the government or its policies.

Legalization of the Indian C.P., lifting the ban on the British *Daily Worker*, talk of legalizing the Canadian Stalinist party — the British government is willing to take even these steps if they will help to disorient and straitjacket the masses. But at the same time it cannot help expressing both its contempt for the Stalinists and its disregard of all concepts of democracy.

# UAW Heads Ask FDR To Force General Wage Cut

By JOSEPH ANDREWS

Top leaders of the UAW-CIO went to Washington on Aug. 28 to ask President Roosevelt to act to enforce by decree the abolition of overtime pay for weekends and holidays in all war industry. The union committee included R. J. Thomas, George F. Addes, Walter Reuther and Richard T. Frankenstein.

The UAW leaders based their demand upon the action of the UAW convention recently concluded in Chicago, which adopted a resolution demanding that the UAW agreement to waive the premium pay be nullified unless it was universally applied by September 7.

This resolution was proposed and supported by the leadership, and put across after a prolonged debate. The demand of many UAW delegates was that the overtime pay waiver be immediately rescinded.

The full implications of the resolution as passed have now become evident. It means that the UAW leadership gives endorsement to, and asks for, government coercion of the labor movement.

In asking Roosevelt to arbitrarily apply the abolition of premium pay universally, they are proposing a forced wage cut.

These UAW officials, who today propose government enforcement of the overtime waiver, originally based their whole campaign to sell the overtime waiver to the rank and file on the proposition that unless the union voluntarily surrendered week-end and holiday pay, the government would take it away by law.

Now these same leaders are the exponents of just the kind of governmental compulsion they warned against in the past.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT  
This step sets a dangerous pre-

cedent which can be used by Roosevelt to make further inroads on the rights and independence of the union movement. By begging for government enforcement upon all unions of the premium pay waiver, the UAW officials are giving Roosevelt the best ground-work possible for government enforcement by decree of wage freezing, abolition of all overtime pay, extension of the work week, etc.

The argument used by the UAW leaders in demanding that Roosevelt abolish premium pay universally was that men were leaving UAW plants where no premium pay is paid to go to work in plants which still paid extra for week-end and holiday work. This same type of argument could be used by Roosevelt to arbitrarily freeze all wages at a low level, to prevent workers from moving from one plant to another in search of decent wages.

The UAW leadership, moreover, deliberately misled the UAW membership into believing that the sacrifice of premium pay would be followed by "equal sacrifices" by the employers of their profits and high salaries. This, it is obvious, has not been the case. Profits have been and still are increasing, for all the big corporations engaged in war production.

This time the Thomas-Reuther-Frankenstein-Addes leadership have not even demanded the fraud of "equal sacrifices," but that the government step in and take premium pay away from all workers. This is the end result of their "equal sacrifice" program.

### IN DETROIT

## THE SATURDAY BOOKSHOP

(Open Saturday Evenings from 6 to 9 O'clock)

carries THE MILITANT, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, and a full list of Pioneer Publishers books and pamphlets on the labor movement.

3513 Woodward Ave.  
Room 5  
Detroit, Mich.

## That Old Time Religion

The London correspondent of the *Pittsburgh Courier* recently sent that paper a copy of an interesting statement adopted by leaders of the (white) Dutch Reformed Church in the Union of South Africa. In that country there has been some discussion about the advisability of arming the native people in the event of an invasion of South Africa by the Axis. The contribution of this church to this discussion was the following resolution:

"The principle of arming non-Europeans is contrary to the constitution and principles of the Word of God, which is based on social separateness and the principles of trusteeship on the part of Europeans against non-Europeans.

"The arming of non-Europeans would be contrary to the best traditions of the Afrikaner people. The policy of Christian governments in the Union, when involved in war, has always been to use the services of natives and colored races in subordinate and menial capacities.

"This whole church admits that it is the duty of every Christian citizen to arm himself in defense of his country should there be unmistakable signs of threatened danger, but warns the government against the proposal to arm non-Europeans.

"The unhappy results of the government's announcement are already to be discerned in the disrespectful attitude of natives toward Europeans and European women.

"The church urgently asks the government not to give any native or colored person control over firearms or of light or heavy artillery, and to make an early statement in this connection.

"The government should see that non-Europeans will be used only in subordinate and menial capacities."

# Geo-politics Offers New Myths For Old

AMERICA'S STRATEGY IN WORLD POLITICS, by Nicholas John Spykman. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York. 500 pages. \$3.75.

Recognizing that the "social myths" of bourgeois democracy "have lost much of their effectiveness," Professor Spykman believes that what is required is a "reinterpretation and reconstruction" of the myths. This the Sterling professor of international relations at Yale University aspires to create through his "geo-political study."

Whereas Marxism (and all history) teaches that the domestic and foreign policies of a nation are determined by the class relationships within the nation, Spykman's "geo-politics" teaches that physical environment and geography determine a nation's policies.

Thus Spykman would hold, and he does hold, that the Soviet Union today has the same foreign policy as that pursued by Peter the Great—because, you see, of Russia's physical environment.

Geo-politics is no science at all, but only another literary device of the capitalist class, a concept and a vocabulary, with which they seek to mask and to justify imperialism and its wars.

If we still consider this book merits attention, it is because Spykman is much franker than the State Department, and expresses several interesting ideas held by high circles in Washington.

### Polemic Against Isolationists

America's Strategy In World Politics is in essence a polemic against the isolationist wing of the capitalists, calculated to prove that the New World could never survive a German-Japanese victory because of the many-sided conflict between South and North America, the dependency of the New World on Eurasia for strategic war materials and export markets, and the difficulty for the United States of defending that zone of South America falling below the bulge of Brazil.

The most valuable section of the book is that analyzing the economic relationships of the Latin American countries to each other, and to the United States. Here is no pretense that the military dictatorships to the South are "sister republics," but instead a recognition of the insoluble contradictions that exist between Yankee imperialism and its Latin American victims.

Spykman points out a geo-political contradiction in Washington's foreign policy: the government supports England, the island sea power which stands between the United States and

Europe, and is at present fighting Japan, the island sea power standing between the United States and Asia. Spykman believes that Washington will have to change this policy, and he states that American capitalism will soon have more to fear from a rejuvenated China than from Japan. Unquestionably a powerful segment of the American capitalist class believes the same thing, which helps to explain the State Department's "contradictory" policies in the Far East.

### Same Old World After the War

What sort of new world does the school of American geo-politics promise will emerge from the Second World War if only the United States is victorious? Is it a future worth labor's fighting for and dying for?

All that Spykman can envisage is the same old world of power politics, half-clothed in geo-political verbiage. "It must be remembered that the end of a war is not the end of the power struggle. . . It will be immediately resumed by other means."

He considers the various patterns in which the world can fall after the war. World federation (which requires socialism as an economic base) he dismisses in one paragraph, because "the people who have the most progressive ideas about the problem of peace are seldom the ones in positions of political power."

American-British hegemony he rejects because "it would inevitably create a counter-alliance by the great land powers."

"A European federation," he frankly states, "is not a power constellation that the United States should encourage." He believes the United States should continue its policy of balkanizing Europe.

As to Asia, he fears that the real threat to Washington and Wall Street will come not from Japan but from "a modern, vitalized and militarized China."

The very best solution he can propose is a precarious balance of power between Europe, Asia and North America, a program which he admits "does not promise the end of international strife" but "accepts the fact that there will always be conflict, and that war will remain a necessary instrument in the preservation of power. An equilibrium of forces inherently unstable, always shifting, always changing, is certainly not an ideal power pattern for an international society. But . . . it is an indispensable element of an international order based on independent states (that is, on capitalism—J. R.)." The school of geo-politics is as bankrupt as are all the other programs to maintain the capitalist world.

Reviewed by Jack Ranger

## Britain In India-From World War I To World War II

By HOWARD ALLEN

Many workers think that when the war is over, England will give India its freedom if the Axis is beaten. Most of these workers, unfortunately, are not acquainted with the history of British rule in India. Wholeheartedly for India's independence themselves, they do not realize why British imperialism refuses to let go of India. They accept Churchill's "after-the-war promises" as good coin.

During World War I, many "after-the-war promises" were also made, but England did not surrender its political control over India. In spite of the fact that Indian nationalists of every shade of opinion rallied to the government in the belief that the war was being fought for freedom and democracy, their loyalty was repaid with an even harsher repression than they had suffered before. This first "war to save democracy" was followed by the Rowlatt Act of 1919 which empowered the British to lock up without trial anyone they disliked, and for as long as they pleased.

The history of the British in India since the first World War should offer convincing proof that the promises made by Churchill and Cripps are no basis for hoping that India will get its independence without fighting for it.

### Post-War Repressions

After World War I there occurred wide-spread uprising against the unsupportable exploitation and starvation of the Indian masses. In Bengal there was a no-tax campaign among the peasantry of the Midnapore district; in the Punjab, the Sikh peasants rose; in South India the Moplah rebellion took place. The visits of the Duke of Connaught and of the Prince of Wales were everywhere boycotted. The non-cooperation movement started by Gandhi spread all over the country.

In spite of the fact that there was then no alibi of a threatened Japanese invasion the British not only did not grant India independence, they jailed thousands of demonstrators; Gandhi himself—although he had already called off the non-cooperation movement—was sentenced to six years. And with typical imperialist business acumen . . . the salt tax was doubled!

Again in 1930, processions, public meetings, demonstrations, picketing, boycotts and other peaceful manifestations of India's demand for independence occurred throughout the country. Again, the British attacked the demonstrators, suppressed newspapers, seized bank accounts, confiscated property. They arrested over 100,000 people and put them in concentration camps. Their police charged peaceful crowds of men, women and children beating them with long heavy iron-weighted clubs. Their troops fired point-blank into assemblies that did not disperse fast enough.

In Peshawar hundreds of helpless persons were shot and killed at that time despite the heroic mutiny of the Garwhalis Rifles who said: "We will not shoot our unarmed brothers. You may blow us from the guns if you like"—a reference to the ancient British manner of dealing with rebellious Indians: tying them to the mouth of cannons.

Of this Peshawar massacre, the *Indian Daily Mail* of May 10, 1930 reported a British officer as saying: "We taught the blighters a lesson. . . Our fellows stood there shooting down the agitators and leaders who were pointed out to them by the police. . . It was a case of continuous shooting."

About a similar affair at Sholapur, a young English soldier said, "My Gawd, sir, our fellows didn't half torture them natives. They stripped 'em naked and burnt 'em all over with lighted cigarettes till they shouted like blue ruin. And they cracked open their heads as soon as look at you." (*The White Sahibs in India*, by Reginald Reynolds, pp. 344.)

### The 1935 Government Of India Act

In an effort to stem the rising tide of militancy, the British Parliament in 1935 passed the Government of India Act which embodied a constitution for India. Under this constitution 9 out of every 10 people are excluded from the franchise, based on property and educational qualifications—little more than 35 million out of about 400 million people have the right to vote.

"The most curious feature of all in the 1935 constitution is this," says K. S. Shelvankar in *The Problem of India*, "although the Federal Legislature is as undemocratic as one can imagine a legislature to be; although capitalists and landlords are in full control of one chamber, and form the predominant element in the other; although the representatives of the princes constitute the largest single bloc in both; although, in short, it is an eminently safe, respectable and reactionary body, it has yet very little power."

This "constitution" which was supposed to give Indians "self-government" doesn't permit the legislature to handle such matters as defense, foreign relations, regulation of credit, currency, exchange, railways, military expenditures, interest on public debt, salaries, pensions, etc.

The constitution is however calculated to stir up and maintain a maximum of religious and racial strife by dividing the electorate up into groups of Sikhs, Mohammedans, Hindus, etc. The constitution is also calculated to continue the power of the anti-democratic, autocratic Indian Princes and their 600 despotically ruled states.

"The situations of these feudatory States," said Professor Rushbrook Williams in the *Evening Standard*, May 28th, 1930, "checkerboarding all India as they do, are a great safeguard. It is like establishing a vast network of friendly fortresses in debatable territory. It would be difficult for a general rebellion against the British to sweep India because of this network of powerful, loyal Native States." (Quoted in Reynolds's book.)

As true today as when he wrote them in the *N. Y. Tribune* of August 8, 1853, are the words of Karl Marx: "The Indians will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society scattered among them by the British bourgeoisie till in Great Britain itself the now ruling classes shall have been supplanted by the industrial proletariat, or till the Indians themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether."