

Belgian Trotskyist Leader Dies In Prison at Hands of the Nazis

Leon Lesoil, leading member of the Trotskyist movement in Belgium, has died at the hands of the Nazis in a Belgian prison, according to information received by the British Socialist Appeal and printed in its Oct. issue.

Prominent member of the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Belgium, affiliate of the Fourth International, Comrade Lesoil participated in all the national meetings and conferences of the Fourth International held on the European continent.

His life was inseparable for the last 30 years from the life of the working class in the Belgian Charleroi district where he lived as a mining draughtsman. As a militant fighter he was driven from his work and victimized by the mineowners.

After the last war he was one of the pioneer members and founders of the Belgian Communist Party. He was driven out of the party at the time of the expulsion of the Trotskyist Left Opposition from the Communist International.

He immediately threw himself into the work of the Left Opposition and was largely responsible for the systematic way in which our Belgian comrades conducted their activities under difficult circumstances.

Leon Lesoil was loved not only by our comrades but also by thousands of miners. When the great strike movements swept the Belgian coal fields, workers would walk miles to hear him address meetings in the public square or from the balcony of the Town Hall. Social-Democrats, Stalinists and Syndicalists also recognized Lesoil as a leading militant in battle.

At this time when the Stalinists slander the Trotskyists and try to link them with the Nazis, Hitler has struck another blow at the Belgian workers by the murder of Comrade Lesoil. His death at the hands of the Nazis gives the lie to these foul Stalinist slanders.

We salute the memory of our Comrade Leon Lesoil, a front line fighter in the workers' battles, a gallant soldier of the Fourth International who died a martyr in the socialist struggle against capitalist reaction.

CIO Opens Fifth Annual Convention In Boston

Murray Report Distorts Meaning of Roosevelt's Labor Record; Discussion on Anti-Jim Crow Fight Livens 2nd Day's Sessions

By Felix Morrow

BOSTON, Nov. 9. — The fifth convention of the CIO opened here today, with President Philip Murray making unmistakably clear, in his printed report and his first speech to the delegates, that the line of the CIO top leadership remains one of complete subordination to the Roosevelt administration.

Perhaps the only point in Murray's opening address where he grew firm and positive was in saying:

"I am determined to support our Commander-in-Chief, Roosevelt, and I am going to support him. I know that this great organization that I am privileged to represent supports that statement one hundred per cent."

FIRST DAY ATMOSPHERE

The atmosphere of the first day's proceedings is indicated by those who spouted from the speakers' platform today: two clergymen ("May you be preserved from class hatred"); Mayor Tobin of Boston ("Trust our military chiefs"); Governor Saltonstall of Massachusetts (he wouldn't abrogate labor laws "unless absolutely necessary"); Undersecretary of War Patterson; a rabbi; the "labor" attaché of the British Embassy.

Except for short welcoming addresses by the regional and state directors of the CIO, a fraternal address by a Canadian labor leader and Murray's speech, the day was monopolized by spokesmen of the capitalist class. Still other government officials—Undersecretary of War

(Continued on page 2)

Boss Unity

The government last week indicted the U. S. Sugar Corporation of Florida on the charge of holding Negro workers in peonage and violating the federal laws against slavery.

The corporation was recruiting workers in Southern states and offering them free transportation to the plantations. Once the workers arrived, they were informed that they were in debt to the company for travelling expenses, and forced to work out the debt.

Workers who attempted to escape were captured, the indictment charged, and "injured, oppressed and threatened."

Behind these conditions, the newspaper PM revealed on Nov. 8, are wealthy Northern industrialists who own the controlling stock in the sugar company. Several of the directors and stockholders are officers of the General Motors Corporation. Among these is C. S. Mott, one of the largest stockholders in GM, whose family controls 68% of the sugar corporation's stock.

The fact that such industrialists control the sugar company and its policies is additional evidence that the enemy of the Southern Negro and poor white workers are the same financiers and big capitalists who oppress the workers of the North.

Labor Papers Threatened By Government Newsprint Plan

A grave threat to all labor publications was revealed in the Nov. 3 issue of the *AFL Weekly News Service*, which reports that a government board is attempting to curtail the amount of newsprint issued to labor papers.

If adopted, the board's proposal would result in a drastic cut in the circulation of all labor papers, particularly of those papers presenting a militant analysis of events, for in the eyes of government officials such papers are considered least "essential" of all.

The AFL story follows: "If the War Production Board puts through a recommendation made by its newly-created Newspaper Industry Advisory Committee, labor publications are going to be struck a body blow. 'After an all-day conference, the committee called on the WPB to 'freeze' newsprint and to make a 'horizontal' cut of at least 10 per cent in paper consumption.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE LABOR PRESS

"E. W. Palmer, deputy chief of

WPB's printing and publishing branch, declared that the suggestion would probably be adopted and that it would mean that newspapers and magazines would be allotted only a percentage of their consumption, and that to obtain an allowance a publication would have to prove it is 'essential'.

"This would create a problem which publishers of large newspapers could meet by reducing the number of pages.

"With labor papers that print only four pages (as most of them do), this solution would not be possible. If their supply of paper is cut, they will be forced to sacrifice subscribers.

"BITTER FOES OF UNIONS"

"On the Newspaper Advisory Committee there is not a single spokesman for the labor and farm press.

"On the contrary, it is made up largely of bitter foes of unions. 'Publishers of labor papers throughout the country have protested this discrimination in letters and telegrams to Donald M. Nelson, WPB chieftain.'

READERS OF LABOR PAPERS SHOULD DO THE SAME.

Stalin Says Imperialists Will Save The Soviet Union

African War Shows Imperialists' Aims Differ from USSR's

By ANTHONY MASSINI

Stalin showed on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Revolution — in his speech before the Moscow Soviet and his Order of the Day on Nov. 6 — that he is staking the very existence of the Soviet Union on the aid of the "democratic" imperialists and that he still refuses to call on the German masses to revolt against Hitlerism.

A year ago Stalin admitted that the Soviet Union was unable by itself to defeat Hitler who had mobilized the manpower and resources of most of Europe for the purpose of crushing the workers' state. Stalin promised at that time that his policies of relying on his imperialist allies would "in the nearest future" bring aid from outside the USSR

(Continued on page 3)



Red Army infantry are shown moving toward prepared positions in the outer defenses of Stalingrad. Their heroic struggle demonstrates to the world that despite the crimes of Stalinism, the Russian Revolution still lives. (Fed'ted Picture.)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI.—No. 46

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1942

287

FIVE (5) CENTS

ELECTION RESULTS SHOW NEED FOR A LABOR PARTY

Next Week

THE MILITANT will print: A continuation of the report on the CIO Convention by Felix Morrow, our special correspondent now in Boston. A stenographic report of James P. Cannon's historic speech at the New York celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

OPA Lets Price Rise



The Campbell Soup Co. has been authorized by the OPA to raise its prices from 1c to 3c per can because of a "new and improved recipe" label on the cover. The only "new" thing that housewives can find is the label; contents of both, listed on backs of the can, are identical. (Federated Picture.)

And while the OPA is permitting price rises for dozens of commodities, Leon Henderson had to admit last week that the majority of retailers are violating price regulations.

Of more than 10,000 stores inspected in the last month, a majority were found to be violating price laws either by simple overcharging, by reductions in quality of goods sold or by reductions in quantity.

A Labor Department report issued this month shows that food costs for the average family rose 2.4% between September 15 and October 15. The cost of all foods has risen 6.6% since May, the date at which the War Labor Board is freezing wages.

CIRCUIT COURT HEARS APPEAL ON MINNEAPOLIS CONVICTIONS

Decision Concerning Trial of Eighteen Is Expected in Approximately Six Weeks

ST. LOUIS, Mo., Nov. 5 — Arguments on behalf of the defendants and the government were heard today in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the appeal of the 18 defendants from the conviction for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act. The convictions which are

being appealed followed a six weeks' trial of 18 Socialist Workers Party and CIO members in Minneapolis in October and November of last year.

GOLDMAN AND FRAENKEL PRESENT ARGUMENTS

On behalf of the defendants, Albert Goldman, attorney and himself a defendant, and Osmond K. Fraenkel, attorney of the American Civil Liberties Union, contended the Smith Act as applied in the Minneapolis case was unconstitutional and deprived the defendants of their right of free speech and free press.

The attorneys for the defense also argued that membership in any conspiracy after the passage of the Smith Act on June 28, 1940 had not been proved, and that the indictment was legally insufficient.

On the constitutional question, they urged the court to adopt the "clear and present danger" views expressed by Justices Holmes and Brandeis in the criminal syndicalism cases after World War I.

The government's case was argued by Henry Schweinhaut of Washington and Victor Anderson of St. Paul.

DECISION EXPECTED WITHIN SIX WEEKS

The case was taken under advisement by the judges and a decision is expected in about six weeks.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee of 160 Fifth Ave., New York City, which is mobilizing public support for the defendants, has said that it will take the case to the U. S. Supreme Court if necessary.

Breitman Gets Higher Vote Than in 1940

More New Jersey Workers Reached With SWP Program Than Ever Before

NEWARK, N. J.—Although it will be a comparatively low vote and although complete returns have not yet been published, the vote cast for George Breitman, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U. S. Senator from New Jersey, will definitely show an increase over that tabulated for him when he ran for the same office in 1940.

According to information received by THE MILITANT, 418 votes were counted for Breitman last week in three of the state's 21 counties, Essex, Union and Passaic.

Unlike the other minority party candidates, Breitman's campaign was waged in a fighting spirit, which took up — instead of skirting around — the really vital issues of the war and the government, and answered them in forthright, uncompromising socialist terms. More workers were reached with the Socialist Workers Party program than in any previous New Jersey election.

A large number of workers residing in the state's industrial centers did not go to the polls at all on Nov. 3. Undoubtedly this had an effect — although only a minor effect — on the comparatively low Breitman vote.



G. Breitman

MANY WORKERS VOTED ONLY WITH THEIR FEET

Workers, Having An Independent Labor Choice, Cast Significant Vote for ALP

By George Breitman

The most important aspect of the Nov. 3 elections was the fact that a large and decisive section of the American workers voted only with their feet.

These workers, who have generally voted Democratic for the last ten years, were faced in most parts of the country with a choice only between Democratic and Republican candidates running on virtually the same conservative and reactionary programs. Not seeing enough of a difference between them to make a choice worthwhile, these workers stayed away from the polls.

This factor, combined with the growing dissatisfaction of the middle class, professional workers and farmers — all being squeezed to the wall by the war and not knowing any other way of voicing their protests than by voting for the Republican "outs" — resulted in sharp reductions of the Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress and the winning of many new state posts by the Republicans.

REASON FOR LOW VOTE

The extremely low vote of 26 million cannot, of course, be explained only by the indifference or hostility of many workers to the Democratic and Republican campaigns. Midterm voting is usually lower than that cast in presidential elections.

In addition, many people have been drafted, or have moved and thus been deprived of the right to vote, or were unable to get to the polls because of their long hours of work.

But all these other factors had been taken into consideration in the pre-election polls and forecasts. Bearing them in mind, the Associated Press had predicted a turnout of 34 million, and the Gallup poll, which is generally accurate within 1 to 2 per cent in its election polls, predicted 30 million.

Everyone had agreed that these estimates would represent a deep "apathy" toward the elections. Nevertheless the low Gallup estimate was 15 per cent more than actually voted!

In other words, all the polls

and machine politicians greatly underestimated the extent of the prevailing "apathy" which was manifested primarily in the working class districts, from New Jersey to Michigan to California, that usually vote Democratic.

TREND IN IMPORTANT INDUSTRIAL STATES

In New Jersey the Roosevelt wheelhorse, Senator Smathers, was supported by all the leaders of both the AFL and CIO. He even had a number of labor leaders running on his ticket in many parts of the state, and taunted his Republican opponent on not being able to get the endorsement of a single labor leader in New Jersey. Mayor Hague kept his promise to Smathers and gave him the amazing plurality of 117,000 votes in Hudson County.

In spite of this, Smathers and his labor supporters were resoundingly defeated by the Republican Albert W. Hawkes.

The explanation, as labor leaders ruefully admitted after the elections, was that they just couldn't get the workers in the big cities out for Smathers. If they had, the Democrats would have been able to overcome the high Republican middle class and suburban vote.

Similarly in Michigan and California, where the trade union bureaucracies campaigned for the Democratic incumbents, Senator Prentiss Brown and Governor Culbert Olson, but where the Re-

(Continued on page 3)

C. P. Helped To Elect Minnesota Republican

Only the Candidate of the Trotskyists Presented Correct Working Class Program

By VINCENT R. DUNNE

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn. — Another victory for the Republican machine of Governor Harold Stassen was chalked up in the recently concluded Minnesota election as a result of the Stalinist-created disunity in the ranks of the Farmer-Labor Party.

The final figures are not yet in as this is written, but it appears, on the basis of the latest unofficial tabulations, that Stassen's plurality over his Farmer-Labor opponent, Hjalmer Petersen, will be only half as large as his 1940 plurality, and only one-third the size of his 1938 plurality over the then Farmer-Labor Governor, Elmer Benson.

STASSEN MACHINE COULD HAVE BEEN DEFEATED

Had Minnesota workers and farmers been given any real leadership by Farmer-Labor politicians in the campaign, they would have broken the Stassen machine control of the state, a control which has kept Minnesota trade unionists shackled by the infamous Stassen Labor Law since 1939.

But the Stalinists in control of the official Farmer-Labor machinery were actually supporting the labor-hating Stassen for governor rather than the Farmer-Labor nominee, Petersen. The anti-Stalinist, Petersen, who had won the

Farmer-Labor nomination in the primaries from the Association-endorsed Paul Rasmussen, was condemned by the Benson-Stalinist clique as an "appeaser" and "American Firstler."

These charges were made repeatedly despite Petersen's denial of membership in the America First Committee, and notwithstanding the fact that the Stalinists were the most rabid "isolationists" and "appeasers" during the period of the Nazi-Soviet pact.

CIO members were openly advised in a radio address by Robert Madigan, spokesman of the Stalinist-dominated state CIO Council to vote for Stassen, because of Stassen's "endorsement and support of President Roosevelt's win-the-war program."

Equally treacherous anti-Stalinist AFL trade union leaders, such as Sydney Brennan, business agent of General Drivers 544-AFL, supported Stassen, as well as the Republican candidate for U. S. Senator, Joseph Ball. (The Stalinists in the CIO and in the Farmer-Labor Association supported Elmer Benson, the Farmer-Labor nominee for Senator.)

PETERSEN'S CAMPAIGN

The Railroad Brotherhoods of Minnesota endorsed the candidacy of Petersen, as did many trade union leaders, such as Roy Wier, organizer of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, John Carlgren, an official of the St. Paul Building

Elections Followed By Sales Tax Talk

One of the results of the recent elections will probably be a new drive to put over a sales tax next year.

An AP dispatch on Nov. 6 stated that the administration economic leaders forecast "that sentiment for a retail sales tax would be stronger in the new Congress."

Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau has announced that he will ask Congress for an additional six billion dollars in the near future.

Congress will probably try to use this request as an excuse for the sales tax which soaks the poor and spares the rich.

Wall Street also looks with favor on sales taxes and similar measures to tax the masses. On Oct. 17 the "Magazine of Wall Street" stated: "Whether through a sales tax or otherwise, the major part of any further increase in the total tax revenue will have to be had from the masses of lower-income people."

In other words, last month's tax bill drastically reducing the workers' incomes is only the beginning!

(Continued on page 3)

SWP Celebrates Russian Revolution Anniversary

Meetings were held everywhere throughout the country last week on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Revolution. Many of these meetings were held under the auspices of groups such as the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, sponsored jointly by spokesmen of United States imperialism and the Stalinists. A few of the meetings were sponsored by renegades from the Marxist movement who no longer defend the workers' state. But only the gatherings held under the auspices of the Socialist Workers Party celebrated the anniversary in the spirit of the Russian Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky.

Below we reprint accounts of those Socialist Workers Party meetings which reached us before we went to press.—Ed.

New York

NEW YORK, Nov. 8.—The 250 workers attending the Socialist Workers Party celebration of the Russian Revolution's twenty-fifth anniversary enthusiastically demonstrated their agreement with the speakers, who called for continued working class defense of the Soviet Union, by pouring \$430 into a collection for an expansion of the party's propaganda work.

The audience gave close attention to James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party and main speaker of the evening, as he discussed the present critical peril of the Soviet Union and the need for the continuation of the Trotskyist position for defense of the workers' state.

Comrade Cannon commented on the Nov. 8 speech to the Moscow Soviet: "Stalin's speech," he stated, "only shows that he is still doing all he can to insure the defeat of the Soviet Union." He rejects the support of the workers of the world and directs his appeal to his imperialist allies.

"We on our part turn to the workers and above all to the German and colonial workers as the future allies of the Soviet Union."

He examined the theory that fascist Germany and the Soviet Union were identical, and pointed to the differences between the continued strength of the Soviet economy and the high morale of its people and the breakdown of Italy. As for Germany, he stated, "Hitler must look to Mussolini and there he will see the image of his future."

Comrade Cannon partially attributed the recent defeats of the Axis in the East and in Africa to Hitler's mistake concerning the Soviet Union:

"Hitler looks to the East tonight with dark gloom, with the fear of having crushed his hopes on the Russian front. . . The fascist thinking was too superficial in its attitude towards the Soviet Union. Hitler saw only the bureaucracy. He did not understand the vitality of the still living revolution."

Only the Fourth International recognized that despite the political degeneration it suffered under Stalinism, the Soviet Union remained a workers' state; that the October Revolution was still alive and would be defended with unsurpassed heroism and self-sacrifice by the workers of Russia and of the world. "The funeral of the October Revolution," Cannon continued, "now announced by so many renegades, will not only be postponed, but will never take place."

Cannon was preceded by Joseph Hansen and Eloise Black, as speakers. Hansen compared the present betrayals of the petty bourgeoisie and their rejection of the Soviet Union with the past betrayals of the working class movement in period of reaction. (His speech is reprinted on P. 3 of this issue.)

Eloise Black discussed the continuation and sharpening of the class struggle as the best method for the defense of the Soviet Union.

The meeting sent greetings of solidarity to Natalia Sedov Trotsky in Mexico. William F. Warde acted as chairman.

Boston

BOSTON, Mass., Nov. 8.—Felix Morrow, editor of *Fourth International*, main speaker at the meeting celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Revolution held by the Boston Branch of the Socialist Workers Party, stressed the fact that the Russian Revolution was carried out by a majority of the population, led by the Bolshevik Party.

He was followed by Farrell Dobbs, National Labor Secretary, who pointed out the role of the Socialist Workers Party in the United States as the vanguard of the American working class, and showed the growth and increased activity of the party during the past period.

About thirty-five members and sympathizers attended the meet-

ing. After the singing of The Internationale, the meeting adjourned for a social.

Detroit

DETROIT, Mich., Nov. 8.—Fifty-five workers from the ranks of the most militant sections of American labor gathered here tonight to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Revolution. Here was a typical cross-section of labor: old workers experiencing for the second time the short-lived false prosperity of the initial war boom and young workers, many holding "steady" jobs for the first time; men and women; whites and their Negro comrades associating fraternally.

Comrade Jones, organizer of the Detroit S.W.P. Branch, who acted as chairman noted the ever-increasing role of women in the party in his introduction of the speaker, Lydia Beidel.

Comrade Beidel pointed out the place occupied by the Russian Revolution, the most significant event in recent history, when, in October 1917 the working class, acting in its own interest consciously for the first time, kicked the bosses out of the factories and the landlords off the land. She heaped scorn upon the hysterical efforts of the leaders of moribund capitalism whose vain thrashings to push back the sands of time, succeed only in burying themselves more thoroughly.

The meeting celebrated simultaneously the anniversary of the Russian Revolution and the birthday of one of its greatest leaders, Leon Trotsky. Comradely greetings and expressions of solidarity were conveyed to Comrade Natalia in Mexico in a telegram sent by the audience.

The assembled workers contributed generously to a collection to further another celebration in the not-too-distant future of another revolution.

Twin Cities

MINNEAPOLIS, Nov. 8.—"It is the planned economy, socialized production and nationalization of property in the Soviet Union which represents the workers' power that the Trotskyists defend today," said Max Goldman, speaking to a well attended Twin City Sunday Forum in Minneapolis. The weekly forum session was devoted to a commemoration of the anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

Citing the heroism of the Red Army on the one hand, and condemning the policies of the present leadership of the Soviet Union which has abandoned the struggle for socialism, the speaker showed that the Trotskyists are the only group in the world which calls for real defense of Soviet Russia through a program of world socialism.

Following the speech, a number of workers present participated in the discussion and showed clearly their desire to know the facts about the degenerate Stalinist bureaucracy which rules Russia today.

The usual social hour followed the forum session at which a lunch was served and opportunity provided for those in attendance to carry on their discussion informally.

Youngst'n

YOUNGSTOWN, Nov. 8.—A roundtable discussion on the meaning and history of the Russian revolution was the main feature of the anniversary meeting held here by the Youngstown Branch of the S.W.P. The following telegram was sent to Natalia Sedov Trotsky in Mexico:

"Dear Comrade Natalia: On this twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Revolution, we draw renewed inspiration from the first successful proletarian revolution to face our present tasks, supported by the vigor, integrity and ideological soundness of our great teacher, L. D. Trotsky."

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Living Costs

Los Angeles

LOS ANGELES, Nov. 8.—Fifty workers were present here at the S.W.P. meeting on the Russian Revolution which was celebrated in the true spirit of October.

The speakers, C. Thomas and Janet Bowers, recalled the persistent warnings of Leon Trotsky that imperialism would inevitably attack the USSR and seek to destroy the gains made in 1917, unless the world revolution came to the aid of the Soviets.

They condemned the Stalinist policy of relying on the imperialists to save the Soviet Union, a policy which makes it difficult to arouse the German workers for the overthrow of Hitlerite capitalism.

The meeting sent greetings to Natalia Sedov Trotsky, widow of the leader of the Russian Revolution and founder of the Red Army.

Chicago

CHICAGO, Nov. 8.—A well-attended meeting in celebration of the Russian Revolution anniversary was held here this afternoon at the Hotel Hamilton. The meeting was under the auspices of the Chicago Local of the Socialist Workers Party.

An attentive and responsive audience, composed largely of industrial workers including many Negro trade union militants, heard an address by Arthur Preis, former associate editor of THE MILITANT, on the nature and significance of the Bolshevik Revolution.

The speaker contrasted the program and methods of Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolshevik Party in their opposition to all the imperialists in the last war and their successful revolutionary defense of the early Soviet Union with the present policies of Stalinism. The Stalinist policies, he demonstrated, have undermined the international revolutionary socialist movement, bound the workers of all countries to their capitalist rulers, and weakened the defense of the Soviet Union.

A special feature of the meeting was the showing of the documentary film of the Russian Revolution, "Tsar To Lenin," which was greatly enjoyed by the audience.

Newark

NEWARK, Nov. 6.—George Collins was the principal speaker at the Newark S.W.P. meeting held to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

Comrade Collins emphasized the thoroughgoing and uncompromising nature of the revolution. It was this solid foundation, he pointed out, which made possible the resistance of the workers' state to the reactionary Stalinist regime and also provided the basis for the unequalled Soviet resistance to the Nazi war machine.

He compared the conduct of the Bolshevik government in the last war with that of the Stalinist government today. He reviewed the Bolshevik slogan of "no annexations — no indemnities," which attracted the support of the militant workers everywhere. He then contrasted this policy with that of the Stalinists which at present is preparing a bill of indemnities to be presented to whatever government may be in power in Germany after the war.

WHY we Defend The Soviet Union
by ALBERT GOLDMAN

Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York City

At The CIO Convention

First Day of CIO Convention:

Murray Tries To Distort Roosevelt's Labor Record

(Continued from page 1)

Bard, Senator Pepper of Florida, etc., will take up many hours during the rest of the convention.

This parade of capitalist spokesmen gives the dominant tone of the convention—subservience to the government.

It is worth recalling, in contrast to this atmosphere, that of the Atlantic City convention in 1940, not a single government official was invited to speak, except Sidney Hillman, President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and then co-director of the OPM, who served as the butt of John L. Lewis' criticisms of the administration.

ANTI-LABOR POLICIES

Although Murray's keynote was support of the "Commander-in-Chief," his report and speech nevertheless had to refer to some of the more obvious anti-labor consequences of the policies of the self-same Commander-in-Chief. Among the complaints which Murray had to record were the following:

1. Growth of monopoly. "A hundred companies still hold over 80% of all the war contracts. Ten of these companies hold almost half of the outstanding war contracts."

2. Soak the poor. The 1942 tax measure—signed by Roosevelt on Oct. 21—"will actually deprive the workers of the means to purchase sufficient necessities of life with which to maintain their strength and health."

"The tax situation remains the first legislative problem of the CIO. Reactionary Congressional leaders have made very clear the fact that they are not yet finished with their vicious work. . . The working men and women of America will recognize in 1943 that the Revenue Act passed this year has meant a nationwide wage cut which creates serious dangers to food budgets."

3. Anti-labor acts of the WLB. "On wage issues representatives of the CIO have felt that the War Labor Board has not recognized the extent to which the needs of war production require upward adjustment of wage levels. . . On union security issues the CIO has urged unsuccessfully upon the Board a fuller appreciation of the value of the union shop. . . On these and other issues the CIO has not been in agreement with the decisions of the Board."

ROOSEVELT'S COURT

4. Anti-labor acts of the Roosevelt-appointed Supreme Court. "The past year in the Court has witnessed the crystallization of an increasingly conservative majority consisting primarily of Justices Stone, Roberts, Frankfurter, Jackson and Byrnes. . . The decisions have included a number of extremely unfortunate regressions in the law affecting labor and labor relations."

The Southern Steamship Company case "dealt a severe blow to the rights of organized seamen." "Three of the five decisions relating to the Fair Labor Standards Act were adverse" to labor. In the Ritter case the Court

"took a long step backward" on the right of picketing. And so on. 5. Anti-labor role of WPB. Of its 15,000 employees, only 90 trade unionists are "holding jobs of a very subordinate nature" while "1,000 leading American business men—mostly dollar-a-year men—are running the organization." "What are they running in Washington? A war production organization to win the war, or a war production organization to destroy labor?"

MURRAY'S METHOD

These and other complaints made by Murray's report and speech, if added together, constitute a fundamental indictment of the anti-labor role of the Roosevelt Administration. No logical person could add all this together and then urge the workers to support the Roosevelt Administration. You can't do both. So Murray carefully abstained from adding together the facts he himself presented.

On the contrary, each complaint remained an individual item in a separate part of his report or speech, and the connection of each complaint with the others was in no way indicated. Each item was presented as if it were a single flaw in an otherwise perfect situation.

Moreover, Murray deliberately sought to absolve Roosevelt of all blame for the anti-labor consequences.

Murray's report referred to the 100 companies who monopolize 80% of all war contracts as if the companies had been able to create such a stranglehold by their own unaided efforts.

That it is Roosevelt's administration, Roosevelt's underlings, who hand out these contracts—about this Murray was as mum as a Cape Cod oyster.

That Roosevelt signed the tax bill, that it was Roosevelt's own party and his own lieutenants in the Senate and House who engineered the bill which Murray condemned as anti-labor—of this Murray was silent. Moreover, he directly sought to whitewash Roosevelt by a demonstrable falsehood.

LIES ON THE TAX BILL

The tax bill, claimed Murray, "completely ignored the proposals of the President and the Treasury." The fact is, however, that the differences between Roosevelt-Morgenthau and the Senate Finance Committee were limited to minor points—whether corporations should be taxed a top limit of 40 or 50 per cent of "normal" profits, and similar items—while Roosevelt, and the "reactionary Congressional leaders" stigmatized by Murray, saw eye to eye on the fundamental principle of sharply cutting down the living standards of the masses by taxes.

Had the differences between Roosevelt and the reactionaries been fundamental, Roosevelt could have vetoed the bill. Instead, he signed it.

MURRAY'S HOPES

One of the most ludicrous things in Murray's report is his reason for hoping that the "increasingly conservative majority" of the Supreme Court may be changed. "This line-up," writes Murray, "may be significantly affected by the resignation of Justice Byrnes from the bench to take the position of Economic Stabilization Director." Byrnes wrote some of the most reactionary decisions handed down by the court. Whereupon Murray says, in effect: Cheer up boys, Byrnes has resigned—to become the economic dictator, the most powerful government official next to the president!

Who is responsible for the anti-labor acts of the War Labor

Next Week's Classes

of the New York School of Social Science

Wednesday, Nov. 18, 8:15 P. M.

International Cartels and Monopolies

C. CHARLES, Instructor

Friday, Nov. 20, 8:15 P. M.

The Lessons of the Chinese Revolution

JOHN G. WRIGHT, Instructor

At 116 University Place—2d Fl.

Encouraging Response To School's First Sessions

The New York School of Social Science opened its fall term last week with two lectures, one by C. Charles on American cartels and monopolies, the other by John G. Wright on the Bolsheviks and the colonial question. Both lectures, held on Wednesday and Friday evenings in the new second floor hall at 116 University Place, were marked by the attendance of more than 50 workers, most of them trade unionists.

The Charles lecture on November 4, which was part of a series entitled "American Economy at War," explained the operation of American cartels, and patent pools, and analyzed the accelerated drive of American capitalism toward monopoly control of the entire economy.

The future lectures by Charles, held each Wednesday evening at 8:15 through December 9, will

explain international cartels, the operation of capitalist war economy, price control, wage freezing and inflation.

John G. Wright devoted his opening lecture to the question of the national aspirations of the colonial peoples and traced the great theoretical contributions of Lenin and Trotsky to a scientific understanding of the problem. He emphasized that history has verified the theoretical truth of Lenin's slogan, "We live in an epoch of imperialist wars, proletarian revolutions and colonial uprisings."

Wright's future lectures, to be held each Friday evening, will deal with the concrete problems of China and India.

Following both opening lectures, refreshments were served and a lively informal discussion took place. This custom will be observed throughout the courses. Admission charge to single lectures is 25 cents.

Second Day of Convention:

Delegates Discuss Ways Of Destroying Jim Crow

By FELIX MORROW

BOSTON, Nov. 10.—The struggle of the CIO against racial discrimination was discussed this afternoon for over an hour by the fifth convention of the CIO, coming up in the course of the report of the resolutions committee, it was the first moment of real life in the convention so far. The committee presented for adoption the following resolution on discrimination:

"Whereas, discrimination against workers because of race, religion or country of origin is an evil characteristic of our fascist enemies. We of the democracies are fighting fascism at home and abroad by welding all races, all religions and all peoples into a united body of warriors for democracy. Any discriminatory practices within our own ranks, against Negroes or other groups, directly aids the enemy by creating divisions, dissension and confusion. Such discrimination practiced in employment policies hampers production by depriving the nation of the use of available skills and manpower.

"Therefore be it resolved, that the CIO now reiterates its firm opposition to any form of racial or religious discrimination and renews its pledge, as a war-time duty, to carry on the fight for protection in law and in fact of the rights of every racial and religious group to participate fully in our social, political and industrial life."

Officers of a Negro trade union, the United Transport Service Em-

ployees of America — the red caps' organization — objected to the committee's resolution as being too weak, and asked that it be recommitted for strengthening.

SPIRITED DISCUSSION

John L. Yancey, Secretary-Treasurer of the UTSEA, asked the convention to "get away from platitudes" and move for "real and practical action."

Answering for the committee, John Brophy defended the Roosevelt-appointed Fair Employment Practices Committee although Yancey had not mentioned it. Brophy promised that the coming year would see "greater activity" by the governmental committee charged with discouraging racial discrimination. Similarly Van A. Bittner, steel workers' official, defended the committee resolution.

Another critic of the resolution was Willard S. Townsend, President of the UTSEA. He emphasized the distinction between formal "lip-service" to the fight against racial discrimination and actually pitching in to fight it. He cited the example of "a prominent CIO leader" in the South, who had told him: "We organize in this section of the country according to the established pattern" — that is, catering to white supremacy.

After the passage of the resolution against racial discrimination, Walter Reuther of the UAW proposed that the committee be instructed to bring in another resolution, implementing in detail the principle of the first reso-

lution. In answer, CIO President Philip Murray spoke at some length on the detailed record of CIO actions against racial discrimination.

Murray was able to cite an impressive record of CIO actions and to declare that no other organization could claim to have done more than the CIO on this issue. All that was true enough, but was not the real point in question — whether the CIO was doing all it could for racial equality.

NO CRITICISM OF FEPC

Absent from the CIO resolution is any criticism of the notorious pussyfooting of the Fair Employment Practices Committee, which has failed to crack down on employers discriminating against Negroes.

Likewise absent is any criticism of the Jim Crow practices of the government itself in the Army, Navy and Air Corps. In short, while the CIO as a whole is undoubtedly wholeheartedly with the Negro against discrimination, the CIO leadership is committed to covering up Roosevelt's responsibility for the continuing of discrimination in government and industry.

The discussion was notable for the way in which the Stalinists rushed to the aid of the CIO leadership in resisting strengthening of the resolution. Stalinist delegates from the National Maritime Union (Smith), the United Electrical Workers (Wm. Senter), the Leather Workers (Feinglass), and Philip Connolly of the California Industrial Council, all rushed to the microphone to defend the resolution. Informed delegates nudged each other in amusement as this parade was on.

There is a certain vagueness concerning the actual present membership of the CIO. The Murray report gave no figures, but there have been several oral references to "about five million" and one to "over five million." The plain fact is that, in a year of unprecedented increase of employment, the CIO does not claim much growth beyond last year.

SUBSCRIBE NOW
READ
THE MILITANT
WEEKLY

Six Months \$1.00
One Year \$2.00

(Clip and Mail This Coupon)

THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Place New York, N. Y.

I enclose \$ Please send my subscription to:

Name

Address

City State

WHERE YOU CAN GET THE MILITANT

Boston—Adelman's Newsstand
284 Tremont St.

Chicago—Socialist Bookshop,
Room 421, 160 N. Wells St.

Detroit—The Saturday Bookshop, Room 5, 3513 Woodward Ave., open Saturday evenings from 6 to 9 o'clock.

Harlem—Newsstands at northwest corner of Lenox Ave. and 125th St. and at the northeast corner of Lenox Ave. and 135th St.

Newark (Downtown)—Newsstand, 11 Springfield Ave., near Court House.

New Haven—Nodelman's News Depot, 106 Church St., near Chapel.

Roxbury, Mass.—Friendly Variety Newsstand, Grove Hall.

Seattle—Eckhart News, 102 Washington Street.

The Negro Struggle

By JOHN SAUNDERS

The Effect of the Nov. 3 Elections on the Fight to End Jim Crow and Judge Lynch

Ever since Roosevelt came to the White House, militant Negroes have protested against his policy of "appeasing" the Southern Democrats.

They have pointed out, with complete accuracy, that even when Roosevelt did not personally object to a particular measure which the Negro people wanted passed, he would usually be influenced into opposing it by the objections of the Southern members of his party in Congress.

When Roosevelt transferred the Fair Employment Practices Committee to the jurisdiction of McNutt's War Manpower Commission last summer, Negro organizations protested again. They knew that the funds for the FEPC's work—and therefore the policies for the FEPC—could be limited and controlled by Congress committees in which the poll-taxers have so much influence.

Roosevelt himself would probably like to remove, at least for the duration, some of the Jim Crow bars to Negro employment. Not because he is interested in the Negro's welfare, but because he wants to win the war.

Nevertheless, he has gone easy since the war began because he doesn't want to start a fight with the die-hard poll-taxers, who insist on maintaining Jim Crow in full force, regardless of its effects on the war.

As is shown by the analysis of the elections beginning on Page 1 of this issue of *THE MILITANT* and the editorial dealing with the poll tax on Page 4, from now on and for the next two years Congress is going to be a harder nut for Negroes to crack than ever before.

The poll-taxers are now the balance of power in Congress. Both Roosevelt and the Republicans will be falling all over themselves to show the poll-tax-

ers that they are friendly to the aspirations of the Southern ruling class and would never dream of altering the lovely institution of "white supremacy."

It is not hard to guess what such a Congress will try to do to proposals to abolish the poll tax or punish lynching or end segregation in the armed forces.

So far as the Negro is concerned, the coming Congress will be one of the most reactionary of the century.

Bear in mind also that unless a Workers' and Farmers' Government is established by the workers, both white and Negro, before then, this Congress may be in office not only for the next two years but also at the end of the war.

Most Negroes have long been convinced of the necessity for beginning a fight against Jim Crow now and continuing it until the fight is successful.

To them we say: the elections show how justified your attitude is and how necessary it is to speed up and extend this fight with all the energy at your command.

There are still some Negroes who think if they sit back during the war and act respectable, the way the Jim Crow artists want them to act, that maybe they will get some concessions and make some advances.

To them we say: Wake up! Stop dreaming! Quit kidding yourselves and others! The elections show that if you don't fight for your rights, you'll have less of them after the war than you had before Pearl Harbor.

The fight against Jim Crow and Judge Lynch may be a little harder from now on.

But if the fight against them doesn't continue now, it will be very much harder to achieve racial equality later on.

Second Front Depends On Political As Well As Military Considerations

By MARK BRADEN

(The following article, dealing with some of the political considerations affecting the question of a second front, was received by *THE MILITANT* more than a week before United States forces landed in North Africa. It is printed here as a discussion of a political question overlooked or distorted by most commentators. It will be followed by other articles in subsequent issues dealing with other aspects of the same general question.—Ed.)

Every time the question of the second front is raised, Roosevelt and Churchill assert that the second front is exclusively a military question which should be left to the general staffs and its military strategists.

Yes, the second front is a military question and one which the imperialists will weigh carefully before they launch an invasion of Europe. But like every other major military move, beneath its purely military aspects are grave political issues.

The Stalinist policy of making every concession to the "democracies" in return for the "second front in 1942" becomes more glaringly bankrupt every day. Roosevelt-Churchill have claimed they are all for the second front, but that they don't want to launch a premature invasion which might be defeated. Behind this reply, however, are concealed political motivations which clearly reveal their real views on this question:

The underlying strategy of Roosevelt-Churchill thus far has been to give the Soviet Union only that amount of aid which will keep it in the fight against Germany but will drain its fighting forces and economic capacities. It must never be forgotten for a moment that world imperialism is hostile to the workers' state, even in its degenerated Stalinist form; and that if Hitler is defeated, the "democratic" imperialists will renew their efforts of 1918-20 to destroy the nationalized economy in the USSR. The glorious defense of the Soviet workers has shown the whole world the terrific fighting capacities generated by the economic conquests of October; but the staggering losses in manpower, territory and economy have a totally different meaning

to the defenders of the Soviet Union on the one hand, and to its Roosevelt-Churchill "friends" on the other.

To the former, it emphasizes the mortal peril in which the Soviet Union finds itself as a result of the catastrophic policies of Stalinism; to the imperialist "allies," these losses mean that they have so far been largely successful in letting Germany and the Soviet Union mutually weaken each other. This factor is ever-present in second front considerations of the imperialists.

THE KIND OF VICTORY THEY WANT

But sooner or later the "democratic" imperialists must come to decisive struggles with Hitler; the stakes for which they are fighting dictate that they invade Europe, and all the evidence indicates they are now carefully preparing for that.

When they do launch the invasion, however, it will be only under such conditions that they believe will ensure their victory over Hitler without exhausting their own forces. For an exhausting struggle would leave them helpless in the face of the rising tide of workers' revolts.

Consequently, they will invade only when they have a tremendous force capable not only of defeating Hitler but also of maintaining "order" among the oppressed European masses. Just as Hitler's bayonets propped up the defeated Petain government, so the "democratic" imperialists will use their armed forces to prop up the defeated German imperialists against the revolt of the German masses, or to establish another variety of dictatorship against the European workers.

To the "democratic" imperialists, a second front invasion is a "two-fronted" fight; to smash German imperialism's attempt to redivide the world, and to prevent the oppressed European masses from utilizing the occasion to establish their own workers' regimes.

Under such circumstances, far from being a concession to the Stalinist demands or a victory of the Stalinist position, the second front will present a terrible imperialist threat to the working class.

Whatever military advantages might accrue from a second front, already purchased at staggering

Election Results Show Need For Nationwide Labor Party

(Continued from page 1)

publicans won because many workers did not feel it worthwhile to go to the polls for the candidates whom they had elected previously.

DEMOCRATIC ALIBI

Administration spokesmen, including Vice-President Henry A. Wallace, and administration papers such as PM, have tried to make it appear that the "apathy" on the part of the workers was due to satisfaction with administration policies. This "explanation" can be refuted on many grounds.

For one thing, the workers generally vote in greater numbers when they feel really interested. In 1934, a midterm election, and in 1936, when most workers were sold on the New Deal, they gave the Democrats the greatest Congressional majorities in many decades.

Furthermore, the vote in New York State also serves to blow up this alibi. There the workers' interest in the elections was very keen, and their participation in the voting was almost as great as usual, corresponding to the predictions.

THE ALP VOTE IN N. Y.

For in New York, in contrast to other important states, a large section of the working class felt it had a real choice, and a significant number of them voted for Alfange on the American Labor Party ticket in opposition to the Democrat Bennett and the Republican Dewey.

A total of 409,000 votes were cast for Alfange. This represented more than 10 per cent of the state vote, and included 18 per cent of the New York City total. This represented a very small decline in the total state vote cast for the ALP candidate for governor in 1938, although it was a small increase in the percentage of the state vote over that year.

But the political significance of the ALP constitutes something far greater than these figures show by themselves.

In the first place, the workers were voting for an independent candidate of labor last week, while in 1938 they were voting for the Democrat Lehman on the ALP line of the voting machine. In 1938 the choice before the workers was which lever to push down for the same capitalist candidate. In 1942 the choice was an independent candidate in op-

position to a capitalist party candidate.

It is true that the workers were still voting for a reformist program when they voted for the ALP last week, but now they were doing it in opposition to the Democratic Party which they had so long supported.

Still more, they were voting an independent ticket even though they knew their candidate did not have a chance of being elected, which is a very important psychological consideration to the average militant worker, who does not want to waste his vote.

Even more important, they were doing it in opposition to the plea of Roosevelt, who asked them not to cast a protest vote and urged them to vote for Bennett.

Many self-styled "astute" politicians claimed that Roosevelt really "did not mean this," that he was just pretending loyalty to party traditions and that he really wanted the workers to pile up a big vote for Alfange so that he could rid himself of the Farley opposition in the Democratic Party.

None of these "acute" people has yet tried to explain why it was that Sidney Hillman, Roosevelt's most consistent labor lackey who certainly is in a position to know what Roosevelt "means," deserted the ALP in this campaign and swung the official support of the powerful Amalgamated Clothing Workers behind Bennett.

INTERNAL OBSTACLES

This vote for Alfange was recorded, also, in spite of many obstacles raised by the ALP leaders themselves, who were more surprised at the encouraging outcome of the Alfange campaign than anyone else.

The ALP leaders had not wanted originally to run an independent candidate. They would have been more than satisfied to settle for some "acceptable" Democrat—that is, acceptable in the sense that the ALP leaders would have a chance of "selling" him to the workers as a "friend of labor."

But the reactionary trends intensified by the war and reflected in all capitalist parties made this impossible, and the ALP leaders were forced to go through with an independent campaign, hoping to get enough votes so that they would be "recognized" by the capitalist parties next time.

Their choice of Alfange, a colorless Tammany hack, was cer-

tainly not the cause of the high vote given the ALP. The choice of Alfange undoubtedly disheartened many rank-and-file ALP workers. The vote for Alfange was not a vote for him as an individual—it was a vote for an independent labor ticket.

The campaign itself was run in an inept and defeatist manner. The platform of the ALP was almost indistinguishable from that of the Democrats and Republicans. Alfange avoided all the fundamental issues.

And yet, despite all the obstacles—internal, external and psychological—the workers saw the class line clearly enough to pile up a vote which far exceeded the ALP leaders' fondest expectations.

THE NEW CONGRESS

The Nov. 3 elections showed the need for the creation of a labor party. The present Congress, reactionary though it is, will be replaced by an even more reactionary crowd in January. Even before it has been seated, there is already increased talk in Washington of a sales tax, abolition of the National Labor Relations Act and of the 40-hour week, etc.

The most anti-labor section of Congress has long been the Southern Democrats, elected by a small minority of the southern electorate. Their numbers have not increased as a result of the Nov. 3 elections, but their relative strength has. They now clearly hold the balance of power between the Republican and Democratic congressmen, and will obviously have a greater voice than before in legislation affecting the workers of the whole nation.

C. P. Helped To Elect Minnesota Republicans

(Continued from page 1)

ing Trades Council and a number of others.

But Petersen did not conduct the kind of campaign which could have aroused real enthusiasm among the workers. He did not attempt to unify the Farmer-Labor movement by calling upon the organized workers and farmers to get rid of the Stalinist disrupters and rebuild the Farmer-Labor Association as an instrument of working-class political action.

Although he was the Farmer-Labor standard bearer, he did not ask the support of the working masses of Minnesota to place a working class administration in office and clean out the corrupt anti-labor Stassen machine, which has placed so many reactionary laws upon the statute books of Minnesota.

THE C. P. VOTE

The Communist Party ran candidates for the offices of Governor, Railroad and Warehouse Commissioner, and Representative from the Fourth District. These were the offices for which anti-Stalinist Farmer-Laborites had been successful in the primary election. The Stalinist candidates used the campaign in order to put forth their hysterical demand for a second front, opposition to so-called "appeasers," etc.

It appears certain from the present unofficial tabulation of election returns that the Stalinists will increase their vote over 1940 when their presidential candidate, Earl Browder received 2711 votes and their sticker candidates for state offices obtained an average of 300 votes.

Considering the large sum of money which the Minnesota Stalinists put into the 1942 campaign—they had 11 or 12 radio speeches, for example, many of them on class A time—and more important, considering the "popular" line which their 1942 candidates put forth, the possible doubling of Browder's 1940 vote does not represent a very significant gain.

In 1940 Grace Carlson received 8761 votes as the Socialist Workers Party candidate for U. S. Senator just ended, she ran as a sticker candidate, so her vote will not be reported until the State Canvassing Board meets on November 17.

S. W. P. CAMPAIGN

Despite the encouraging response to the 1940 Trotskyist campaign, it was feasible only to run a sticker campaign in this election. Two thousand citizens who did not vote in the primary election must sign a petition before a Notary Public in order to place the name of the candidate of a minority party on the ballot.

The state law further provides that both the circulator of the petition and the signer may be punished by prison sentences if the law is violated in any technical detail.

In the middle of opportunism, fakery, and outright treachery which characterized the election campaigns of other so-called working class parties in Minnesota this year, the candidate of the Socialist Workers Party brought the clarity of principled Marxist politics.

To the workers and farmers of Minnesota, struggling under the heavy burden of the war, Comrade Grace Carlson brought the message of international socialism—the message of hope for a future society, free from the barbarities of war, fascism, racial repression and colonial tyranny.

The Nov. 3 elections also showed that the workers are ready for a labor party—negatively, on the part of the 10 to 15% of the voters, most of them workers, who were expected to vote and did not—positively, on the part of the approximately same percentage of the New York voters who supported the first statewide independent candidate in the history of the ALP.

LABOR PARTY IS NOW NEEDED AND POSSIBLE

A labor party would quickly win the support of more than these 15 per cent of the voters, who represent in many ways the most advanced and militant sections of the working class. Once a labor party was formed, the other workers would soon recognize it as a step forward and would give it their allegiance.

In addition, such a party, by adopting a fighting anti-capitalist program could win the support of the greater part of the farmers and middle class, who voted for the Republicans in this last campaign not because they are convinced that it will benefit them but because they saw no other sizeable party through which they could register their protests.

A labor party can and should be formed now. Workers should not make the mistake of thinking that political problems are settled just because the elections are over.

Unless they prepare now, they will be unprepared when the next national elections come around in 1944, and when the fascist demagogues in this country set out seriously to create a mass base among the bewildered and desperate middle class.

WE CELEBRATE THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

By Joseph Hansen

Opening Speech at SWP Meeting in N. Y.

It is a great historic privilege to be able to celebrate the existence of the workers' state for a quarter of a century. For thousands of years planned society was nothing but a dream of the future, a distant goal which one could not hope to see although he gave his life in the struggle to attain it. Even when such a society became objectively possible, thousands and tens of thousands who hoped to participate in the victorious struggle never gained their wish. What wouldn't Marx and Engels have given if they could have lived to see the fruition of their struggle in the mighty leap forward which humanity took in 1917!

For of all the great historic gains which mankind has made since our species first became able to think and to work out methods of controlling the surrounding environment, the greatest single step forward was that taken in October, 1917 when the Russian proletariat blazed the pathway to the planned world economy of the future.

Our celebration of the October Revolution constitutes not only praise of this great accomplishment but more properly its defense. The conquests which the Russian workers and peasants made under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky face danger of destruction today more acute than at any time in the history of the Soviet Union.

Our defense of the Soviet Union includes its defense against certain former friends of the USSR, and that is what I want to talk about. These former friends have abandoned the defense of the Soviet Union. They considered the October Revolution and its conquests as liquidated even before the attack of Hitler's armies.

Why do these people consider the October Revolution as having perished some time ago? As capitalism in its death agony reached the impasse of a second world war, they responded to the war pressure emanating from the world bourgeoisie who are irreconcilable enemies of the Soviet Union. That is the basic reason.

But they give as their reason the monstrous crimes of the Stalinist regime. These crimes, they say, have reached such proportions as to constitute an economic system hitherto unknown in history. Disoriented and repelled by the degeneration of the Soviet Union, they gave up all the conquests of the October Revolution.

Such people are not an unknown phenomena. They have appeared before in history. They constitute a tendency that is easily recognizable.

In 1848 the first great proletarian revolution ended in defeat. As a result of this defeat all the petty bourgeois radicals, the unstable elements who had joined with the revolution in its upswing, now gave up the workers' cause as hopeless.

However the Marxists did not lose hope. They understood that in the final analysis the lessons of the defeat would seep down to the bottom-most layers of the masses and prepare them for a new and more powerful uprising in the future. Out of those experiences in 1848 arose the First International.

The confidence of the Marxists was justified. The experience of 1848 made possible the Paris Commune of 1871 when the working class stormed the heights and gave the world the first sample of what the workers' government of the future will look like.

But that bright token of the socialist society likewise was defeated and again gloom and despair prevailed among the petty-bourgeois radicals. The First International was overwhelmed in the backwash of reaction.

The Paris Commune, however, became for the Marxists a model for study. Out of the experiences of the Paris Commune arose the Second International which built powerful mass parties and spread the program of scientific socialism to all the far corners of the earth.

The Paris Commune prepared the Bolsheviks for their great role in the revolution of 1905 in Russia, when the working class reared a socialist government in opposition to Czarism.

But that revolution too was defeated. And again a period of intense reaction set in, the reaction which culminated in the first world war. The petty bourgeois radicals scurried for cover.

They were unable to see that the revolution of 1905 had elec-

trified the masses of the whole world, inspiring them with hope and confidence and the determination to strike out for themselves.

These petty bourgeois radicals were unable to see what the Marxists saw—that they must place the revolution of 1905 under the microscope and study it with the most scrupulous scientific care. They were unable to see that out of 1905 would come a still mightier upsurge of the workers and peasants.

The confidence and toughness of the Marxists proved well justified. 1905 was the necessary condition for the revolution of 1917. It was the dress rehearsal for 1917. Without the experience of 1905 the revolution of 1917 could not have become victorious.

The revolution of 1917, however, differed from all previous revolutions in one profound respect. Whereas previously the most recurring revolution had succeeded in establishing a power dual to that of the bourgeoisie, now the workers had conquered state power and managed to hold it. This enabled them to smash the bourgeoisie as a class and thereby to lay the economic foundations of a new order.

It is the existence of these economic foundations that has given the Soviet Union its great vitality and which permits us to say with scientific precision that it is still very much alive. We can see the verification of this scientific judgment in the magnificent defense put up by the Soviet people against the imperialist invader.

In the past the petty bourgeois radicals had a semblance of justification for their defeatist mood, for the bourgeoisie re-established its power, apparently on a firmer basis than before. The miserable, cowardly character of the present defeatists can be judged from the fact that the 1917 revolution was not vanquished in a few days nor in a few months but has existed today for a quarter of a century despite all the corroding influence of Stalinism and despite all the blows of world imperialism. Their stupidity is evident in the fact that they are incapable of seeing what even the bourgeoisie are aware of—that the October revolution exists deep in the consciousness of the workers of the whole world—not only in Europe but in the colonial countries, in China, India, the Far East, Africa, even here in America; and that world capitalism never stood on such insecure foundations as it does today.

The Trotskyists throughout the world celebrate the Russian Revolution by defending the Soviet Union not only rifle in hand but primarily by furthering the class struggle against the international bourgeoisie. In contradistinction to the Stalinists who defend the Soviet Union mainly to safeguard their own bureaucratic privileges we defend it to advance the interests of the world socialist revolution.

The great Bolshevik party of Lenin and Trotsky, the most honest and the most revolutionary party in history, was principally a product of the 1905 revolution. The great product of the 1917 Revolution in addition to the Soviet Union is the Fourth International, which on a new historic level continues the traditions and program of Bolshevism. The Fourth International constitutes in the political arena the crowning achievement of the 1917 revolution.

Now in the midst of a second World War it may seem on the surface that the world labor movement has reached a new low ebb. In Italy, Germany and Japan the workers' organizations are completely smashed and in the so-called "democracies" they are on the retreat before the offensive of Big Business.

But underneath, the revolution is preparing for another leap forward. A new October is forming—a new October that will be a continuation and extension of the old. It will burst out of the bloodshed and destruction of the second world war with invincible force and sweep the entire earth.

Then on the titanic scale of the completed world revolution, humanity can look back at October 1917. What will be their judgment? They will see it as the first brilliant conquest of socialist society—the dawn of real civilization. They will see that the Russian Revolution and the defense of its conquests was the indispensable condition for final victory. And they will also see that history chose as leaders for the next victorious upsurges after 1917 only those who were capable of defending the old positions.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People.

VOL. VI—No. 46 Saturday, Nov. 14, 1942

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 115 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALexandria 4-8547

Editor:
GEORGE BREITMAN

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

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 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.

Talking About Stabs In The Back...

An unprovoked act of aggression! A treacherous stab in the back!

Do such expressions sound familiar? They've been used so often that they should.

Most recently these tones of indignation have been heard from the French government. Less than a year ago they were heard from the United States government. Even Japan this week denounced the invasion of French Africa as "ungentlemanly." The same things have been said countless times by all other imperialist governments.

Remember how Secretary Hull denounced the deceit of Japan which engaged in long diplomatic discussions while Pearl Harbor was being prepared? That's the same Secretary Hull who this week smilingly admitted that the government's policy of "friendship" toward Vichy was designed all along to pave the way for an invasion of the French Empire.

A nation that gets beat to the punch always hollers. It seeks by acting the part of injured innocence to justify its own imperialist policies and thus gain support from the masses. This unprovoked aggression, they say, proves that ours is a just and holy war. As for the imperialist nations that manage to put over the "Pearl Harbors," they have a different line, but also a uniform and by now trite one.

President Roosevelt says that French Africa was invaded "in order to forestall an invasion of Africa by Germany and Italy." "The ultimate and greater aim is the liberation of France and its empire..."

And Hitler says he has marched into unoccupied France "with one single aim, and that is to repel an American and British landing. I have given the order to the troops to look after the interests of France."

And of course Japan also claimed to have invaded China in self-defense and in the best interests of the Chinese people. And the French government originally entered the war to defend poor little Poland, didn't it?

We have often said that the character of a war cannot be determined by who strikes the first blow or by diplomatic maneuvers employed to prepare the first blow or by the indignant complaints of the nation that gets struck the first blow. For these are methods and arguments used interchangeably by all the imperialists to serve their own reactionary interests.

We hope that the latest events will open the eyes of the workers and lead them to an examination of the real causes of imperialist war — the capitalist system and the continuous struggle for profits which it breeds among all capitalist nations.

The Central Aim

The central idea around which all the activities and decisions of the government revolve was again illustrated on Friday, Nov. 6.

On that day the Treasury Department announced that it would "ease up" on the \$25,000 limitation on the "salaries" of the bosses.

And on the very same day, the War Labor Board, which has jurisdiction over wages and salaries below \$5000 a year, cracked down on the workers' wages.

The Treasury made another concession to the bosses. It ruled that the wealthy who hold contracts providing salaries in excess of \$25,000, would be permitted to continue receiving this "salary" in 1942, providing the contract was entered in before Oct. 4.

A few months ago Roosevelt abolished by decree

all overtime pay for week-end and holiday work unless these days were the six and seventh of a working week. The fact that many unions had contracts stipulating such payment did not halt Roosevelt. The contract is not at all sacred when it benefits the workers; when it favors the bosses it is a holy of holies.

The WLB sternly notified the workers that not even to correct maladjustments and inequalities would any group of employees be allowed to receive wage increases greater than 15 per cent over the January 1, 1941 level.

In his statement announcing the policy of the WLB, the chairman of that body, William H. Davis, said that the board would grant increases "very sparingly" and that the "Little Steel" 15 per cent formula would be interpreted "rather strictly."

For the small handful of capitalists who are making tremendous profits out of the war, the government adopts a policy of conciliation and makes further extensive concessions.

For the great mass of the people, the toilers who produce the wealth of the nation, the government adopts what Davis calls a "pretty damn tough policy."

Nothing illustrates better than this the fundamental policies of the government.

Now He's 'Our' S.O.B.

"From the headquarters of General Eisenhower in North Africa comes the dramatic announcement that General Henri Giraud, hero of two world wars, has arrived in Algeria and that he will organize there a French North African Army 'to take up arms side by side with the United Nations for the defeat of Germany and Italy and the liberation of France and her Empire.'" From an editorial in the Nov. 10 N. Y. Times.

Who is this great "hero" who once more unsheathes his sword for the cause of "liberation?"

The answer was not long in coming. Out of the wrangling, bickering camp of French capitalist refugees who prefer to kneel at the foot of the Anglo-American masters rather than bend before the German overlord comes an answer written by the informed Pertinax in the N. Y. Times the following day: "Anti-German General Giraud decidedly is, but he is also anti-communist and it cannot be said that he ever was a friend of Great Britain. With all that, for the sake of national liberation, he dropped for the present his anti-British prejudice."

"General Giraud is a vigorous leader in the field. He pacified South Morocco before the war, but in Belgium and in Northern France two and a half years ago he did not have the opportunity to prove his mettle."

"All Frenchmen opposed to Germany who at the same time want to save the Vichy regime and prevent the restoration of the republic will flock to General Giraud while former republicans take their stand by General de Gaulle."

"General Giraud (in pre-war days) belonged to the extreme right. On his staff of the Seventh Army was Guy de Wendel who was wont to exclaim: 'Between Hitler and Stalin I don't hesitate; I am for Hitler.'"

"As Prime Minister and Minister of War, M. Daladier did not relish General Giraud's public indictments of representative institutions and several times was on the point of dismissing him."

Here is the portrait of our "great" general who has been assigned the task of "liberating" France:

1. He is a confirmed opponent of capitalist democracy, even of the sickly degenerate kind represented by Daladier before the war.

2. He is "anti-communist," that is, a foe of the working class and the unions and therefore undoubtedly a supporter of fascism.

3. He was a supporter of the now defunct Vichy Regime which collaborated with the Nazi conqueror in a reign of terror against the French people.

4. He is a bitter enemy of the Soviet Union — on whose side he is now supposed to be fighting — and preferred an allied invasion of the workers' state to a war with Hitler.

5. He is a butcher of colonial peoples. As a "great general" he won his spurs "pacifying" the helpless natives of Morocco.

6. He differs from de Gaulle only in the time he jumped on the Anglo-American bandwagon. De Gaulle, leader of "Republicans" is an avowed monarchist and recently took to his bosom Vallin, one of the leaders of the French fascist Croix de Feu.

The N. Y. Times commented in its editorial that Giraud's "assumption of leadership of the Free French movement in North Africa cannot fail to aid our cause enormously."

What "cause" is this? And in whose interests? The cause of imperialism! Against the interests of the French masses!

Election And The Anti-Poll Tax Bill

The danger that the present Congress will not pass legislation abolishing payment of poll taxes for federal elections has been increased by the outcome of the Nov. 3 elections.

The poll-tax Democrats will hold the balance of power in the new Congress. If they throw their support to the Republicans on any issue, the Democrats can become a minority. And vice versa.

The tendency of the Democratic and Republican machines will therefore be increasingly to make horse trades with the poll-tax Democrats in return for support on issues in which the machines are interested.

That tendency will develop not only next January when the new Congress is seated, but right now.

More than ever, the national leaders of the two parties will hesitate to take any steps that might offend the poll-taxers.

During the next six weeks the anti-poll tax bill will be threatened not only by the danger of filibuster and obstructionism on the part of the poll-taxers, but also sabotage, concealed if not open, on the part of the administration and of the Republican leaders.

It will be hard to pass the anti-poll tax bill this year under these conditions.

But it will be much harder to pass it next year.

It is therefore necessary, even more now than before the elections, for all workers' organizations in the country to intensify their pressure on Congress, the administration and the Republicans, to demand the immediate passage of the anti-poll tax bill.

Old Enough To Fight? Old Enough To Vote!

By A. ROLAND

The exacting and exhausting demands made on the mechanized soldier in the present war have caused all the nations to turn for man-power to the youth. The United States is preparing to take the unprecedented step of applying conscription to those who are eighteen and over. It is recognized that the young make the best fighters, those who can "take it" under the worst conditions. Thus the youth are being called upon to make the supreme sacrifice in the imperialist war.

It is not only as fighters that the young are called upon to bear the burdens. In the factories also both young men and young women are being driven for production in the totalitarian war. The "forgotten generation" is suddenly no longer forgotten.

All the agencies of government, all the controlled peripheral organizations, lay themselves out to foster the good will of the youth. The employers who but yesterday hurled anathema at the New Deal for "coddling" the young men and women who could find no place in an industry in crisis,

now work the other tack and glorify the idealistic youth who, if anybody, will save their civilization of privilege. Or so they hope.

But the ruling class will take no chances with the youth who are found perfectly capable of carrying all the burdens of the war on their shoulders. They are given all responsibilities except that of having a voice in their own fate.

WHERE DEMOCRACY ENDS

It seems that democracy ends where youth begins. The right to vote is reserved for their elders. The law which acknowledges their manhood by sending them to the battlefield, gives them the status of minors when it comes to politics. They are not asked to make up their own minds concerning any of the larger issues of the war or the post-war world. That will be done for them by those with greater experience, the experience that brought on the war. The old line, "Theirs not to question why, theirs but to do and die," applies doubly now — to the home-front as well as the battlefield.

The reasons back of the failure to grant the democratic right to vote to the eighteen to twenty-

ones, are not far to seek. They are characteristic of class society, and particularly of capitalist society. Politics, the game of ruling society, is held to be the sphere of those who have a stake in it.

It is the prerogative of the class that dominates modern society, who permit the right to vote to the masses only so long as the vote does not endanger the present system. The older men and women are under all sorts of pressures in their daily lives to keep them under the thumb of the powers-that-be.

But the youth cannot so easily be cowed. They are proverbially the idealists and the radicals. They do not fear, but on the contrary, welcome change and progress.

The present younger generation is especially under suspicion by the finance capitalists who really run capitalist society. This generation has been raised in the period of the greatest crisis in American history.

It has learned the bitter experience of seeing fathers and brothers and sisters out of work, of being on relief, of having to fight for its daily bread. The lessons of the awful years from '29 to '39 can never be forgotten.

LEARNING LESSONS

The war and the post-war events will serve, without question, to drive those lessons even deeper into the minds of the young soldiers who return from the battlefield. The kind of democracy they are fighting for is not in the least the same as the democracy for which the bankers have sent them to fight.

They are not interested in seeing American imperialism dominate the world in place of Hitler imperialism. They want a world that will really be fit to live in without fear, without constant insecurity.

The demand for the right of those who are eighteen and over to vote, has long been inscribed on our banner. The very reasons for the capitalists' fear to grant this right are the reasons for our making the demand. We make this demand in time of peace, an additional reason then being the fact that capitalism exploits youth in special ways which they must be capable of resisting politically and economically. But the democratic demand for this right now becomes even more urgent and more meaningful when these young men — and women — are sent into the war.

REACTIONARIES AND THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

It is interesting to see that reactionaries like Vandenberg have taken up the cry for the right of these youth to vote. The reactionaries want to capitalize on the natural feelings of the young soldiers.

The Vandenberg's rightly fear that we Marxists may gain increasing influence among the young soldiers by our efforts in their behalf. But these demagogues are not serious for one moment in putting up the demand. They know that Congress will never grant the right, and they bank on that fact to gain a false popularity.

The attitude of a political party towards the rights of youth characterizes the nature of the party. The social-democrats, for example, fear to make the demand for the right to vote. The editor of the *New Leader*, William E. Bohn, has conducted several columns treating this question. There are repeated all the capitalist arguments for refusing the right to youth.

Bohn even goes to the trouble to quote at length from the letter of a "socialist" lawyer (God save the mark!), in which this cretin harps on the inconsistency of calling youth "minors" in law — and granting them the vote! His concern with capitalist law and its definitions shows precisely how he views the functions of his party.

Bohn evidently fears for "democracy" should youth get the vote. Our attitude is clear and unambiguous. We demand the right, the democratic right, of youth to vote. The so-called irresponsibility of such youth we consider to be the responsibility to the future, and not to the dying past.

S. B.
San Francisco

A New Pamphlet!

MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

To the Workers and Peasants of India

20 Pages 5 Cents

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place, New York, N. Y.

And They Call It A 'War For Democracy'!

What are the British fighting for? Do they intend to grant freedom to the colonial peoples in the British Empire?

Stung by the growing criticisms of British imperialist policy, Brigadier General Lord Croft, Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary for the War Office got up in Parliament on Oct. 28 not only to defend the British government but also to brag about its slave-master policies:

"The time has come to throw off the inferiority complex and realize that what Britain is fighting to defend is as sound as anything yet discovered and to cease apologizing for our existence. This 'decadent, dying race' has a finer system of justice and better social services than any other land, and nowhere in the world has the gap between riches and poverty been made so narrow without a revolution..."

"We intend to drive out the aggressor from Malaya and Burma and restore happiness and liberty to those unhappy countries. Far from quitting, we have the opportunity of continuing to lift those countries from illiteracy to understanding, and some day, in our wisdom and at our own time, into full self-expression, and by our example, lead the world to a fuller, happier life."

It is unlikely that the speech of Lord Croft — who, according to Time of Nov. 9, "was a supporter of Francisco Franco during the Spanish Civil War, of Benito Mussolini at the partition of Abyssinia" — will be published in all sections of the British Empire to encourage the colonial masses.

After all, 90% of the colonial subjects still cannot read after hundreds of years under British rule; and very few of those who can read, can afford to buy newspapers.

More On Why Bosses Are Happy About New Tax Bill

By C. CHARLES

The recently passed tax bill is full of provisions favorable to the capitalist class. These loopholes, which are called "relief" provisions, were exposed in last week's issue of THE MILITANT.

There is an additional method that the bosses use which was not mentioned in THE MILITANT article on "Why the Bosses Are Happy About the New Tax Bill." This method, which has been in operation for some time, is called the tax amortization allowance.

This is an example of how the tax amortization allowance works:

A firm plans to put up a new plant to produce war goods (at a very good profit). If the Army and Navy decide that this plant is necessary, they certify it to receive the benefits of the tax amortization provisions.

According to these provisions, the firm is allowed to deduct from its taxable income 20 per cent of the cost of the plant for purposes of "amortization." Amortization is a financial device whereby a company each year or period pays off a certain part of a debt.

Since a steel plant wears out only about 3% each year, this means that every year the firm receives 17% of the cost of the new plant as a gift in the form of exemption from tax payment.

Thus the government, over a period of less than six years, gives a free plant to the firm, saving the capitalists hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes annually.

German Tax Laws Also Go Easy On Capitalist Class

By HOWARD ALLEN

The Nazis and Fascists have always posed as anti-capitalists. The speeches of Hitler, Mussolini and their stooges have been full of demagogic attacks on "Big Business." They have tried to cover up their naked dictatorship with phrases against profiteering.

Nazi propaganda in particular has exploited to the limit the deep-seated desire of the workers for an economic system without profits. In this they have been aided by a host of phoney economists and sociologists, inside Germany and out, who have pictured the Hitler dictatorship as a non-capitalist system.

According to these vulgar, would-be theoreticians, the Nazi economy is a new social order, a planned economy; they identify Nazi Germany with Soviet Russia. In spite of their divergent interests, both the apologists for "democratic" imperialism and the fascist soothsayers have agreed that the capitalist class no longer rules in Germany. They both lie.

Waverly Root, writing in the Nov. 2 *Philadelphia Record* reports, "When the war began, German business firms were subject to a corporation tax of 50% and an excess profits tax of 100%." But there was a loophole in the law big enough to drive an armored car through. The German companies simply added their excess profits to their reserves, instead of listing them as profits.

"In order to keep on paying high dividends without running over the 6% of capital, (upon which a heavy tax was levied on June 12, 1941) the big German concerns wrote up their capital, revealing in so doing the tremendous hidden reserves they had accumulated, which now became part of the permanent capitalization."

"The reserves in many cases turned out to be greater than the original capital. Thus, the Deutsche Waffen und Munitions-fabriken increased its capital 300%..." The overall capital increase for all German corporations was 60%.

In other words, Mr. Root charges the German capitalist class with a hunger for profits equal to that of the American capitalists. The tax-evasion devices of the German industrialists which Root exposes, is certainly nothing new to the American "captains of industry."

Despite the political differences between the Nazi and the "democratic" imperialist states, one fact sticks out: Both are concerned primarily with helping the bosses to coin profits at the expense of the workers.