

How To Fight The Wage Freezing Order

- See Editorial On Page 4 -

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VII—No. 18

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1943

267

PRICE (5) CENTS

MINE STRUGGLE HEADS FOR SHOWDOWN

Soviet-Polish Relations Broken

Rupture Dramatically Bares Antagonisms Between Workers' State and Democracies

By Anthony Massini

What *The Militant* has consistently pointed out since Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union—that the end of the war and the defeat of Hitler by the "United Nations" will not end the danger to the Soviet Union—was dramatically confirmed this week when the Soviet government broke relations with the Polish government-in-exile because of its "hostile campaign" in connection with the German claim that the Soviet Union had massacred 10,000 Polish officers.

Foreign Commissar Molotov's note announcing the rupture of relations describes the recent behavior of the Polish government as "entirely abnormal, violating all regulations and standards of relations between two allied states." There can be no doubt that the Polish government's procedure over the German charge was deliberately hostile to the USSR.

Despite the fact that the two nations are allied, despite the fact that the Polish government has an ambassador in the Soviet Union, the Polish officials pointedly ignored the Soviet government and appealed to the International Red Cross for an investigation of the Nazi charges.

AIM OF POLISH COURSE

What was the Polish government's aim in following such a procedure? Molotov's note charges that the present campaign around the issue of the Polish officers was undertaken "in order to exert pressure upon the Soviet government" for the purpose of getting territorial concessions on the Soviet-Polish border. The Soviet government's response to this pressure must be interpreted therefore as counter-pressure and an open indication that it is not inclined to make any such concessions as are sought by the Polish officials.

BRITISH AND U. S. ROLE

Why did the Polish government adopt such a provocative course? Government circles in Britain and the United States have deplored and regretted the latest developments, but it must not be forgotten that only a few months ago they permitted the Polish government-in-exile, which generally does not dare to take a step without their permission, to arouse an anti-Soviet agitation over the border question and over alleged interference by the Soviet Union in Polish "internal" affairs. The present crisis, even if not desired by London and Washington, is a natural consequence of that agitation. If the break represents a victory for Nazi propaganda, as the British and American press insist, then it was one made possible by the atmosphere encouraged by Washington and London.

STALIN'S CRIMES

It must also be remembered that the present anti-Soviet agitation has been facilitated by the methods of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the past. The execution of the Polish socialist leaders, Alter and Ehrlich, on the ground that they were aiding the Nazis, is only the most recent Stalinist crime which has served to discredit the Soviet Union in the eyes of the masses.

The Stalinist regime and its monstrous crimes provide all the actual and potential enemies of the Soviet Union with most convenient and effective pretexts for dealing blows to the first workers' state in history. The *N. Y. Herald Tribune*, the representative of the capitalists in this country who are most willing now a days to strike some kind of deal with Stalin, declares editorially on April 27 that "the record of the Russian government is such that not even its staunchest friends can reject the (Polish officers) story as

beyond the possibility of some basis in fact."

Whatever the other specific motives of the Allied and Soviet governments, the latest developments must be viewed as the most graphic expression to date of the fundamental antagonism between the "democracies" and the Soviet Union. Those who stand for the defense of the Soviet Union, as we Trotskyists do, must continue to warn the masses that the Soviet Union remains in great danger.

Post Office Bans Apr. 24 'Militant' From the Mails

The Post Office continues to persecute *The Militant* and to interfere with its delivery to subscribers.

Last week's edition, a special six page issue dated April 24 and devoted to May Day, has been declared "nonmailable" by the postal authorities in Washington and will not be allowed through the mails. The subscribers' copies were ordered destroyed.

The letter announcing this brazen interference with the right of free press did not state why the postal authorities had taken this action or what articles in the April 24 issue they found "objectionable." Efforts are being made to obtain this information, but in the past such efforts have always been in vain.

The feature articles in the April 24 issue of *The Militant* were the May Day Manifesto of the Socialist Workers Party; an article analyzing the government's job-freezing order of April 17; stories and editorials denouncing the corporations which have been caught selling the government defective war material; a short history of the trial of Frank Jackson, GPU killer of Leon Trotsky who was sentenced to 20 years by a Mexican court; the announcement that V. R. Dunne is running as the Socialist Workers Party candidate for Mayor of Minneapolis, etc.

Which Side of the Fence Are They On?



Grade Labeling Plan Abandoned By OPA

Action Will Make It Much Easier for Profiteers to Violate Price Ceilingss

On April 21 Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown solemnly stated that the OPA will carry out Roosevelt's pledge to "hold the line" on prices.

The emptiness of Brown's promise was revealed less than a week later when on April 26 the *N. Y. Times* reported that the OPA had decided to scuttle the grade labeling program—a step which will inevitably lead to higher prices by making it easier for profiteers to violate price ceilings.

Brown's sabotage of the grade labeling program was the result of pressure brought upon his office by the canning and advertising industries, as well as Big Business in general.

Under this program all fruits and vegetables canned this year would have been graded according to government standards, with the grade marked on the label. The National Canners Association and the Grocery Manufacturers of America opposed this step because it would have revealed to the consumers that many little-advertised brands are of the same quality as the high priced and better-known brands.

Further, it would have been more difficult to palm off inferior products as "specially improved" and to defraud the consumers in a hundred different ways if the quality of the product was plainly indicated and the price ceilings uniform for all similar grades.

PRESSURE

The Big Business campaign against this program was not confined to propaganda methods, but included direct blackmail when the canners threatened not to can the 1943 crop if grade labeling was enforced.

The "Heard in Washington" column of the Scripps-Howard newspapers reported on March 27 that the canners would have their way in the fight because they had notified the OPA that they had not yet contracted for crops from the farmers and would not contract for them until they were certain of "relief from grade labeling, assurance on prices."

In other words, Big Business warned the government that the people would simply have to go without canned food next year unless prices were allowed to rise even higher than they are today.

N. Y. SWP Holds 2 May Day Affairs

To celebrate May Day, the traditional working class holiday, Local New York of the Socialist Workers Party will hold a meeting on Sunday, May 2, at 8:15 P. M. Precisely because May Day is an international holiday, the manner in which it has been celebrated each year has reflected the condition of the world working class at the time. This holds true today. E. R. Frank, the main speaker of the evening, will show how May Day, 1943 reflects nationally and internationally the situation of workers in the Second World War. There will be a special May Day program. The place: hall of the New York School of Social Science, 116 University Place, New York City.

Local New York has also arranged a May Day party. The program includes dancing, mass singing of working class songs, and other special features. Refreshments and food will be served. The party will be held at the local headquarters, 116 University Pl., 4th floor. Time: Saturday, May 1, 8:30 P. M.

Those who really wish to celebrate this May Day are urged to celebrate it with the New York Trotskyists.

Tens Of Thousands Walk Out Of Mines As Union Demands Negotiations Be Resumed

UMW Policy Committee Denounces War Labor Board, Lewis Says Members Won't 'Trespass' Without a Contract After April 30

By Philip Blake

NEW YORK, April 28. — The government's wage-freezing program entered a profound crisis and the miners' struggle for higher wages was headed for a showdown this week as the policy committee of the United Mine Workers voted to stand firm in its wage demands and as tens of thousands of union members walked out of the coal mines. The UP reported that 41,000 had already discontinued work by this morning, and many more were expected to join them before the extended contract expired at midnight April 30.

"As matters stand, there will be no bituminous contract by April 30,"

UMW President John L. Lewis declared last night, and he reaffirmed the traditional stand of the union by adding that "It is perfectly reasonable to assume at all times that the mine workers of the country will not trespass on the properties of the coal operators in the absence of a contract."

WLB INTERVENTION

The miners' struggle entered a new stage on April 22 when the War Labor Board announced that it was assuming jurisdiction over the case and ordered representatives of the union and the coal operators to appear at a hearing in Washington. This was a step greeted with joy by the operators, who had been requesting it ever since the negotiations began on March 10, and they immediately left for Washington. The union had denounced the WLB as a court packed against labor, and it refused to appear at its hearing.

The WLB then went ahead in the absence of the union; its chairman, William H. Davis, declared on April 24 that it would handle the case under the Little Steel formula, which automatically rules out higher wage rates for the miners. On the same day the War Labor Board, with its CIO and AFL members concurring, ordered the miners to continue "uninterrupted production." On April 26 it set up a three-man panel to consider the case, with David B. Robertson of Cleveland, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, accepting a place on the panel.

THE UNION'S STAND

The UMW policy committee met yesterday to consider these developments and adopted a letter to Secretary of Labor Perkins, blaming the breakdown of the negotiations on "certain political figures in Washington" and on the U. S. Steel Corporation and associated steel interests who dominate the operators' group and who "are

among the fattest of the nation's cost-plus war hogs."

The letter repeated the union's opposition to the WLB, declaring that "this board wields the headman's axe against the workers of the country" and that by Davis' April 24 statement it "has already rendered a decision in the mine workers' case."

The policy committee concluded the letter by requesting "that government authority should direct the coal operators in Washington... to return forthwith and work out a settlement through collective bargaining, without political limitation." Lewis added that the policy committee was "standing by" in New York for a reply to this letter.

OPPOSING FORCES

Arrayed against the miners are powerful forces who realize that the stake in the present fight is the whole pattern for keeping labor in subjection during the war—the entire government apparatus, the power and authority of the White House, Congress, the government mediation agencies, the draft boards and control of the armed forces whom Roosevelt has already used more than once to break strikes and whom he was ready to use to end the UMW District 50 strike at the Celanese Corporation in Newark, N. J., last week.

Then there are the coal operators, who are supported by all the other capitalists, bankers and monopolists; the capitalist press—both conservative and "liberal"—to be used to incite public opinion against the miners and their leaders; the Stalinist betrayers of labor and the labor fakers who are forced by pressure from the union ranks to

mumble support for the miners' demands but who refuse to get off the government boards which are being used to deny those demands.

THE MINERS' STRENGTH

The UMW relies first of all on its own half-million members, loyal and militant unionists who understand the difficulties facing them, who have more than once shown the way to the rest of American labor and who are supporting the present struggle almost to a man. Their readiness to fight can be verified by the reports of newspapermen covering the mining areas and by the walkouts that have already occurred.

In addition, "Lewis was pictured yesterday as convinced not only of the support of the miners in the position taken by their negotiators, but also of the rank and file of organized labor." In this connection, miners' spokesmen pointed to the growing manifestations of discontent by both AFL and CIO unions with the government's wage and price control policies, as well as with the policies and regulations of the War Manpower Commission freezing tens of millions of workers in their jobs." (*N. Y. Times*, April 26.)

Acting together and following a militant policy, the workers in the UMW, CIO and AFL could overcome any obstacle. But the members of the CIO and AFL, while wholly sympathetic to the miners' fight, have unfortunately not been mobilized to give active support to it. This is one of the key problems facing the workers in the present struggle. (See editorial, "How To Fight The Wage-Freezing Order," on Page 4 of this issue.)

UAW EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETS TO PROTEST FREEZING ORDER

The International Executive Board of the CIO United Auto Workers met in Cleveland last week to discuss the crisis created by Roosevelt's wage-freezing and job-freezing orders. The decisions of the board, representing almost a million workers in the most militant and democratic CIO international, reflected the views and the pressure of labor's rank and file.

The board voted: To ask its members to resign from the War Manpower Commission, which handed down the job-freezing order.

To reaffirm its opposition to "incentive pay" speedup plans; to table such plans introduced at the meeting by Richard Frankenstein; and to make it plain that Frankenstein was without authority to commit the union to such plans in the WPB subcommittee of which he is a member.

To demand the scrapping of the Little Steel formula which prohibits wage increases for the great majority of the nation's workers.

To seek the guarantee of a minimum work week of 40 hours in war plants.

To insist on rigid price control and a roll-back in prices to the Sept. 15, 1942 level.

To meet again in Washington within ten days to exert pressure for modification of Roosevelt's freezing order.

To issue a call for nine regional conferences to include all UAW locals to register the union's protest against the freezing order.

To appropriate money for newspaper advertisements and radio time to take its case "to the public."

'Mission To Moscow' Continues A Frameup

The following are extracts from a speech at the Sunday Open Forum of the N. Y. School of Social Science, April 25. Albert Goldman acted as Leon Trotsky's attorney at the historic hearings in Mexico conducted by the Dewey Commission investigating the Moscow trials.

Without an understanding of politics it is impossible to explain the appearance of the film "Mission To Moscow." Without an understanding of politics it is impossible to explain the publication of the book "Mission To Moscow" by Joseph E. Davies, former American Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

There is no value whatever in the book. It consists of reports furnished to the State Department by Davies while he was ambassador, and of letters written by him to various individuals during that time. The reports and letters contain statistical data concerning the Soviet Union and interpretations of events occurring in the Soviet Union, showing the intellectual development of a college sophomore.

In general the theories which Davies presents in explanation of events in the Soviet Union are those of Walter Duranty, the journalist who has made a name for himself by giving a version of these events, acceptable both to the GPU and the capitalist newspapers. In his reports Davies speaks of Duranty as a veritable genius.

The book appeared subsequent to Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, when Stalin, after a round of friendship with Hitler, joined Churchill and Roosevelt in the great crusade

for democracy, justice, humanity, freedom and truth. It is possible that Davies could have gotten a publisher for his dull and sophomoric reports if Hitler had not attacked the Soviet Union. He has enough money to purchase publication and the right to be classed as an author.

But it is impossible to conceive that such a book should ever have been made the basis of a film. It is highly doubtful that even with his millions Davies could have succeeded in convincing Hollywood to film the impressions of a traveller.

What explains the appearance of the film? There is in it a scene of the Moscow trials and it is this which gives meaning and importance to the film. It is this scene which gives the picture political importance and explains its very existence.

It is this scene which makes of the film a continuation of Stalin's frameups.

The Method of the Film

It is reported that the film will show a composite scene of the last two Moscow trials, the two which Davies personally attended. Some, apparently naive persons, will undoubtedly contend that only that which actually occurred has been filmed. There were of course trials in Moscow. If Radek and Bukharin and Krestinsky are depicted in the film it can also be said that they were defendants in the trials. Moreover they repeat only that which was actually said by the original actors at the trials. How can then the film be designated as a continuation of a frameup?

(Continued on page 3)

TRADE UNION NOTES

By E. R. Frank

The Roosevelt war government is up against its first labor crisis since Pearl Harbor. Green and Murray had intended to support Roosevelt in his "Hold-the-line" order, but the pressure is getting too strong for their comfort. These august "labor statesmen" are being shoved around by the leaders of the international unions, who in turn are feeling the hot anger of their own membership. Labor ranks are seething with dissatisfaction.

Green has assailed McNutt's job freeze order as "an assault on the exercise of freedom by working men and women, and on their right to sell their labor under the most advantageous conditions." Murray bestirred himself after the action of the UAW International Executive Board and criticized the job-freeze order. Eric Peterson, Vice-President of the International Association of Machinists, declared that the WMC restrictions are "bringing workers in this country close to the level of slave labor."

There is no question but that the labor movement is in a furor over Roosevelt's wage and job freeze. The coal controversy will bring the crisis to a head. The government faces a crisis with its own labor movement 17 months after America's entry into the second world war.

Following the UAW International Executive Board's denunciation of McNutt's War Manpower Commission, CIO representatives Victor Reuther, August Scholle, president of the Michigan CIO, and Tracy Doll, president of Michigan's Labor's Non-Partisan League, resigned from the Detroit War Manpower Commission. Immediately afterwards all AFL members, headed by Frank X. Martel, president of the Wayne County Federation of Labor, submitted their resignations.

For the time being the Detroit WMC is dead as a doer. These government bureaus and boards cannot function for a minute without labor support.

Tremendous sympathy for the mine workers and support for their struggle is sweeping the ranks of the United Auto workers. R. J. Thomas, president of the union, tried to ward off criticism that he and the other UAW leaders were not backing the mine workers' demands vigorously enough, by sending a long letter of explanation to all local unions. The letter stated in part: "I and all other officers of the UAW-CIO are strongly in favor of the miners' wage demands. I and all other of our International officers have constantly opposed the 'Little Steel formula' through which an effort is being made to freeze the wages of labor."

"Mr. Lewis' charges that some officers of the UAW-CIO have sniped at the United Mine Workers is completely false. Your officers have at all times supported the demands of the United Mine Workers."

"I want to urge your local union to continue support of the legitimate demands of the United Mine Workers."

The Buffalo labor movement was electrified this week by the announcement of Louis Mayer, president of Lodge No. 535 of the International Association of Machinists, that 20,000 workers of the Curtiss-Wright Buffalo airplane division will demand release from their jobs despite the WMC

freeze order unless a decision on their wage case is announced by May 10. The union seeks a 5 cent general increase and 20% of the basic pay as replacement for the bonus system. The case was certified to the WLB on November 18, 1942.

Sheriff Tipping announced that the draft registrations and classifications of about one hundred strikers were being checked in connection with the strike now taking place at the Bendix Aviation Corporation plant at Bendix, N. J.

Draft registrations, apparently, have many uses.

In a special communication the UAW-CIO has urged all local unions to demand that their shop committees be given equal authority with management in preparing "manning tables" and replacement schedules at the factory level. The letter pointed out that this policy was necessary as otherwise the employers would "use the threat of induction of workers into the armed services as a club to stifle union organizations or to intimidate shop committees."

Iowa AFL leaders have announced a new plan they have developed whereby labor can wield greater influence in political elections. The new scheme gives union members a financial incentive for voting, according to A. A. Couch, President of the Iowa State Federation of Labor.

He said the program would be based upon an increase of 5 or 10 cents a month in union dues. This money would be accumulated in a fund for use in paying bonuses to members after they had voted on election days.

There are about 190,000 union voters in the state and Mr. Couch emphasized that the aim of the plan would be not to tell union members how they should vote, but to get out the union vote.

Wonderful plan! Someone should tip off the "labor statesmen of Iowa" that they might try to adopt a program of action designed to solve the problems of the workers of Iowa and then put a labor party and some labor candidates in the field to fight for that program. This will surely provide a greater incentive for the workers to go out and vote than giving them a door prize at the end of the election.

Boris Shishkin, economist of the AFL, declared that in the first year of the war "six American workers were killed on the job for every soldier killed in action. . . . Over 4,000,000 workers were injured in industrial accidents. Of these, 165,000 will never work again—their injuries left them permanently disabled."

The Associated Industries of Florida and their creature State Attorney General Watson have succeeded in pushing through the Florida House of Representatives a constitutional amendment to outlaw closed shop agreements in the state. The amendment is now in the hands of the State Senate. Immediately the notorious Rickenbacker jumped to attention and wired the Florida Legislature congratulating them on their stand and endorsing the proposed amendment.

We wish the labor movement would display as much energy and decisiveness as Rickenbacker and his backers do.

Govt. Agencies Reveal Some Facts

By ALBERT PARKER

The war may bring suffering and lowered living standards to the great majority of the people, but the monopolies and the wealthy are doing all right by themselves in wartime as in peace. And you don't have to take *The Militant's* word for it either. Just listen to the cautious and carefully-worded statements of government officials and agencies.

Assistant Attorney General Tom C. Clark addressed a meeting of the American Business Congress in New York on April 22, and this is what he said, according to the *N. Y. Times* report:

"Mr. Clark pointed out that the war has created monopoly in industry. At the start of the war program in this country 175,000 companies provided 70% of the nation's manufacturing output, while today, two and a half years later, the ratio has been reversed to the point where 100 corporations hold 70% of the war and essential civilian contracts. This group, he declared, has obtained the bulk of the \$14,000,000,000 worth of new plants built at government expense."

"He called the 'monumental junk heaps of aluminum pots and pans commandeered from the housewives of America; the piles of scrap rubber and old iron now scarring the public squares of our cities; the pleas of our armed forces for binoculars; the enormous difficulties we have experienced in the production of magnesium, electric equipment, plastics, machine tools, critical chemicals and vital medicines' memorial to the role of monopoly played in this war."

"He declared that it was impossible to produce such items as electric lamps, glass bottles, aluminum pots, a pair of spectacles, synthetic rubber and vitamin products without the permission from a private group which has usurped power over industry. . . ."

And while the monopolies are repaid for having thus played havoc with essential production by being given "the lion's share of war production orders, the industrialists, bankers, coupon-clippers and their families continue to receive the lion's share of the national income."

This was demonstrated in the recently-issued study of the Office of Price Administration's Division of Research, "Civilian Spending and Saving, 1941 and 1942," according to which:

There are 33,360,000 families and 7,850,000 single people constituting over 41,000,000 spending units."

Of these units 40.6% received less than \$1,500 per unit in 1942. The total money income of this group amounted to 13.7% of the national income received by the whole population.

On the other side of the tracks, 1.9% of the nation's spending units received \$10,000 and over last year. The total income received by these came to 15.8% of the money income.

Thus less than 2% of the people got more money than over 40%!

That's the kind of "equality of sacrifice" that the capitalists go for in a big way.

Giraud Issues Another Anti-Semitic Decree

Fresh proof of the anti-Semitic views held by General Giraud and his American-supported regime in North Africa was presented this week by the French Republican Committee in New York. Documentary evidence of anti-Jewish decrees issued by Giraud after he had been placed in power by the United States was shown by the French Committee to reporters for the Overseas News Agency, Inc. The story was printed in the *N. Y. Times* April 27.

On Jan. 30, 1943 Giraud issued an order entitled "The Use of the Jews in the Army" to the officer caste under his command. This document contained the hitherto unpublished clauses:

"1. Jewish commissioned and non-commissioned officers and men in the reserve will generally be assigned to special non-combatant work units."

"2. This measure appears necessary in order to avoid having the entire Jewish population gain the title of war veteran, which might prejudice the status to be given to these people after the war."

This directive shows that Giraud and his staff envisage a secondary citizenship for the Jews, not only during the war, but afterwards as well.

This anti-Semitic order was handed down AFTER the Casablanca conference when Giraud met with Churchill and Roosevelt.

2 More Auto Locals Give Aid for Postal

"We as well as all the other unions hope that the case will be won," writes Local 5 of the United Auto Workers, South Bend, Ind., in a letter to the Civil Rights Defense Committee containing a contribution in support of the appeal to reverse the conviction of Kelly Postal, Minneapolis unionist, whose only "crime" was that he carried out the directives of his union when it voted to transfer from the AFL to the CIO in 1941.

Another contribution in defense of Postal was received by the CRDC last week from Local 581 of the UAW, Flint, Mich.

Seven Reinstated at Thompson Products

Seven UAW-CIO committee men and stewards who were fired from the Thompson Products plant in Cleveland two weeks ago for union activity, won their jobs back after the one-day strike of their union on April 15.

The militancy of the workers was such that the regional War Labor Board for once moved rapidly to arbitrate the dispute and ordered the reinstatement of the seven men. Five other discharged unionists will have their cases reviewed through the regular labor-management grievance machinery set up by the union.

Celebrate MAY DAY With the Trotskyists!

Attend

The May Day Social SATURDAY EVENING MAY 1

Auspices: N. Y. Local, SWP

and

The May Day Meeting SUNDAY, MAY 2, at 8 P. M.

Speaker: E. R. FRANK

MASS SINGING

Other May Day Features

Socialist Workers Party

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK CITY

Harlem Rally Against Army Jim Crow

Asks for Support In the Lynn Case

By ROBERT KINGSLEY

NEW YORK—Over 1000 members and sympathizers of the March-On-Washington Movement met at the Golden Gate Ballroom in Harlem on April 22 to protest against segregation and the fostering of race hatred in the armed forces.

The speakers at the meeting paid particular attention to the case of Winfred Lynn, the first Negro inducted into the army to challenge in the courts the segregation of Negroes by the military and draft authorities, which he contends is a violation of Section 4(a) of the 1940 Draft Act which states ". . . there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

In previous decisions concerning Jim Crow cases the Supreme Court has held that segregation is not in itself discrimination. The defenders of Winfred Lynn at the Harlem meeting differed with this view. They argued that there is no segregation without discrimination; juggling words does not eliminate inequities.

THEME OF MEETING

The fundamental theme of the meeting was that the government itself is spreading fascist doctrines and segregation in this country and that although "this is the Negro's darkest hour, it is also his greatest opportunity to fight for equality."

A. Philip Randolph, national director of the MOWM, declared that the state and its leader are subject to pressure and that they move in the direction of the greatest pressure. He referred as examples to the Odell Waller case where Roosevelt refused to intervene on behalf of the doomed sharecropper because of insufficient pressure on him and to Roosevelt's decision to reopen the FEPC hearings on railroad Jim Crowism after labor, Negro and liberal groups had protested their cancellation by McNutt.


Randolph said that the time for the Negro people to apply their pressure for equality is now because it will be too late after the war.

Roy Wilkins, assistant secretary of the NAACP, gave a detailed discussion of conditions in the armed forces to show that segregation for Negroes there means discrimination as it does in civilian life; his example of the Negroes in the Army Air Corps made the point very well.

Other speakers included Arthur Garfield Hays of the American Civil Liberties Union and Arthur Gilbert, both attorneys in the Lynn case; Dwight Macdonald, author of the March-On-Washington Movement's new pamphlet on military Jim Crow and the Lynn case; Wilfred Kerr of the Brooklyn NAACP; Samuel Zack.

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Living Costs

A NEW BOOK



182 Pages — \$1.00

Order from PIONEER PUBLISHERS, 116 University Pl., N. Y.

Stalinism and the Plans to Save Capitalism in Europe

By A. ROLAND

The fate of the European continent and of the world lies in what happens in Germany and France in the near future. It is only a question of time for Hitler's doom to be sealed. Germany will stand defeated in the second world war, just as in the first. France, having tasted all the dregs of the bitter cup of catastrophe, will face the problem of renewing her national life. She will be in the position of a step-child of the victorious Allies. What will be the class relations in these two countries as the war begins to terminate?

It is in the decisive phases of wars, when it becomes quite clear where the victory will fall and where the defeat, that the social problem of the relation between the classes assumes primary importance. The leaders of the capitalist nations, just as much as the Stalinist leadership of the Soviet Union, know the almost imperceptible dividing line that separates war from revolution.

Hitler in his day performed a useful function for the world bourgeoisie. He saved German capitalism from expropriation by the German workers. The moment he assumed power he became the mouthpiece not only inside, but outside of Germany as well, for ruthless German imperialism. The capitalist nations now, fighting him, were faced with the contradiction of supporting the Hitler regime inside Germany in its suppression of the German proletariat—but of opposing him in his world aims. This contradiction now takes on a new form. How to defeat Hitler in the war, thus depriving the German ruling class of its savior, and yet somehow maintaining this same ruling class in power.

PROPOSALS FOR EUROPE

Even the most powerful capitalist leaders, those of the United States and England, see no way to solve this knotty problem by any hocus-pocus of deception. They propose to use the most direct and clear-cut method for continuing capitalism in Germany—and in France. That is the method of an armed dictatorship to last as long as is felt necessary. That is the entire sum and substance of the policing of the world that is proposed by Roosevelt and Churchill for the indefinite future.

It is with this openly avowed perspective that we must examine the role of Stalinism in and after the war. Stalin's aims in Yugoslavia or in Poland have entirely secondary importance compared to the role he proposes to play with regard to France and Germany. These will be the decisive sectors for the world working class in the coming period.

Trotsky warned us again and again that the defeat of Hitler in the war did not at all mean the defeat of fascism. This war leaves capitalism on a world scale in a far more shaky condition than even the last world war. Its rule can be maintained only by means of the totalitarian state. It is that historic fact which explains the policy of the United States government towards the Darlans, the Girauds, and tomorrow perhaps the Dino Grandis. United States capitalism is aware of the neces-

sity to somehow bolster up the capitalist classes in the defeated countries. Left alone, these nations would without question enter into the period of proletarian revolution for the building of the socialist society.

A STRATEGIC POSITION

Stalin and his Kremlin clique occupy a strategic position at a time which must prove so momentous for the future of humanity. The Soviet Union under revolutionary guidance could today play a decisive role in assisting the European workers to achieve the socialist revolution. Only Stalinism stands squarely in the way. The most far-seeing section of the capitalists understands this quite well. This section is prepared to pay a heavy price for Stalin's aid in disorienting and suppressing the working class revolution in France and Germany. The *N. Y. Herald Tribune* asks editorially that no obstacles be placed in the path of Stalin's reuniting to the Soviet Union of all the territory possessed by the czar before the first world war. These capitalists know that this will mean the nationalizing of property in those section of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, etc., taken over by Stalin. But better that temporary calamity than to lose all of Western Europe, and especially powerful industrial Germany.

The bargaining between Stalin and the capitalist leaders is the same kind of uneasy affair as was that between Stalin and Hitler in its day. The game of power politics is a cut-throat game at best, but here we have in addition the fundamental clash of social systems represented on the two sides, still there despite the Stalinist gangrene. But Stalin offers his help to the capitalist world in its desire to stave off revolution in France and Germany. True, he does this for his own sake as well, knowing fully that the Stalinist parasites will be swept overboard by the next gigantic revolutionary wave.

Nevertheless Stalin will do his "best" to uphold his end of the bargain.

STALINIST POLICY

The Stalinists propose to accomplish the common aim by means of a refurbished "national front." A recent pamphlet by Andre Marty, the butcher of the Spanish Civil War, calls for such a front to be established in France. The national front is even wider, it must be understood, than the old "popular front" of the Stalinists. Marty (read Stalin) proposes to include in such a front not only the "communists" and the "liberals" but the Catholics and the most reactionary French elements, so long as they help defeat Hitler.

The German Stalinist magazine, *Freies Deutschland*, published in Mexico, at this same time calls for the "national front" in Germany. There they actually appeal to certain strata of the Nazi party, that section supposedly disgruntled at Hitler's failure to carry out his "socialist" promises. This is the Stalinist method of attempting to subject the workers completely to the capitalists. It is proposed to guarantee private property and to support the support of the capitalists by annulling all of Hitler's restrictions due to war economy. The Catholics will naturally be granted full freedom of worship—just as in Russia.

This new-old line of Stalin's reveals in all its ugly nakedness the reactionary role of the Soviet Union and the world, Albert Goldman spoke before an interested audience of over 100 workers at the regular Sunday night forum of the New York School of Social Science last Sunday night.

The speaker, attorney for Leon Trotsky at the Mexico City hearings of the Dewey Investigating commission into the Moscow trials, pointed out that the trials had been declared frameups by that body of outstanding international labor and liberal spokesmen.

The question period revealed the genuine concern in the ranks of labor over this connivance of Hollywood and the Stalinists to lend credence to Stalin's falsifications and vilification of the men who made the Russian revolution.

Mothers' Group to Hold Classes On Lenin's Classic

NEW YORK—Starting on Tuesday, May 18, at 10 A. M., the Mothers Group of Local New York of the Socialist Workers Party will hold a new series of classes at 116 University Pl.

The new class will be on Lenin's "State and Revolution," which was selected by the Mothers Group as the natural follow-up to the recent series on Engels' "Origin of the Family." The instructor will be Arlene Williams.

The class is open to non-members as well as members of the Socialist Workers Party.

Charles Pamphlet Warmly Received; Ready 2nd Edition

"Your Standard of Living — What's Happening to It," the popular new pamphlet by C. Charles, has had such a warm response from the readers in all parts of the country that the first edition is completely sold out and a second, revised, up-to-date edition is now being prepared. Pioneer Publishers announced this week.

Following are reports from some of the branches of the Socialist Workers Party which had taken bundle orders of the pamphlet: CHICAGO held a Red Sunday on April 18, combining sale of the pamphlet with distribution of *The Militant* and leaflets for its May Day meeting. "There were exactly 25 who went out and in an average time of one hour sold 250 pamphlets at a nickel apiece. . . . Everything was completely organized in advance. We had five teams in five different sections of town. . . . Meanwhile we had five women comrades assigned to prepare a feed for us all at a centrally located home and everyone had to report in there, where we held an informal social and get-together for the rest of the afternoon."

"It was a wonderful and inspiring afternoon and I have never seen the morale and spirits soar so high here as the reports came in of the results. It was like a Democratic Party campaign headquarters getting the returns on the Presidential elections. As each comrade came in to make his report, he was immediately besieged and questioned, 'How many did you sell?'"

Of the 1000 copies Chicago had taken at that time, only 100 remained for sale at an important CIO meeting that week.

BUFFALO: "The pamphlets are selling wonderfully well. Yesterday three of us sold 33 copies door-to-door in about two hours. I sold 25 copies on several other occasions. It is the most timely pamphlet we have ever had and is of special interest to housewives."

NEW HAVEN: "Last Wednesday another comrade and I canvassed the Negro district. Within approximately 40 minutes we sold 16 pamphlets and collected 90 cents. The reception and sale of the pamphlet has encouraged us to order another 50 pamphlets. Please send them to us at once."

"Its timeliness, as well as the urgency of its topic matter, sold the pamphlet with little encouragement. Workers realize that they are being misled, but they want to know why, and what can be done to stop it."

FLINT: "Please send 50 more copies. First reports of the reception have been very good."

"One worker said he was having his children read it and wished all high school boys and girls could get copies. He was also passing it around among his friends. Others generally agree the pamphlet is certainly the true story of living conditions today."

SAN DIEGO: "Swell. That's just the type of thing we need. The type of literature you can give everybody you know and it hits the spot."

Orders for copies of the revised edition, which will soon be ready, should be sent to Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Pl., New York.

Goldman Speaks At N. Y. Forum

Denouncing the film "Mission to Moscow" as an attempted whitewash of Stalin's crimes against the working class of the Soviet Union and the world, Albert Goldman spoke before an interested audience of over 100 workers at the regular Sunday night forum of the New York School of Social Science last Sunday night.

The speaker, attorney for Leon Trotsky at the Mexico City hearings of the Dewey Investigating commission into the Moscow trials, pointed out that the trials had been declared frameups by that body of outstanding international labor and liberal spokesmen.

The question period revealed the genuine concern in the ranks of labor over this connivance of Hollywood and the Stalinists to lend credence to Stalin's falsifications and vilification of the men who made the Russian revolution.

Seattle Branch SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

Announces Opening of New Headquarters

521 Pike Street, Room 7

In Downtown Seattle

Phone: Seneca 0453

Hours: 12-3 and 7-9 P. M.

Daily Except Sundays

Monday Evenings, Open until 10 O'clock

N.Y. SWP Protests Frameup Film

NEW YORK, April 28. — The Socialist Workers Party, New York Local, today issued the following statement of protest against Warner Brothers film production, "Mission to Moscow," which is having its premiere at the New York Hollywood Theatre on Thursday, April 29:

"Warner Brothers has produced 'Mission to Moscow' with the tacit approval of the Roosevelt administration. Washington wants to do a diplomatic favor for Stalin, to whitewash his crimes in return for Stalin's continued support of the Allied Powers."

"But no book and no number of films can whitewash Stalin's crimes against the world working class. Foremost among them were the Moscow Frameup Trials, the judicial murder of the Old Bolshevik leaders, Lenin's comrades-in-arms, accompanied by the mass purges of thousands and tens of thousands. Then Stalin shot the Red Generals, seriously

weakening the Red Army on the eve of Hitler's attack.

"Leon Trotsky, creator of the Red Army and chief defendant in the Moscow Trials, was condemned to death by Stalin. This verdict was carried out in August, 1940 by the GPU agent 'Jackson,' who has just been sentenced to 20 years by the Mexican courts for assassinating Trotsky."

"The Moscow Trials were branded as frameups by the Dewey Commission of Inquiry which summed up its findings as follows:

"The Commission finds, on the basis of all available evidence, both for the prosecution and for Leon Trotsky, that Leon Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov are not guilty of the charges made against them in the Moscow Trials of August, 1936 and January, 1937. It also finds that the trials were frameups."

"The film, 'Mission to Moscow,' is being used today to whitewash Stalin's crimes."

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

NAACP Conference to be Held in June

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People last week sent its 600 branches and youth councils a call for an emergency conference to be held in Detroit June 3-6. Part of the call read as follows:

"Jim Crow rides high in the armed forces. Negro women continue to be barred from the WAVES, SPARS and Women's Marine Corps Reserve. American soldiers die for want of nursing while Negro nurses, eager to serve, are turned down except for a small quota accepted for service only in Jim Crow Army units. The Red Cross pleads for blood donations but continues to segregate Negro blood plasma in violation of every law of science. Negro soldiers continue to be killed, beaten, Jim Crowed and insulted.

"Jobs in war industries are still barred to Negroes despite the dire necessity created by the manpower shortage. But the modest efforts to achieve more efficient and fuller use of the skills of Negro men and women by the FEPC brought down the wrath of powerful anti-minority forces on that agency so that it has been reduced to virtually complete impotence. Legislation to freeze labor already enacted will fix Negroes—particularly the nine million in Southern states—in their present mental and poorly paid jobs for the duration without hope or prospect of upgrading. A farm worker can move out of the country only if permitted by the country agent! Do we need to speculate on the chance a Negro in Mississippi has of obtaining such permission? With more than one million unemployed or underemployed Negro men and women in the United States, the Congress today considers legislation to draft labor."

"We must act now or all can be lost—not alone for ourselves but for every race or creed."

But precisely what action the leaders of the NAACP propose to take is not indicated in the conference call.

The March-On-Washington Movement is also preparing for a national conference, to be held in Chicago from June 30 to July 4.

We'll have more to say about these conferences in future issues.

Nothing Doing On The FEPC Front

Time marches on, but still nothing is being done about reconstituting the Fair Employment Practices Committee, and getting it to work on the job for which it was ostensibly created. The railroad hearings were called off in January; in February Roosevelt said that they would be held after all; since then there have been no developments but lots of stories about the difficulty which McNutt is having in trying to get someone to act as the chairman of the reorganized committee.

"LABOR WITH A WHITE SKIN CAN NOT EMANCIPATE ITSELF WHEREAS LABOR WITH A BLACK SKIN IS BRANDED" — KARL MARX.

Tiring of the delay (and perhaps wanting to apply a little pressure on McNutt) four of the five remaining members of the FEPC—the two Negro members and the representatives of the AFL and CIO—met last week and announced that they had fixed May 18 as the date for the holding of public hearings on discrimination cases in Washington, D. C., where the Capital Transit Co. still refuses to hire Negro conductors, motormen and bus operators; and the date of May 24 for hearings on discrimination in Detroit.

But McNutt didn't like this, and he had the proposed hearings killed on the ground that the War Manpower Commission "didn't want the new chairman bound" by any of the commitments contained in the present committee's statement. This may be the reason, but there is no indication that McNutt will find a suitable chairman during the next month; and if he doesn't, what harm would be done by the proposed Washington and Detroit hearings? How would they "bind" the new chairman?

After the last four months, during which even the largely ineffective work of the FEPC has been completely discontinued, it would be no exaggeration to say that there isn't an informed Negro in the country who has any illusions about McNutt's attitude toward employment discrimination. And let it be borne in mind that even after the FEPC is reorganized, it will still be at the mercy of the McNutts and will still be subject to the same kind of interference and restraints that blew up the old committee.

More than ever, independent action and struggle against Jim Crowism is the duty of the labor and Negro movements. We've said that many times, and it's still the truth.

The Status of the Anti-Poll Tax Bill

By last week 193 members of the House of Representatives had signed their names to the petition to discharge the anti-poll tax bill buried by the House Judiciary Committee. That means 25 more signatures are needed to force the bill to a vote on the floor of the House.

The sooner mass pressure obtains those 25 signatures, the better the chance is to get the anti-poll tax bill passed, the less is the chance for the Southern poll taxers to filibuster the bill to death in the Senate, as they did last November. And the enemies of the poll tax will need every such advantage they can get, for the fight to end the poll tax is not only a struggle against the Southern Democrats but also against the Republicans seeking poll tax support and against the Roosevelt administration trying to appease the poll taxers.

International Notes

By BETTY KUEHN

With the failure of Gandhi's 21-day fast, non-violence as a political weapon has been discredited. Forced by the political pressure of the Indian masses to make his gesture against the British government, Gandhi failed to obtain his release from jail. This does not mean, however, that the struggle of the masses for national liberation is over.

Hunger strikes and food riots are following the wave of political strikes of last August and November. The economic situation in India has brought to a permanent underfed population worse hunger than ever.

Prices of the staple foods rice, wheat and millet, have risen 600% since the beginning of the war. One major reason for this is the exports from India to the British armies in the Middle East, Iran and Ceylon.

The situation is described as "truly serious" by the Commerce Member of the Government of India who adds, "the difficulties are most acute in Bombay city and province. . . . Bijapur has been declared a famine area."

Famine conditions, soaring prices and food riots have all been described by the British press during the last few months.

Yet the Secretary of State for India, Amery, has said "There is no famine, and no widespread prevalence of acute shortage." And further, "with care and proper distribution, there should be enough to go round, and there is no cause for alarm."

However, no rationing of any kind has been instituted. As a result, what few gestures of price-fixing have been made, are completely useless.

"Price control has proved in-

effective against hoarders of wheat in the Punjab. The Commerce Member who has charge of the Food Department admits the difficulty of adopting stern measures against hoarders in view of the political situation. . . . The black market flourishes everywhere including Delhi, though police do not hesitate to arrest retail shopkeepers who commit offences," wrote a Manchester Guardian correspondent recently.

"The government does nothing about the promoters of the famine because it requires their political support, and instead attacks the middlemen who are partly victims of these same promoters," comments the Mid-March War Commentary of England.

As the British regime is hated by the masses, its sole support comes from those who are profiteering from food scarcity and selling supplies to the British and the U. S. armed forces in India: the landlords, importers, food concerns, money-lenders, speculators, etc.

Any steps to establish rationing and fixed prices, to prosecute price violators and hoarders, would be blows at those very elements on which the British regime rests.

Basic Training Course in Marxism

EVERY FRIDAY NIGHT

from 8:15 to 9:45 P. M.

A new session of the Basic Training Course begins on May 13, 1943

Friends and members are urged to enroll now

Inquire 4th floor

116 University Pl., N. Y. C.

'Mission To Moscow' Continues A Frameup

(Continued from page 1)

It must be constantly emphasized that the film entitled "Mission To Moscow" is not a picture of the book "Mission To Moscow." It is not a film showing the ideas of Davies concerning the trials as reported by him while ambassador and while they were staged. There is, so to speak, a frameup within a frameup. The public is led to believe that the picture presents the ideas of Davies as they are given in his book. That is not so. It presents the ideas of only two or three pages of the book, those few pages which he wrote after Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. The film presents a picture of the trials in accordance with the present interpretation of Davies and not in accordance with his interpretation at the time he saw the trials and made his reports.

What judgment did Davies pass on the trials at the time they were staged? He makes several observations about which I shall summarize.

1. "I confess," he writes, "that the situation has me guessing." Had he stuck to that formula he would, at least, have showed that he is an honest man.

2. In general he expresses the belief that the defendants were guilty. But this is the interesting point, that he does not think they were guilty of the actual charges leveled against them but of general political opposition. He does not say so in so many words but the clear inference is that he thinks that Stalin was executing all political opponents. The defendants were guilty, according to Davies, of seeking to overthrow Stalin but not of charges like sabotage or conspiracy with foreign governments to divide Soviet territory.

3. He believes the defendants guilty because they confessed, taking a technical legal position that by virtue of the confessions the state made out its case against the defendants. At the same time he asks a legitimate question and gives a correct answer. This question and answer destroy his technical legal position. He asks why the trials were staged on such an elaborate scale since the defendants confessed. Davies answers the question by saying that the trials were really held to discredit Trotsky.

That is correct but, if that is so, then the confessions do not have the weight that he gives to them. If Trotsky is the real defendant, the confessions are only evidence against him and, as a lawyer, Davies should not accept this evidence as final but should listen to the evidence of the real defendant, Trotsky. And if Trotsky succeeds in presenting evidence proving the confessions to be false, as he did, then not only is Trotsky not guilty but all of the defendants of the various trials.

Because the guilt of the defendants was predicated on the leadership of Trotsky it follows that, if Trotsky is not guilty, even they who confessed are not guilty. Were Davies a good lawyer he would have seen this simple point.

4. As far as the execution of the Red Army commanders is concerned, Davies expresses the opinion that the army leaders were guilty only of a plot to prevent the party from controlling the army. Then he remarks: "With characteristic speed Stalin killed off all potential leadership."

If Davies were a half-honest person he would insist that the film present all of his ideas and opinions at the time the trials were staged. He could then show that his opinions had changed. But Davies is not interested in simple honesty. He is only interested in a war for justice, humanity, the four freedoms, international law and incidentally in a system which permits him to accumulate and retain huge investments.

Will the picture show what Davies reported about the testimony of one of the defendants—Serebryakov? "I noticed," Davies writes, "that after Serebryakov, who was an old railroad man, was called to his feet, to corroborate the fact of a peculiarly horrible crime (which he did laconically) he sat down quite unconcerned and yawned."

Will the picture show what Davies reported in the case of one of the defendants that the prosecutor "had even to admonish him to get down to the case and not embroider his testimony with additional crimes?"

Will the picture show that one of the defendants in the third Moscow trial, Krestinsky, repudiated his confession on the first day of the trial and repudiated his repudiation on the very next day?

Davies Has Intuitions

Davies changed his mind about the significance of the trials and purges. Good! A man has a right to change his mind. In his book Davies tells the world what led him to change his mind. He delivered a speech at the Univ. of Chicago in June 1941, after Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. Some one asked him: what about fifth columnists in Russia? And "right off the anvil," to use his expression, he answered, "There aren't any—they shot them." And that day, he says, while he was on the train he thought about the trials and he realized that he had completely missed their significance. He, together with others, were in fact disposed to discount them. But now he realized that the people who were executed were the fifth columnists who had connections with Hitler.

Mr. Davies then, like Mr. Hitler, has intuitions. Did he make any attempt to verify his new intuition about the trials by an examination of all the evidence pro and con? It would not have been difficult for him to investigate and examine all of the evidence available.

The Charges at the Trials

There were three Moscow trials, the first in August 1936 against 16 people and commonly known as the Zinoviev trial, the second in January 1937 involving 17 persons and generally referred to as the Radek-Pyatakoff trial, the third in March 1938 involving 21 persons and known as the Bukharin trial. All the defendants confessed and all were found guilty. With the exception of a few who were given prison sentences, they were all executed. Most of the defendants spent many years in the revolutionary movement and played leading roles in the Russian Revolution.

Since the Commission headed by John Dewey conducted its investigation in 1937 it dealt only with the first two trials. The main charges in all of the trials were that, under the leadership of Trotsky, the defendants did the following:

1. Conspired to commit and did commit terroristic acts against Soviet officials.

2. Conspired to and actually did sabotage and wreck industry.

3. Conspired with the German and Japanese governments to wage war on the Soviet Union and cede territory to these governments.

To prove these charges the prosecution depended solely on the testimony of some defendants and one witness to the effect that they conversed with Trotsky who gave them written and oral instructions for terrorism and sabotage and who informed them that he was in contact with German and Japanese officials.

Although documentary evidence was promised not one bit of it was produced, the witnesses stating that all letters and memoranda were destroyed or lost. The case for the prosecution therefore rested on the verbal testimony of some defendants and one witness. We undertook, before the Dewey Commission, to disprove the testimony of the main witnesses and thus shatter the whole case.

Pyatakoff, Holtzman, Berman-Yurin and Fritz David were the defendants and Vladimir Romm was the witness who claimed direct contact with Trotsky. We conclusively proved that these people were lying.

Holtzman claimed that, by pre-arrangement with Sedov, Trotsky's son, he came to Copenhagen in November, 1932, when Trotsky was there to lecture to the students at the University. He testified that he met Sedov in the vestibule of the Hotel Bristol and then visited Trotsky. It was proved that there was no Hotel Bristol in Copenhagen.

We proved that Sedov never was in Copenhagen since he was unable to get permission from the German government to leave Berlin and return. We proved by many witnesses who were constantly with Trotsky that Berman-Yurin and Fritz David, who also claimed that they saw Trotsky in Copenhagen, could not possibly have been there.

Pyatakoff testified that he flew from Berlin to Oslo, Norway in December, 1935 and saw Trotsky in Norway. We proved that no foreign plane landed in the Oslo airdrome in December, 1935. The testimony was then changed to designate the Kjellar airdrome as the one where Pyatakoff landed. But unfortunately for Vyshinsky, the prosecutor, it was proved that no foreign plane landed in that field in December, 1935. Other testimony also showed that Pyatakoff was lying when he stated that he saw Trotsky in 1935.

Vladimir Romm, a foreign correspondent for Tass, the Soviet News Agency, testified that he saw Trotsky in Paris in late July 1933, and received instructions for Radek. We proved that Trotsky could not have been and was not in Paris at that time.

Thus we prove the only concrete evidence linking Trotsky to the defendants to be sheer fabrication. The whole case, resting as it did on this testimony, fell to pieces.

We did not of course confine ourselves simply to disproving the testimony of those who claimed to have talked with Trotsky. By means of everything that Trotsky wrote, by all of his activities during his whole revolutionary career, we proved that the charges of terrorism, sabotage and conspiracy with the German and Japanese governments to war on the Soviet Union were fantastic and utterly false.

Dewey Commission's Findings

In the first place we showed that the defendants were not Trotskyists, that those who once had been Trotsky's supporters had long ago capitulated to Stalin and that they were all political enemies of Trotsky. We showed that Trotsky was a principled opponent of terrorism and sabotage. We proved that his hopes for defeating the Stalinist bureaucracy rested partly upon the building of industry in the Soviet Union and the consequent improvement in the life of the masses. We introduced the testimony of engineers who were in the Soviet Union, to the effect that whatever disasters occurred to industrial plants within the Soviet Union were the result primarily of bureaucratic incompetency. One of the purposes of the trials was to shift the responsibility for the failure of industry from the Stalinist bureaucracy to alleged wreckers.

We proved that Trotsky never wavered from his position of defending the Soviet Union in any war against a capitalist state. Even after these abominable frameups, Trotsky remained steadfast in his position of defense of the Soviet Union. When Stalin attacked Finland, Trotsky, while condemning the attack, defended the Soviet Union, in opposition to public opinion in the capitalist democracies and in opposition to a minority in the Trotskyist movement itself.

Even after Stalin succeeded in having one of his GPU agents murder Trotsky, we, the followers of Trotsky's ideas, did not swerve from our attitude of defense of the Soviet Union. We differentiated between the Stalinist totalitarian regime and the Soviet Union which is a complex of institutions based on nationalized property brought into existence by the October Revolution led by Lenin and Trotsky.

The prosecutor Vyshinsky and other Stalinist functionaries naturally had to claim that all of the public writings of Trotsky were only for the purpose of concealing his real purposes and actions. In one of the most powerful sections of his great speech, delivered before the Dewey Commission, Trotsky showed what an absurd argument that is. His public writings, consisting of tens of thousands of pages, must have necessarily taken up all of his time. Accepting the testimony of the witnesses at the Moscow trials, Trotsky spent at the very most about three days for his alleged plots against the Soviet Union. In other words, Trotsky spent all of his life camouflaging activities which took only three days. As Trotsky put it, it is like building a skyscraper to camouflage a dead rat.

On the basis of all of the evidence that was presented to it, the Dewey Commission found Trotsky and his son Sedov not guilty and declared the Moscow trials to be frameups.

The question can be raised by Davies, as it has been raised by many others, as to why the defendants confessed. It is of course impossible, without getting at the archives of the GPU or without getting a truthful statement from those who engineered the confessions and trials, to be certain how the GPU got the defendants to make fantastic confessions. The fact that people may differ as to the reasons compelling innocent men to confess to a crime does not mean that the confessions have any validity. The fact that we may not be able to explain why revolutionists confessed to impossible crimes does not make the confessions any the more truthful. The truth or falsity of the confessions must be judged by all the evidence.

The Dewey Commission examined the question of the reasons for the confessions. Witnesses who were in Soviet jails, as political prisoners, testified to the methods used by the GPU to compel fantastic confessions. Torture and threats to their families finally broke the defendants who had been previously demoralized by capitulations to Stalin. For a fuller explanation, one should read Trotsky's speech before the Dewey Commission.

Davies and the Dewey Commission

All of this evidence was certainly available to Davies. Most of the evidence was published in "The Case of Leon Trotsky." All of the evidence was analyzed in the book "Not Guilty" and the findings and verdict of the Dewey Commission are included in that book.

An honest person frequently has intuitions about something or other but where there is evidence available he verifies his intuitions by the evidence. An honest person would have read all of the evidence before passing judgment on the basis

of his intuition. An honest person would, if he disagreed with the findings of the Commission, show why he disagreed.

Can Davies claim that he never heard of the Dewey Commission and its report? Hardly. After the tremendous publicity given to the investigation, it is not possible that Davies would be ignorant of it. I do not claim that Davies is illiterate. I claim only that he is dishonest.

Mr. Davies felt that some justification for his intuition was necessary and he presents the argument that the lack of quislings in the Soviet Union proves that all those who were executed were quislings, in league with the German and Japanese high command. Mr. Davies has a very queer logic. Stalin executes men who have devoted their lives to the revolutionary movement and played leading roles in the Soviet government. Hitler attacks the Soviet Union and, because there are no quislings, it follows that the men executed were quislings. According to that logic, if Mr. Roosevelt were to execute Mr. Davies on a frameup and no quislings appeared on the scene subsequent to the demise of Mr. Davies, it would prove that Mr. Davies was a quisling in the pay of Hitler.

If Mr. Davies wants to know why no quislings appeared on the Soviet scene he must study the social character of the Soviet Union. If we use the term quisling to designate a fascist movement preferring the victory of Hitler, then only capitalist countries can give birth to such a movement. For fascism is a movement whose social base rests on decaying capitalism. That does not mean that Hitler would not find people in the Soviet bureaucracy who would cooperate with him in case he succeeded in achieving a final victory. But the people cooperating with him would come from the Soviet bureaucracy and not from the revolutionary opposition to that bureaucracy.

Davies suggests the argument used by many others to prove that the executed revolutionists were quislings, and that is, the fierce resistance and victories of the Red Army in the present war. But then, what explains the colossal defeats of the Red Army in the summer of 1941? What explains the terrible fact that the German army is fighting on Soviet soil and not vice versa? An honest person, examining the evidence and concluding that the Red Army generals who were executed were innocent and were loyal and able men, would contend that the Red Army might not have suffered any defeats were it not for the execution of the generals.

Do the victories of the Red Army last winter prove that Erlich and Alter, the two Polish-Jewish socialists executed by Stalin, were Nazi agents?

Appeasing Stalin

In reality the explanation for the intuition of Mr. Davies lies in the fact that Hitler attacked the Soviet Union and thus made Stalin a partner of Churchill and Roosevelt in the war for democracy, humanity, justice, international law, the four freedoms, and, incidentally, to safeguard the investments of Mr. Davies and those like him. It is significant that his intuition coincides with his material interests.

Stalin never succeeded in convincing the public opinion of the world that the Moscow trials had any basis of truth. He must be grateful indeed to Davies, to Warner Brothers and to the American government for a book and a film which pictures him not as the criminal that he is but as a far-sighted leader hesitating at no measures, no matter how cruel and brutal, to safeguard his country.

The Moscow and Minneapolis Trials

The fact that a book like "Mission to Moscow" is made into a film shows how far a certain section of the American capitalist class is willing to go to appease the Kremlin dictator. It is in reality a small price for Joseph E. Davies and those who think as he does, to pay for Stalin's good will.

Davies and others like him are interested in getting Stalin's cooperation to suppress any possible revolution in Europe and to continue Stalin's frameups is part of the price they are willing to pay to achieve their objective. What does it matter to them that historic truth is violated by the film? These people who claim to be fighting for justice, democracy, truth and many other beautiful things find it very easy to take the greatest lie in history and try to palm it off as historic truth on the American people.

In the last analysis Davies and those like him know that it is not only in the interests of Stalin but in the interests of their own class to continue the vile slanders against revolutionists who devoted their lives to the cause of humanity.

Here it must be pointed out that consistency is not an attribute of people like Davies when it comes to struggling against revolutionary forces. The theory that Davies has at present is that the defendants in the Moscow trials were Trotskyists and were guilty of conspiring with Hitler and the Mikado. That is, they are betrayers of the teachings of Lenin. But in the city of Minneapolis 28 Trotskyists and CIO members were put on trial by the government for being revolutionists and followers of Lenin.

Anything goes in order to persecute revolutionists. Not all capitalists and their representatives are happy at the thought of whitewashing Stalin's criminal career. There are too many contradictions and conflicts within the capitalist class to permit unanimity of opinion on the question of what attitude should be taken to Stalin.

Of one thing we can be certain. If, among the capitalist class there is a certain section that frowns upon the whitewashing of Stalin, it is not because it is interested in historic truth, but because it looks upon Stalin as a potential enemy. He is, after all, at the head of the Soviet Union, a country from which the capitalist system has been driven out by the masses.

Only a small group of intellectuals possess a sense of honor and a devotion to truth sufficiently great to protest against the continuation, by means of a film, of Stalin's slanders and frameups.

Slander As a Weapon

Slander is a weapon that always has been and always will be used by the forces of reaction against the forces of progress. In the period of the Russian Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky were designated as German agents by the reactionary forces of Russia and of other countries including our own.

In a struggle to preserve a social system based on exploitation and justified by lies the defenders of that system do not hesitate to use the filthiest slanders against the protagonists of a new social order.

But violence and slander in the service of reaction can at best prevail temporarily. Stalin and Davies represent, essentially, the same forces of reaction, though Stalin happens to be at the head of a degenerated workers' state. Both defend a world based on violence and lies and one of their weapons must necessarily be slander.

The slanders of Stalin and Davies cannot solve the social problems confronting mankind. They are impotent against the truth and their impotence will show itself, if not today, then tomorrow. Unable to bear any longer the world of agony which the lies of Stalin and Davies want to preserve, the masses, armed with the truth of socialism, will destroy that world and build a new social order in which the slanders of Stalin and Davies will be buried forever.

LEARN

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MOSCOW TRIALS

Read These Two Books:

'THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY'

636 Pages. Cloth \$3.00, paper \$1.00

'NOT GUILTY'

437 Pages. Clothbound \$2.75

Pioneer Publishers :: 116 University Place, New York

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People

VOL. VII—No. 18 Saturday, May 1, 1943

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8647

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 6 months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for 6 months. Bundle orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.



To defend the USSR as the main fortress of the world proletariat, against all assaults of world imperialism and of internal counter-revolution, is the most important duty of every class-conscious worker.

— LEON TROTSKY

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.
9. Defend the Soviet Union against imperialist attack.

How To Fight The Wage-Freezing Order

Two months ago the coal miners began to negotiate for wage increases to meet the rising cost of living. But unlike the other unions since Pearl Harbor, the miners union has showed by all of its behavior that it means business. Its determined stand aroused the support and enthusiasm of the rank and file members of all unions, AFL, CIO and railroad brotherhoods.

Roosevelt answered the United Mine Workers' demands with his "hold-the-line" order freezing the wages of the great majority of the workers and authorizing the subsequent McNutt order freezing jobs of 27,000,000 workers. The coal mine operators answered the United Mine Workers by standing pat behind Roosevelt and urging that the case be turned over to the War Labor Board to be decided in their favor in line with the Little Steel formula. The case has now gone to the War Labor Board and the press is freely discussing the use of the army and draft boards to smash any resolute action by the miners to achieve their demands.

The fight of the miners has now come to a head, and with it the struggle of the whole labor movement to defend its living standards in wartime. For the fight of the miners is the fight of all labor. The United Mine Workers are fighting not only for \$2 a day, but against the entire wage-freezing, job-freezing program of the administration. What Roosevelt and the labor baiters are challenging is not only the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis, but the whole union movement. If the miners can be defeated today, it will be trebly hard for other workers to secure wage raises tomorrow. If the government and the employers are permitted to crush the mine union now, it will be easier for them to do the same to any other union raising justified demands in the future. If Murray and Green stand back and let the enemies of labor drive a knife into the heart of the UMW, they will be responsible for helping to throw all of the unions backward.

The present situation indicates the obvious course for the labor movement to follow: the immediate convocation of a conference of representatives from the AFL, CIO, railroad brotherhoods and UMW, for a single purpose: to fight the Roosevelt wage-freezing and job-freezing order.

All the labor leaders are ostensibly agreed on the need for such a fight. They have all committed themselves against the Roosevelt order, they have all expressed opposition to it as a measure striking at the interests of labor. But mere decla-

rations of protests, mere speeches and statements are not enough. Action must supplement verbal protests or they go ignored as all of Murray's and Green's protests have gone ignored at the White House. The workers, who know how ineffective it is to merely SPEAK their grievances to the bosses, must see to it that the leaders of their unions fit their actions to their words of protest.

The United Mine Workers' struggle would of course be strengthened tenfold by the support of a labor movement united in action against the Roosevelt order. It is in the interests of the miners for Lewis to issue a genuine call for a united conference and not to rely, as he has done, on perfunctory appeals to labor's ranks and peremptory demands on the other union leaders.

What action should a united conference of labor take in the present situation? It should decide on and carry out an immediate withdrawal of all union members from the War Labor Board and other government agencies.

The labor leaders say that they oppose Roosevelt's freezing order, but they continue to sit on and support the agencies carrying out that order. The labor leaders say that they support the miners' demands, but their representatives on the War Labor Board joined with the other WLB members last week in ordering the miners not to take independent action to win their demands. The labor leaders denounce the Little Steel formula but they let a leader of the railroad brotherhoods accept a seat on the coal panel of the WLB which is committed to the Little Steel formula.

The unions should withdraw from the War Labor Board, thus destroying the claim of "impartiality" behind which it "wields the headman's axe against the workers of this country." This simple step would demonstrate the strength of labor, just as it did in 1941 when the CIO's withdrawal from the WLB's predecessor blew that body up and gained the demands of the captive miners. For bodies like the WLB cannot function without the support of the unions.

The experience of the last 17 months has shown that workers cannot depend on the labor leaders to take the initiative for the mobilization of united labor action. These labor leaders have shown on numerous occasions that they place their petty personal interests ahead of the interests of the workers, that militant action is alien to them and they are afraid of it. Experience of recent weeks — when Murray and Green were first silent on Roosevelt's order and then compelled to speak out against it — has also shown that the labor leaders are subject to the pressure of the ranks of their unions. In the interests of the miners, in the interests of all workers, pressure for united labor action should now be exerted on the AFL, CIO and railroad union leaders

Punishment To Fit The Crime

The House Judiciary Committee last week opened hearings on a bill which would provide a death penalty or a million dollar fine for members of industrial management convicted of deliberately and knowingly manufacturing defective war material.

The bill was introduced as a result of the recent discovery of corporation scandals showing that U. S. Steel, Anaconda Copper and National Bronze and Aluminum officials had deliberately sold substandard and defective steel armor plate, wire cable and airplane parts, thus endangering the lives of countless men in the armed forces and merchant marine of the United States and its allies.

It is not difficult to understand why this bill was introduced by Representative Hobbs (D., Ala.), the poll tax demagogue whose anti-labor bill to fine and arrest workers for conducting ordinary trade union activities was passed by the House last month. Introduction of such a bill gives him the opportunity to pose as an "impartial" defender of "the public interest" and thus to secure more support for his anti-labor bill in the Senate where it is now under consideration.

The bill to punish deliberate sale of defective war material will undoubtedly get the verbal support of other reactionaries of the same stripe who know that by speaking for it they can get cheap favorable publicity under cover of which they can push new measures against the labor movement for "sabotage," etc.; and who know that it has little chance of being adopted at the present time anyway.

It is hard to imagine that the present Congress which is the servant, body, and soul, of the big corporations — and which abolished the \$25,000 salary limit to protect the wealthy — would be interested in adopting legislation to punish them. There is also no reason for believing that the administration is interested in pushing such a bill when the representatives of all its war production agencies have been rushing into print in the last few weeks defending U. S. Steel and assuring the world at large that its steel armor plate was all right, even though it was substandard.

The passage of the bill now before the House Judiciary Committee would make all the corporate officials more careful not to be caught at their criminal practices and it would discourage many from continuing them altogether. For this reason a Trotskyist member of Congress would vote for the passage of the bill. But as he did so, he would warn the workers that its passage alone could not end the murderous frauds of the corporations for it would not do away with the cause of such frauds: the profit motive which always comes first with the capitalist class.

We favor a far more drastic measure than the bill introduced by Hobbs, we advocate ending the dangerous practices of the capitalists by taking away from them the control of production and placing it in the hands of democratically-elected committees of workers.

In Remembrance Of Carlo Tresca

By James T. Farrell

The following tribute to Carlo Tresca, anti-fascist martyr, was written by James T. Farrell, noted writer and chairman of the Civil Rights Defense Committee, on which Tresca also served as an officer. It is reprinted with permission of the author from a special memorial issue of Tresca's paper, Il Martello.

The weeks which have elapsed since Carlo Tresca was brutally annihilated have not dulled one's pain of loss. Time can never fully heal the wounds caused by his murder: time can never cool one's anger: time can never teach us fully to assimilate the awful meaning lodged in these simple words—Carlo Tresca is no more.

Carlo Tresca was one of the heroes of the American labor movement. He was a living link with the past that is represented by such names as Eugene Debs and Big Bill Haywood. Until his very last breath, he was an active fighter. He contributed his services to the American labor and radical movement as a militant organizer, an editor, an orator, a defender of civil liberties and workers' rights. Whenever a class struggle issue arose, Carlo Tresca knew on which side he belonged, and there he was to be found. Carlo Tresca was a revolutionist.

A Lifelong Anti-Fascist

His guiding ideal was that of a humanity more free than it has ever been in the past. He knew that in order even to march toward achieving that ideal, he must fight capitalism and capitalists. From the very day that Benito Mussolini marched on Rome in a sleeping car, Carlo Tresca was an anti-fascist. All through days when Mussolini was making the trains of Italy run on time (at least in the American press), when the American newspapers had eliminated beggars from the streets of Italy, when American bankers were shaking the hand of Mussolini and loaning him money, when Il Duce was even regarded by some Americans as the savior of Italy — Carlo Tresca fought Italian fascism relentlessly. And his struggle against fascism in these days was only one of his many services to the American labor and radical movement.

I think that the politics of Carlo Tresca can more or less be described as Anarcho-Communism. His ideal of freedom was that posited in Anarchism. Not an organizational man in the sense that Marxian revolutionists are, he saw clearly the need to work with and through organizations while he maintained his own independence of action. He cooperated with practically all groups, organizations, parties on the left except with the Stalinists. We know why he did not collaborate with them. His rejection of Stalinism is but one of the marks of honor associated with his career.

Carlo Tresca maintained his independence of action, not as an excuse for doing nothing as some

do, but because it flowed out of his convictions, his measured estimation of his own role in the labor and radical movement, and out of his free and generous personality. In many ways, he possessed the stature as a man which permitted him to follow such a political course. All who knew him are aware of his sharp sense of responsibility, his political seriousness, his devotion and loyalty to a great cause.

There are many who sincerely disagreed with him on this or that tactic, on this or that theoretical question: I recall one summer evening when I had a long discussion with Carlo on the nature of the state. We parted in amicable disagreement. At this moment, these differences seem secondary as one recalls the image of Carlo to mind, remembers him addressing mass meetings briefly looks back on events of his long and valiant career.

The Last Grim Honor

I am convinced that, had Carlo Tresca not been a revolutionist, he never would have been assassinated. The assassin's bullet is the last grim honor that is often paid to a revolutionist. There is no consolation in realizing this. There can be no consolation for those who knew and loved Carlo Tresca. Grimly, they pay him honor. With no gross motives of vengeance, do they demand that the assassins be tracked down. This murder was more than a crime perpetrated against the mortal flesh of Carlo Tresca: his murder was a crime against the whole American labor and radical movement. Unless it be exposed, others are in danger. Those who destroyed Carlo Tresca have given unmistakable warning that no lives are sacred to them. Who killed Carlo Tresca? Why? These questions must be hurled forth again and again as challenges. We do not know their answers. We want to know. We do know that his bitterest enemies were the fascists and the Stalinists. We know why both these groups hated him. Suspicion has been cast in these directions. The enemies of Carlo were in command of power, resources, bullets. But their power, their resources, their bullets must never choke these questions.

There is a personal pain one must feel if one knew and loved Carlo as a friend and as a collaborator in civil liberties cases. We cherish what links of personal association we had with him. We remember his geniality, his warmth, his humor, his great sense of life. Words still seem to be inadequate, even too hollow, to give adequate expression to these personal feelings and memories.

One's life has been the richer to have known Carlo: now we are more poor. We have been robbed of a friend. The working class and the radical movement have been robbed of a friend and a leader. To his memory, let us offer these words of farewell:

"Carlo, we will not forget: we will not relent: each in our appointed way, carry on."

Report Anti-Labor Despotism In Bolivia

Bolivian capitalists maintain within their country conditions bordering on serfdom; workers are deliberately kept in ignorance and poverty; their attempts to improve their living standards through organization are brutally smashed. This was the conclusion of a joint United States-Bolivian Investigating Commission which was appointed on the first of the year to get the facts behind the recent massacre of striking tin workers by the Bolivian government.

At the time of the strike the U. S. ambassador to Bolivia joined the Bolivian government and capitalists in smearing the strikers as Nazi saboteurs. It was the

vigorous protest voiced by the American labor movement which was primarily responsible for the appointment of the Investigating Commission.

According to PM of April 23, the Commission's report has been submitted to the Bolivian government and "unfolds a picture of feudal economic life and blames both the government and the employers for the plight of the people."

The commission makes recommendations for major economic and political reforms. An important reform advocated is the granting to the workers of the right to organize and bargain collectively.

The report declares, "The evidence collected by the Commission is sufficient to show that trade union activities do not pursue a free and normal course in Bolivia."

"The unsatisfactory situation in Bolivia with respect to freedom of association and collective bargaining must, in the opinion of the Commission, be attributed mainly to three causes: 'The reserved and suspicious attitude that is often adopted by the authorities; the economic control exercised by many enterprises over their employees and the fundamental hostility of many of the employers.'"

Bermuda Parley Leaves Refugee Problem Unsolved

While millions have already died, and countless others are slated to die in the Gestapo's slaughter-chambers or face a living death in slave labor, the International Refugee Conference came to a close this week in Bermuda. The delegates met, talked, passed the buck back and forth, and adjourned. To all intents and purposes this is the sum total of the conference's results and attainments.

Great secrecy surrounded the sessions of the conference. The delegates tried to explain it away as an indispensable protection for steps contemplated in behalf of the refugees. In reality the lid was clamped down in an effort to hide the unwillingness and inability of the "democracies" to settle the problem, or even to face it squarely.

Apparently the secrecy is to continue even after the conference's adjournment. For just before it ended, newsmen were told, according to the N. Y. Times of April 27, that "public disclosure of the contents of the (final) report may be delayed for some time. . ."

In spite of attempts to keep from the world the failure of the conference to formulate any practical and concrete plan, statements of participating delegations reveal that neither America nor England wished to take the least responsibility for the plight of the refugees.

To begin with, the American delegates insisted that the conference be bound by the State Department note of last February which stated that refugees should be kept as near as possible to the areas where they now are. This meant, of course, that the United States would not allow the use of its territory for refugee relocation and would continue to maintain immigration barriers against the suffering European peoples. This was reported on April 22.

The following day the Times reported that the British countered the American move by "the positive assertion that the conference would not alter the British Government's White Paper policy, restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine to about 29,000 for the five years ending March 1944." Thus British-controlled territory was likewise ruled out as a haven for the victims of fascism.

By April 26 a compromise had been worked out between the two groups — a "temporary compromise" which envisioned the establishment of refugee settlements in remote sections of North Africa and Ethiopia.

But even this appears destined to be a meaningless gesture for the Times reported that "it is believed that the North African plan may run counter to military considerations and therefore be subject to American objections."

All of which leaves the refugees and their burning problems exactly where they were before the conference convened.

A 'Legal' Angle of the British Terror in India

For the past nine months the Indian people have been terrorized and often massacred by their British masters, while the Congress leaders, Gandhi, Nehru and others were held in jail for the crime of demanding freedom for their country.

It appears now that this has all been illegal!

On April 27 the New Delhi federal court ruled that the "Defense of India Rule 26," under which the British had acted, was invalid. The court held the British "went beyond the powers which the legislature thought fit to confer on the central government."

The Indian martyrs who fell before the whips and guns of the British Colonial administrators, will no doubt be glad to know that their agony was "invalid."

However, new laws are easily created by a ruling class to serve its own interests — and the "invalidity" of the British reign of terror will, without question, be corrected.

For, as an unnamed British functionary said to an Associated Press reporter immediately after the court had labeled these acts invalid, the Viceroy could "put the matter right" overnight by simply issuing an ordinance.

The Indian masses may rest assured that their persecutions will be found "legal," regardless of what the New Delhi court may have ruled.

FBI Harasses Militant Negro Group in Ohio

The government seems determined to label as subversive any group which fights the Negro rights. As a reason for denying The Militant the use of the second-class mails, Attorney General Biddle cited the fact that this paper defended Negroes in their struggle to end Jim Crowism and win equality.

Now the Federal Bureau of Investigation is moving against the Forward Outlook League, a Negro organization in Ohio which has for many years been fighting for jobs for Negroes. Last week FOL officers of the Akron branch, which has been picketing the United States Employment Service because of its refusal to assign Negro girls to learners' classes, charged that the organization is now the subject of a Gestapo-like investigation by the FBI.

Upon hearing of the latest government move to intimidate the Negro people, regional FOL president John O. Holly said, "If demanding all the rights to which every citizen is entitled under our constitution is 'subversive,' then I guess the FBI has a pretty good case against me."

A Marxist Record of the first year of
World War II
THE BOUND VOLUME
of
THE MILITANT
for 1942
Now Available at
\$3.00 each
116 University Place — New York City

Despite the Post Office cancellation of our second-class mail rights, this paper continues to be sent through the U. S. mails. Be sure to get your copy regularly:

SUBSCRIBE NOW

Read

THE MILITANT

Weekly

Six Months \$1.00
One Year \$2.00

Combination offer:

1 year of *The Militant* and 1 year of the
monthly magazine, *Fourth International* . \$3.00

(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



A New, Timely 32-page

Pamphlet

by C. Charles

5c per copy

3 1/2c in bundles

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place