

BOSSSES SEEK TO 'FREEZE' OPEN SHOP

The Negro Mess Attendant On The 'Arizona'

An Editorial

An eye-witness account of the Pearl Harbor battle, published in the Dec. 22 *New York Times*, tells how "a Negro mess attendant who never before had fired a gun manned a machine gun on the bridge (of the sinking battleship Arizona) until his ammunition was exhausted."

We cite this story not simply to show that Negroes have heroic fighting qualities. The Negro people have demonstrated such qualities in fullest measure through all the centuries of their struggle against slavery and racial oppression and in every war in which this nation has participated.

Rather we point to this incident of the Negro mess attendant on the U. S. S. Arizona as an example of the discriminatory treatment accorded Negroes in all branches of the American armed forces, particularly the naval division.

This unnamed Negro sailor gave an example of bravery and resourcefulness under fire that would do credit to any member of the Navy. Yet, if he is still alive, he will not be permitted the opportunity even now to train in the use of a gun on an American naval vessel. He must remain what he was, a mess attendant, "privileged" only to clean tables, empty slops and clean the boots of some who might have but half of his intelligence and courage.

The thing that sticks out like a sore thumb in the *Times* account of this Negro mess attendant's action is that he "never before had fired a gun." Why? Only because this Negro and every Negro in the country is barred by the Navy's Jim-Crow regulations from any post other than mess attendant.

This picture of the Negro mess attendant — segregated, discriminated against, denied his elementary right of an equal opportunity for training and position in the nation's fighting forces, yet turning with cool courage to fight in defense even of those who might have discriminated against him — this picture must cause the blood to boil in the veins of decent, democratic men and women.

The Navy Department recently announced that it was considering a request permitting assignment of draftees to the Navy, because enlistments were not keeping up with the expanding needs of the sea forces. One of the reasons for this is that young, qualified Negroes — men of the calibre of the Arizona mess attendant — are not permitted to enlist in the Navy in any capacity other than as a steward. The Navy is crying for men, for fighters. Yet it bars the Negro people among whom there is a reservoir of tens of thousands of young men with aptitude for naval service and with fighting capacities second to none.

The Negro people for a long time have wondered what kind of war for democracy it is that must be fought by a Jim Crow Navy. They have asked what is the difference between Hitler's treatment of the Jews in Germany and the treatment they receive here in a war that has been officially dedicated to the high principles of the "four freedoms." Perhaps wider sections of the population will begin to wonder the same thing after reading about the Negro mess attendant on the Arizona.

The American people must demand an end to the Jim Crow system in the armed forces. They must speak up in a loud voice for equal rights for the Negro people in the armed forces as well as everywhere else.

Dodge Local Sends Funds To Defend 18

Dodge Local No. 3 Declares Solidarity In Minneapolis Case

Dodge Local 3 of the United Auto Workers, CIO in Detroit, last week made a contribution of \$50 and sent a letter expressing solidarity with the 18 members of the CIO and Socialist Workers Party who were convicted early this month under the Smith Gag Law, according to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, the official organization mobilizing public support on behalf of the 18.

Accompanying the contribution was a letter of Dec. 19 signed by Mr. John A. Zaremba, secretary acting on behalf of the Dodge local, which expressed the hope that "this small contribution will be of some help to the persecuted workers of Minneapolis."

The Dodge local is one of the largest in the Detroit area, and is well known in labor circles as militant and active union.

It is the twenty-fifth local in the UAW to contribute to the defense of the Minneapolis defendants since the UAW at its Buffalo national convention last August passed a resolution protesting the prosecution.

Longshoremen Tax Themselves To Aid the 18

The Industrial Organizer, Minneapolis Local, 544-CIO newspaper, last week printed a letter from a union member active in the Civil Rights Defense Committee in San Diego, Cal., demonstrating how strongly union men feel about the recent Minneapolis "sedition" trial. Part reads as follows:

"... a few words about the donation toward the trial made by the San Diego local of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union Local No. 129. They donated \$17.25. When this is compared to the small membership of only 69 men, I believe this amounts to one of the finest examples of working-class solidarity shown."

Also, they passed unanimously the same resolution that was passed by the CIO Council in San Francisco, supporting the defendants."

Cops Fail to Intimidate Canadian Strikers



Canadian strikers from eight gold mining companies parade through the streets of Kirkland Lake, Ontario, (above) in answer to a police demonstration (below) intended to intimidate the striking workers. The strike was called by Local 240, Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, CIO.

USSR Victories Could Be Turning Point Of War

With a Policy of Revolutionary War They Could Lead to the Overthrow of Hitler

By ANTHONY MASSINI

The recent victories and advances of the Red Army along the whole front have recovered an important section of the territory lost by the Soviet Union in the first five months of the war. They thus give a much needed breathing spell to the USSR on all three fronts of the war, and relieve the danger to Leningrad, Moscow and Rostov.

In addition, the Hitler myth of invincibility — used to bludgeon the governments of some of the smaller European countries into the war against the USSR — has been struck a blow from which it will not soon recover. This will have an inevitable effect on the morale of the German armies, and will do much to increase the unrest in the occupied countries.

Hitler's assumption last week of full personal command of the front, an attempt to cover up the latest blows to his prestige, is a direct consequence of events on the eastern front, and a symptom of growing unrest among the German soldiers and people.

These victories must not be overestimated. Most of the territory taken by the German armies is still in the hands of the enemy — and with it, the factories and raw materials so necessary for continuing the war. The Soviet Union is still in grave danger, and still in an unfavorable position as compared with last summer or autumn. Those who spread any illusions to the contrary are not helping the defense of the first workers state.

IMPORTANT LESSONS FOR FIGHT AGAINST FASCISM

But neither must these victories be underestimated. They can teach the workers of the world the most important lessons on how to defeat fascism. And properly taken advantage of, they could become the turning point in the war.

The chief significance of these victories lies in the fact that the first army to halt, and then

these victories was the participation of armed worker detachments in the struggle. THE MILITANT (Dec. 6) has already related the part played by the armed workers in the recapture of Rostov, where the German army had entered the city only to be set upon by the workers living in the city and driven back so fiercely that the Red Army was able to take the initiative and start the drive that has kept the German army on the defensive in the southern front ever since.

PART PLAYED BY THE ARMED WORKER DETACHMENTS

Likewise on the central and northern fronts. There were extensive reports in the Soviet and world press late last summer of the workers of Leningrad and Moscow receiving instruction in

(Continued on page 2)

War Order 'Commission' Racket Bared at Hearing

Fat Fees Paid Agents for Using Influence To Steer War Contracts to Their Clients

A Senate investigating committee, set up last Spring after several Senators and Congressmen had spilled the beans about discriminatory practices in the issuance of war orders, last week turned attention to the men who are selling their "influence" to aid various corporations in securing war contracts. The committee's hearings have brought to light several instances of staggering "fees" being paid "commission men" for services rendered in enabling corporations to get war orders.

There is the case of Leon K. Shanack, a New York "defense broker," who admitted to the investigating committee that he had cleared \$52,773.06 — after deductions for taxes and "operating" expenses — in ten months for subcontracting war orders of \$262,663.83. Most of Shanack's orders came from the Remington

Arms Company of Bridgeport, Conn.

Then there is the affair of the \$687,000 remainder of a \$700,000 commission which Charles West, former Under-Secretary of the Interior in the early New Deal administration, claims the Empire Ordnance Corporation owes him for "services rendered" in assisting that company to get \$70,000,000 in war orders, including guns

\$700,000 WORTH OF 'ADVICE'

West explained further that this "compensation in lieu of fee, commission, stock or salary," as he termed it, was for "advising him (Cohen) on all matters involving business in Washington."

(Continued on page 2)

Trusts, Not Farmers, Gain From Food Price Rises

Despite all the talk of price "ceilings" and price "control," the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale commodities price index for the week ending Dec. 13 stood at 93.1, the highest level since Dec. 1929. On Aug. 19, 1939, just prior to the outbreak of the war in Europe, the price index was at 74.6. The week following the outbreak of the war in the Pacific there were "general and sharp price rises" (*New York Times*, Dec. 19).

Contrary to the idea generally circulated among business circles, it is manufactured products, metal and metal products, chemical and allied products, building materials, house-furnishings goods, etc., which are leading the way in these price rises. Farm products stand at 92.8 on the price index as contrasted with the figure of 93.2 for all commodities other than farm products.

In so far as rising food prices are concerned, the real culprits are the big food combinations and trusts, and not the working farmers. Anti-trust indictments for price-fixing have been handed down against most of the leading corporations in the baking, dairy, canning and fruit exchange industries.

On Dec. 17, small fines were imposed on five big baking companies, including Continental, General Baking and Ward's, for price fixing. On the same day, leading Florida and California fruit exchanges, controlling the nation's supply of citrus fruits, were indicted for similar practices.

The profits for these companies are so great that they rarely contest the indictments, preferring to pay their small fines and go on raking in their millions in profits.

Demand Unions Surrender All Basic Rights

Employers Responsible for Deadlock In War Labor Policy Conference at Capitol

DEC. 23. — Last week the employer representatives at the Washington labor-industry conference on war labor policy exacted a no-strike pledge from AFL and CIO leaders under Congressional threat of drastic anti-strike laws. This week they are pressing for an agreement to "freeze" the open shop for the duration of the war.

Their obvious objective is to prevent further organizational drives and to establish the most favorable conditions for undermining present union strength. Given a hand by the labor leaders, the employing class is trying to slice off a whole arm.

The 12 union spokesmen at the conference, no doubt mindful of the disastrous consequence to labor that ensued from the "freezing" of the open-shop in the last war, have so far refused to accede to this employer demand.

THE THOMAS PROPOSAL

They have, however, approved the proposal of Senator Thomas calling for a no-strike, no-lockout policy, agreement to settle all controversies through negotiations, mediation or arbitration, and the establishment of machinery by the President with power to settle all disputes. The particular form of this machinery, as suggested by the labor leaders, is a nine-man War Labor Board similar to the 1918 body, with equal labor-employer representation plus one so-called public representative.

Nevertheless, the employers are boldly holding out for nothing less than the complete and unconditional capitulation of labor. They are taking an adamant stand in line with their class interests. As usual, the employer representatives are far less conciliatory than the union leaders.

Through this entire period of putting the heat on labor to "voluntarily" surrender its rights, there has been an almost unbroken silence on the part of the press and legislators with respect to restrictions upon the employers.

Through this entire period of putting the heat on labor to "voluntarily" surrender its rights, there has been an almost unbroken silence on the part of the press and legislators with respect to restrictions upon the employers.

THE BOSSES' AIMS

Signs multiply that the employers are following a deliberate long-term strategic plan aimed at permanently paralyzing or destroying the union altogether. Agreement by labor to "freezing" of the open-shop, it is apparent, will be a signal for the employers to extend their demands still further. The next step, as contemplated, would be the "freezing" of wage levels.

This was indicated in a Dec. 22 *New York Times* editorial backing the employers' open shop proposal and urging further that "labor must be discouraged from making unreasonable and disruptive wage demands. Canada has boldly applied the principle of stabilization both to prices and wages." Naturally, neither the Canadian authorities nor the *New York Times* proposes the "stabilization" of profits.

BEYOND THE 'DEADLINE'

When the conference began last Wednesday, the emphasis was all on high-pressureing the union leaders into a quick unconditional no-strike agreement. The union leaders, prodded by the threat of anti-strike laws and under the direct injunction of President Roosevelt to come to a speedy accord, gave in.

The employers, however, have felt no compulsion to follow the President's injunction. They know that no matter how much their responsibility for delaying agreement, they have nothing to lose if the conference collapses. Congress stands eagerly waiting for the pretext to shove through the Smith Slave Labor Bill or similar measures.

The employers have now prolonged the conference for several days beyond the President's "dead-

line" fixed for last Friday. The nation's big-business press, instead of raising a fuss as it would if the labor leaders had hesitated for one minute, over the no-strike issue is showing little concern that the conference, whose speedy conclusion was represented as a life-and-death matter a week ago, now appears deadlocked. In fact, the press is egging on the employer representatives to stand fast on the open shop issue.

The employers have been further emboldened to press their open shop demand by the renewed threats of immediate anti-strike legislation coming from the Congressional halls. The powerful Southern Democratic poll-tax blocs in both the House and the Senate, having muted their labor-hating chorus for the first three days of the conference, on Saturday started to swing into crescendo once more. Other legislators are taking up the refrain.

EMPLOYERS HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE

The employers have gone into this conference with literally no obligations to sacrifice a single privilege or benefit, save the virtually meaningless "right" to invoke lockouts. They can afford the luxury of sitting tight with-

(Continued on page 2)

Union Donations To the C.R.D.C. Since War Began

Financial contributions to the Civil Rights Defense Committee, sent by trade unions since the declaration of war earlier this month, include the following:

District Council 11 of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, of Lockport, N. Y., sent \$50.

Dodge Local 3, UAW, of Detroit sent \$50.

Midland Steel Local 410, UAW, of Detroit, sent \$30.

Motor Products Local 203, UAW of Detroit, sent \$25.

Republic Lodge 1743 of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, CIO, of Buffalo, N. Y., sent \$25.

General Electric Local 203 of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, sent \$10.

Local 836 of the UAW, of Saginaw, Mich., sent \$5.

This is a clear indication that the workers in the trade unions have by no means forgotten that it is necessary to continue the fight to protect civil liberties, even after the declaration of war.

The Bosses Are Seeking to 'Freeze' the Open Shop

(Continued from page 1)

out fear of being forced to yield on any point.

So far as they are concerned, they have breached labor's major defense when they have won the surrender of the right to strike. Attacking the remaining points of resistance are then in the nature of follow-through operations to consolidate the victory.

In surrendering this right the union leaders give up the most effective independent means possessed by the workers for protecting their interests. Without this right labor places its interests at the mercy of arbitration by a board whose essential purpose is to eliminate labor disputes, not safeguard the interests of labor. The example of the 1918 War Labor Board, and the present National Defense Mediation Board, show that such boards have always been distinctly favorable to the employers.

The union leaders have expressed willingness to submit questions of the union or closed shop to war labor board arbitration. The impression given is that the unions will be able to win union shop conditions through such arbitration.

But there is no assurance whatever that arbitration would decide in favor of the union shop in most or in any cases. The likelihood is the very reverse. What will the unions have to back up their just demands? They already will have given up the right to strike. And without this right to fall back upon, they will be literally helpless.

WORKERS DON'T STRIKE FOR THE FUN OF IT

The impression conveyed by a willingness to surrender the right to strike is that strikes are a weapon lightly and freely employed by the workers. The contrary is the case. Workers neither like nor want to strike. Indeed, they

employ this weapon only when pressed by the employers to the limit of their endurance. Strikes are a last resort for the workers, used only when they have, exhausted all other means of securing their just demands or a reasonable compromise on their demands. It is the employers who are responsible for strikes when they persist in denying the workers their elementary rights and just conditions.

If the vital objective is to maintain continuous production, then

that objective can be attained without any abrogation of the right to strike.

The workers can guarantee uninterrupted production if the employers will do one simple thing: meet the just demands of the workers.

At this writing, the conference is dead-locked. But it is dead-locked on a relatively secondary, though vastly important, issue. The basic issue is the right to strike.

Garbage Collectors Get Dirty Deal In Rochester

ROCHESTER, Dec. 18. — Rochester garbage collectors have just been given a deal which smells more than the garbage they collected.

Last September these workers, members of the AFL Building Material Drivers Union, asked for an increase from 58c to 68c an hour. The City Manager, Cartwright, answered them with the statement that nothing could be done about it until next year as the city budget did not allow for any increases for wages. The workers answered this with a strike.

It so happened that this was

just before the elections, and so the city administration was in an embarrassing position. Finally, although no contract was advertised, a man named Leonard B. Finewood, received a contract to collect the city garbage. Of course, Finewood was not going to collect it all by himself; his job was to watch the city trucks and equipment go out and collect the garbage and bring it to the city disposal plant. For this he received \$3.25 per ton, which it was understood would enable him not only to pay for wages but to make a little profit for himself.

When the union heard that Finewood had the contract to collect garbage, it contacted him and offered to work for him at 68c per hour. Finewood accepted, and the strike was ended.

Late in November — after the elections were well out of the way — there came the news that Finewood had notified the city that he would no longer watch their wagons collect the garbage because he was not making money on the contract, and was as a matter of fact losing money on it.

Immediately City Manager Cartwright and Public Works Commissioner Roberts decided that if a private collector couldn't make money on the contract, maybe it would be better if the city took over the work again. They went ahead at once and hired a crew of garbage collectors to do the work for the city. Their salary is 65c an hour.

They did not hire back any of the men who had formerly worked for them, gone on strike, then gone to work for Finewood. When they reapplied for these jobs, they were told it was too late.

So these workers are now out on the street, although their union is still protesting what happened, and they are wondering, "How can the city now pay collectors 65c an hour when we were told it couldn't pay more than 58c, in September?"

James T. Farrell On The Minneapolis Convictions

The Conviction of the 18 Is a Clear and Present Danger to the Bill of Rights

By JAMES T. FARRELL

(Text of the statement delivered to the Dec. 15 mass meeting in the New York Hotel Diplomat, celebrating the 150th anniversary of the signing of the Bill of Rights and protesting the conviction of the 18 Socialist Workers Party and CIO members in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial).

On the 150th anniversary of the Bill of Rights, the defense and preservation of civil liberties has become a paramount issue. Now more than ever, the priceless political rights guaranteed in the First Amendment of the American Constitution must remain operative. In peace or in war, when the right of free speech is destroyed, public life becomes rigid. Thinking turns

The convictions obtained at Minneapolis are, to my mind, a clear and present danger to the Bill of Rights. On this issue, the liberal magazine, *The Nation*, has already sounded an alarm. In an editorial, appearing after the outbreak of war between this country and Japan, it declared: "We believe that all progressives of whatever political orientation must join in the defense of the Minneapolis defendants or permit the establishment of a precedent that may some day be used against them."

The names of Holmes and Brandeis are among the most honored in American legal history, but their words are not as respected as are their names. For it is clear that they had in mind a period such as the present one when they enunciated their theory of a "clear and present danger."

In the Minneapolis case, this theory was abandoned; for it, the prosecution substituted one of indirect causation. Such a theory is a parallel to the Japanese notion of "dangerous thoughts." Once this is established as the law of the land, all thinking will become dangerous. In place of thinking, we will only be allowed to quote; and even quotation will be dangerous.

To destroy freedom of speech

is to admit implicitly that one has lost faith in the great masses of the people. Instead of confidence in the masses of the common people whose ancestors were responsible for the Bill of Rights one substitutes an elite. On them is placed all responsibility for continuing the succession of ideas which alone can give us the intellectual resources for the creation of a civilization, a culture, that is truly human. On December 15, 1941, I am not prepared to sacrifice this faith. That is why I assert that the question of civil liberties is of such paramount importance now.

KEEP THE TRUTH ON THE MARCH

Many years ago, the courageous French novelist, Emile Zola, boldly and confidently proclaimed that the truth is on the march. Since then, oppression has spread over nation after nation. But in the face of every oppression, it is our duty to do what Zola tried to do — to keep the truth on the march. That, we cannot do unless men are allowed publicly, honestly, seriously to think, to express their ideas, to defend their convictions.

When Socrates stood on trial for his life, he told his judges that "the unexamined life is not worth living." These words of Socrates are as profoundly significant today as they were when he uttered them. Allow me to repeat: "... the unexamined life is not worth living ..."

'The Nation' Calls Trial Attack On Free Speech

An Editorial In Dec. 13 Issue of Liberal Weekly Urges Progressives to Join Defense

(Reprinted in full below is the 'Nation' editorial of December 13, warning of the far-reaching implications of the Minneapolis prosecution of leaders of the SWP and of Local 544-CIO.)

December 15 is the 150th anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. We can think of no better way to celebrate it than by calling attention to the Minneapolis sedition trial. The prosecution of twenty-three Trotskyists for sedition and the conviction of eighteen of them on charges of conspiracy to create insubordination in the armed forces are challenges to every believer in civil liberties. They

are brought about by dangerous men and dangerous thoughts is a familiar one in Japan. We ought to be careful that it is not naturalized here. There was revolution in czarist Russia, not because of the tiny Bolshevik Party, but because long-standing oppression and the corruption and military defeat of czarism disgusted and alienated the great mass of the people. It is in the correction of abuses and not in the suppression of revolutionary opinions that the safety of any social order lies. Were it otherwise, czarism, with its Siberian prisons for revolutionaries, would still be a going concern. We are ashamed to have to repeat these truisms now.

We believe that the precedents established by this conviction are dangerous to freedom of thought and expression in America. We are brought about by dangerous men and dangerous thoughts is a familiar one in Japan. We ought to be careful that it is not naturalized here. There was revolution in czarist Russia, not because of the tiny Bolshevik Party, but because long-standing oppression and the corruption and military defeat of czarism disgusted and alienated the great mass of the people. It is in the correction of abuses and not in the suppression of revolutionary opinions that the safety of any social order lies. Were it otherwise, czarism, with its Siberian prisons for revolutionaries, would still be a going concern. We are ashamed to have to repeat these truisms now.

Two aspects of the prosecution are of the greatest importance. The first is that the government contended that it did not need to wait for an "overt act" but could penalize the expression of opinions that might some day lead to overt acts. The second is that Assistant Attorney General Henry Schweinhaut, who is supposed to be a great champion of civil liberties, expressly disclaimed any intention on the part of the government to be bound by the Holmes-Brandeis theory of "clear and present danger."

This concept, developed in a series of dissents by the two great liberal jurists, holds that the expression of opinion may be prosecuted if there is a "clear and present danger" that it will lead an overt act.

Though Holmes and Brandeis are often invoked by the Department of Justice and Attorney General Francis Biddle, their guiding principles, as often happens with the celebrated dead, are overlooked and evaded. Schweinhaut declared that the government was proceeding on the basis of conservative minority opinions of the Supreme Court which permit prosecution of opinion. Obviously the tiny Socialist Workers' Party is no threat either to established government or to the loyalty of the army. Any attempt to proceed against it on the basis of what it is doing today must fall flat. Schweinhaut argued that the Bolshevik Party in Russia was also a tiny minority before the revolution. His argument reduced itself to the proposition that the Socialist Workers' Party, though tiny too, might also make a revolution.

The assumptions implicit in this view should hardly need to be driven home again at this late date. The idea that revolutions

believe that they open the door to the possible prosecution of other trade-union leaders on the ground that they belong to a "revolutionary" party. We believe this case all the more dangerous because the Department of Justice has picked a tiny unpopular minority as its legal-laboratory specimen in the experiment of grafting foreign ideas on American law. We believe that all progressives of whatever political orientation must join in the defense of the Minneapolis defendants or permit the establishment of a precedent that may some day be used against any of them.

These fears may seem exaggerated. They are much less exaggerated than the fears which led the common people of one state after another at the time of the ratification of the Constitution to demand its amendment by a Bill of Rights. Learned and legally conclusive arguments were brought forward to prove that these fears were unfounded, but experience has shown the wisdom in that clamor. Liberty is most easily preserved when the threat to it is small. Then is the time to act, and that time is now.

Subscribe to the 'Fourth International'



In the next several months, increasing emphasis will be laid upon the business of securing subscriptions to the MILITANT and its brother publication FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. The record of subscriptions for the month of December is not so high that it offers anything to brag about, but certain of the branches display a commendable understanding of the importance of this kind of work.

FLINT takes the lead this month, with a total of fourteen subscriptions to THE MILITANT, a tribute to the efficacy of the simple practice of raising the problem of sub-getting to a position of first prominence in the minds of the comrades and then going around and collecting subscriptions from those workers who have come to look to our press for information and advice on labor problems.

Place	Regular	Special	Total
Flint	6	3	14
Minneapolis	7		7
Newark	3	3	6
Detroit	1	2	3
Cleveland	1		2
Los Angeles	2		2
New Haven	1	1	2
New York	2		2
Boston		1	1
Memphis		1	1
Plentywood	1		1
Reading	1		1
St. Louis	1		1
Miscellaneous	4		4
TOTALS	...30	18	48

USSR Victories Could Be Turning Point

(Continued from page 1)

the use of arms and military tactics. It is reported now that on the Finnish front a large force of Leningrad workers is participating in the struggle. Nor can it be doubted that the workers of Moscow played an important role in the defense of the Soviet capital, especially when we realize that the German armies were as close as 25 miles to the city.

In the light of those developments, workers in this country who are concerned about the defeat of Hitlerism would do well to ponder the significance of the Trotskyist proposal for military training of workers, financed by the government and under the control of the trade unions!

THE QUESTION OF THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

The third significant aspect of the German attack on the three key cities prior to the recent Soviet advances was that at no time did there appear any evidence of a "fifth column" to aid the Germans or sabotage the Soviet war effort.

The Stalinists, of course, attribute this to the wisdom and foresight of the Kremlin. The absence of such a "fifth column" is widely cited by them as the result of the infamous Moscow Trials and the purges of industry, agriculture and the armed forces that followed them. Thus do they — and capitalist apologists in this country like ex-Ambassador Davies and Harry Hopkins — try to justify the regime, the trials and the purges which destroyed the flower of the military command of the Red Army, disrupted and dislocated industry and agriculture, and imprisoned thousands of the best defenders of the workers state.

But what does the absence of a "fifth column" in the Soviet Union really show?

It shows that the foundations of the October Revolution were so securely laid that even in the moment of greatest crisis, and despite 17 years of Stalinist degeneration, there is no bourgeoisie to raise its head in the Soviet Union. There is no "fifth column" to lend aid to the imperialists today, because capitalism was abolished 24 years ago.

The Stalinists try to give the

credit for this to Stalin and call on the capitalist governments to organize frame-up trials against revolutionists as Stalin did. But actually the credit belongs to the leaders and the forces of the workers revolution of 1917. Had Stalin followed their policies since the death of Lenin — as Trotsky advocated — the German revolution would have taken place long ago, and prevented Hitler's rise to power; the French revolution would have taken place, and wiped out the capitalist "fifth column" which capitulated to the Nazis in 1940; the present assault on the USSR would have been avoided, or at the very worst, the Soviet Union would have had powerful workers and farmers governments throughout Europe as allies.

Workers who want to fight fascism and who want to prevent "fifth columns" can learn from the Soviet experience. Establish a powerful Workers and Farmers Government in your own country, and you will not have to worry about "fifth columns." This is the policy which the Stalinists are fighting against everywhere today, in the fascist as well as the democratic countries.

GERMAN MORALE

The experiences of the last month are pregnant not only with lessons for workers everywhere, but also with possibilities for the Soviet war. With the proper policy, these victories could be used for the turning point in the war — as were the first victories after many defeats in the Civil War of 1918-20 — for the opening of a military and political offensive that would sweep the invader out of the Soviet Union.

Even without exaggerating the extent of the Soviet victories, there is no question that Hitler's position on the whole is more menacing and the morale of the German armies lower than at any time since the beginning of the war. Now is the time, before Hitler can reconsolidate his position for a new spring offensive which will again threaten key Soviet centers, for vigorous assault against him and his regime.

If ever, the German soldiers and the German masses are now, on the heels of the latest blows to Hitler's "prestige," ready to listen to revolutionary propaganda. Un-

doubtedly they are already asking themselves all kinds of questions. The German masses do not have to be told that it will be a long war. After the entry of the United States into the war, they do not have to be told by Hitler that "millions of our soldiers stand after a year of the heaviest battles against an enemy who is superior in numbers and in material on the front." (Goebbels' speech of Dec. 20). It is no consolation for them to be told by Goebbels that "the nutrition is admittedly limited," but it "sufficient" when "compared" with that of other European nations.

ARMY MORALE

The morale of the German soldiers will not be greatly increased by Hitler's personal assumption of the military command or by this plea for the German people to contribute all their extra winter clothing to the front, for they are asking themselves: "If we are driven back because of the poor military leadership, why did Hitler assign us such a leadership? Why were there no arrangements made for winter equipment before now? Why were we sent out here to freeze to death?"

They too know it is going to be a long war. They have had the opportunity to see how the Soviet masses rise up to assist the Red Army in the defense of their cities. Sooner or later they may begin to ask themselves why the Soviet masses fight this way, what it is they die to defend. They know that Hitler's strategy is not infallible, that he can make mistakes and that he can lose the war in spite of all their sacrifices.

A spring offensive may dissipate many of these doubts and questions — but spring is a long way off, and a great change could be effected in the German soldiers' outlook before it comes.

Hitler's regime and Hitler's war were never popular, even before his present reverses. It is a regime that is hated by the masses, whose organizations it smashed and whose living standards it reduced drastically. But for one thing, attempts supported by large sections of the population would have been made to overthrow it long ago in this war.

And that one thing is the fear of the German people of

what will happen if the Allies win the war. They had one such experience only 23 years ago, and they still recall vividly what it means.

WHAT REVOLUTIONARY PROPAGANDA CAN DO

Above everything else, they fear the imposition of another Versailles Treaty on Germany, with its starvation and unemployment and misery for the masses. Until they are shown that there is a way for them to overthrow Hitler and stop the war without a Versailles Treaty as a consequence, the chances are that they will continue to remain quiet and permit Hitler to go ahead with his war against the Soviet Union.

And conversely all that is needed to move them into action is the right program and perspective, the assurance that when they overthrow Hitler and end the war, they will have allies, powerful and close enough to be of immediate assistance, who will aid them in their struggle against any new Versailles policies, regardless of which direction the threat of such policies comes from.

Revolutionary propaganda, directed by the Soviet Union at the German soldiers and masses, could do more to lower morale and disintegrate Hitler's regime, than the coldest weather conceivable. Five million leaflets urging the German masses to make their own revolution and promising the aid of the Soviet Union against all attempts at counter-revolution or imperialist intervention would mean more toward winning the war than all the aid that the United States or Great Britain will send the USSR in the next two years.

HOW STALIN HELPS HITLER

Stalin does not adopt this policy of revolutionary warfare — he refuses to compensate for the lack of airplanes and tanks, to which he has ascribed the Soviet defeats in the war, by a program that would disintegrate Hitler's armies from the rear and from within. What is more, not only does he fail to drive a wedge between Hitler and the German soldiers and masses, but he follows out a policy that makes it still more difficult for such a wedge to be driven between them.

Albert Goldman Tells The Minneapolis Jury That We Seek To Organize "The Immense Majority In The Interest Of The Immense Majority"

This is the second installment of the brilliant final argument of chief defense counsel and defendant Albert Goldman to the jury in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial. The initial portion of this address, published in last week's MILITANT, included a conclusive refutation of the federal prosecution's charges that the Socialist Workers Party and its program constitute a "conspiracy to overthrow the government by force and violence." In years to come, this speech will be read and studied as a model both of a principled defense of the rights of working-class political minorities, and as an historic exposition of the ideas of Marxian socialism.

WHAT WE MEAN BY MAJORITY

Mr. Anderson read an article of mine which I introduced into evidence just before closing the case for the defense. It was published in *The Militant* of March 29, 1941.

In order to prove that we did not believe in convincing a majority of the people, Mr. Anderson showed that in that article I used the term "majority" without mentioning the people and at other times I used the term "majority of the working class."

What do I mean when I use the phrase "the majority of the working class?" Read the section that I have already cited from the "Communist Manifesto". Read in my pamphlet, "What is Socialism", that section where I state specifically that there are probably no more than three million people who can be considered capitalists in the United States. Read that section in my pamphlet which says that the working class in an industrially developed country like the United States, constitutes a majority of the people. And then read that section where I say that the workers, even though they are in a majority, must have the help of the middle classes, especially of the farmers, in order to achieve victory, and you

WHAT THE SEEKING OF A MAJORITY MEANS

I am certain that, if the government in this case were simply interested in bringing into court possible violators of a law, it would have moved for a dismissal of the case immediately upon learning that the Socialist Workers Party aims to get a majority of the people to accept its ideas. If counsel for the government did not know our position before, they should by now have wired Washington for permission to dismiss the case because the phrase *majority of people* settles all questions as far as our guilt of advocating the violent overthrow of the government is concerned.

I presume, ladies and gentlemen, that you do not think the defendants are insane. You may not agree with us; you may think that we are Utopians, but I believe you consider us sane people. Only insane people, however, would be capable of actually preferring and desiring violence. If there is an individual who says that he *wants* a violent overthrow of the government, a violent transformation from the capitalist system to the socialist system, he belongs in the insane asylum.

And if, as is shown by our writings, we want a majority of the people to accept our ideas, why should we advocate a violent change from capitalism to socialism? What does advocate mean? To incite, to urge. We would then be convicted of saying: Even though we shall get a majority of the people behind us, we still want to overthrow the government by violence. The fact that we want a majority of the people to accept our ideas proves beyond all doubt that we want a peaceful transformation.

I want to repeat this fundamental proposition because it is all-important: If we want a majority of the people, as we do, to accept our ideas, then we must be in favor of a peaceful "destruction" of the government. Does peaceful destruction sound paradoxical? Not if you understand it correctly in the sense that it means the removal of certain persons ruling on the basis of certain principles, and replacing them by other persons obligating themselves to rule upon different principles. When government counsel failed to

REACTIONARIES WILL INSTIGATE VIOLENCE AGAINST MAJORITY

Will there be struggle at the time the majority decides to establish socialism? I told you before that in this society struggle is an unalterable law. At times the struggle is on a political plane, at times it is on an economic plane. Workers join together, create a union, try to get a raise in wages or an improvement in conditions, and struggle follows.

And sometimes that struggle is accompanied by violence. That is true not only of a strike of truck drivers in Minneapolis. Read the history of the labor struggles in the United States, of great strikes in Colorado, in southern Illinois, in Ohio and elsewhere, and you will convince yourselves that violence is not something that occurs in strikes led by Trotskyists. In 1877, at a time when socialists were never heard of outside, perhaps, of New York City, there were great railroad strikes, and violence resulted. What caused the violence? The agitation of some people? No. The bitter struggle between exploited workers and greedy employers.

Unfortunately, we are compelled to say that in all probability the social revolution will be accompanied by violence. Do we therefore advocate violence? No. We want a peaceful transformation.

There have been civil wars in history. History does not know of a single case where a ruling group, controlling economic and political power, has peacefully surrendered that power to a majority. Perhaps we have entered a period when the ruling class will realize that it is useless to struggle and will surrender its power without violence. We hope so; we hope that the ruling class in this country, when confronted by a majority determined to establish a new social order, will see the advisability of giving in peacefully. But we do not want to create that illusion; and that is what we mean in our Declaration of Principles when we say it is an illusion that socialism can be introduced through parliamentary means. It simply means that we believe that after we gain a majority of the people to our ideas, the ruling group will not surrender peacefully.

OUR RIGHTS WERE WON BY STRUGGLE

Theoretically, the existence of political democracy offers a chance to achieve socialism in a peaceful manner. But even the democratic rights that we have now have not been gained without struggle.

Do you think that everyone had a right to vote in the early stages of the republic? No, there were property quali-

"If, As Our Writings Show, We Want Majority Of People To Accept Our Ideas, Why Should We Advocate Violence?"

will see that I cannot mean what Mr. Anderson says I mean, that is, a majority of only one class, a minority of the people.

The industrial wage workers are the ones to take the lead in the struggle against the capitalist system. In the first place, they come more directly in conflict with the owners of industry — in the big steel mills, auto plants, mines, etc. In the second place, the industrial wage workers are used to working together — cooperation is the key word under socialism and the industrial wage workers in their factories learn to work cooperatively. They understand that it is necessary under conditions of modern industry to work cooperatively in order to build an automobile or a complicated machine.

The farmer, on the other hand, working on his own land, tends to be individualistic. It is necessary for the workers to get the support of the farmers. In my pamphlet I state that in a socialist society the farmers will finally come to realize the advisability of cooperative farming. The point that I want to emphasize is that whenever we use the expression "the majority" or "the majority of the people" or "the majority of the working class" we mean one and the same thing — the same thing that I read to you from the "Communist Manifesto": "All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority."

stress the fact that the Socialist Workers Party desires to have a majority of the people on its side, it could only be explained on the hypothesis that Washington in this case was out for a conviction regardless of the evidence.

The only interpretation that honest people can accept of the idea of violence as contained in our program is the following: We predict that even after a majority of the people will be won over to the ideas of socialism and will try to establish socialism peacefully, the minority, organized by the capitalists, will resist with violence. Especially is that true now, because of the rise of fascism.

THE PROSECUTION DISTORTS OUR IDEAS

One factor that you must take into consideration and always be on your guard against, is the possibility of distortion by excerpts. A person writes an article, a party formulates a program based on fundamental theories. Along comes a prosecutor and snatches an excerpt here and a sentence there. The possibility of distortion is very great.

"Think not that I am come to bring peace on earth. I come not to bring peace, but the sword, and the son shall be set against the father, and the daughter against the mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law." Is not the one who wrote these two verses an advocate of violence and hatred? If Mr. Anderson did not know that the Prince of Peace uttered these words, he probably would seek to indict the author.

Every piece of great literature can be distorted. The Bible can be made into an obscene book simply by taking out certain excerpts. This is the method which the jury must guard against. Excerpts can be found from the writings of Karl Marx, from our program, from Trotsky, from Lenin, which would indicate that we want and we advocate a violent revolution, but that would be false, that would be a distortion, because taking the program as a whole, it is clear that we want to gain a majority of the people to our ideas, and from that it follows that we want to gain power peacefully.

fications. A struggle began to abolish these qualifications. Mass agitations, mass demonstrations were utilized in that struggle. People were jailed in that struggle, but finally they won the passage of laws granting the right of suffrage to every person without any property qualifications. But go down into the South and you will find that the Negroes still do not have the right to vote.

Take the principle of compulsory free education. Do you think that was gained without tremendous agitation that lasted for years and decades? Read the history of our country and you will see differently. Nothing, nothing of value that mankind possesses has been achieved without sacrifice, without struggle.

The prosecutors point to our literature which speaks about mass demonstrations and mass agitation. We do not deny that we believe in the effectiveness of mass demonstrations. The prosecutors must have forgotten that in the history of this country many things have been won by mass demonstrations.

We are now in a period when the people should have economic democracy in addition to political democracy, and a struggle will be necessary in order to achieve that. It will be waged on the political field; it will be waged in strikes against employers; it will be waged in debates, mass demonstrations, in the courtrooms, and people will be jailed.

WE SHALL TRY TO AVOID VIOLENCE

On the basis of their analysis of history and social conditions, Marxists predict the future. Will we be right? No one knows. I hope, and I am certain that every one of my co-defendants do, that our prediction with reference to violence accompanying the social revolution will not be fulfilled.

We want to take over the means of production peacefully, but we predict that the minority will use violence to prevent the majority from achieving a peaceful transformation, and it is necessary to be ready for the violence of that minority.

We are not able to predict with great exactness. A social scientist cannot predict with the exactitude of a physical scientist. What we can say now, however, is that as the ideas of socialism gain ground, as more and more people become convinced that socialism is the only possible solution, the fascists will also gain strength. In Germany the



ALBERT GOLDMAN

fascists were financed by the big industrialists. The capitalists in this country will do the same. They will finance the fascists to destroy the labor movement. The only real possibility of avoiding violence is for the working masses and the farmers to organize so strongly that the minority of capitalists will not attempt the use of violence.

The fact that we support the formation of a Labor Party is an indication that we shall try our best to exhaust all possibilities for a peaceful change. To Mr. Anderson our support of a Labor Party is evidence of a plot. To him it means that we would like to see a Labor Party so that the dupes in that party will participate in elections while we, behind the scenes, plot to overthrow the government by violence. What utter nonsense!

HISTORIC EXAMPLES OF VIOLENCE BY REACTIONARIES

Mr. Cannon pointed out under cross examination by Mr. Schweinhaut some historical examples where the majority won the power peacefully, but where the ruling minority initiated violence and began a counter revolution. One example is our own Civil War where, after Lincoln was elected by the people, the southern slaveholders began the revolt. The slaveholders refused to give up their privilege of owning chattel slaves and fought to extend slavery. Violence began, but it came from the South, from the minority, and it was not until the majority of the people residing in the North assembled all their forces that they were able to put down the slaveholders' revolt.

Who was responsible for the violence? A minority of slaveholders determined to hold on to their property rights against the majority of the people.

I presume there were many people who, prior to the Civil War, predicted that violence would accompany the abolition of slavery. Were they responsible, then, for the Civil War? Is the Civil War not a clear example of a peaceful accession to power and the use of violence by a minority to overthrow the majority?

In Spain we have another example. The Loyalist government had the support of the vast majority of the people and came to power because of the support of the people. The fascists thereupon organized their minority, and with the aid of Germany and Italy, began a violent counter-revolution and succeeded in defeating the majority.

On the basis of these historic examples and many others, on the basis of the present day struggles in industry, where the employers do not hesitate to use violence to prevent workers from organizing unions and improve their working conditions, we predict that the social revolution, which will have as its aim to take away the wealth and the power and the privileges of a small minority, will be resisted by that minority to the death.

The more we emphasize that possibility, the more the people understand that possibility and prepare for it, the less will be the violence. But if violence does come, will we be responsible? Is the weatherman responsible for predicting a hurricane? Is the physician responsible when he predicts death for the patient? Is the astronomer responsible when he predicts the coming of an eclipse? Are we, predicting a great social storm at the time of the social revolution, responsible for the violence that may ensue?

WHAT IS A REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION?

A great deal has been made by the prosecution of the fact that in our writings appears the statement that we intend to take advantage of a revolutionary situation. What is that revolutionary situation? The only government witness who attempted to explain it, Bartlett, went way beyond his depth. He may be a shrewd union business agent, but he is hardly capable of explaining the theoretical problems connected with socialism.

The prerequisites for a revolutionary situation have been summed up by Marxists to be the following: first and foremost is the decline of the social system when the forces of

Mr. Cannon said on the witness stand that, as serious political people, expecting the masses to accept our ideas, we cannot conceal those ideas. We cannot say or do one thing and expect that the masses will be able to read our minds and follow us in doing something else. According to Mr. Anderson, we organized a Union Defense Guard in order to overthrow the government by force and violence. But he never proved, because he never could prove, that we ever told that to the members of the Union Defense Guard. Presumably, then, we would call together the Union Defense Guard one fine morning and reveal the startling secret to them that they are expected to overthrow the government by force and violence. Is it not absurd to think that we expect people to follow us in an attempt to overthrow the government when we have never told them that that was their duty?

Our task is to inform the masses of our ideas. We cannot possibly be conspirators, because we want to educate the majority of the people to accept our ideas. There is a section in our Declaration of Principles which says specifically that our task is to convince the masses that our ideas and our solution to the problems of mankind are correct and that it is impossible to use force against the masses. We can only use the power of persuasion and no other power.

Through a Labor Party we attempt to educate the masses to act independently on the political field and also to exhaust all possibilities of a peaceful change. We do not claim that the creation of a Labor Party will assure a peaceful change. We are against creating illusions because even if a labor party is created, the probability of the capitalists organizing a minority to prevent a peaceful change remains the same. And we are not afraid to tell the masses exactly that, and it is not against the law to say so. It is against the law to incite and urge people to overthrow the government by force and violence, but it is not against the law to predict that violence will be used by the minority to thwart the will of the majority. And this is the crux of the question, ladies and gentlemen:

On the basis of the evidence you can find only that, basing ourselves on an analysis of history, on an analysis of the social forces operating in present society, we declare that the probability is overwhelming that the social revolution will be accompanied by violence — the violence of the minority determined to guard its rights, its powers, its privileges.

I think — I am certain — that the court will instruct you that if, in considering all of the evidence in the case, you conclude that the evidence may just as well be consistent with the innocence of the defendants as with the guilt of the defendants, you are under an obligation to accept the hypothesis of innocence. That is the law.

Let us assume that after listening to all of the evidence and all the arguments in this case, and after reading all of the exhibits, you say to yourselves that the evidence can be interpreted in two ways: one, that the defendants advocated the violent overthrow of the government, and the other that the defendants predicted that there will be violence. Then you must accept the latter hypothesis and find us not guilty.

production can no longer function effectively; second, the inability of the ruling class to solve the problems it is confronted with; third, great suffering of the masses; fourth, the desire and determination of the masses to change the social system; fifth and final, existence of a party trained to understand the operation of social forces, able to predict the direction in which society moves, and determined not to permit a minority from thwarting the will of the majority.

Mr. Cannon correctly explained to you that these conditions do not as yet exist in the United States. Much has been said here by the prosecution to the effect that the defendants believe that the war will create a revolutionary situation. Perhaps it will, ladies and gentlemen, but are we responsible for the war? And if the war does create a revolutionary situation, can we be held responsible for the revolutionary situation? Perhaps the prosecution — and by the prosecution I do not mean Mr. Schweinhaut or Mr. Anderson, but Washington — should busy itself with passing a law preventing the war from creating a revolutionary situation. Or might I suggest that in order to prevent the possibility of a revolutionary situation, the present administration refrain from going to war.

THE COURT: We will take our afternoon recess now.

(AFTERNOON RECESS)

ADVOCACY OF VIOLENCE—OR PREDICTION?

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. GOLDMAN: The distinction between prediction and advocacy should by this time be perfectly clear. But that does not seem to be the case as far as government counsel are concerned. They introduced into evidence my pamphlet "What is Socialism" and read an excerpt from it beginning with Page 33. This is the pamphlet that I handed out to you at the beginning of the trial and if you have read it, you probably saw that it was written in very simple language because it consists of a series of lectures delivered to workers. It is under such conditions that the clearest exposition of our thought is necessary because when one speaks to workers he is compelled to reduce his ideas into the simplest terms. On Page 33 I asked the following question: "What methods will the workers be compelled to use in order to destroy the political power of the capitalists and to establish their own power?" And I went on:

"In countries, such as Germany and Italy, where the fascists have destroyed every right that the workers ever had, it is perfectly clear that the workers will be compelled to use violence in order to get rid of their fascist oppressors. But how about the United States, England or France?" — the pamphlet was written in 1938 before the Vichy government took control — "In these countries the workers have the right to vote. Why is it not possible for them to elect a majority of socialists in Congress or in Parliament and establish socialism by law?"

"A peaceful change," I wrote, "is an ideal most desirable. Everyone, especially the revolutionary socialists, will

(Continued on page 4)

Distinction Between Prediction and Advocacy

(Continued from page 3)

subscribe to that idea" — I say a peaceful change, I do not say a violent one — "the question, however, is not whether it is desirable but whether it is possible. On the statute books of most of the states there are criminal syndicalism laws" — and the Smith Law, upon which the second count of this indictment is based, is a criminal syndicalism law — "providing long prison sentences for anyone who advocates the overthrow of the government by violence. Such laws will be as effective as laws against the occurrence of earthquakes. For revolutions cannot be prevented by any law. Like convulsions in nature, they are the result of the evolution of forces beyond the power of man to stop."

Then here comes the significant section, the section that should settle all doubts concerning the question — "On the basis of history and of theory, we are justified in predicting that the capitalist class will not surrender power to the working class without a violent struggle. History knows no example of the peaceful surrender of an exploiting minority to an oppressed majority. The actual conduct of the capitalist class at the present time, the violence which it uses against the workers when they strike for an improvement in their conditions, confirm the historical lesson, and justify the prediction that they, who will lose their wealth and power, will utilize all forms of violence against the overwhelming majority."

What possible interpretation can anyone who is free of prejudice place upon that paragraph other than that I predict, but I do not advocate, the use of violence. I concluded: "The form of government in the United States practically guarantees the ruling class its domination against the will of the majority of the people. To introduce socialism

"We Are Justified In Predicting Capitalists Will Not Surrender Power To Workers Without Violent Struggle"

by law would require an amendment to the Constitution and for that, a two-thirds majority of both houses of Congress and a majority in three-fourths of the state legislatures is required. Thirteen small and backward states could prevent any Amendment to the Constitution. Revolutionary socialists all favor a peaceful transformation of the present order to the socialist order" — we favor it, we want it, we desire it, then how, I ask, can we advocate the contrary — "but he is insane who thinks that millions of workers will consent to starve because a minority of exploiters will threaten to, and will actually use violence against them."

I continue reading: "If there is any one thing that will prevent the capitalists from using violence, it will be the strong organizations of the working class. The greater the strength of the working class organizations, the less violence will there be."

If, after reading this section of my pamphlet and after reading my column published in *The Militant* of March 29, 1941, the prosecution still insists in pressing this case, it must be that Washington wants a conviction regardless of the evidence. Possibly the prosecution missed this section of my pamphlet and missed the column which I wrote, but they know about them now and have known about them for several weeks; and for the prosecution to continue this case can mean nothing else but a determination to get a conviction regardless of the evidence.

States has not very many colonies in the strict sense of the word, but it has billions of dollars invested in Latin America and in other parts of the world and it wants markets in China, in the Far East.

One of the government witnesses, Mr. Harris I believe, was a member of the Marine Corps and he testified that he was stationed in China sometime ago and Mr. Anderson praised him to the sky for serving his country in China. We do not conceal our belief that the marines in China are not there to protect the interests of the people of the

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD IMPERIALIST WAR

When we state that this is an imperialist war, it follows that we cannot possibly support the administration in its war efforts. You may not agree with us — some of you undoubtedly think that we are wrong — but I hope that in considering the evidence in this case, your opinion as to the correctness or incorrectness of our attitude on the war should not sway in the least your decision.

Mr. Cannon explained in his testimony for the defense that opposition to the war means non-support in a political sense. If any member of our party were a member of Congress, he would not vote for a declaration of war, nor would he vote for the war budget. No matter how much we may antagonize any jury, we must say that because it is the truth.

Certain expressions found in some of the literature introduced by the government have been emphasized by the prosecution, especially the expression, "Turn imperialist war into civil war". This expression is not found in our Declaration of Principles. I never used it either in my pamphlet or in any of the columns I wrote for *The Militant*. But it has been used, and by great socialists, and at times it has been repeated by some of our members. If you should take this expression into consideration, you must take it in connection with our general program which says that we must win over a majority of the people. The expression is correctly interpreted as follows: If, in the midst of the war or at the end of the war, a majority of the people, tired and weary and driven by the agony and suffering to which they will be subjected by the war, will accept our ideas and decide to take power, then if the minority will resist, the result will be that the imperialist war will be turned into a civil war. That is the only correct way to interpret that expression in the light of our Declaration of Principles which says that we must win a majority of the people over to our ideas.

We say now and we shall continue to say it as long as we are permitted, that war is a result of the conflict between imperialist nations.

WE PREDICTED THIS WAR

The exhibits introduced by the government show that long before the war began we predicted that it would come. Were we then responsible for it when we predicted its coming? Who is responsible for the war? In the last analysis,

FASCISM IS THE PRODUCT OF DECAYING CAPITALISM

Even assuming that Hitler should be defeated, fascism will not be destroyed because fascism is not a product of Hitler but it is a product of a decaying capitalist system. Dislocation of economy is bound to follow this war; millions of men will be thrown out of work, misery and suffering will be their lot and in such a situation fascism is bound to flourish. It is in such a situation that the fascist demagogues of Germany succeeded in gaining power. The German people, crushed and humiliated by the Versailles peace, not given a chance to work and live, were thrown into the arms of Hitler. Should capitalism continue to exist after this war, fascism is inevitable unless the masses of people take their fate into their own hands and create a socialist order.

Should war last a long time, the possibility of a peace between the imperialist nations is very great. The British ruling class and the American ruling class can easily come to terms with Hitler if they cannot defeat him, but not so the working masses; they must fight Hitler to the very death — especially the socialists who know the fate that awaits them if Hitler is victorious.

The prosecution statement that in a war between the United States and Germany the defendants will prefer a victory of Germany is made either because of complete ignorance of our position or because of a malicious intention to falsify our position. Mr. Anderson said that in his opening statement. At that time, he did not perhaps know our position with reference to this question. Let no one dare, however, to stand up before you now after the exhibits have been introduced and say that we want a Hitler victory.

OUR PROGRAM TO DEFEAT FASCISM

We say that to defeat Hitlerism it is necessary for the masses to assume leadership in that struggle.

What is the fundamental reason for Hitler's victories? Is it simply because he has been preparing for a longer time? How could he win his victories if a large section of the German people did not support him? To say that the German people, a great and cultured people, willingly accept the violent regime of Hitler is to insult the Germans. They are, however, given no alternative; it is either supporting Hitler or suffering a crushing defeat at the hands of the British imperialists and they fear that more than they fear a Hitler victory.

Hitler can come to the German people and say truthfully: The British ruling class has a monopoly on the wealth of this world; we ought to have our share of it. When he attacks Churchill and the British ruling class, he is speaking the truth — at least 90 per cent of the time; when he talks about his own intentions, he speaks nothing but lies. The same is true of Churchill who tells the truth only when he is attacking Hitler.

The situation would be entirely changed if in England the workers would establish their own socialist government and if in the United States a Workers' and Farmers' Gov-

United States but the interests of the Standard Oil Company and other big companies who have investments in China. The capitalists of this country are not interested in the development of China; they are interested in China because it furnishes them a market for the sale of their goods and a field for the investment of their capital.

The same thing is true with reference to Latin America. Roosevelt, representing the interests of the American capitalists, is not interested in the welfare of the people of Latin America. The claim that the present administration is interested in fighting for democracy can be disproved by the fact that when Franco was fighting the Loyalist government in Spain, the present administration declared its neutrality. It was not interested in defending democracy so long as there was no threat to the economic interests of the American capitalist class.

not even Hitler who fired the first shot, is responsible. As far as we are concerned, the responsibility for this war is primarily upon the system that creates the imperialist rivalries. On the basis of the present system Leagues of Nations, Kellogg Peace Pacts and all the good intentions in the world cannot preserve peace.

Most of you are old enough to remember the statements that were made during the last war, that it was a war for democracy and it was a war to end wars. And the results of the last war are visible to everyone — fascism and now another war. Who was right? Socialists like Lenin who said that without socialist revolutions all over the world there will be more imperialist wars, or the people who proclaimed that the first World War was the last war? We can predict with absolute certainty the same thing that Lenin predicted in the first World War: if socialism does not come, more wars will follow.

FASCISM MUST BE DESTROYED — HOW?

The vast majority of the people of this country are terribly afraid of Hitler and justifiably so. I don't think the isolationists are correct when they say that we do not have to fear an invasion of this country by Hitler. It is not a question of invasion; it is a question of imperialist rivalries and Hitler is no doubt the greatest potential enemy of the ruling group in this country and above all he is the greatest potential enemy of the American masses. The destruction of Hitler — and I am using Hitler as a symbol of fascism — is a task which should be undertaken by everyone who values freedom and culture. No nation is sure of liberty so long as fascism exists anywhere in the world.

But the question is: What method should be used in exterminating the fascist danger? We contend that this war is not a war against Hitlerism. The British ruling class is not hostile to fascism. It can be taken as an elementary proposition that the British ruling class is not interested in preserving democracy.

The people of Great Britain and the people of this country are interested in democracy and want to fight for it, but in our opinion to fight under the leadership of the Churchill government or under the leadership of any other capitalist government is to fight not for democracy but for the financiers and industrialists.

ernment would displace the present capitalist government.

Socialist governments in England and the United States would proclaim to the German people: "We have nothing against you; all we want is that you join us in creating a cooperative commonwealth throughout the whole world. We have no ambitions against your territory and we shall not do anything to deprive you of your liberty; revolt against Hitler and establish your own Socialist government." Hitler could not last one week after such an appeal. He would be destroyed by his own people.

This is our solution to the problem of Hitlerism. Unfortunately we are as yet too small a group really to influence the thought of the masses. It is not we who will create difficulties for the ruling class in this country; it is the war that will create those difficulties. Let us assume a war which will last five or even more years; the cost of living will be going up; over 50 per cent of our productive efforts will go for war purposes; the people in this country will be suffering as well as the people in England and in Germany and in Italy; and we hope that the day will come when all the peoples of the various countries will fraternize and put an end to the conflict which is now being fought to guard the interests of the ruling cliques.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE WILL INTENSIFY

It is nonsense to think that a small party like ours can, by its agitation, create dissatisfaction. What will create dissatisfaction is the war and we are not responsible for that.

The class struggle will go on during the war whether we agitate for it or not. We have very little influence in the labor movement but the struggle goes on right now. With the cost of living going up, the workers are bound to strike for higher wages and he is indeed foolish who thinks that, by putting us behind bars, strikes will cease. Neither will a revolutionary situation be prevented by putting us behind bars. It would be necessary to put the whole working class behind bars in order to assure the capitalists the kind of peace that they want. Hitler thinks that by his methods of force he can bring to an end the class struggle and this trial is an indication that the same methods will be used in this country. The spectre of fascism haunts this trial — a mass trial that is characteristic of trials in Italy and in Germany.

I do not mean to say that fascism is here; we still have a chance to argue before a jury, but the very fact that a large number of people can be dragged into court because of their ideas and writings is an indication that the monster of fascism is coming ever closer to us.

"Revolutionary defeatism" is another expression that the prosecution points to as something terrible to contemplate. I expressly defined that phrase in the column that I referred to before, published in *The Militant* of March 29, 1941. It simply means that we continue to advocate the class struggle during the war. By that is meant that if the workers have

(Continued on page 5)

WHY WE ARE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS

If you consider what motives have led the defendants into the socialist movement you can realize how absurd it is to accuse them of advocating violence. You have seen enough of the defendants and heard enough about their theories to convince you, I am certain, that it was not for personal gain that the defendants have become socialists. We are in a small minority and can therefore expect for a long time to come to meet only with hatred and scoffing, with persecution and prosecution. You can realize that we are in the socialist movement because we are devoted to its ideas and ideals.

If there is any one thing that impelled us to join the socialist movement, it is a hatred of the violence that exists in society — not only the physical violence but spiritual and moral violence — the violence which condemns children to starvation or semi-starvation because of the poverty of the parents, the violence which condemns children to go to work long before they have received an adequate education. Everywhere in society there is violence of one sort or another, culminating in the dreadful violence which sacrifices millions of human beings upon the altar of war. It is this violence which we hate that drives us into a movement which has as its ideal the creation of a world free from violence, where human beings will cooperate in the production of goods to satisfy their needs, where peace and security will prevail.

We are, of course, not pacifists. We do not believe with Ghandi that it is wrong for three hundred million people in India to use violence to drive out the British oppressors who claim to be fighting a war for democracy. As much as we hate the violence that exists in society, we see no alternative to the necessity of destroying the violence of the minority with the violence of the majority. But to accuse us of wanting and advocating violence is to accuse us of something that is revolting to our very nature.

Perhaps it would be fitting to close this section of my argument by quoting some people who are not in the ranks of the defendants and who can hardly be accused of being against the government.

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

None other than Abraham Lincoln said this in his first inaugural address.

"I hold a little revolution now and then as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical."

The man who uttered this sentiment is not on trial. It was Thomas Jefferson.

OUR POSITION ON THE WAR

It would stand to reason that, once having settled the central question of the case, whether or not we advocate or predict violence, there should not be much more to say. But you will excuse me, ladies and gentlemen, if I continue the argument on matters that in my opinion are subsidiary but which the prosecution has emphasized over and over again.

OUR ANTI-WAR OPINIONS ARE BEING PROSECUTED

There is at present no law making it a crime to oppose the war. But I am safe in saying that our opposition to the war is one of the most important, if not the most important, factor in explaining this prosecution. The rules of evidence do not permit me, as I indicated before, to go into the motives for the prosecution; but I would say that the address of Mr. Anderson yesterday and the emphasis which the prosecution has placed throughout the course of the trial on the party's position with reference to the war and with reference to our policy on military training, justifies the conclusion that to a large extent it is our opposition to the war that explains this prosecution.

To justify the introduction of our position on the war into evidence, the government contends that our opposition to the entry of the United States into the war, and our statement that we will continue to oppose the war even after the United States declares war, is evidence that we are conspiring to overthrow the government by force and violence. A far-fetched and an unreasonable contention! There are pacifists, conscientious objectors and others opposed to the war who are not interested in establishing socialism or overthrowing the government. There are socialists of a type that support the war. Only we revolutionary socialists who oppose the war are prosecuted.

As I indicated, there is no law preventing us from opposing the war. Nor is there a law which prohibits people

There is always the danger that Mr. Anderson will claim that something is undeniable and uncontradicted and perhaps it will be said, if I refrain from discussing other matters in the case, that I was afraid to do so.

The government follows a simple principle. It first assumes that the defendants are guilty of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence and then it introduces evidence of our position and policies on various questions in order to prove that all of our activities are based on one motive and that is to further the conspiracy. If the defendants oppose the war, that shows that they are guilty of the central conspiracy; if they are active in the trade unions, that proves the same thing, and thus with all the activities of the defendants.

There are many people in this country opposed to our entry into the war, but since they are not members of the Socialist Workers Party they have the right to do so, but we who are members of the Socialist Workers Party have no such right.

The government of course did not have to introduce any evidence with reference to our opposition to the war; we would gladly have stipulated that we are guilty of that. As a matter of fact, the government could have shortened the case by at least two weeks if it had come to us and asked us to stipulate the facts on a great many questions which it laboriously attempted to prove. We could have stipulated that we oppose the war, that we visited Leon Trotsky and that we sent men to guard him, that we advocate the creation of Workers Defense Guards, etc. These things are found in our principles. Ninety per cent of what the government tried to prove, we would have stipulated to and we could then have gone to the heart of the question as to whether or not we conspired to advocate the overthrow of the government by force. But since the government took all this trouble to prove things that we admit, it is necessary for me to explain those policies and analyze them.

The government accuses us of two things with reference to the war, one, that we oppose it, and two, that we intend to take advantage of a revolutionary situation which we expect the war to create.

While it is true that we hold wars to be inevitable under the capitalist system, it is also true that we would like to avoid them. War is the greatest destructive force in modern society. If this war should last for years, it may well be that all the resources of society will be exhausted and not even a social revolution could solve the problems of mankind. With the exhaustion of all the material and spiritual forces of society, the possibility of creating a new social system is very slim. We would then have to wait until the material and spiritual resources of mankind are resuscitated.

It is our duty to prevent war if possible and to shorten the war if war is declared in spite of our efforts. We shall try to convince the masses that in order to live and in order to permit their children and their children's children to live, they are under an obligation to end the war and create a socialist order.

from saying that they will continue to oppose the war even after war is declared. Of course when war will be declared, the Espionage Act will come into effect, making certain statements about the war unlawful, but thus far war has not been declared and I am certain that no one could be convicted simply for a statement that he intends to oppose the war even after it will be declared.

WHERE WE STAND ON THE WAR

Our reasons for our opposition to the war have been sufficiently clarified by the testimony of the defense and I need not go into detail. We consider the war, on the part of England, of Germany, of France, of Italy, of Japan and of the United States as imperialist in character. We do not hesitate to admit that. We have written and said it thousands of times.

What do we mean by characterizing the war on the part of these countries as imperialist? We mean that the ruling classes which are responsible for the war and which lead the masses into the war are fighting to protect or to acquire markets, colonies, sources of raw material and spheres of influence. Germany wants the colonies that England has. England came upon the scene first, grabbed off most of the rich colonies in the world, and now Germany is trying to get some of these colonies away from England. The United

Our Party Favors Compulsory Military Training

"With Fascism On Scene, We Recognize That All Important Questions Will Be Settled By Military Means"

(Continued from page 4)

any grievances, they should demand the settlement of those grievances and if no settlement is made, they should go on strike. Will that interfere with the military effort? The responsibility is not that of the workers but of the employers who refuse to settle the grievances.

WHAT POLITICAL OPPOSITION MEANS

In that same article I state that we want to carry on our agitation and gain a majority even during the war. But so long as we have no majority, there is nothing for us to do except to submit to the majority. "To submit to the majority", ladies and gentlemen, that phrase is found several times in my column. Do the prosecutors expect us to change our ideas because there is a war? Do they want us to stop thinking? Yes, we want to convince workers and soldiers that our ideas are correct and until we convince the majority, we are willing to submit to the decisions of the majority. For any government to demand anything more than that means practically introducing fascism.

In that article I expressly state that our party opposes sabotage, opposes any individual or group action which would obstruct the conduct of the war. If the prosecutors were fair and had the power to dismiss this case, they would do so without hesitation the moment their attention was brought to this column. He who would contend, after reading that article, that we are in favor of a victory of Hitler or that we would practice sabotage, does not want to read correctly.

THE PROLETARIAN MILITARY POLICY OF OUR PARTY

The indictment charges us with conspiring to create insurrection and disobedience in the armed forces of the United States. It is important to discuss our so-called military policy. The government depends upon that policy, I think, in its attempt to convince you that we are guilty of that section of the indictment.

When the question of compulsory military service was first taken up in Congress and a discussion upon it began in the country, our party felt it necessary to take a position on that question.

As you know, there are people in this country who are pacifists and conscientious objectors who, under no circumstances, would fight in the armed forces or even allow themselves to be drafted for military service. There are many socialists who take a similar stand.

We, on the other hand, considered the situation from its fundamental aspect, namely, that in this epoch when fascism has come upon the scene with its horrible violence, it is futile not to recognize the fact that all important questions will be settled by military means. Not only futile, but extremely dangerous! Of all groups in society, we are most vehemently opposed to war but so long as war exists in the world and so long as there are fascists ready to use violence against the working class, every worker has the duty of training to defend himself. Young people will have to go to war whether they like it or not and since that is the case, we are in favor of having our youth trained in the arts of war. Modern warfare requires great technical skill and he is foolish who does not understand that it is necessary to acquire that skill.

We cannot tell the young generation to oppose military training when we know that it will be dragged into war. And it is on the basis of this fundamental proposition that we say to the young men: Do not resist compulsory military training; go into the army and do your best to get the training necessary to defend yourselves against the enemy from without and — we also added — against the enemy from within. In a world where fascism and violence and war dominates the scene, it is necessary for you to accept military training in order to defend yourselves.

Naturally, we would like our members, wherever they are, in the factory or in a union or in the army, to propagate our ideas, but we understand that the army is not a place where one can speak as freely as outside of the army. We don't like it but we are realistic enough to understand that in the army it is necessary to be cautious. Just as a trade unionist in an open shop must be careful in propagating his ideas for trade unionism, so must a soldier in the army be careful in propagating ideas frowned upon by the generals. In the army, of course, it is far more dangerous to propagate socialism than it is to propagate trade unionism in an open shop. The greatest open shop institution in this country is the United States Army.

Conditions in our army are not so bad now as they were fifty or a hundred years ago. There was a time when it was impossible for a human being who was not brutalized to remain in the army. That has been changed and not without a struggle.

FOR EQUAL RIGHTS IN THE ARMY

At present we advocate the idea that soldiers in the army should be on terms of equality with the officers. We consider the private soldiers equal in every way, except from the point of view of technical training, to the officers and we insist that they be treated in the same way as officers are treated. We advocate legislation compelling the officers to treat privates with respect and to change the rules which permit officers in charge of a military tribunal to inflict inhuman punishment for some minor infraction of the Military Code.

The government has introduced evidence that we urge the soldiers to kick about their food. I do not know whether there have been complaints about food in the army. If the food is not good, then the soldiers, including members of our party who are drafted, should kick about the food. If the prosecution is interested in preventing such complaints about the food, then let it see to it that the soldiers are provided with good food. Are we in a situation where soldiers must eat rotten food without complaining? That seems to be the theory of the prosecution.

WHY WORKERS FOLLOW US

Here I want to point out to you the absurdity of the accusation levelled against us to the effect that we send our members into the army in order to kick about food and create insubordination. Do you think we could win any influence in that way, and after all, that is our main aim — to win

Of course, under Mr. Anderson's theory, to teach socialism constitutes, in and of itself, sabotage. He stated that, but he does not claim that we would try to sabotage the army by doing something to the rifles or to the planes or cannons so that they could not be used properly. The prosecutors simply claim that, if the soldiers listen to our theories, they will not fight for the government. In other words, socialism is sabotage to the prosecutors regardless of the fact that we say over and over again that so long as we are not in a majority, we can do nothing but what we are told to do.

THE COURT: We will adjourn now.

MORNING SESSION.

Friday, November 28, 1941.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. GOLDMAN: Once more I beg your indulgence for taking so much of your time. Last night I went through my notes and I cut out enough to shorten my argument by about four hours. If, in your deliberations, someone asks why did not Goldman touch upon this matter and that matter, then the answer is that I had to refrain from discussing many questions because of lack of time.

Yesterday, in discussing the question of whether or not we advocate or predict violence, I forgot to mention the fact that in the majority of instances where violence is mentioned in the exhibits, it refers to defense against the fascists. This is an important point which I ask you to consider in your deliberations.

people over to our ideas, and thus gain influence. How do you think Vincent Dunne and Farrell Dobbs and Miles Dunne and Carl Skoglund and all the other leaders of Local 544 succeeded in gaining influence over the truck drivers? Simply by kicking?

And certainly not by proclaiming themselves to be Trotskyists. You can readily assume that the 6,000 truck drivers do not follow their leadership because it is composed of Socialist Workers Party members. The vast majority of the truck drivers is composed of Republicans, Democrats and Farmer-Laborites. But these people also voted for Farrell Dobbs and Vincent and Miles Dunne as their union leaders. Why? Because they saw in them men who have served their interests. The truck drivers may not even like the fact that those defendants who are leaders of Local 544 are socialists; but still they vote for them because they see in the defendants men who guard the interests of the workers. Our party members in Local 544 did not win influence among the truck drivers because they taught socialism, but because they improved the conditions under which the truck drivers worked.

The same thing holds with reference to any of our members who may be in the army. They did not gain influence by teaching the abstract doctrine of socialism, but by taking care of the soldiers' interests. It is true that we take ad-

vantage of every opportunity to teach the ideas of socialism. But we feel the socialist ideas will take root, not at present, when the vast majority of the people is satisfied with its conditions, but in the future when the masses will be driven to accept new ideas because of their suffering and privations. Human beings are very slow to change their ideas. The hu-

MILITARY TRAINING UNDER TRADE UNION CONTROL

We have put forth the idea of military training under trade union control. As Mr. Cannon testified, a training camp was operated in Plattsburg, New York, for the purpose of training businessmen and professional men as officers, and the government furnished the necessary funds. Why not have training camps where the trade unions could train their men both as soldiers and as officers?

In our opinion the great majority of generals and higher officers in the army are hostile to the laboring class. The higher officers are raised and trained in an environment which makes them hostile to the workers. They are not interested in democracy or in fighting for democracy. Have not the events in France confirmed our opinion in that respect? The American and British generals are not any different from the French generals. Who surrendered to Germany? Not the rank and file, but Petain and Weygand and the other generals in command of the French army. Who permitted the Germans to enter Norway? Not the rank and file soldiers, but the fascists in the upper ranks. We say plainly that we do not trust the generals and higher officers to fight for democracy.

Because of that we propose that the trade unions train their own officers — officers in whom the workers can have confidence and whom they can control. And you must remember, when you consider this point, that the trade unions are not under the control of the Socialist Workers Party, but under the control of men who are, from our viewpoint, very conservative, and even reactionary. Still, rather than have officers trained at West Point, we prefer to have them trained under trade union control because the trade unions are organizations of workers. Furthermore, you must remember that our program of military training under trade union control is a legislative program. We want Congress to pass legislation making such training possible by appropriating funds for that purpose.

Of course, as with all other activities and policies of the Socialist Workers Party, our idea of military training under trade union control is evidence, as far as the prosecution is concerned, of a conspiracy to overthrow the government by force. No matter what we do, it is taken by the government as evidence of this conspiracy. If we opposed military training, that would constitute evidence of a conspiracy; when we are for military training, that is brought in as evidence of a conspiracy!

WHY WE WANT WORKERS DEFENSE GUARDS

Another policy of ours which the government introduced

man mind is surrounded by a crust of all the ideas it has absorbed from childhood, and not until events destroy that crust is it ready to accept new ideas. It is because we want to get the confidence of the workers and the soldiers that we defend their immediate interests, and do not merely teach them the abstract doctrine of socialism.

as evidence of a conspiracy is our proposal of establishing Workers Defense Guards. We have no hesitation to admit that we would like to see the workers create such defense guards. I shall even admit — and let the government make the most of it — that if Workers Defense Guards should be created, they would defend the revolution of the majority against the violence of the minority. We shall do our utmost to create Workers Defense Guards so that when the majority of the people take power, it will be able to put down any revolt by the minority.

The charge that is levelled against us, you must remember, is that we are conspiring to overthrow and to advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. The government must first prove that charge beyond a reasonable doubt, and it cannot prove it by introducing evidence that we advise the establishment of Workers Defense Guards or a Union Defense Guard. If the jury agrees with me that we do not advocate the use of violence, but predict that the minority will use violence against the majority, then everything else is immaterial. It is perfectly proper for us to propose to workers the idea of creating defense guards to protect them against fascist violence, and mind you, we are not advocating a policy of creating defense guards of our own members. We want the workers to build these defense guards.

Unfortunately, they have not as yet followed our proposals. The fascist danger is not so evident to the workers as it is to us, and they have not acted in accordance with our proposals. This is a fine example of the idea that it is not agitation that can bring certain things into existence. If conditions are not ripe for it, then we can talk from now until doomsday and the workers will not follow our advice. There is not a single Workers Defense Guard in the United States today.

MR SCHWEINHOUT (Prosecutor): That statement, that there is not a single defense guard in the United States today, is not brought out by the evidence. The contrary has been established. As a matter of fact, in March of this year the Union Defense Guard was in existence in Minneapolis.

MR. GOLDMAN: I still contend on the basis of the evidence that there does not exist a single defense guard in the United States at the present time.

THE COURT: Well, the jury will remember what the evidence was on that particular question.

(To be continued next week)

ITALIAN FASCISTS FEAR MASS REVOLT

Signs of Crumbling Fascist Rule Multiply; Regime Dreads Coming Revolutionary Tide

By Don Dore

Italy's Fascist regime, prototype of all fascist systems, can no longer conceal the symptoms of its impending breakdown. Events of the past few months strongly indicate the internal forces which are destined to overthrow Mussolini's rule. It is above all the Italian workers, soldiers and peasants whom the Fascist bosses fear will end Italy's ruthless political dictatorship, established two decades ago by the Italian industrialists and big landowners.

That fear was openly displayed at Trieste three weeks ago in the staging of the first public political "trial" in Italy since 1930.

In this "trial", conducted by the Fascist Special Tribunal for Defense of the State, 60 persons were cross-examined in an attempt to make them repeat publicly "confessions" allegedly made to the secret police. These "confessions", it was charged, linked the defendants with Yugoslavian "terrorist" groups alleged to have been planning to "sabotage" war industries and transportation systems, assassinate Mussolini, seize state power and set up a "Soviet republic".

All the defendants had been "tried" and convicted previously before a secret tribunal, the customary method of dealing with political opponents of the regime. The purpose of this public mock "trial", therefore, was solely for its political effect on the Italian people.

REASON FOR THE TRIAL

This "trial", to begin with, was unexpectedly staged during the most critical phase of the Italian imperialist war efforts. The Italian "empire" has been stripped of most of its colonies. Its economy is tottering. In the past two months, the regime has had to strike another blow at the already low living standards of the Italian masses, through a series of drastic rationing decrees. Not merely the nature of the "trial", but the time and circumstances in which it was held, indicate that it was intended first of all to demonstrate that the regime,

weakened as it is by the war, is strong enough and vigilant enough to deal with all internal opposition.

The "trial" in itself is an admission of the regime's fear of growing unrest. But even more than to terrorize and intimidate the internal enemies of the fascist rule, its purpose was to discredit the motives and origins of such opposition.

The government represented the "plot" as being confined largely to a "movement of a conspirative nature, formed in Trieste and the surrounding provinces." Trieste formerly belonged to Jugo-Slavia, and it has, consequently, a large "foreign" population. Thus, the government sought to give the impression that the unrest in Italy did not come from the native Italian people.

MUSSOLINI PARROTS THE DEMOCRACIES

The defendants were charged with being connected with "an organization formerly existing in Yugoslavia and made up of refugees supported and aided in turn by persons of foreign nationality." The acts of "terrorism" and "sabotage" allegedly committed or planned by the defendants were "directly or indirectly maneuvered by foreign powers and had insurrectional aims." The political views of the defendants ranged "from democracy to communism, from communism to terrorism — all imbued with anti-Italian hatred."

The indictment emphasized that the defendants conducted propagandistic activities to establish an atmosphere "favorable to their

dream of a Soviet republic."

From this it appears that the purpose of the "trial" was to discredit revolutionary ideas by linking communism with "democracy" and "terrorism", and depicting internal opposition to the government as the work of "spies" and "saboteurs in the pay of 'foreign powers' — presumably the Allied governments.

Mussolini uses the time-worn device of labeling internal opposition as "foreign", and seeks to strengthen his hold on the Italian masses by an appeal to their fear of domination by a victorious Britain. The Italian workers and peasants know what happened to the German people after the last war ended in the Versailles Treaty, and they know that the "democratic" imperialists hold the same fate in store for them. Mussolini's strongest weapon in maintaining his regime during the war is the Italian people's fear of what an Allied victory will mean for the Italian people, and he never hesitates to exploit it. All those who want to overthrow me, he says, want a victory for Britain. Thus he parrots the arguments of the reactionary forces in the democratic countries who accuse the advocates of a socialist change of wanting the victory of the fascists.

RECENT DECREES

In addition to this "trial", there have been even more direct signs of the widening fissures in the crumbling fascist regime. On Dec. 2, the day of the opening of the Trieste "trial", Mussolini issued a decree directing the greatest shakeup in the history of the Fascist National Council. Twenty-eight new council members were named and 21 others were removed.

This shakeup follows a similar one of Oct. 25, when the Duce was forced to announce a complete "reorganization" of the leadership of the Fascist guilds, which direct virtually every phase of Italian economic organization. At least 19 of the 22 highest officials were removed or

reduced in rank. These included heads of "corporations" of every vital industry. Other war-time purges have occurred among the army commanders, Mussolini's cabinet and the Fascist party leadership.

Much of the dissension which these purges reveal in the official ranks of the Fascists is undoubtedly the result of dissatisfaction with the increasing encroachment of the Nazis in the internal administrative affairs of Italy. For the past year Nazi functionaries and military agents have been infiltrating deeper and deeper into the administrative machinery of the Italian government, usurping many of the functions and power of the Italian officials. They have already taken over the operations of some of the most vital phases of Italian economy, including the railway systems.

This has been a most unpleasant experience to the Fascist functionaries, but they have had to accept it as the only alternative to a possible complete collapse of their administrative machinery. Thus, not only does Hitler protect the Italian ruling class from its external rivals, but from the Italian masses as well.

THE ITALIAN ECONOMY

The disintegration of the Fascist machinery of control is in part a reflection of its own corruption. Italian capitalist economy, weak at best and incapable of sustaining a major war effort, has been further undermined by the unrestrained graft, hoarding, speculation, profiteering and all-around thievery of the Fascist officials from top to bottom. This has intensified the scarcity of consumers goods and boosted prices skyward.

The recent "reorganizations" among the various Fascist bodies have been, in part, an attempt by Mussolini to provide scapegoats on whom to fix the blame for the

terrible mass living conditions now prevailing in Italy. He hoped, no doubt, that this would quiet the increasing mass unrest resulting from the open thiev-

ery and flaunting of privileges practised by the Fascist officials.

RATIONS IN ITALY

Under the guise of safeguarding the people from "hoarders" and "speculators" — that is, the Fascist ruling class itself — Mussolini on Oct. 1 further reduced the already inadequate food rations, the meagre clothing and fuel allotments, etc. That mainstay of all impoverished European nations — bread — was limited to 200 grams daily per person, about 7 ounces, or less than that allowed in the Nazi-occupied countries of Norway, Denmark and France.

Spaghetti, traditional bread substitute of the Italian poor, was limited to 65 grams, 2½ ounces daily, per person. Meat is virtually unknown to the ordinary worker and peasant. Potatoes, milk, eggs, cheese, olive oil, fats, are rationed out by the ounce.

The Italian masses each day see the further collapse of Mussolini's boasts and pretenses. The Ethiopian adventure has ended not with expanded empire and resources but with the loss even of the old Italian North African colonies. Mussolini has nothing to show for the hundreds of thousands of lives wasted in the imperialist ventures of his regime but paralyzing debts and a ruined industrial system, and economic restrictions and starvation for the masses.

Moreover, the Italian people observe the commanded trains, guarded by Nazi troops, rolling constantly north, laden with the produce of Italy. Everywhere throughout Italy, they see Nazi uniforms and suffer the insolence and contempt of the Nazi officers and officials. They cannot help but feel increasingly that they are dominated by a foreign conqueror, and that Mussolini himself is nothing but the helpless captive of his more powerful German imperialist ally.

The possibility of the overthrow of Italian Fascism by a popular internal revolution is recognized in important circles in this country. There has been

no little speculation as to who will overthrow and what class will rule the new order in Italy.

WHO WOULD REPLACE MUSSOLINI?

There is no question but that leading circles of American capitalism strongly desire the maintenance of the capitalist order in Italy. They would be content with any capitalist regime, provided it would support American and British, rather than Nazi, interests.

But where among the present Italian ruling class is there a group which is not tainted with the Fascist brush and which can command the support of the Italian masses in the establishment of a new government which might be friendly to the interests of the bourgeois democratic powers?

Pertinax, an authoritative political commentator, declared in a Washington dispatch in the New York Times, Oct. 8:

"It has been said that the Duke of Aosta and the generals of the army were ready to come forward at the first opportunity and take the helm (in Italy). This is another case of wishful thinking. To start with, the Duke and before him his father and mother proved towers of strength to Premier Mussolini in the early days of his dictatorship and they have never changed. The responsibility of the entire royal family is too deeply involved in the Fascist undertaking for any one of them to ever take the lead in the great experiment has broken down."

Both the Italian capitalists, the present beneficiaries of Fascism, and the reactionary capitalist interests in this country and England face a dilemma. They all alike fear socialist revolution in Italy, yet have no satisfactory alternative leadership and program to offer the Italian masses.

The pre-conditions for a socialist revolution exist in full force in Italy today. Its coming would kindle a fire throughout all Europe, in Germany and the occupied countries, which would destroy fascism more quickly and surely than all the outside armies of the world put together.

THE MILITANT

Formerly the SOCIALIST APPEAL

VOL. V. — No. 52 Saturday, December 27, 1941

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

Editor:
FELIX MORROW
Business Manager:
LYDIA BEIDEL

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

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

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

Lynch Incitements

The Stalinist *Daily Worker* last week published two editorials attacking Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party. The virulent tone and general content of these editorials can be construed as nothing less than an indictment to lynch violence against the members of the Socialist Party and all other working-class groups who are critical of administration policies.

Informed people who know the methods of Stalinism in attacking its political opponents in the working-class movement, will recognize as a typical Stalinist slander the charge that the Socialist Party wants "the defeat of the United States in the fight against Hitler." (*Daily Worker*, Dec. 17).

That is precisely the way in which Mussolini attacks his political opponents. During the trials in Trieste several weeks ago, the Fascist prosecutors accused 71 opponents of their regime of "acting for foreign powers." The *Daily Worker*, Dec. 11, itself rejected this Fascist characterization.

One does not have to agree with the Socialist Party's ideas to defend the right of its members to freely express their opinions in war-time as in peace. Nor does one need to know any more of Stalinism than its lynch provocation in this instance to understand that it is seeking to silence its political opponents with methods used everywhere by reactionaries — including the Nazi and Fascist variety.

We use the term "lynch provocation" advisedly. That is the clear intent of these vicious editorials against the Socialist Party. It is part of the Stalinist campaign to invoke totalitarian repression against all those working-class groups which do not vote "ja" on everything the administration says and, more particularly, which continue their opposition to Stalinism.

The Communist Party, acting under a cloak of patriotism, wants to deprive its working-class opponents of the right to speak, to exist as legal political movements, to publish literature and hold meetings.

Such incitement of totalitarian measures against working-class political minorities, we may be sure, will prove in the end to be a knife in the back of the Stalinist workers themselves. The very amalgam used by the Communist Party, in identifying its opponents in the workers' movement with the Nazi and Japanese imperialists, is being used by Congress right now against the Stalinists. On Dec. 19 the House passed a bill requiring the Communist Party to register the names of its members with the Department of Justice and linking the Communist Party with the German-American Bund as "agents of foreign governments."

The American labor movement and all liberal groups must be on guard against this Stalinist attempt to use the war situation to incite lynch terror against the civil rights of the Communist Party's opponents in the labor movement.

Bosses' Sacrifices

The voice of reaction is loud in the land demanding that labor "sacrifice" to the limit for the war by surrendering its right to strike and its legitimate demands such as the union shop.

Yet from nowhere among the ruling circles does there come a call upon the industrialists and financiers to make one iota of sacrifice. The halls of Congress are mute on the question of the staggering profits which the leading monopoly corporations are milking out of the war program.

Reports of the Federal Reserve Board show that

for the first six months of this year, net corporate profits exceeded those of the corresponding period of 1940 by 25 per cent. It is conservatively estimated that net corporate profits for this entire year will be well over 30% greater than 1940.

But that doesn't tell the whole story. The handful of dominant corporations which have most of the war orders have increased their profits about 170 per cent since the start of the war in 1939. Profits for the big steel corporations have soared 1,300 per cent; other war industries are showing increases of from 500 to 1,000 per cent.

War's hardship for the capitalists is to wear their fingers to the bone clipping dividend coupons. Their contribution to the war is to pile up the war costs.

It's about time for organized labor to call a halt to the threats and demands of the reactionaries. It's about time instead for the wage-earners and farmers to point the finger at the bosses and monopolists and demand an end to their outrageous profits.

Stalinists On The Trial

The Stalinist leadership is showing its anxiety over the growing support labor and liberal organizations have extended to the 18 Socialist Workers Party and CIO members convicted in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial. Of particular concern to the Communist Party tops is the fact that no little of this support is coming from union locals where Stalinists have important influence.

The CP role in this historic civil liberties case has evoked such disgust in labor and liberal circles that the party now feels compelled to "explain" to workers and progressives generally, and its own followers in particular, why it sought to sabotage the defense.

Its "explanation" is given in the *Daily Worker*, Dec. 19, under the headline, "Minneapolis Trial Shows Labor Wary of Trotskyites." As this headline indicates, the Stalinist leaders seek to justify themselves by slanderously attributing their own foul role to the labor movement generally.

At the same time, they try to show that the Trotskyists deserved to be convicted, that the prosecution made the "mistake" of railroad the defendants for being Marxists and revolutionary socialists, instead of taking the *Daily Worker's* advice and using the Moscow Trials technique of framing up revolutionary socialists as "pro-Nazis". The SWP program, complains the *Daily Worker*, "was taken at face value by the prosecution."

By its contention that the prosecution had the right spirit but the wrong charges, the Communist Party seeks to whitewash an anti-labor prosecution which has been denounced by every leading civil rights group and liberal publication, and by unions representing tens of thousands of workers.

This article attempts, further, to counteract the publicity about the real program of Trotskyism, which this trial enabled the SWP to explain in detail before a national forum. For the first time, thousands upon thousands of workers, including Stalinists, learned that the Trotskyists are intransigent defenders of the Soviet Union, militant trade unionists, revolutionary fighters against fascism, uncompromising proponents of socialism. That is why the *Daily Worker* tries desperately to convince its readers that "there has been a general refusal to accept the evaluation of Trotskyites as 'radicals'."

But while seeking to show that the SWP defendants posed as 'radicals' in the trial, the *Daily Worker* at the same time tries to insinuate that the defendants sought to conceal their views. This is a further effort to blunt the impact of this trial on thinking Stalinist workers, who followed the press reports of the prosecution and know that the Minneapolis defendants gave the most outspoken and principled defense of Marxian socialism ever offered in an American courtroom.

How does it happen, Stalinist workers are undoubtedly asking themselves, that these Trotskyists whom our leaders characterize as "agents of fascism" dared to risk long prison terms by refusing to deny their Marxist principles and by boldly defending these principles? And these same Stalinist workers cannot help contrasting this courageous stand of the Trotskyists with the cowardly position of their own leaders in defense of Earl Browder. Everyone knows that Browder was framed up for his refusal to support the war preparations. Now the CP leaders do not dare state the real reason for Browder's imprisonment nor denounce those who engineered his frameup. Instead, they beg for Browder's release on the grounds that he is a 100 per cent supporter of those responsible for his imprisonment.

It is easy to understand the anxiety the Minneapolis trial is causing the Stalinist leaders. The Minneapolis prosecution has given the SWP an audience among the Stalinist workers it never had.

Lay-Offs In Auto

The Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission reported on Dec. 20 that 206,000 auto workers in the state would be laid off "in the next seven days" because of production curtailment.

Eventually, they will probably secure new employment on war production. But what is to happen to them in the meantime? Shall they be forced to live on inadequate unemployment compensation benefits — where they are lucky enough to get them — particularly when the layoffs are the result, as CIO leaders have charged, of the auto barons' "waste, inefficiency and needless duplication" in adjusting plant production from peace to war production?

The labor movement must raise the demand that all workers suffering from priorities unemployment be provided with government subsidies adequate to tide them through the period of unemployment.

Our Answer To Foster's Questions And Answers

Foster's Explanation of the Stalin-Hitler Pact Is Intended Only To Whitewash and Justify Course of the Stalinist Bureaucracy

By M. STEIN

Every time the members of the Communist Party are swept off their feet by a new turn in the party line, the C.P. apparatus sets the well-oiled "enlightenment" machine into motion. The object of this machine is to knock out of the party members' heads the ideas of yesterday, the ideas they have grown accustomed to seeing in their party publications and for which they argued so heatedly.

Simultaneously with this difficult operation, a new set of ideas is to be pounded home. And all this must be accomplished in a way which will leave unimpaired the "prestige" of the leadership and the infallibility of Stalin.

FOSTER TRIES TO CALM C. P. RANKS

In the "enlightenment" campaign now under way to put over the new war position of the C. P., William Z. Foster, appropriately enough, plays a prominent role. He did his bit in the first World War "to make the world safe for democracy" by peddling Liberty Bonds. He is no slacker this time either. Part of his modest contribution to the U. S. war effort consists of a column on the editorial page of the *Daily Worker* under the general heading: "The People's War: Questions and Answers." In it he undertakes each day to answer questions about the war which are agitating the minds of C. P. members.

In this article we wish to deal with his answer on Oct. 30 to the important question: "Did the USSR make a mistake in signing the non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany?" For the answer he gives is typical of all the other apologies made by the Stalinist bureaucrats for Stalin's policies before the German-Soviet war.

From the time of the signing of the Stalin-Hitler Pact up to the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union — almost two years — it has been drilled into the minds of the Stalinist rank and file that the Pact was just about the cleverest piece of strategy the world had ever seen, that in a world torn by war, Stalin had played his cards so well that he had succeeded in keeping the Soviet Union out of it.

COST OF THE PACT

To be sure, many Stalinists felt that it was a terrible price Stalin had paid for this peace. They knew from their own experiences and contacts that many workers held Stalin responsible for giving Hitler the green light for the opening of the Polish offensive, they knew that, so far as the best militants were concerned, the prestige of the Soviet Union in this period had reached the lowest point in its history.

But, argued the Fosters in that period of "enlightenment", life itself will teach the workers in time; for when the whole capitalist world lies in ruins, the Soviet Union will still be there in its full glory, attesting to the indisputable correctness of Stalin's course in signing the pact.

But the whole thin web of rationalization thus spun by the Stalinists was blown to bits by Hitler's armies, which laid waste the most productive, the most industrial sections of the country and killed and maimed countless hundreds of thousands of the bravest defenders of the Russian Revolution.

Foster's aim, it is clear from his answer to the question, is not to tell the truth to the C. P. rank and file, but only to salvage out of the debacle of the Stalin-Hitler Pact the prestige of his master, Joseph Stalin.

INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT

Foster makes three points in his answer: "First, in the period that the pact lasted the USSR increased industrial output by a full 25 per cent. . . . We do not know where Foster got his figures. The official Soviet figures, at least those which have been published, show on the contrary a decline in production. (See "How Stalin Cleared Road for Hitler" by John G. Wright, *Fourth International*, November, 1941).

But let us for the sake of argument take Foster's figures for a moment. What significance has this alleged increase in the face of the undeniable increase in German productivity? In this same period Hitler conquered the territories and workshops of all of Europe. And what is the sig-

picture of Europe and the world at the time of the Pact.

"Third," Foster informs his readers, "the attitude of England and the United States, because of events during the period of the pact, has become more friendly towards the USSR. . . . What a roundabout way of winning the friendship of England and the U. S.!! If Dale Carnegie does not have this method on his book on "How to Win Friends and Influence People", he must by all means include it.

Apparently by the time he came to the end of his article, Foster felt he had not been very convincing, for he concludes with the following: "Later experience will show that the signing of the pact with the Soviet Union was a major defeat for Hitler, which will eventually end up in his downfall."

EFFECT ON GERMAN WORKERS

That Hitler's downfall is imminent, we are convinced. But this will not occur because of the Pact, but despite it, and despite the treachery of Stalin and Foster. If anything, the Pact helped to prolong Hitler's regime. His gains from the Pact were not only military. Even more important, the Pact helped to solidify Hitler's home front and to disorder the working class everywhere. Germany had a great Socialist and Communist tradition and millions of workers who were supporters of either the Socialist or Communist Party. The Pact must have had the effect of a terrific blow to these workers, many of them in army uniforms today. How could they help but feel that Stalin had discovered some hidden virtues in their arch enemy, Hitler, that perhaps there were some progressive features about Hitler's war? And many of the German workers who were not thrown into Hitler's arms must assuredly fell into a mood of despair where they felt, "What is the use of opposing Hitler when he has even the Soviet Union lined up?"

DECISIVE CRITERION

The Stalin-Hitler Pact was only a link in the whole chain of Stalinist policy which is based on utter contempt for the independent role of the working class. This contempt by the Stalinist bureaucracy for the working class has its counterpart in their servility before the capitalist rulers. Not so long ago Laval, representing the French rulers at the time, was hailed as the best friend of the Soviet Union, then it was Hitler, now it is Roosevelt and Churchill.

It goes without saying that the Soviet Union because of capitalist encirclement is compelled to enter into pacts with one or another group of imperialists. What is criminal on the part of the Stalinists and Fosters is not the mere making of pacts, but their subordination of the revolutionary workers' movement in the interests of the imperialists who are temporarily in an alliance with the USSR.

There is another criterion. The value of pacts must be judged in the final analysis by their results. Did the Pact strengthen the relative position of the Soviet Union? The terrible position of the Soviet Union in the war today speaks for itself. Only a hardened Stalinist scribbler can maintain the contrary.

Union Contributors To Civil Rights Defense Committee

The Civil Rights Defense Committee, the organization mobilizing public support for the 18 members of the CIO and the Socialist Workers Party recently convicted under the Smith Gag Law in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial, this week published the following list of unions which have made financial contributions in support of the defense. Numerous other unions, which have passed resolutions condemning the prosecution, are not listed here. It is expected that the list of union contributors will be greatly swelled during coming months, while preparations for an appeal to higher courts are under way.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee stated that this list is incomplete, and that as names of the other union contributors are sent in by local branches of the C.R.D.C., they will be made public.

COUNCILS AND JOINT BOARDS

Bridgeport Industrial Union Council, Bridgeport, Conn.
San Francisco Industrial Union Council, San Francisco, Cal.
CIO Council, No. 2 Bucks Co., Quakertown, Pa.
Joint Board of Dress and Waistmakers' Union of Greater New York, Locals 10, 22, 60, 89, ILGWU, AFL.

Steel Workers Organizing Committee, CIO

Wickwire Spencer Local 1060, Buffalo, N. Y.
Local 1330, Youngstown, Ohio.
Local 1339, Jersey City, N. J.
Local 1725, Newark, N. J.
Republic Lodge 1743, Buffalo, N. Y.
Fedders Local 1753, Buffalo, N. Y.
Harrison Machinery Lodge 1833, Newark, N. J.
Local 2014, Newark, N. J.
Buffalo Machinery Lodge 2017, Buffalo, N. J.

United Auto Workers of America, CIO

District Council No. 11, Lockport, N. Y.
Dodge Local 3, Detroit, Mich.
Fisher Body Local 45, Cleveland, Ohio.
Plymouth Local 51, Detroit, Mich.
Local 88, Cleveland, Ohio.
Local 102, Eau Claire, Wisc.
Local 198, Cleveland, Ohio.
Local 203, Detroit, Mich.
Local 260, Newark, N. J.
Local 262, Detroit, Mich.
Local 407, Milwaukee, Wisc.
Local 410, Detroit, Mich.
Ford Local 425, Buffalo, N. Y.
Local 486, Cleveland, Ohio.
Local 490, Highland Park, Mich.
Local 511, Newark, N. J.
Local 560, Richmond, Calif.
Local 662, Anderson, Ind.
Sparks-Withington Local 666, Jackson, Mich.
Local 672, Trenton, N. J.
Local 751, Roxbury, Mass.
Local 764, Elkhart, Ind.
Local 805, Chicago, Ill.
Local 818, Detroit, Mich.
Local 836, Saginaw, Mich.

International Longshoremen & Warehousemen Union, CIO

Local 1-10, San Francisco, Calif.
Local 1-13, San Pedro, Calif.
Local 1-29, San Diego, Calif. (Directly to Local 544)

Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, CIO

Local 13, Staten Island, N. Y.
Local 15, Hoboken, N. J.
Local 44, Bayonne, N. J.

United Construction Workers Organizing Committee, CIO

Local 135, Chicago, Ill.
Local 177, Chicago, Ill.
Local 245, Melrose Park, Ill.

Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers

San Pedro, Calif., Local
New York, N. Y., Local

United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO

G. E. Local 203, Bridgeport, Conn.
Local 402, Newark, N. J.
Westinghouse Local 426, Newark, N. J.

United Rubber Workers of America, CIO

Local 120, Chicago, Ill.
Local 187, Newark, N. J.

OTHER UNIONS

BREWERS UNION, Local 2, Newark, N. J.
BREWERY WORKERS, Local 148, Newark, N. J.
ALUMINUM WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, Local 4, Chicago, Ill.
FUR WORKERS UNION, CIO, Local 30, Boston, Mass.
JOURNEYMAN TAILORS, CIO, Local 195, Newark, N. J.
KNITGOOD WORKERS UNION, ILGWU, AFL, Local 155, New York, N. Y.
MINE, MILL AND SMELTER WORKERS UNION, CIO, Local 462, Newark, N. J.
PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, CIO, Agar Local, Chicago, Ill.
STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, Newark, N. J.
UNITED HOSPITAL WORKERS, CIO, Local Industrial Union 787, Chicago, Ill.
UNITED RETAIL & WHOLESALE EMPLOYEES CIO, Local 108, Newark, N. J.
MECHANICAL EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA, Detroit, Mich.
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF HOSIERY WORKERS, CIO, Branch No. 49, Newark, N. J.

SPECIAL Subscription Offer

valid until February 1, 1942

2 issues of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (20c each)

8 issues of the MILITANT (5c each) both for

50¢

THE MILITANT

116 University Place

New York City