

The Hudson Walkout And Race Prejudice

See Editorial On Page 4

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

VOL. VI.—No. 26

NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1942

FIVE (5) CENTS

The New Soviet Agreements and A Second Front

By Felix Morrow

Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union made war allies of Britain, the United States and the USSR, but did not change the fundamental attitude of the capitalist "democracies" toward the first workers' state. Nor is that fundamental attitude changed by the May 26 British-Russian Treaty and the June 11 U. S.-Soviet Lend-Lease Agreement. Every real friend of the Soviet Union must understand this basic fact.

The Soviet military officer who writes the Daily Worker commentaries on the military fronts once blurted out what the real attitude of the "democracies" is, indicating various examples of lack of British military activity where it would best aid the Soviet Union, he wrote:

"The (British) idea might be to see the Soviet Union win the war with one division left. Furthermore, this writer doubts that the British Imperial General Staff enjoys the sight of a developing guerrilla warfare in the German rear... Guerilla—civil—class—these are all unwelcome adjectives for the noble word War." (Daily Worker, July 13, 1941.)

To "win the war with one division left" would mean that the Soviet Union would be at the mercy of the "democracies."

Two Different Standards

The point is that no real friend of the Soviet Union can have the same standards for judging Soviet "progress" against the Nazis as the standards used by Roosevelt-Churchill. The governments and press of the "democracies" don't care how much territory, manpower and productive plant the Soviet Union is losing, so long as the Red Army continues to keep an Eastern Front going. At bottom the "democratic" capitalists hope that the Soviet Union and the Nazis will mutually exhaust each other, leaving the "democracies" as masters of the world at the end. Nothing in the U. S.-British-Soviet pacts has changed this attitude.

When Churchill returned to England in January after his meeting with Roosevelt, a very significant statement appeared in the Tribune, the British weekly organ of the "left" Laborites and "unofficially" controlled by Cripps. Three and a half million soldiers and Home Guards were resting on their arms in the British Isles; in addition, wrote the Tribune, "Industry is being combed for skilled men to man a British Army of a size which is surely out of all proportion to our present or future needs, assuming that all those men are to fight the Axis and no one else." Yet the troops already available were not being prepared for invasion of the continent.

Why not? Churchill's aiibi was that Britain did not have enough big ships. The Tribune answered: "Apparently we are the only nation that needs big ships to launch an invasion. The Japanese invade Malaya in barges and sampans. The Russians land troops in the Crimea from small boats and parachutes; Germany prepared a vast fleet of flat-bottomed boats of all kinds within sight of our bombers. . . We were able to deny him a footing on these shores because our bombers smashed his concentration of barges. We have local air superiority across the Channel and under its protection we should be able to launch our invading armies in the West while Stalin continues to hammer Hitler in the East."

Why, then, was this plan for a second front not being carried out? The Tribune answered this question in the following terms:

"There Is An Obvious Plan"

"We suggest it is because we want a big army after the war in order to bring back the riches of the Pacific to their former possessors. There would be less assurance of this if the occupying armies (in the Pacific) were Chinese or Indians or Russians. If that is not the case, why is it that we refused Chiang Kai-shek's offer of men which he said he made months ago? Imperialist and not military considerations are at work in that refusal. . . So far we have no plan for winning the war but there is an obvious plan to keep the British Empire intact if the Russians and the Chinese will only win it back for us." (Tribune, Jan. 23, 1942.)

These revealing words are especially significant because they come, not from proletarian revolutionists irreconcilably opposed to Churchill, but from "left" Laborites who are actually part of the British government and know concretely whereof they speak. The Tribune ends up by appealing to Churchill "to drop his imperialist military policy; but all real friends of the Soviet Union should realize that Churchill can no more do that than the leopard can change his spots. His eyes remain fixed on the Indian and Pacific Ocean empire; that is what he, and the British ruling class, are fighting for. They, like Roosevelt, will send aid to the Soviet Union only insofar as it fits into the plans of the "democracies."

In England the pro-Soviet sentiment of the British masses — which is not merely pro-Russian but something much more significant, for it is accompanied by ever-growing hostility to the British capitalist class — is so great that scarcely a politician but gives lip-service to opening a second front to aid the Soviet Union. It was this prevailing atmosphere in Britain which dictated the formula, in both the Molotov-Eden and Roosevelt-Molotov communiques, that "full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a second front in Europe in 1942."

The Second-Front Formulation

But what does this ambiguous formulation mean? No sooner was it issued than it was followed by a flood of semi-official statements from London that it was "fantastic" to expect a second front this year; the Washington correspondent of the N. Y. Times authoritatively says that Churchill is opposed to "premature" invasion; Cripps, speaking at a celebration of the June 22 anniversary of Soviet entry into the war can offer nothing more than: "When the moment to strike (in Europe) will come, no one can say." Newswreck explains: "Don't be misled by too glib interpretations of the U. S.-Anglo-Russian agreements. Actually, London and Washington have not definitely promised to

(Continued on page 2)

Four More New Jersey Unions Send Aid for 18

Total Rises to 39;
Louisville CIO Also
Vote to Back CRDC

Four more local unions in New Jersey have sent contributions to aid the 18 defendants in the Minneapolis "sedition" trial, the Civil Rights Defense Committee announced this week. In addition, the Committee reported, the Louisville Industrial Union Council of the CIO has voted to endorse the work of the CRDC and to support the 18 defendants.

This brings to a total of 39 the number of New Jersey CIO, AFL and independent union locals which have contributed to the Committee. In addition, numerous unions and the New Jersey State Industrial Union Council of the CIO have passed resolutions condemning the convictions and supporting the work of the CRDC in appealing the convictions to the Supreme Court.

The four locals were:

Textile Workers Union of America, Local 26 of Freehold and Local 363 of Roselle Park. Oil Workers Organizing Committee, Local 337 of Linden and Local 397 of Carteret. In addition, the CRDC reported the receipt of a donation from United Auto Workers Local 578 of Oshkosh, Wisconsin.

'UE News' Hits Role Of Army-Navy In Industry

Union Paper Says Officer Corps Is Filled
With Boss Elements Hostile to Unionism

By JOE EDWARDS

Workers in the war industries are being constantly confronted with the anti-labor prejudice and activities of the reactionary Army and Navy officers corps, according to an article in the June 13 issue of *UE News*, organ of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO.

"The authority of the Armed Services applies to virtually all aspects of war production and labor relations," the article states. "Efforts of the OPM and WPB to gain control of war production have completely failed."

Increasing military control over production and labor relations threatens the labor movement with a fascist-like regime in the plants.

"No satisfactory participating relationship now exists between labor and the operating divisions of the Army and Navy," the article says.

"POSSESS ALL THE PREJUDICES"

Complaining of the long delay and red tape involved in dealings with the arrogant Army and Navy representatives the *UE News* points out that "an unfortunate proportion of Army and Navy officers are lacking in sympathy with . . . the labor movement." The true class character of the officers corps is revealed in the statement that "a vast majority of new commissioned officers coming from civilian ranks are businessmen, big business lawyers, bankers, etc., and possess all the prejudices of those groups insofar as labor is concerned."

This flood of labor-hating businessmen into the Army and Navy officers corps strengthens the West Point and Annapolis officer caste which protects the interests of Wall Street and the capitalist class.

Even in awarding the Navy "E" for production or the Army "A" for speed-up in the plants, the Army and Navy officer cliques discriminate against the unions, the article points out, and give the unions no recognition. In ceremonies of a patriotic nature held in the plants, the Army and Navy administrators working with the company choose non-union workers to speak for the men in the plants.

AN IMPORTANT SIGN

That such an article appears in the *UE News* is proof in itself of the fact that the increasing military rule in the plants is resulting in an intense campaign of anti-labor intimidation and union-busting. The *UE News* is edited by Stalinist elements, whose program is complete subservience

OPA Fails To Enforce Own Price Regulations

No Effective Enforcement Machinery To Be
Set Up, High Official Admits In Speech

The administration's price control program is heading into troubled waters. A high official of the Office of Price Administration, speaking last week before the convention of the National Retail Dry Goods Association in Chicago, indicated that the government's price ceilings are being endangered from two directions.

1. The lack of any machinery to effectively police and enforce price regulations.

2. The widespread sidestepping of price regulations by qualitative

deterioration and adulteration of goods.

David Ginsburg, general counsel of OPA, stated on June 17: "FALSE AND MISLEADING" "At one recent national conven-

tion of retailers the charge was made that OPA proposes to hire an 'army of inspectors' and that our enforcement intentions 'evidence a lack of faith in the honesty and patriotism of American retailers.'"

Indignantly, Ginsburg denied the allegation. "This is false — completely false and misleading."

"The charge was made that we were seeking 30,000 to 100,000 policemen. The facts are that we have asked Congress for a total of about 3,300 investigators — just about one man to a county — who will be responsible for obtaining facts regarding compliance with retail-

rationing and price regulations."

The OPA's touching faith in the "honesty" of America's cutthroat businessmen — who have never been able to resist the temptation of cleaning up through high prices when purchasing power exceeds supply of goods — is due for a rude shock.

Even Ginsburg had to admit, in this same speech, that a government survey of retailers shows that two-thirds of them have failed to comply with OPA regulations about posting publicly their March prices, and that "not more than half of the remaining third are posting properly." (N. Y. Times, June 18.)

A further indication of the "honesty" of the businessmen, was given by Ginsburg when he declared that the pressure to maintain high price levels is tending to changes of quality "that are not good economy for the shopping public."

"Already there is a marked tendency on the part of some manufacturers to switch their production from low price, low profit items to high price, higher profit items. The shift has generally taken two forms.

"NEW MODELS"

"First, some manufacturers have eliminated the low-priced lines almost entirely, and have concentrated their production in the high-priced lines. Second, some manufacturers have begun to produce so-called 'new models' designed to sell at higher prices. In both cases the result is inflationary. In both cases, the public will eventually suffer."

The workers can scarcely take comfort in this "price control" program. Already, the merchants and manufacturers have cooked up a hundred different devices for beating the price regulations. And the administration's "honor system" is nothing but an open invitation for all-out violations.

(Articles on the rise of the bootleg market in this country and Europe, and on the government's program for combatting inflation, will be found on pages 2 and 3 of this issue.)

Nelson Attempts To Suppress Exposure Of \$1-A-Year Men

WPB Head Puts Pressure On Truman Senate
Committee To Withhold Critical Report

Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, and corporation-minded Congressmen sought frantically last week to suppress a report of the Truman Senate Investigating Committee which mildly criticized the influence of the dollar-a-year men on the policies of the WPB.

Advance copies of the report sent to Nelson aroused his ire, and he brought strong pressure to bear to prevent its public release.

Among the findings of the report that Nelson considered most objectionable was its condemnation of his chief of the Bureau of Industry Branches, Philip Reed, \$120,000 a year chairman of the General Electric board. Reed came under fire several months ago when his assistant, Robert Guthrie, brought charges against him of protecting the interests of his own corporation and industry to the detriment of war production.

Nelson sent a letter to every member of the Truman Committee expressing his "full confidence" in Reed, telling the Committee it was "raking up an old scandal" and demanding that it withhold its findings.

He confronted Senator Truman in Truman's office and angrily threatened a showdown fight if the report were given out.

Member of the committee had various forms of pressure put upon them to repudiate the report, but they could not easily do so after they had already voted for it and the announcement of its forthcoming release had already been made.

A WHITEWASH REPORT

To soften the impact of the Truman Committee report, the House Military Affairs Committee hastily issued a whitewash report on the Guthrie case 24 hours before the Truman findings were made public.

The chief criticisms of the Truman Committee, aside from the specific charges against Reed, were that the WPB "has not fully measured up to its responsibility" in organizing war production and

Sudden Treachery

An article by Ernest K. Lindley and Forrest Davis in the current Ladies Home Journal reveals that Soviet Ambassador Oumansky was warned by Sumner Welles, Undersecretary of State, six months before Hitler's invasion of the USSR began that the Nazis would march in June 1941.

breaking, will have no effect in protecting workers' rights. The workers might just as well appeal to the duPonts and Morgans for a square deal.

THE STALINISTS HAVE NO PROGRAM

The Stalinist union leaders are forced to whine and complain about this situation because it directly threatens their own union base. But at the same time they have no program to offer the workers in defense of their unions and working conditions.

Appeals to the brass hats in Washington, who have been training draftees in the art of strike-

Gestapo Terror Failed To Uncover Heydrich Killers

Czech Masses Defied "Last Warning" And
Kept Silent Despite Murderous Reprisals

By ART PREIS

The full fury of the most ruthless terror machine on earth was unleashed on the Czechoslovakian people after the killing of Gestapo chief Reinhard (The Hangman) Heydrich. In an effort to terrorize the Czech masses into divulging the identity of the slayers of Heydrich, thousands were arrested, hundreds were executed, a whole village, Lidice, was razed to the ground and all its male inhabitants murdered.

An announcement was issued by the Gestapo that the Czech people had a "last chance" to deliver up Heydrich's slayers by 8 o'clock in the evening of June 18, or suffer even worse reprisals, a threat which all knew the Nazis were more than ready to carry out.

At the same time, an offer of a huge reward, 100,000 marks, was made to be paid the person or persons divulging information useful to the Gestapo in discovering and seizing Heydrich's assassins.

Thus, Hitler used his two most effective weapons, terror and bribery, to loosen the tongues of the Czech people. He made their own lives forfeit for those of the killers — in sheer self-defense, he thought, they would have to speak out. And he offered the temptation — hard to resist among people who are slowly starving to death — of enough money to free them from the tortures of abysmal poverty and want.

Yet not one voice spoke. Not a single person came forward, despite the terror and bribery, to betray those who killed Hey-

drich. In order to save face, the Gestapo had to announce — just two hours after the expiration of the deadline — that two of the killers of Heydrich had been "discovered" hiding in a church in Prague and that "they were shot immediately upon arrest."

AN OBVIOUS HOAX

All the world knows from these words that this announcement is a hoax. The Gestapo had to "discover" two persons — any two persons — in order not to admit that the Czech people, the workers and peasants, had successfully defied the Nazi terror. For this successful resistance, the news of which will spread throughout occupied Europe, constitutes a major defeat for Hitler.

The resistance of the Czechoslovakian people in this instance is a sign that the day of reckoning for Hitler is close at hand. It is a sign of the failure of his "new order" and of the indestructible hatred of the European masses for Nazism. Through this resistance, Hitler can already see the noose about his neck — the noose that will be drawn tight by the revolutionary power of the resurgent workers and peasants of Europe.

Mass Pressure Wins New Stay Of Execution For Waller

But It Must Continue
If He Is To Be Kept
From Chair On July 2

Nation-wide mass protest from Negro and labor groups has won a 13-day stay of execution for Odell Waller, young Negro sharecropper who had been scheduled to die on June 19 for the self-defense slaying of his white landlord. Waller was convicted by an all-white planter jury, from which impoverished Negro and white sharecroppers were excluded by the Virginia poll-tax laws.

A flood of letters and telegrams from all over the country moved Governor Darden of Virginia on June 18 to grant Waller a last-minute reprieve until July 2, to allow for a hearing on a petition for commutation of his sentence. The hearing is to be held on Monday, June 29.

Previously, the United States Supreme Court had twice refused to review Waller's case, declining to state any reason for the refusal. It is obvious, however, that its failure to act was in the interests of the southern ruling class, which maintains the poll-tax system in order to disfranchise the Negro and white masses and retain political power.

Just before Governor Darden announced his stay of execution, U. S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Harlan Stone had closed the last avenue of court action to save Waller's life. Stone, recently appointed to his high post by President Roosevelt, refused to allow Waller to appeal to the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals and denied a stay of execution to permit Waller's counsel to apply to the full bench of the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari.

As a last measure to forestall the legal lynching of Waller, a petition signed by hundreds of Negro and white liberals and labor leaders has been sent to President Roosevelt appealing for the establishment of an Executive Commission of Inquiry to investigate the case. Such an action by Roosevelt would lead to a further stay of execution.

The petition, which was unanimously endorsed by last week's giant Madison Square Garden rally of the Negro March-on-Washington movement, states in part:

"Waller, disfranchised by poverty, was convicted by a jury of white poll-tax payers. Through misapprehension of his counsel at the trial, an objection without proof was made to the systematic exclusion of non-poll tax payers from jury service. This proof was presented at subsequent habeas corpus proceedings. If this failure of counsel to offer proof of his contention to the trial court is the basis for refusal by the United States Supreme Court to review the case, then Waller is dying because of a technicality."

Waller's life remains in mortal danger. Only tremendous last-minute mass protest will prevent the hand of Southern Bourbon poll-tax justice from pulling the switch of the electric chair on July 2 and snuffing out the life of a victim of Jim Crowism.

Every progressive and labor organization must act now, without delay, to demand the freedom of Waller.

Wire or write President Roosevelt demanding the Commission of Inquiry into the Waller case. Wire or write Governor Colgate W. Darden, Jr., Richmond, Va., urging him to grant clemency to Waller.

Back up your moral support to Waller with material aid, by rushing contributions to meet the heavy last-minute expenses to the Workers Defense League, 112 E. 19 Street, New York City. The WDL is the official organization handling Waller's defense.

Act at once! Save Odell Waller! Strike a blow at Jim Crowism and the poll-tax system!

Government Fails To Curb Inflation At Its Source

Profit System Responsible for 'Pressure' Which Forces Up Wartime Living Costs

By A. ROLAND

Next to war itself there is no greater curse for the masses than inflation. This terrible scourge completely disrupted the economic and social life of one country after the other in the years following the last World War. As though people had not paid enough in blood for the war, inflation exacted all that was left. Both the workers and the middle classes were subjected to untold misery and starvation as the monetary system fell apart.

It is acknowledged on all sides that the first stage in the inflation accompanying the second World War has already been passed in the United States. That stage is the rapid rise in the cost of living, which has fast outstripped wages and salaries. The government's own figures show that the cost of raw materials has gone up 67%, the general price level 32%, retail prices for food, clothing and house furnishings 25%. E. V. Bell, writing in the N. Y. Times, says matter-of-factly: "This is only the beginning." And he is quite right. The economic system being a profit system, there will be other stages inevitably following this first "mild" one.

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS DOING ABOUT IT

What is the government doing to fend off the pressing danger? It is preparing to attack the problem not at its roots — it could not possibly do that — but at the last and most obvious point in the process. Inflation, we are told, comes about because there is too much purchasing power for the goods available on the market. War production has involved tremendous outlays of government money. Some of this money, paid to manufacturers of guns, munitions, airplanes, ships, has found its way into the hands of the workers. They are ready to spend the money for needed food and clothing and shelter. But these things are not in demand for the war. Industry cannot produce both war goods and consumers' goods. The latter are being sacrificed. Less of it is being produced just when people can buy more of it.

The trouble, say the capitalist economists, lies in the fact that if the masses of people try to buy the things they need, the prices of the few things on the market will go skyrocketing. But why cannot the government control prices and thus prevent the inflationary process? Bell admits that even if the government could really control prices, this would merely produce greater scarcities of goods. The goods would tend to disappear from the market.

The "tendency" is for prices to rise in such a case. There is a "pressure" of demand or purchasing power on the supply tending to cause this rise in prices. We may strip this abstract way of saying a simple thing: the capitalist sellers will try to get as much on the market as the traffic will bear. The tendency is for the capitalists to make the highest possible profits.

WHO GIVES WAY?

Bell tries to cover up this simple explanation by saying that "the government itself does not think that prices can be held down so long as excess purchasing power is left uncontrolled. It expects that black markets will spring up." Let us again interpret in incontrovertible terms what this means. Bell is simply saying that the capitalist manufacturers and profit-seekers will not cooperate with their own government to fix the price level. Under these circumstances, it is not the capitalists who give way, but the government!

The black (or bootleg) market is notoriously the preserve of the well-to-do and the rich. If the worker goes to the black market, it is only when sheer necessity drives him to pay enormous prices for what he cannot do without. Certainly the masses of people would be only too happy to obtain the things they must buy at reasonable fixed prices. Inherent in this whole argument is the acknowledgment of the anarchy, the uncontrollability, of capitalist production and distribution. The anarchy is produced by the capitalists and well-to-do. But who shall pay for this anarchy? All the machinery of government

Attention!

PHILADELPHIA READERS:

Will the Philadelphia correspondent who sent us an unsigned letter on the international situation please get in touch with us at his convenience?

THE MILITANT
116 University Pl.

VERA FIGNER

1852-1942

The death of Vera Figner, at the age of 90, was announced June 16 by Pravda. Hers is a revered name out of a past so far away from us that it is astonishing to realize that the intervening distance has been covered by the span of life of a frail woman. It makes one realize anew how young the Marxist movement is, how recently it began, that a pre-Marxist forerunner of the Russian revolutionary movement should just now be laid in her grave in the Soviet Union.

Vera Figner was born in 1852, when Marx was 34 years old. In 1876 she began her revolutionary career and shortly after became a leading member of the Executive Committee of the famous terrorist organization, Narodnaya Volya (the People's Will). It requires a considerable effort of historical imagination to understand that movement and the Russia in which it operated. Serfdom had been abrogated in 1861, but Russia remained outside the modern world, a vast factory-less agrarian land ruled by an absolute autocracy, part of pre-capitalist Asia rather than of Europe. Yet from the tiny middle class and the nobility came a group of young intellectuals who "went to the people" to share the sufferings of the peasantry. The terrorist methods they employed to avenge the wrongs of the agrarian masses belong in spirit closer to the desperate peasant revolts of medieval Europe than they do to the modern proletarian movement; but they served to awaken the first sparks among the masses and to create examples of revolutionary heroism which inspired the Marxists who came after them.

The Czar Laughed — Then Died

Dynamiting of public buildings and official trains were organized by Vera Figner and her small band of collaborators, the first dynamiting taking place in 1879 (the year Trotsky was born; Lenin was nearly ten years old). In August, 1879, Narodnaya Volya pronounced the death sentence against Czar Alexander II and during the next 18 months made several attempts to carry it out.

The Czar was offered an alternative in a formal letter sent him by the Executive Committee of Narodnaya Volya on March 10, 1881, demanding: 1. General amnesty to all political offenders; 2. The convening of an assembly of representatives of the whole of the Russian people on the basis of universal suffrage, free press, free speech and the right of assembly. No doubt the Czar laughed at the affront of the tiny band of revolutionaries who were demanding that he sign his abdication. Three days later, on March 13, 1881, he was dead, slain by the People's Will.

Vera Figner was among those seized, held for three years in prison, then condemned to death. Among those executed was Lenin's older brother. Figner's sentence was commuted to twenty years' imprisonment. Though held behind closed doors, the trial and the heroic conduct of the convicted was an inspiring story throughout Europe.

When the first leaders of Narodnaya Volya were seized and arraigned, Marx wrote to his daughter Jenny on April 11, 1881: "Have you been following the trial of the assassins in Petersburg? They are sterling people through and through, without melodramatic pose, simple, businesslike, heroic. Shouting and doing are irreconcilable opposites. The Petersburg Executive Committee (of the People's Will) which

acts so energetically, issues manifestoes of refined moderation. It is far removed from the schoolboy way in which Johannes Most and other childish whippersnappers preach tyrannicide as a 'theory' and 'panacea'. . . ; on the contrary they try to teach Europe that their method of action is a specifically Russian and historically inevitable method about which there is no more reason to moralize, for or against, than there is about the earthquake in Chios."

20 Years of Solitary Confinement

For twenty years Vera Figner was in solitary confinement in Schlusselburg fortress. The mind can scarcely grasp what that means — 20 years of solitary confinement. Yet by sheer will she lived through it; more, some of the poetry she wrote then has its permanent place in Russian literature. Meanwhile the development of modern capitalism began in Russia, and with it a modern proletariat and a Marxist movement. The bestial repressions had well-nigh destroyed the remnants of Narodnaya Volya, but enough remained to pass on the torch to the young Marxists, many of whom — including both Lenin and Trotsky — began as followers of Narodnaya Volya.

If the Populist ideas of the older movement gave little to the Marxists, the example of men and women like Vera Figner gave very much. As a boy of 17, just entering the revolutionary movement, Trotsky listened to the talk of former exiles in the provincial town of Nikolayev: "The conversations of the exiles were punctuated with the names of the populists, Zhelyabov, Perovskaya, Figner, who were treated not as legendary heroes but as real people with whom the older friends of these exiles, if not they themselves, were familiar. I had a feeling that I was joining a great chain as a tiny link."

She survived those twenty years and, in 1904, was deported to wintry Archangelsk, from which the first Russian revolution liberated her; she lived abroad between 1906 and 1917. When the second revolution came, she was an old woman of 65 years; she returned to Russia. After her imprisonment she was always in fragile health and played no active role. In May, 1917 she was elected to the All-Russian Executive of the Congress of Peasant Soviets; whatever the motive of the reformists who nominated her, she deserved the honor, nor did she follow those reformists when they left Russia after the October revolution. What her views were on the degeneration of the Stalinist bureaucracy, we have no way now of knowing; but in spirit she was worlds apart from the usurpers who did not make the three revolutions but were parasites upon the result.

Her Heroism Lives On

In the Asiatic darkness of 1876 this spirit flamed and 20 years of solitary confinement did not prevent the sparks from igniting the conflagration that consumed Czarism and capitalism. We can be sure that, as Trotsky heard her name whispered in Nicolayev and felt himself a link in the great chain, so many Russian youth today are imbued with that spirit. The heroism and selflessness which she gave to the world did not die with her. It lives on, as it always has, in the new generation which will do its work in the world as she did hers.

F. M.

The Stalinists Betray The Negro Struggle

They Attacked March-On-Washington Rally and Called Another To Counteract Its Effect, Their Silence On Waller Explained

By ALBERT PARKER

When the Communist Party shifted its line just a year ago, and went from its all-out defense of the Stalin-Hitler pact to all-out support of the war program, THE MILITANT predicted that the Stalinists would also stop advocating a militant struggle against Jim Crowism.

This prediction was fulfilled in short order. Now, at the end of one year, the Stalinists have gone so far along their new treacherous road that they not only do not advocate militancy, but viciously attack and slander everyone who does. The best example of this was the approach they took to the Madison Square Garden rally held last week under the auspices of the March-on-Washington movement.

Until less than a week before June 16 the Stalinist Daily Worker remained silent about the meeting. On June 12 and June 14 appeared articles by Benjamin Davis, Jr., of the Daily Worker editorial board, attacking the March-on-Washington movement because it had taken "no sharp and clear stand on the war" and because the Trotskyists among others were supporting the objectives of this movement, and stating that for these reasons, the Daily Worker "cannot commit itself unreservedly to the June 16 meeting."

On the morning of June 16 itself, Davis appeared with a new attack on the movement, because the Socialist Party paper, The Call, had endorsed the meeting. Again Davis complained that the movement's 8-point program omitted "all reference to the war — to say nothing of winning it." He asked if A. Philip Randolph, leader of the movement, has been working "to exploit the just demands of the Negro people against the war and against the best interests of the Negroes." No one could any longer doubt after this article that the Stalinists were opposed to the meeting. The meeting was held, and was so well attended despite the efforts of the Stalinists, that Davis in reporting the rally had to say "the movement represents the honest yearnings of the Negro masses, whatever may be said of Trotskyites who would ultimately wreck the movement as they would the nation." (Daily Worker, June 18.)

Along with this admission came another attack on Randolph because he "introduced no resolution in support of the war."

COUNTER-MEETING

Meanwhile during this period the Stalinists had been preparing another mass meeting, to be held in Harlem on June 28 under the auspices of the Negro Labor Victory Committee, which includes non-Stalinist elements but is dominated by the Communist Party.

As the Stalinists had foreseen, the Madison Square Garden rally had left a very definite impression that the Negro masses are ready to fight for democratic rights at home NOW. The Stalinists want to counteract this impression by holding another Negro meeting at which the dominant theme will be support of the war. Randolph very correctly summed up its role when he said last week:

"This is a typical Communist-front movement that has been roping people in. It wants the Negro to forget all his grievances and to make it appear Negroes are not concerned with discrimination in the army and navy and the war industries. It is definitely in opposition to the March-on-Washington movement."

Now the interesting thing about this whole business is that Randolph does support the war and has supported it from the beginning — even a year ago when the Stalinists attacked the March-on-Washington movement because Randolph was a "warmonger." How, then, can the Stalinist attacks on the movement be explained, especially when it is realized that their behavior on the meeting has knocked Stalinist prestige among the Negro masses to a new low point?

The Stalinist attacks can be understood only by those who are acquainted with the different bases of support on which men like Randolph and on which the Stalinists rest.

RANDOLPH'S POLICY

Without the backing of the Negro masses, Randolph does not amount to two cents and he knows it. Without the support of the Negro ranks, Randolph would never be permitted into even the back door of the White House, let alone to a conference with Roosevelt. Randolph supports the war, but if that were all he offered the Negro masses they would pay no more attention to him than they do to the Stalinists. To keep the mass support he wants, Randolph has to speak the language of militancy. He

knows very well from the temper of the masses that this is the only language they want to hear today. He fears that if he loses leadership over the masses today, he will be unable to regain it tomorrow or after the war. That is why he speaks a language so different from the course he follows. In the speech he was supposed to make on June 16, but which he could not deliver because of the poor arrangements of the meeting, Randolph said:

"It is well-nigh unanimous among Negroes, even though some may be a little timid in expressing it, that Negroes must fight now for their rights. Negro leaders made a grave blunder in the last war by stating: 'Let us close ranks and forget our grievances.' The government took them at their word and forgot the Negroes' grievances for good. We all saw what happened. Negro boys were shell-shocked, lost their minds, bled and died fighting for a democracy they never knew and which their comrades never found upon their return home. No, they never found democracy when they returned from over there, but they did find mob rule, lynch law, Jim Crow and a callous and indifferent government to the Negroes' pleas for justice and fair play.

"We are resolved that we shall not make this blunder again. We must fight the government's policy of Jim Crow with all we have got. We have nothing to lose but our chains; we have freedom, justice and democracy to gain."

That is not really Randolph speaking; it is the masses speaking through Randolph. Randolph's failure to present a program for achieving the masses' demands is proof of that.

Randolph's policy then is to speak militantly because he bases himself on the support of the Negro ranks, and to fail to offer a militant program, of action because he supports the war and is afraid to lead a fundamental struggle against the capitalist class. It is his illusion that by speaking militantly he can secure a number of concessions from the administration and thus maintain his leadership of the Negro movement.

THE STALINIST POLICY

The Stalinists proceed from an entirely different basis: Their line on the Negro question as on everything else is determined by the Stalin bureaucracy in Moscow, which is concerned only with protecting its own interests. Sometimes these interests seem to coincide with those of the Negro and white workers in the United States sometimes they clearly do not; but that does not concern the Stalin bureaucracy or its stooges in this country. In this you can find the explanation for the Daily Worker's attack on a movement which despite the defects of its leadership expresses the aspirations of the Negro people.

The Stalinist line on the Negro question today is to complain that Jim Crowism interferes with the war (the effects of Jim Crowism on the Negro people are secondary, so far as the Communist Party is concerned.) As Davis said in the June 14 Worker, for the Stalinists "the winning of this war is the primary issue before the Negro people." Naturally, if you think that, then you won't like a movement and a meeting which says that nothing is more important than winning democracy at home, even though its leaders also support the war. Randolph believes it is possible to win concessions from the Negro people by speaking militantly and letting Roosevelt hear it. That is why he and most of the other speakers at the meeting emphasized the point that the Negro people are not enthusiastic about the war.

The Stalinists, however, say that the way to win concessions is by supporting the war, because then the administration will be ready to reward the loyalty of the Negro masses. As Davis said in his June 14 article, The war "is a fight in and through which the Negro people will realize their just demands. With our nation needing national unity, maximum war production and the highest possible morale in the armed forces, the opportunities are greater than ever for securing the equality of the Negro people through the very prosecution of the war."

There is one other and differ-

ent aspect of Stalinism which might just as well be commented on here as anywhere else. That is the Communist Party's attitude toward the case of Odell Waller, Negro sharecropper sentenced to death because he killed his landlord in self-defense.

For almost two years now the fight to save Waller's life has been supported by various Negro, defense and labor organizations, including the Socialist Workers Party. The thing which united all these organizations in this fight was the elementary desire to save a victim of Jim Crowism and thus to strike a blow at the system of Jim Crowism.

During this entire period the Communist Party and all its news papers and magazines and all of its forces in the labor movement remained silent on the case. Finally, on June 18, reporting the Garden rally, Davis devoted one sentence to it. And then the next day, on the day Waller was scheduled to be electrocuted, there appeared an article at last. Written by Eugene Gordon, it was entitled "Let Governor Darden Know Before Tonight: Waller Must Not Die."

Many readers of the Daily Worker must have been puzzled by its last sentence: "Time is short but not too short — if we hurry!" They must have thought to themselves that time certainly was short, but why had it taken the Daily Worker such a long time to even mention the case — why had it not hurried in informing its readers about the need for action?

"RULE OR RUIN"

The truth is of course that the Stalinists were really trying to save face on the day Waller was scheduled to die. They were not really interested in saving Waller or they would long ago have begun to move their powerful apparatus into action.

The single sentence in Davis' report and Gordon's article explain why this is so. Davis refers to it as "a case which should be supported despite its sinister exploitation by the Trotskyist defeatists." And Gordon says: "True, Odell Waller's case was grabbed up and, has been exploited by the Trotskyites, the Lovestonites and the Norman Thomas 'socialists' for their own questionable purposes. But the very fact that this breed of non-descript defeatists and fifth columnists profane the Negro's just grievances impels decent Americans to shout their protests against the threatened Virginia outrage." (Gordon does not explain why it is that while the so-called fifth columnists were fighting to save Waller's life, the Stalinists were not even whispering let alone "shouting" against the threatened legal lynching.)

The Stalinist general line may change from year to year, but their filthy tactics of "rule or ruin" remain the same. They did not control the Waller case, they could not use it to push their own policies and extend their own influence, so they did not care what happened to Waller. A last minute face-saving "shout" does not excuse their treachery nor change the fact that their whole course helped the forces that are trying to lynch Waller.

This Won't Get The Bosses Sore

After approving income taxes for wage earners making as little as \$9.60 weekly, the House Ways and Means Committee finally got around to the question of corporation profits taxes. On June 23, the Committee passed a measure for a 94% "excess" profits tax, to take all but 6% of the profits made over the average high profits raked in during 1936-1939. This virtually guarantees the war industries bigger profits than in peacetime.

BUT — The Committee also voted a credit of 14% on all "excess" profits taxes to be repaid the corporations after the war. They are to get government bonds equal to that amount of their profits taxes redeemable when the war is over.

The Wall Street Journal, June 24, commented that the Committee did this in order not to "severely curtail the incentive to efficient production." This amounts to the corporations saying through Congress, "War or no war — if you don't permit us tremendous profits, we won't produce." The bosses are ready to sacrifice, all right — down to the last drop of the workers' blood.

The Negro Struggle

"LABOR WITH A WHITE SKIN CANNOT EMANCIPATE ITSELF WHERE LABOR WITH A BLACK SKIN IS BRANDED" — KARL MARX

Important to Realize That Negro Masses Are Ready to Fight for Their Rights NOW

By Albert Parker

Last week in this column we discussed the growing manifestations of a new fighting spirit among the Negro masses. We intend to discuss it again this week, and again and again in the weeks to come, until everyone who reads this column becomes as convinced as we have that a new situation is arising which is of the utmost importance to every fighter against Jim Crowism.

Our column last week noted a new tendency shown by administration officials, capitalist politicians, powerful daily newspapers and the leaders of even the most conservative Negro organizations. This tendency, which has been growing since the United States entered the war, indicated that these people know the Negro masses are today ready to fight for their rights. Since then we have received new confirmations of this change; the enthusiastic response of the audience at the June 16 Madison Square Garden rally to every suggestion for a struggle now; more articles in the capitalist press reflecting the fears of the ruling class and Washington; the desperate attempts of the Communist Party to persuade the Negro people that their struggle is "secondary" and that support of the war is their most important task today.

We place especial emphasis on all these signs of a changing situation, because the fighters for Negro equality must be fully conscious of these changes and must keep closely in touch with them if they hope to be able to win their fight.

What Is Changing

Exactly what is it that is changing in the present situation? Is it the conditions of the Negro masses? By and large, the only honest answer to this question can be no. More Negro workers may be employed today than a year or six months ago, wages may be a trifle higher, government officials may promise a few things more today than they did before — but conditions on the whole are about the same. We do not have to go into details — no one has to convince the Negro masses on this score, for they know that conditions have not improved, and in all discussions they take it for granted.

What is changing is not the conditions, but the thinking and the attitudes of the Negro masses. Of course these attitudes are changing because of the new national and international conditions. The Negro masses have never been enthusiastic about talk of a second war for democracy somewhere else. Every impartial observer could testify to this before Pearl Harbor.

After Pearl Harbor the talk of democracy and equality and four freedoms increased. So did the demands for sacrifice and blood and sweat and tears increase. No one yearns for democracy and freedom and equality more than the Negro, for he above all has denied it in this country. No one wants to fight for them more than he does, and no one is more ready to sacrifice for them than he is.

But the Negro masses have not forgotten what happened during the last war. Nor have they forgotten what happened to them yesterday — and what is still happening to them today. They have not yet reached the position where they are ready to institute the struggle for a revolutionary change which will do away with Jim Crowism and imperialism by replacing capitalism with socialism. But they have just about reached the point where they are thinking:

"They tell us to fight and sacrifice and die for democracy and equality. Maybe this war will bring such things to other peoples, maybe it will not; maybe the people who are conducting the war are sincere about wanting to end oppression throughout the world, maybe they are not. But we would be fools to sit back quietly and take their word for it, as our fathers and mothers did in 1917, that this war will automatically give us here in the United States the democratic rights which have always been denied to us. What we must do now is take steps which will insure our getting the rights which belong to us."

They Want Action Now

All these thoughts have crystallized into a slogan which the leaders of the March-on-Washington movement have introduced into their literature: "Now or never!" Perhaps the leaders of this movement, most of whom support the war and urge the masses to support it, do not appreciate its full significance, do not realize that it implies a strong lack of faith in the flowery promises of the ruling class about what is going to happen to Negro rights and conditions after the war.

But that is not so important as the emphasis which the slogan places on the need for action today, now.

In short, the rapid events of the war, the type of propaganda which the government is forced to issue and the refusal of the Jim Crow ruling class to materially improve conditions have combined to bring about a change for which all of us have been agitating: a situation where the ranks of the Negro people are ready to fight for their rights now.

Those of us who have been acting and waiting for this new situation must recognize it and take

steps accordingly to increase and intensify our work. Let's be careful not to become victims of routine; let us not by failing to understand what is happening, miss the opportunity to spread the influence of militant ideas and the program of struggle. Many people feared that the war would make the struggle for Negro equality more difficult than ever. The cold facts of life have already shown that these fears were unwarranted and that the opportunities are greater than before.

We said above that we intend to return to this subject again. Here we wish to conclude for the present by citing a newspaper article which confirms everything said above.

We have already commented on the meaning of increasing numbers of articles on the Negro question in the capitalist newspapers and magazines. One of the longest and most significant of these was written by Richard Wilson, chief of the Washington Bureau of Minneapolis Sunday Tribune and Star Journal, and printed in the June 14 issue of that paper.

Secret Government Survey

The article, which covers almost a full newspaper page, is filled with many typical misstatements and slanders which we do not have the room to answer here and which most of our readers will recognize anyhow. But aside from them the author gives us some revealing information about what official Washington is worrying about:

"Unmistakable evidences of unrest are found in the American Negro community which makes up one-tenth of the population of the United States.

"A government survey, which is regarded as a secret document, has uncovered the information that 38% of the Negroes questioned believe it is more important to 'make democracy work at home' than it is to beat the Germans and Japanese.

"Only 50.5% of the Negroes questioned regard beating the Germans and Japanese as more important than 'making democracy work at home.'

"That phrase has a diverse meaning. . . Essentially, and to most Negroes, it means the elimination of economic discrimination, the right to work and live in decency; to others it means the elimination of segregation, and to still others complete race equality.

"Negroes are restive, and what is the cause? This same secret government survey analyzes the cause and shows that this is what Negroes feel worst about:

- "Discrimination in obtaining jobs—47.5%.
- "Discrimination in wages—22.5%.
- "Discrimination in housing—16%.
- "Segregation—9.5%."

We are not in a position to check on the accuracy of figures in a report which is kept secret. Nor do we know what kind of people were questioned in this survey — what proportion for example were government employees and what proportion were in the south where a Negro worker or sharecropper might be putting his life in jeopardy by stating his true opinion. But we can take it for granted that if there was any exaggeration in it, it was all on the side of making things seem as rosy and cheerful as possible.

"Atmosphere of Disillusion"

Following are some more quotations from Wilson's article: (To really appreciate their significance, you must realize that Wilson got most of this information from government officials, possibly the same ones who let him know of the secret survey.)

"Roosevelt caused a great lifting of hearts in the Negro community by the now famous executive order 8802. . . Yet the problem remains. The first bloom of order 8802 has worn off. Though the tone of the Negro press has improved markedly, there is an atmosphere of disillusion among Negro leaders, according to the reports of government officials."

Wilson quotes Mark Etheridge, former head of Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practices Committee, as saying:

"The 10 commandments still are in effect, but pretty much with the same effect as the executive order. The Negroes have been disillusioned. They have some employment, some advance; they want more."

And he quotes Lawrence W. Cramer, executive secretary of the same committee;

"There is some expression by the Negro he wouldn't be any worse off if the Axis won the war. There is a great deal more expression by the Negro he isn't going to be any better off if we do win the war. These attitudes together are the spoken attitudes of a majority of Negroes in America."

Another quotation from Etheridge has him declaring that the Negro people are "better educated; they are better organized; they are under friendlier auspices (?); and they are more aggressive and demanding than they ever have been before; and, I think, we all ought to learn that."

We think so too.

Bootleg Market Has Already Appeared Here

Experiences In Europe Foretell New Threats to Living Standards of Masses

By LARISSA REED

Declaring that "crooks and racketeers already are trying to move into rationing," David Ginsburg, general counsel of the Office of Price Administration, announced on May 27 that the government would do its utmost to imprison the operators of "black markets" and those who deal with them.

Two days before that, Robert Sessions, new head of the Consumers Division of the OPA, frankly admitted that bootlegging cannot be avoided under a government price-fixing policy. He stated that the price fixing "machinery will undoubtedly creak and bog down" and added that when "shortages of civilian commodities become acute. . . the fight against the 'black markets,' the bootlegging, the unpatriotic chisellers will really begin."

And John MacCormack, Washington commentator, warned in the N. Y. Times of June 13 that consumers' goods shortages will reach acute proportions by the end of this year and predicted: "Those with money to spend will then begin to spend it on such things as food or to compete for such consumers' goods as still remain. The pressure then will be against price ceilings and they may not hold."

Without doubt the price ceilings will not hold, but this does not mean that the government will abandon its policy of rationing and price-fixing. On the contrary, rationing will be extended to cover more and more of the necessities of life and the price ceilings will burst — not in the open and legal market, but in the bootlegging or black market which inevitably springs up alongside the open market upon which ceilings have been set. The threats of imprisonment for bootleggers will be no more effective in abolishing the bootlegging racket in this country than have similar threats, including death sentences, in Europe.

Every American remembers the complete failure of the government to prohibit the sale of liquor in this country during the Prohibition era of the 1920's. Not a single country in Europe can point to an even partially successful control of bootlegging which began and is flourishing as a result of wartime rationing and price ceilings. While in this country it has barely begun, in Europe the bootlegging racket has reached fantastic proportions and is an indication of what we can expect here as the war continues.

BOOTLEGGING IN THE FASCIST COUNTRIES

An A. P. correspondent in Lisbon declares that an acquaintance of his paid \$4 for two pairs of shoe laces. "Behind this extraordinary transaction lies the story of the so-called 'black' market which flourishes today in Germany," reports the N. Y. Daily News of May 18. "A great number of commodities are not to be found in German shops, but they show up in the illegal 'black' market, which thrives despite the death penalty and other drastic police efforts at suppression. . . The manufacturer and merchant are willing to risk violation of the stringent laws and are making vast profits. Economically, it is the story of U. S. prohibition all over again, except that the penalties are much more severe."

This paper quotes the price of coffee at \$18 a pound and states that Italian wines and liquors are bootlegged from the Italian Embassy in Germany.

This is corroborated by Herbert L. Matthews in the May 17 N. Y. Times: "Bootlegging is rife to an extraordinary extent which is an increasing source of class bitterness, for the masses see Fascist officials and other wealthy men buy food that they

ment they need and they do not even see the goods they sell. Their existence is strangely paralleled by that of the N. Y. bootleggers of the late 20's."

Mr. Bayles sums up by stating that "one food expert recently established that well over one-third of English wholesale and retail merchants evade rationing and price laws by one method or another and that more than 75% of all Englishmen have been guilty of paying the black market racketeer his price."

On June 1 a N. Y. Times report revealed that the British Food Ministry is unable to cope with the bootlegging racket! "A vigorous drive against black market racketeers was launched today by the Board of Trade, which drafted George Vandell, former superintendent of Scotland Yard to be the board's chief enforcement officer." Mr. Vandell, the murder expert, may succeed in arresting a few bootleggers but he will be no more effective in wiping out the bootlegging racket itself than were the economic experts of the Food Ministry and the British Government.

IN FRANCE TOO

The N. Y. Times of June 14 reports a similar failure on the part of the French authorities to cope with bootlegging. This paper's Vichy correspondent declares: "One of the results of price fixing and rationing in France is the creation of the black market of tremendous proportions. Heavy fines, prison terms and concentration camps for violators have done nothing to reduce illicit traffic. . . During 1941 232,000-000 francs worth of (bootleg) merchandise was seized." This, moreover, was only a small part of the total consumers' goods which was being bootlegged.

"The Black Market," declared the Catholic newspaper La Croix, "is compromising the health of the French people by depriving workers and poor people of essential foodstuffs. It is thus placing the future of our race in danger. It is also preventing the union of the people by legitimately arousing the anger of the persons who have not the means to buy at black market prices against those who have much money and few scruples."

ALREADY STARTED IN THIS COUNTRY

In the United States although thus far only tires, tubes, gasoline, autos, typewriters and sugar have been rationed, a bootlegging market has already sprung up in these commodities. Gasoline bootlegging jumped the gun and began before rationing was formally established. According to the June 1 N. Y. World Telegram, for the past year a "12-man ring of petroleum bootleggers had been stealing gasoline and fuel oil and selling it at half price to dealers."

This as but the first breeze of the howling wind of bootlegging operations which will soon sweep over this country. The workers must take warning now. They cannot depend upon the threats of imprisonment issuing from government circles now, any more than the European workers can depend upon their governments' Scotland Yards, public whippings, heavy fines, imprisonments and death sentences to relieve them of the staggering toll exacted through the bootleg markets. The wealthy will always get what they need. The workers whose wages are fixed will not.

This means that the workers must (1.) form their own control committees to control prices and check the speculators and bootleggers, and (2.) demand a rising scale of wages to meet all rises in the real cost of living.

Wallace Wants Imperialism Ended-But Not U. S. Brand

By M. MORRISON

The need to ascribe a great moral purpose to the war increases the longer it lasts. For men will not continue to fight, suffer and die without a feeling that, if victorious, they or their children will achieve results that will be of lasting benefit. What earthly use is there in sacrificing it, in the end, a world will emerge no better than the one which existed before the fighting began? Why jeopardize one's life if the same exploitation, the same dreary existence are to continue after the struggle is over?

And they who are leading the conflict are aware of the necessity to furnish the masses with hope and assurance for a better world to come. At the beginning of the war the tendency was to insist almost exclusively on the importance of victory, before the kind of peace that is to follow the war should even be considered. That is still the opinion of the more practical and less far-sighted politicians. But the astute Roosevelt knows better. The recent speeches of Vice-President Wallace and Sumner Welles indicate Roosevelt's concern with the problem of furnishing the masses an ideal to fight for.

No better person than the Vice-President could have been chosen to present the people with such a picture of the objectives of this war as to reconcile them to the sacrifices they are called upon to endure. For Wallace has the air and language of a sincere dreamer. He takes proper advantage of his extensive knowledge of the Bible, alluding constantly to the Prophets and the Apostles.

The speech which Wallace delivered on May 8 has already gone through many printed editions and is being widely distributed. It has of course thrilled the liberals who, in their heart of hearts, must be somewhat afraid that the things they would like to see come out of the war will never appear on the scene. Their gushing enthusiasm about the Wallace speech is itself evidence that they are trying very hard to believe what they say will emerge from this war. People who lack confidence in their beliefs are excessively grateful to official people who by word or deed bolster them up in their beliefs.

This war, says Wallace, is a continuation of the French Revolution, the people's revolution; it is a war between the free world and a slave world. On the part of Hitler it is a counter-revolution and his defeat will permit mankind to march peacefully forward to the goal of democracy, peace and plenty. "The object of this war is to make sure that everybody in the world has the privilege of drinking a quart of milk a day." This is what Wallace told Madame Litvinov who graciously assured him that a pint a day would be sufficient. Even if one doesn't like milk one should resent the Madame's cutting the portion in half. Why should a representative of the Soviet Union be satisfied with half the standard that a representative of a capitalist country wants?

Necessary as it is, however, to furnish the masses with an ideal to fight for, it would seem that to do what Wallace has done is putting it on a little too thick and the danger of a reaction, surely after the war is over, is indeed great. Even now an intelligent worker can ask: what prevented anybody from giving the masses a quart or even a pint of milk a day before the war started? In what way did Hitler interfere with the cows who gave enough milk to satisfy the need for that commodity on the part of every human being? What is there about this war

that will assure a high standard of living to everybody? Mr. Wallace and Mr. Roosevelt had their chance to do that before the war but under the best of circumstances the number of unemployed during their regime, prior to the war, was approximately ten million. Isn't it the war that has solved the problem of unemployment for Roosevelt?

The workers supporting this war are doing so because they fear Hitler and not because they were satisfied with the conditions prevailing prior to the war. It would be best for Mr. Wallace to let it go at that and not get out on a limb by making fabulous promises which the masses will later remember.

Mr. Wallace then turns his attention to the millions of people in China, India and other colonial and semi-colonial countries and assures them that they will achieve unheard-of and unexpected freedom as a result of this war. "No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the path to industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism."

What more can the exploited peoples ask? Why should the people of India hesitate about throwing in their lot with the British and American governments? Ungrateful wretches!

Wallace's speech was followed by one of Sumner Welles who took occasion on Memorial Day to proclaim that "the age of imperialism is ended."

The promises made to the colonial and semi-colonial peoples are not only intended to get the support of those peoples. To a certain extent they are meant quite seriously. It is significant that only representatives of the American government make such bold promises as to end the age of imperialism. The British are as silent as the tomb. The American capitalists are quite willing to bring to an end the kind of imperialism that the British stand for.

In general, American capitalism has not followed the method of actually taking possession of foreign territory through armed force. Coming late upon the scene of history, American capitalism found the world gobled up by the older imperialisms. It has depended primarily upon its economic power to enable it to exploit backward peoples. The British and French capitalists have, on the other hand, invariably seized control of foreign territory by armed force and have relied on such force to assure their exploitation of non-industrial peoples.

The speeches of Wallace and of Welles are not only a promise to the peoples of India and China but also a threat to the British capitalists. In effect they are saying to the British imperialists: Prepare to surrender your political control over subject countries and do the best you can in open economic competition with the American capitalists.

It is true that Wallace promised to end economic imperialism as well as military imperialism. But surely Mr. Wallace did not mean that the American capitalists will turn over their investments to the colonial peoples. If he did mean that, he will learn his mistake soon enough.

Mr. Wallace may live to learn that only the working class, gaining political power in the United States and in all other capitalist countries, will do away with economic imperialism. For the workers, in bringing their own exploitation to an end, will automatically end the exploitation of all peoples and all nations.

"Temporary Reverses"

How many have given proper sympathy to the deplorable state of the war-deposed monarchs, nobility and their retinue? Witness the tragic condition of Crown Princess Juliana, whose mother, Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, bravely insists that although "a difficult struggle still awaits us," nevertheless "temporary reverses should not dishearten us." The poor Princess Juliana, with her two daughters, has been reduced to an estate in the Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts which is described in the June 24 N. Y. Post:

"The Lloyd estate, on 42 acres of handsome old trees

and formal gardens, contains a main residence, which, in addition to the usual living rooms, a flower room, breakfast room and a study on the first floor, has seven master bedrooms and six baths together with ample servants' quarters on the second floor and a game room in the basement. There is also a guest cottage, two cabins and a good-sized swimming pool, in addition to a five-car garage and a stable for six horses on the property."

What a pity the suffering masses of the conquered countries in Europe, and the penniless refugees scattered throughout the world cannot help the Princess share her "temporary reverses!"

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

The official court record of his testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial, with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

116 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM

by Albert Goldman

The official court record of his final speech for the defense in the Minneapolis "Sedition" trial

100 Page Pamphlet . . . Only 10 Cents!

Order from:

PIONEER PUBLISHERS 116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK

Be Sure To Get Your Copy Every Week

SUBSCRIBE Now To

'The MILITANT'

Subscription: \$1 for Six Months

THE MILITANT

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK CITY

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People.

VOL. VI.—No. 26 Saturday, June 27, 1942

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

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN

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

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

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.

The Hudson Walkout And Race Prejudice

The anti-Negro walkout at the Hudson Naval Ordnance Arsenal in Detroit last week marks one of the most shameful pages in recent labor history. It was comparable in every way to scabbing, the violation of all the principles of working class solidarity. Like scabbing, it hurts the interests of the working class as a whole and benefits only the enemies of the labor movement. For these reasons, class conscious workers must do more than deplore it — they must also know what happened, why it happened, and what can be done to prevent it from happening again.

On the morning of June 18 the company, with the support of the United Auto Workers local in the plant, put two Negroes to work on production-machine jobs in each of the four main buildings of the arsenal. Each of these Negro workers was a member of the union, and was entitled by the seniority provisions of the union contract to be transferred from janitorial tasks to production work.

Previously some workers in the arsenal had been whipping up an agitation against permitting Negroes to work alongside of white workers. Responding to their harangues, 3000 of the 4000 workers on the morning shift quit work. The afternoon shift arrived, there was hesitation and argument, the local president arrived to address them and within an hour 90% of the workers on this shift had returned to their machines. The night shift went to work without any hesitation to speak of.

Meanwhile Secretary of Navy Knox ordered the men back to work and threatened to discharge those who refused and to blacklist them from all war plants. UAW President R. J. Thomas also instructed the men to return to work or face charges of violating the union constitution clause which prohibits racial discrimination. Practically all of the men returned to work the next day, and shortly thereafter the company discharged four men accused of having instigated the walkout, and union officials approved the action.

No good will come from trying to deceive ourselves, there are still many white workers who have racial prejudices against their Negro brothers. But why do white workers, even union members, do such things?

Scientists have told us — and we can easily confirm their findings — that no one is born with racial prejudices. Children of all races play with each other and treat each other as absolute equals until they become affected by the society around them. Children never have racial prejudices until they learn them from their parents, from their text-books in school, from the motion pictures, newspapers and prevailing sentiments of the world they live in.

The present capitalist society nurtures and breeds racial prejudice because it benefits the ruling class to have the workers divided and fighting each other instead of uniting to fight their oppressors. In a socialist society where there will

be no capitalists, where the people will be trained from childhood to understand that no man is superior to another because of the color of his skin, racial bias will disappear completely.

Thus the workers who walked out at Hudson were not only responding to the miseducation they got from capitalism, but they were also aiding capitalists to conceal the identity of those who are really responsible for racial prejudices. How happy this walkout must have made the bosses who want to keep the workers divided! How much easier it will be for them to get Negro workers who have been discriminated against, to act as strikebreakers when these same white workers go out on strike to protect their living conditions!

The government does not come into this picture with any cleaner hands than the capitalist class. For decades the government has strengthened and catered to the most reactionary prejudices. The strongest argument of the backward workers at Hudson was that Secretary of Navy Knox himself denies equality to the Negroes in the Navy, compelling them to serve either as mess attendants or, in line with the new Navy plan, on segregated ships. "Why," they asked the workers who were hesitant about walking out, "should we work alongside of Negroes when the government itself separates them from whites in the army and navy?"

Nor does the government propose any basic policy for eradicating racial bias in the future. Firing four workers may convince backward workers that they must be cautious about how they discriminate against Negroes, but it does not convince them that Negroes are entitled to equal rights. Only a basic re-education can do that, and the government which itself continues Jim Crow practices is not in a moral position to do it, even if it wanted to.

It is the task of the class-conscious workers, white and Negro, to reeducate the backward workers in the principles of class solidarity. White workers are most often in the best position to approach other white workers and to explain by past history and current events how discrimination against Negroes undermines the union movement and strengthens only the employers. Revolutionary workers, in particular, must seize on every opportunity to unite the workers on the basis of class unity and equality for workers of all races.

Negro militants too have an important task to fulfill. They must first of all understand the real reason why walkouts such as this occur. They must not permit discrimination by backward workers to blind them to the fact that the solution of their problems both as workers and as an oppressed people is indissolubly tied up with the future of the labor movement.

They must fight to keep events of this kind from further embittering their less class-conscious Negro brothers and thus turning them into anti-union elements. Despite the slow progress that is being made, they must not forget that progress is being made and primarily in the labor movement. Only a few miles from Detroit, in certain Flint auto plants, Negroes are working side by side and in full amity with white workers; who helped them to get their new production jobs and who greeted them in the most comradely spirit as they went onto these jobs.

Nor must they forget the most important thing about the Hudson incident — that the union stood firm, despite all the pressure from backward elements. The union stood firm and insisted on the right of the Negro workers to equal treatment. This fact cannot be too strongly emphasized; it is a sign that conditions have changed in the labor movement; it is a reason for much hope in the future; and every Negro worker who blames white workers as such for discrimination must be reminded of it.

Their One Aim

While the bosses demand that the workers sacrifice everything, including life itself, for the war, they themselves have but one aim — to safeguard and increase their profits.

The House Military Affairs Committee gave an example of this in its June 23 report, disclosing "a sordid picture of excessive commissions by brokers, profits by vendors, exorbitant salaries, bonuses and huge fees for management and related services in many War Department contracts."

For the same motive — profits — the big steel corporations have deliberately curtailed production in the face of a steel shortage. As revealed on June 23 by the Truman Senate Investigating Committee, the steel firms have suppressed a vital process for producing sponge iron used in the making of steel — a process they made available to Japanese interests — and dismantled plants "to maintain their safety and security after the war for monopolistic control." The report also discloses that "dollar-a-year men from the big steel firms absolutely control the steel policy of the WPB."

Every war industry shows the same picture. And every government war production agency is being run by capitalist interests who are aiding these war-profiteering and monopolistic practices.

Almost daily new disclosures are being made showing that the bosses, the private owners of industry, are nothing but a parasitic drain on the working masses and an impediment to the whole productive system.

The capitalist stranglehold on the means of production must be broken if the full productive forces of the country are to be released and the economic welfare of the masses made secure. There is but one way to begin this: by the governmental expropriation of the war industries and their operation under workers' control.

Why So Few Militants Become Army Officers

Methods for Picking Officers Effectively Sift Out All Those With Labor Background

By DAVID WARNER

Any illusion that the United States Army is a democratic institution is quickly dispelled by an examination of the methods by which the officer caste is chosen. In a previous article I have shown how the army still follows the classic method of giving commissions to "leaders" in civil life. These "leaders" are almost always businessmen, employers, individuals of wealth or social prestige, even prominent athletes, but virtually never trade unionists or leaders of working class organizations.

With the perspective of an army that will shortly number close to 5,000,000 men, this method has only one real shortcoming for the army bureaucracy. It cannot furnish anywhere near the number of officers necessary.

John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, in a recent radio address, has stated that the expanded army will require a minimum of 75,000 officers this year, "for the ground forces alone." The total number of officers required for 1942 may easily reach twice this figure.

The bulk of these officers will be selected from the 95,000 enlisted and drafted men now in the Army who will be chosen to attend the Army's special three months Officer's Candidate Schools.

The announcement of this proposal was widely hailed by the liberal press as a sign of the democratic character of the army. Other papers more cautiously referred to it as an indication of the "growing democratization" of the army.

Both claims are complete falsehoods as a slightly closer examination shows.

PROCEDURE FOLLOWED

The procedure involved for a soldier who wants to attend one of the schools is apparently quite simple. Men chosen for the schools must first serve in the ranks for three months. And as the N. Y. Times puts it in reporting Mr. McCloy's speech, "At the end of that period, on the basis of his record in civil life and his record during his service in the

authorities conduct a thorough inquiry into the applicant's background. Any signs of militant trade union work, participation in the radical or civil liberties movement, student anti-war strikes, or similar activities are sufficient to cause rejection of the application. This is made all the easier when it is remembered that it is not necessary for the army bureaucrats to give the applicant any reason for his rejection.

This is just one part however, of the meaning of the phrase, "record in civil life." The recent publicity over the case of Joseph P. Lash, former Socialist Party member and student leader, later a Communist Party follower and now an ardent patriot, is very instructive on this point.

THE CASE OF LASH

Lash, it will be recalled, had his application for a post in the Naval Intelligence rejected, in spite of the fact that he had a letter of recommendation from Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The conservative press whipped itself into a fury because Mrs. Roosevelt had signed a letter for an ex-radical. They had no objections at all to the common system whereby an applicant for a commission in the armed forces — and this holds equally well for the Officer's Candidate Schools — presents letters of recommendation from prominent members of the capitalist class, businessmen, politicians, etc.

The chance that a worker or militant trade unionist might secure such a letter is quite slight, indeed.

Lash had his application rejected and was eventually drafted into the army. The armed forces make it a point not only to reject as officers all militants and radicals, but even those who might have been exposed to progressive ideas in the past!

The campaign of the army to obtain thousands of new officers is not a sign of its "growing democratization." The army bureaucracy looks on it simply as a military necessity and is determined that there shall be no changes in its dictatorial and thoroughly reactionary rule.

ANOTHER PRECAUTION

The army however takes further precautions to insure that no trade union militant or working class leader will manage to slip in to any of the Officer's Candidate Schools.

One of the determining factors in admitting an applicant to a school is his "record in civil life." This phrase covers a wide ground. On the basis of it, the army

The Real Cause Of The 'Poor Man's Disease'

Medical Studies Find That It Can Be Prevented and Cured In Simple Manner

By GRACE CARLSON

Long thought to be caused by a germ infection, the dread pellagra is now known definitely to be a vitamin-deficiency disease. The discovery in 1937 by Dr. C. Elvehjem and other research workers at the University of Wisconsin, that nicotinic acid or niacin, found in fresh meat, green vegetables, eggs and fruit was the pellagra-preventive factor, completed the medical conquest of the disease.

But the social conquest of pellagra, the "scourge of the south," has not yet been achieved. About 400,000 cases of outright pellagra occur in the United States annually. Although it was once thought that pellagra was limited to the south, a recent survey by three Ohio physicians of the patients admitted to the charity hospitals in Cleveland and Cincinnati from 1933-39 showed that from 1% to 2% of these patients had this vitamin-deficiency disease.

Public health officials estimate that there are other hundreds of thousands of cases of "sub-clinical or latent" cases of pellagra in the country, in whom the open symptoms have not yet appeared.

The name, pellagra, a corruption of the Italian words *pelle* (rough skin) came into use about 1771 when pellagra was prevalent in Italy, Austria, Spain and other European countries. Cases of pellagra have been diagnosed as such in the United States from the time of the Civil War. The disease is marked by three principal symptoms: a roughening of the skin, digestive disorders and nervous and mental disturbance which often leads to insanity.

DUE TO FAULTY DIET

Even before the discovery of niacin (part of the vitamin B complex) in 1937, medical scientists knew that pellagra was the "poor man's disease" and was due to a faulty diet. Over 20 years ago, Dr. Joseph Goldberger of the U. S. Public Health Service noted that the pellagra victims of the south lived on salt pork, dried beans, molasses and corn pone. He secured amazing recoveries by having pellagra patients in orphan asylums and other public institutions shift to a diet of fresh meat, milk, eggs, fruit and green vegetables.

Then Dr. Goldberger gave the "poor man's diet" of salt pork

and dried beans to the normally well-fed dogs in his experimental laboratory. All of them developed "blacktongue," a canine form of pellagra and medical research men had an experimental animal with which to work in order to find the cause and cure of pellagra. The synthesis of the pellagra-preventive vitamin, niacin, by Dr. Elvehjem and his associates in 1937 completed the study.

That pellagra still plagues hundreds of thousands of Negro and white workers in the south, despite the fact that medical science has found the key to its complete prevention, is a shameful condemnation of the American social system. The richest country in the world cannot organize its vast resources so as to supply the necessary life-giving food elements to its people.

Doctors are able to cure pellagra now by the administration of the synthetic vitamin niacin to the patient — no patient need die of pellagra today. But the prevention of pellagra, as well as of the millions of cases of other deficiency diseases in the United States, lies in providing adequate, well-balanced diets to the American masses.

A FRANK STATEMENT

In a frank statement as to the basic, therapeutic value of good food, Dr. James McLester of the University of Alabama Medical School, when describing the treatment of patients suffering from a variety of mental and physical disorders whose disease had been found difficult of diagnosis, recently said:

"The patients of whom I speak, have been put to bed in the hospital, reassured, given a pat on the back and forced to eat a liberal, well-balanced diet. . . In the majority of instances, the improvement has been thoroughly satisfactory. The aches and pains have disappeared, foods were eaten that formerly were regarded with fear, emotional stability has been established and not infrequently the patient has blossomed out like a rose. He was cured for the time being, but of what he was cured, I formerly had many doubts. Now I believe I know. It was not, as was first thought, the seclusion, the opportunity for quiet contemplation, the reassurance, the atmosphere of encouragement or the pat on the back that accomplished the cure. It was food."

Troops Are Taught Little About Real Background Of War

BOOK REVIEW

THE BACKGROUND OF OUR WAR, from lectures prepared by the Orientation Course, War Department Bureau of Public Relations. Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1942. 279 pages. \$2.00.

"The Background of Our War" comprises a number of lectures on current events from which the enlisted men in the army are supposed to learn everything about the outbreak and course of the war that the general staff wants them to learn.

It is amusing to observe to what lengths the military hierarchy will prostrate itself to proclaim its idealism and love of peace. Wilsonianism and the League of Nations, which the army militarists once denounced as "Red Internationalism," are now held forth as shining examples of democratic righteousness which failed — and here they revert to the old "blood and iron" — because they were ineffectively enforced.

This talk of enforcement, together with denunciations of the "inherent militarism" of the Axis peoples, and accusations that the German people were the actual instigators of the war, are all signs of the terms which they intend to mete out to the peoples of Germany, Japan and Italy once victory has been gained.

How to Be a "Democracy"

This book is significant if only for what it disregards. There is no mention of the world economic and social conflicts which led to the war, of the breakdown of bourgeois democracy in Germany and its replacement by fascism, nor of the fact that Nazism was financed by both German and Allied capitalists and financiers. As to the Allies — from autocratic Poland, long notorious for its suppression of national minorities, to the Greek dictatorship — they are all regarded as full-fledged "democracies." Thus, to the army's way of thinking, a nation's economic and social system is decided by whichever side it happens to be on at any given moment.

The Polish campaign, according to the "experts" who gave these lectures, was won by the Germans purely on the basis of their military superiority. Naturally, if they are to term Poland as a "democracy," they can hardly refer to the terrible social conditions which manifested themselves in total apathy on the part of the Polish people, and to the corruption and degeneracy of the Polish aristocracy who fled the country at the first shock of combat.

France's defeat is explained as the result of purely military factors and the disruption of "national unity" by German fifth column propaganda. Here the army is obviously sugar-coating the role of French capitalism, its fear of its own working class which led it to welcome the Germans as the better alternative to Communism, its financing of Fascist movements both within France and within Germany as well, and its subordination of everything else to the desire to protect its profits, etc.

Soviet Morale Unexplained

The chapters on the Soviet Union bring to mind some amusing sidelights. The Soviet Union which they so blatantly denounced at the time of the Soviet-Finnish War of 1939 (which incidentally is not even mentioned here) is now welcomed back into the "Democratic Family of Nations" with eulogies and compliments. They are profuse in their praise of Soviet morale, but their only attempt to explain it is by the altogether false statement that the Nazis failed to prepare any fifth column campaign against Russia. The Nazis have for years maintained and organized assorted Russian nationalist and fascist and White Russian organizations and have directed a steady stream of propaganda toward the national groups within the USSR. This agitation failed not because it was insufficiently intensive or thorough but because the Soviet masses, in contrast to the French and Polish people, know that they are defending positive social and economic gains.

The utter hypocrisy of the book is revealed in its treatment of the war in the Far East. The military mind with its traditional limited breadth of vision tries to explain everything along exclusively military lines. And so the army lectures attribute Japan's speedy victories entirely to her superiority in military equipment and trained manpower. This "background" of the war is silent about the two centuries of colonial exploitation and repression which were expressed in either total apathy or animosity toward the war. No mention is made of the failure of the "democratic" imperialists to mobilize the manpower and resources of the colonies — a failure that resulted directly and cannot be separated from the vicious colonial policies of the "democracies." If the army instructors were to discuss this aspect of "democracy" with the troops, they would be destroying the very foundations of their argument. Hence their silence on the subject.

Glosses Over the Important Facts

The chapters on South America are especially noteworthy in light of the absorption of this area into the United States economic network. Here again the book glosses over the terrible economic conditions and tries to explain all dissatisfaction with U. S. capitalism as the manifestation of German fifth column activity. Soldiers who don't know about the role of Yankee imperialism in Honduras, Haiti, Nicaragua, etc., would never be able to understand from these lectures why the South American masses don't greet them with enthusiasm and joy.

In brief, the men in the armed forces will have to look elsewhere if they want to learn the real reasons for the war and if they want to get an honest explanation of the course of the war thus far.

Reviewed by JAMES CADMAN.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
JUNE, 1942

A YEAR OF SOVIET-NAZI WAR:

1. A Balance Sheet of the Year by James Cadman
2. "Socialism in One Country" Editorial Comment
3. Stalin Blames the German Workers . . . by Felix Morrow

AMERICA'S SIXTY FAMILIES AND THE NAZIS
The Role of the U. S.-Nazi Cartel Agreements
by Art Preis

The Degradation of Sidney Hook . . . by William F. Ward

The I. L. P.—Words and Reality by Marc Loris

The Crisis in U. S. Agriculture by C. Charles

TWENTY CENTS PER COPY
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHING CO.
116 University Place New York City

For a Rising Scale of Wages to Meet Rising Living Costs