





# The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

## Plant Discrimination and Army Segregation

Two Cleveland court cases, which ended just before Christmas, were among the most significant trials to be held in 1942. They revealed that employers are still practicing Jim Crow-assembly hiring policies and that the Negroes cannot depend on either the courts or President Roosevelt's Executive Order 8802 to put an end to these discriminatory policies.

Suit was brought against two war plants, Warner and Swasey Co. and Thompson Products, charging them with refusing to employ Negro women workers solely because of their color, and demanding that this practice be discontinued. The court action was organized at the initiative of the Future Outlook League, a militant organization which has been combating job discrimination for many years, and the cases were heard before Common Pleas Judge Frank J. Merriek.

Several Negro women testified against the plants' management. They told how they had gone to training school, learned machine shop work and in most cases been commended by their teachers for their ability, and then applied to the two companies for machine shop work. In each case they were told that there were no jobs for them, although the companies were at that time advertising in the papers for women workers needed for machine shop work.

At the beginning of the trial the lawyers for the employers said they would prove that no discrimination existed. But during the trial itself company executives were forced to admit that it did exist; their excuse for it was that the union or individual white workers had objected to employment of Negro women, a charge which was hotly denied by the union officials involved. At the end no one disputed the contention that the employers had never even attempted to hire a single Negro woman for machine shop work.

The lawyers for the Negro women bringing suit also showed that the plants had war contracts with the government and that these contracts — as provided in Executive Order 8802 — stipulated that there must be no race discrimination in employment.

Nevertheless, the judge hearing the case refused to do anything about it and in effect denied that anything could be done about it through the courts.

Thus for the first time a court confirmed the often-made charge that Executive Order 8802 is completely toothless and ineffective.

Also confirmed by this court decision is the necessity for carrying on a militant struggle to force the adoption of really effective anti-Jim Crow legislation.

# INTERNATIONAL NOTES

By BETTY KUEHN

On December 21, the National Congress party of Ceylon passed a resolution calling for "freedom from Britain after the war instead of dominion status" according to the December 22 New York Times.

This is especially significant in view of the fact that the Ceylon Congress party is considerably more to the right than its counterpart, the Indian National Congress party.

In India, where the Bolshevik-Leninist party of the Fourth International was founded as late as 1941, many revolutionists are still in the Congress party. In Ceylon, however, the revolutionary party, the Lanka Sama Samaja (Fourth International), has been functioning effectively since 1935. It has drawn the revolutionary elements into its own ranks and, indeed, became the acknowledged leader of the toiling masses. It was outlawed by the British in 1940.

Another Ceylon Congress resolution urged "the United Nations to make an immediate declaration guaranteeing freedom for Ceylon." These resolutions reflect the pressure of the Indian events of the past year on even such a conservative party as the National Congress. They also give an indication of what is going on behind the curtain of censorship in Ceylon.

The lie that all Germans are alike, that they all support Hitler, is refuted by the following item in the November 15 Bulletin of the International Federation of Trade Unions which reports from Norway:

"It is significant that the opposition movement is finding

# U. S. Moves In North Africa Strengthen French Reaction

By A. ROLAND

The Allies one and all deplore the assassination of Darlan—but they are also breathing audible sighs of relief.

There is deGaulle for example. He had worked himself into a real lather about democracy and freedom. He had bitterly denounced the regime of Vichy-toadies-to-the-Nazis, especially the collaborating desk-Admiral Darlan. De Gaulle could not suddenly reverse his course and stretch out the hand of amity to this sinister figure just because the United States had recognized Darlan as High Commissioner in North Africa.

Roosevelt had made up his mind, however, that the French ruling class must be reunited before the end of the war. The risk of civil war in post-war France was great enough without making it more likely by virtue of a deep rift in the ranks of the French bourgeoisie.

Darlan had the inside track, far more than de Gaulle, with the very tops of the French capitalists—the Comité des Forges, the coal-steel-chemical-munitions trust. Roosevelt was aiming, through Darlan, at these elements so necessary to his post-war plans for Europe. The fact that Darlan was also very anti-British and therefore far more amenable to American persuasion—as against the pro-British de Gaulle—had its points too.

Had Darlan remained alive, it was merely a question of time before a proper formula would have been worked out to reconcile the "Free French" with Darlan's "Totalitarian French." His death simplifies matters in the most highly pleasing manner. De Gaulle need not eat crow. He saves "honesty and honor" in reaching out his hand, not to Darlan, but to his fellow-General, Henri Honoré Giraud, chosen with the helpful consent of Darlan's lieutenants Nogues and Boisson.

### FDR'S TASK SIMPLIFIED

Roosevelt thus finds his task very much simplified. The criticism has already ceased. Nobody cares to notice that the policies remain quite the same, even if the figure of one Vichyite has been erased from the scene. The most important question of the moment has been solved—finding a figure around whom the ruling class of France and the French Empire could rally under American lead.

### POLITICAL CENSORSHIP

The "military security" motive for secrecy thus may turn out to be more a political than a military motive. The military side exists, of course, since a new sharp break between the Free French and the ex-Vichyites who had previously clapped so many of the Free French in filthy jails to rot, might have led to armed conflict. Roosevelt's indignation at the

## The Lessons of 1918-20

# Revolutionary Propaganda Broke Attacks On Soviet

By MIRIAM CARTER

The signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918 was greeted with joy by the French people, as it was by peoples all over the world because it meant to them an end to the meaningless slaughter and suffering of the First World War. Their celebrating was cut short, however, when, by order of Cleméau several French divisions and ships were sent to Russia to attempt to crush the young workers' state, whose very existence was a threat to the imperialist rulers.

The French troops and fleet were concentrated, mostly, in the Black Sea region. Together with Poles, Serbs, Greeks and White Guards, they occupied the Russian coast along the Black Sea.

The French soldiers and sailors had no enthusiasm for this new war. It was the Bolsheviks who educated the French soldiers and sailors as to the real nature of the Soviet regime, and showed them the way to realize their desires: peace, the return to France, and demobilization.

The Bolsheviks were forced to work underground, since this territory was in the hands of the counter-revolutionists. With the White Terror hounding them "Bolshevik pamphlets and papers in Russian and in French periodically invaded the workers' quarters, the cantonments and the ships." (Andre Marty, "The Revolt of the Black Sea," p. 86)

### BOLSHEVIK PROPAGANDA

The Bolsheviks had a clandestine printing press, which put out a special journal for the French soldiers and sailors called "The Communist," in French, and innumerable leaflets, appeals, small pamphlets in French, Polish, Greek, Rumanian and English. Numerous handbills and proclamations were also printed and posted on the walls at night. The distribution of this literature was carried on, says Marty, in the "cities by children, who under cover of selling cigarettes or mag-

azines, penetrated the cantonments," or by soldiers and sailors with whom contact was established by the party organization, and who each day found ingenious new devices to get the literature to their ranks.

Another means the Bolsheviks used to spread their ideas was the telegraph. "Radiotelegraphists of the Black Sea Fleet," says Marty, "every morning at three received long telegrams from Moscow in French, German and English. . . . Although the exact meaning of the word 'Bolshevik' often escaped many of them, an ardent sympathy developed rapidly among them for the men who expressed so well their sentiments in leaflets and on the radio. The repeated appeals 'Form Soviets! Return to France!' were understood by a greater and greater number of sailors."

### RED FRATERNIZATION

"A group of French sailors were stationed on guard in a city. A small detachment of Red troops passed. Very simply they came and shook our hands. This gesture toward us who fought them a few days before touched us deeply. One of us who knew a little Russian engaged them in conversation. One of them asked us why we treat them as enemies when they fight against exploiters and landlords. . . . All the detachments of Red Guards or Red soldiers who met French sailors agitated in this way. This lowered morale considerably. Fraternization at that moment was already attained."

### REASON FOR VICTORY

The fleet also was withdrawn from the Black Sea. The final withdrawal of the French from South Russia was mainly due to the methods the Bolsheviks used in battling against their imperialist foe. It was due, says Marty, to "the persistent work of the Bolshevik, of all the proletarians of the occupied cities, who wakened in the French soldiers and sailors class consciousness, who concretized their discontent in the aim to refuse to fight against the Russian people, and who pushed them so strongly along the revolutionary path that the government was obliged first to bring them back to France and then to demobilize them rapidly, for fear of seeing insurrections in France."

Hitler's army and his rear would be disintegrated rapidly by the application of these Bolshevik methods today.

# Behind The Dispute Over The Darlan Deal

By M. Morrison

The deal entered into by General Eisenhower (naturally under the direction of the administration) with the late Admiral Darlan has, for various reasons, aroused apprehension and criticism, both here and abroad. The English conservatives as well as the English liberals, the Stalinists and many American liberals have indicated their opposition to any arrangement with one who, only a short while ago, was denounced as an arch appeaser and a collaborator with Hitler.

It is necessary to understand the reasons motivating the different critics of the horse-trade with Darlan. On our part it is also necessary to place the greatest emphasis on those aspects of the deal which can be least beclouded by arguments dealing with military considerations.

British imperialists were not happy about the obvious willingness of Darlan to subject himself to the control of the American military leaders. It has been reported that Giraud, Darlan's successor, at one time definitely stated that he would work with (by that he meant that he would take orders from) the Americans, but not the British.

As is to be expected, the British imperialists have not been very vociferous in their criticism of the Roosevelt administration, for the simple reason that they cannot afford to antagonize the power upon whose support they depend to win the war. Their dissatisfaction takes the form mainly of a half-hearted defense of the arrangement with Darlan. That the English liberals have been more loud in their criticism of the deal with Darlan than their American brothers is a reflection of the state of mind of the British ruling class.

As far as the English conservatives are concerned, their anxiety is assuredly not caused by any concern with the fact that a deal has been made with a friend of Hitler and an enemy of democracy. They would scoff at those who proclaim the principle that a deal with a reactionary appeaser of Hitler is contrary to the democratic purposes of a peoples' war and therefore impermissible. Their concern is solely for their imperialist interests. They saw in Darlan's close tie-up with the American forces an indication that France and the French colonies have completely succumbed to American influence. In the support that the English reactionaries give to de Gaulle as against the American arrangement with Darlan we can see more evidence of the fierce rivalry raging between the English and American monopoly capitalists underneath the cloak of a joint effort to smite the common enemy.

Whatever independent role France played prior to the war is now gone. Its ruling class is divided into three groups — one depending upon and supporting German monopoly capitalism, another tied up with English capitalism and a third with American capitalism.

The criticism of the Stalinists is also modulated. Their support of the Roosevelt administration is so whole-hearted that they are willing to be more than charitable in their judgment of anything done by the government. The Stalinists must, however, consider the outraged feelings of the sincere liberals and progressive workers who object to dealing with an avowed enemy of democracy. Their criticism is also motivated by the consideration that Darlan and those like him are bitter enemies of the Soviet Union.

Their gingerly approach to the deal with Darlan is perhaps dictated by the fact that they are not exactly in the best position to criticize deals with fascists. Not so long ago they strenuously defended a certain agreement between Stalin and Hitler which, in the words of Molotov, was "sealed in blood."

It is the attitude towards the Darlan affair taken by the sincere liberals and the workers who believe that this war is really one for democracy, that deserves the closest attention of revolutionary Marxists. Their feelings have been outraged because, believing that this is a war for democracy, they are unable to explain how it is possible that those who lead such a war can so easily come to an agreement with an open enemy of democracy. They necessarily involve themselves in an argument as to how far military considerations permit an agreement between those fighting for democracy and dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries.

While sympathizing with the sincere liberals and progressive workers we, of course, cannot accept their premise. For us the deal with Darlan was not bad because it violates the principles for which this war is ostensibly being fought. It was simply another indication that the monopoly capitalists are not fighting a war for democracy.

For critical liberals it was a question of supporting de Gaulle as against Darlan. For revolutionary Marxists it was a question of supporting the colonial people of the French colonies against both Darlan and de Gaulle. Our demand of the Roosevelt administration is not that he support de Gaulle but that he recognize and accept the right of the natives to determine their own form of government. The appointment of Darlan's successor after his assassination shows that the natives have not one word to say about the question of the form of their government. If this is a war for democracy, then it is the kind of democracy from which the people of the French colonies are excluded.

# Where You Can Get THE MILITANT

- Boston—Adelman's Newsstand, 284 Tremont St.
- Chicago — Socialist Bookshop, Room 421, 160 N. Wells St.
- Detroit—The Saturday Bookshop, Room 5, 3513 Woodward Ave., open Saturday evenings from 6 to 9 o'clock.
- Minneapolis — Shinder's News Agency, Hennepin Ave. and 6th St.; Pioneer News Agency, 238 2nd Ave. South.
- Newark (Downtown) — Newsstand, 11 Springfield Ave., near Court House.
- New Haven — N o d e l m a n's News Depot, 106 Church St., near Chapel.
- New York (Harlem) — Newsstands north west corner of Lenox Ave. and 125th St. and at the northeast corner of Lenox Ave. and 135th St.
- New York (Garment Area) — Newsstand, corner of 38th St. and 7th Ave.
- New York (Manhattan)—14th St., between 4th and 7th Aves.; Newsstands on 42nd St., between 4th and 5th Aves.
- Rochester — Newsstand, Main St. and Clinton Ave., southeast corner.
- San Francisco — Duncaes Smoke Shop, 1988 Sutter. Ray's Smoke Shop, 1174 Sutter.
- Fitzgerald News Agency, 21 Fourth Golden Gate News Agency, 81 Third MacDonald's Book Shop, 867 Mission Street.

Delivering the goods means two things: to keep order, that is, to prevent the masses from taking power into their own hands, and to do the bidding of the American government. It can be stated with the utmost certainty that any government, no matter how reactionary, that is capable and willing to do these two things will receive the support of the American government.

It is quite probable that, before Hitler's armies crack up, Hitler and his closest associates will turn the reins over to some German generals for the purpose of making the best possible peace with the Allies and to prevent an uprising of the German masses. There will be no hesitation, we can be sure, on the part of the American government in supporting any reactionary regime in Germany if it can assure "order" and obedience to Washington's commands.

Even for those liberals and workers who support the war the task is to prepare for a struggle against the attempts of any government in Washington to prevent the masses of Europe from determining their own fate. No Darlan deal should be tolerated.

