Policy FOR Victory

15c

EARL BROWDER

POLICY FOR VICTORY

Earl Browder

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS • NEW YORK

This booklet is composed of selected articles and speeches written and delivered by the General Secretary of the Communist Party from July, 1942, to April, 1943. Omitted from this selection are the items on economic policy, and the debate with George Sokolsky, which have been issued separately in pamphlet form.

Published by WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC., P. O. BOX 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York City. May, 1943. 209 PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

CONTENTS

I. THE KEY TO VICTORY

WE ARE participating in a globe-encircling war. Its outcome will decide the fate of mankind for many generations. Hitlerism, Nazism gathering to itself all the dark forces of the world, bids for world domination. It has overrun country after country. Only in the Soviet Union has it met serious military reverses and been thrown back on its heels. But the Axis monster still seriously bids for triumph. It is not yet beaten. It openly proclaims its intention to subjugate the United States.

Already the vanguard of Axis military invasion has landed on our Pacific islands, while Atlantic Coast invasion begins with the eight spies and diversionists caught red-handed after landing with explosives from submarines. The United States is in the most deadly danger of its 166 years of independence. It is war, deadly war, a war of life and death for all nations. It has been truly described as a war of survival.

If Hitlérism is victorious, then mankind is thrown back into the darkness of pre-history, human progress of tens of centuries is wiped out. Our children and grandchildren, with their fellows over the world, will suffer a slavery worse than anything the primitive world had known. For Hitler is the ape-man, armed with the most modern military science, claiming to rule the world.

For us in the United States, as for the peoples of the whole world, this war has become a People's War of National Liberation. Our very existence is at stake. That is why the obligatory slogan is: "Everything to win the war! Everything for victory over the Axis!"

The masses of the people are prepared to take up their tasks in this war. It is unfortunately true, however, that our country is not fully organized for the supreme test, that serious obstacles are showing themselves. I do not speak tonight of the short-

comings in economic mobilization; with all its weaknesses, the economic side is still the strongest phase of our war effort, thanks to the labor-management-government joint committees and the unleashing of labor's initiative in production through the trade unions. Tonight I wish to speak mainly of questions of policy, of the mobilization of the masses behind policy, of morale, of those factors which make it possible for a nation to throw its full force into the scales of war to win victory.

We must never forget the armaments and materiel of war are not enough to win. Arms are only the instruments of policy. Without correct policy we are defenseless though we have arms a hundred-fold. The long and mounting list of catastrophies since Hitler took power in Germany are monuments to blunders, and weaknesses in policy—a hundred times more than to lack of arms. The world has been paying for its lack of guiding policy with the lives of its youth and the freedom of its peoples.

We now hold the keys to an adequate policy for winning the war. These keys are: The American-Soviet-British Pacts and alliance—the bulwark of the United Nations and of world democracy; the Washington and London Agreements to open the Second Front in Europe and to extend all-out aid to China. With the fulfillment of these historic agreements, we will have a guiding policy for victory.

But this policy must be fought for. The labor movement, the entire people must and will support this policy. At this moment this—the nation's policy—must be fought for in the Congressional elections. We must have such a Congress as will strongly express this line of policy. The present Congress does not; after voting appropriations, it continues politics as usual, worse than the industrialist or labor leader who continues "business as usual." The Congressional elections must become a vital front in the winning of the war. We must have a Congress with the single thought of turning everything to victory in the war.

With the fall of Hitler the entire Axis will be speedily crushed. Hitler can be smashed in 1942! With 90 per cent of Hitler's forces tied down on the Eastern front, now is the time to strike in the West, to open up the Second Front in Europe. That requires that the United States carry its full share of the battle

—now, not in a year or two. The old and shameful epitaph, "Too little and too late," must be buried and forgotten. We must strike the enemy with all our force and on time. And this is the time, this is the crucial year.

There is only one country as yet pulling its full weight in the supreme test of war. Only the Soviet Union has thrown everything into the scales. When General MacArthur said: "The hopes of civilization rest on the worthy banners of the courageous Russian Army," he was not inviting us to stand aside and admire the Soviet Union, waiting for them to win the war for us; he was calling upon us to emulate the completeness of their effort.

When William Green, in his wholly admirable speech of June 22, declared his wholehearted solidarity with the Soviet people, he was speaking not for the American Federation alone but for all labor, and above all he was speaking for the United States to do its part now, in time. The patriotic speech of Green, and the call of the C.I.O. Executive for cooperation of American labor with the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Council, must now give rise to the unity of action of the great labor movements of our countries which is necessary to achieve victory.

I have not the slightest doubt of the ultimate victory of the peoples over Nazism. But I know that the price of victory in lives and wealth will be much higher, unnecessarily high, if we fail to achieve full national unity in the United States in a mighty effort for victory in 1942.

As spokesman for the Communist Party, I declare that we subordinate every issue to this one imperative necessity of national unity under the nation's Commander-in-Chief to win the war at the earliest possible moment, which means at minimum cost.

National unity does not come automatically. It must be won. It has many enemies, of whom the most dangerous are the masked ones. Washington had his Tories and Benedict Arnolds in 1776-1783, Madison had his Federalist defeatists and traitors in 1812; Lincoln had his Copperheads and Vallandighams—today President Roosevelt must deal with the modern version of this ancent evil—the fifth column, which to its predecessors is as the airplane to the ox-cart.

The fifth column's first and most important job is to undermine and break national unity. To build and maintain national unity requires us to expose, isolate, and crush Hitler's fifth column in the United States, with all its dupes and stooges. The fifth column is Hitler's "secret weapon" with which he rose to power, with which he prepared his invasion of one country after another. It is the weapon upon which Hitler depends especially to conquer the United States.

If you want to know who are the fifth column, ask what Hitler wanted most of all to accomplish in the United States in the past two years in order to prepare to conquer us. The answer is, obviously, that Hitler most of all wanted to keep apart and hostile the two most powerful nations in the world, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., to prevent that fighting alliance of these two countries with England, and, after the alliance had been made, to weaken and undermine it.

Who has been the most active creating issues and rousing sentiments which tended to make more difficult the consummation of the alliance of those powerful nations which could seal Hitler's doom? When you answer that question you have the names of Hitler's chief fifth columnists in the United States. And, amazingly enough, we find them in positions of influence and prestige, working away quite industriously in a way to delight the hearts of Hitler and Goebbels in Berlin.

What names would head that list? Each one will have his own opinion, according to his own observations. Certainly one would be that of a prominent American ex-statesman who was chief organizer in the U.S. of arms for Field Marshal Baron von Mannerheim, whose American-made planes are today sinking American ships off Murmansk. Fantastically enough, the same issues of the newspapers last week which hailed this person as a most important advisor on how to make peace (presumably without victory, for he has no word for that), also report in their news columns that his protégé Mannerheim has just visited Hitler to re-pledge his fealty and to plan his new attacks against the American supply line to the Soviet Union, while Mannerheim's agent Procope sits in Washington gathering information for his chiefs. Thus far are we from really combating the fifth column!

Another, if less illustrious, name on our list, would have to be Congressman Martin Dies. Who worked so hard as he over years to the single end of creating every possible obstacle to understanding and agreement between the two great powers whose unity was and is essential to the safety and survival of each, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.? I advise everyone to read and re-read Martin Dies' book, *The Trojan Horse in America; A Report to the Nation.*

From the typewriter of the man whom Congress placed in charge of protecting our country from the fifth column, this book is the prize exhibit of what the fifth column and its master Hitler wanted most of all in this country. It is an impassioned indictment of the Soviet Union, and of Joseph Stalin, as the deadly enemy, practically the only serious enemy, of the United States. He foresees that the U. S. will join in the war against the Soviet Union, but not against Germany.

Americans are branded by Dies as "traitors" because they refused to endorse in advance Mr. Dies'—and Hitler's—war against the Soviet Union. Mr. Dies did and wrote everything in his power to prevent the establishment of the United Nations, and the U. S.-U.S.S.R. alliance, which today is our greatest guarantee of victory over Hitler. Those who believed Martin Dies—and he has but recently been again endorsed by Congress—must hold a deadly fear of our Ally, the Soviet Union, must consider the alliance an unfortunate accident or great mistake—in short, must think exactly as Hitler wishes them to think in order the better to soften up, isolate, and finally conquer the United States as he has done with unfortunate France.

Surely Hitler finds Martin Dies' work of more value to his campaign of world conquest than even the open pro-Nazism of Laval, Doriot, or Quisling, because it contributes to confusing and defeating the greatest prize of all, the U. S. A. It is not for nothing that the Berlin radio has long praised Martin Dies as the best authority on America.

Uncover the trail of Martin Dies, and it will lead to most of the nests of Hitler's agents in the U. S. whose mission is to break up national unity, throw the public into turmoil, sow suspicion and fear of our Allies, and block the way to an all-out effort to

win the war. It will lead to a number of politicians, publicists, newspapers, radio commentators, political groupings—and behind them Tory industrialists and financiers, our American counterparts of the German Krupps and Thyssens.

My own enforced sojourn for fourteen months in the solitudes of Georgia was an incidental by-product of the desperate efforts of world reaction, headed by Hitler, to prevent by all means the realization of the U.S.-Soviet Alliance which I, as the spokesman for my party, had long advocated as essential to the national interests of our own country as to the whole freedom-loving world.

Today it is the official policy of the U. S. Government that the defense of the Soviet Union is vital to the national interests of the American people. There is much merit in the thought expressed recently by Walter Lippmann that Russia regardless of its prevailing regime was always the natural ally of the U. S.; it is a hundred times true since Russia became the Socialist Soviet Union.

Today, it is universally admitted that the Soviet Union under Stalin's leadership—so viciously denounced over the years by the fifth column—saved the world from Hitler's conquest when it turned back the Nazi invasion. What MacArthur termed "the greatest military achievement in all history" saved the Soviet Union from slavery, and at the same time gave to Britain and the United States the possibility of victory, saved civilization itself.

But today we still have in our U. S. statutes a whole series of laws, based upon the assumption that the Soviet Union is the enemy of civilization in general and of the United States in particular, and outlawing as "foreign agents" those Americans who over the years have looked upon the Soviet Union as a friendly power and potential ally. These laws were largely the result of Martin Dies' propaganda, and therefore are shaped in a way to please and serve Hitler. They are the peculiar product of Hitler's technique of international conquest. I refer to the anti-Communist laws.

Most persons still think the anti-Communist laws are to suppress some obnoxious and disagreeable, if not dangerous, people

who belong to a small minority party and are therefore not of much importance even if an injustice is being done. I speak against these laws not as a matter of injustice, but as an injury to American democracy. These laws and the witch-hunt and purges authorized by them are a Hitlerite poison at the very well-springs of American political and social life. They tear down the American democratic electoral system. They are being used to disrupt national unity and hamper the war effort. They are the instruments of Hitler's hidden invasion of the United States. They must be wiped out, not in the interests of the Communists, but in the interests of winning the war. Every listener will know from his own experience and observation the serious disruption of our democratic processes that comes from the red-baiting campaign.

From the moment this global war and our participation in it became inevitable, the Communist Party declared for the unconditional subordination of all issues to that one issue of winning the war. We meant, among other things, that our proposals for socialism in our country will not be brought forward in any way that could disrupt national unity for the war effort. It does not mean, as some persons have charged, that we advocate that all redress of grievances should be postponed until the war is won. A typical and pressing demand for redress of grievances is that being made by Negro citizens for the removal of disabilities and discriminations which have long denied their full rights under the Constitution. The Communist Party supports these demands of the Negro people unconditionally, and we declare that they must be granted now, at once—precisely in the interests of national unity, of utilizing every productive force, for winning the war. Support for the war requires support for the demands of the Negro people, and not silence on these demands or their denial.

A leading Negro paper, the *New York Age,* in its current issue, while recognizing the Communist Party as an outstanding fighter for Negro rights "until the war," assumes that we are sacrificing Negro rights to the needs of the war, and have made our peace with race prejudice, in order not to come into collision with Southern Democrats and their "white supremacy" dogma. Such

an assumption is nonsense, as we have always proved by our work, and can arise only from a misunderstanding.

We consider the "white supremacy" slogan of Southern Bourbons one of the greatest dangers to the U. S. in this war, tending to drive away from us our allies and potential allies in Asia, Africa and part of the Americas; only as we prove this "white supremacy" ideology does not represent the United States can these allies have trust in us. We consider it necessary to find immediate remedies to the grievances of the Negroes, in a way that will help, not hinder, the successful prosecution of the war. This is quite possible, since the Negroes are overwhelmingly supporting the war, and the Administration has proved its sincere desire to work in this direction.

No, there is not the slightest reason for misunderstanding between any Negro leaders and the Communists because of our support of the war; and we should give no opportunity for doubtful forces to speculate with misunderstandings. In the course of the war we Americans will wipe out the shame of a Hitler-like race discrimination among American citizens, the anti-Negro laws and customs, and the newly rising anti-Semitism along with it.

Just as the blows of war have forced Britain to revise her whole approach to India, so the U. S. is being forced to reconsider the position of the only "subject nation" under U. S. domination—Puerto Rico. We cannot win a People's War for National Liberation by ourselves continuing to hold a people in "subjection." It is a disgrace that our government continues to treat the purest Puerto Rican patriots as "criminals" and "traitors," just as the British for so long treated the Irish, with such dire results for themselves. Let us not, like the Cripps Mission to India, repeat the old mistake of "too little and too late." Puerto Rico is not a mere military outpost of the U. S., it is above all a Latin American nation. It must be treated as such, or we compromise our moral standing, in a war where morals and morale play an ever more decisive part.

One final word; the pacts announced on June 11, establishing the Anglo-Soviet-American Alliance, not only decided on the immediate problems of crushing the Axis. They also, and equally

important for winning the war, outlined a post-war collaboration for the common tasks of world reconstruction. In the Anglo-Soviet Pact this is embodied in a formal twenty-year alliance. This is of enormous significance, opening up a new era in international relationships, with consequences we now can only begin to understand. It is the complete refutation of all pessimists and prophets of evil, who would weaken our will to victory now by picturing disasters to come after the war. The freedom-loving nations, whether capitalist like the U.S.A. or socialist like the Soviet Union, or some intermediate forms that may appear, are pledging themselves to peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the post-war world. All men who deeply desire the full extirpation of Nazism in all its varieties from the world will not only greet this announced program as an ideal, but will shape their every word and deed to helping to bring its full realization in life.

With full faith in the justice of the United Nations' cause, as a People's War of National Liberation; with full faith that our own true national interests coincide with those of other peoples; with pride and confidence in American labor's mighty contributions to our nation's war; with strict adherence to principle as the only sure guide to effective solution of all domestic and international problems; with the inspiration of the glorious achievements of our Soviet Ally in this war; with confidence British and American arms will earn their full share of the glory of final victory—we join our voices to the call to all Americans:

Unite for victory!
Open the Western Front now and smash Hitler in 1942!
Everything for the destruction of the Nazi-Fascist Axis!

(Speech delivered at Madison Square Garden, New York, July 2, 1942.)

II. WHEN DO WE BEGIN TO FIGHT?

ALMOST ten months after the United States is fully committed to the war against the Axis we are being told that "the United States is losing the war, period."

Loss of this war means destruction of our nation and slavery for our people. Yet we are told that we are losing this war. That would seem to be a matter to get excited about, something to call for action.

We are losing this war before we have well begun to fight.

Would it not be more accurate to say that we are losing this war *because* we have not begun to fight?

What is the matter? Whence comes this seeming paralysis which keeps our tremendous military potential idle at the moment our fate and the fate of the world are being decided?

Roy Howard, Hearst and the Patterson-McCormicks, the chief newspaper spokesmen for the modern Copperheads, give the double-barreled answer that the people are not behind this war and that the President is bungling it. But they are liars, and they spread the lies that please Hitler. The people are behind this war to the end, they are ready for every necessary sacrifice, they are impatient to go ahead. The President is doing the best he can with advisers who keep jogging his elbow and holding back his arm; he can only be criticized for hesitating to sweep these michief makers out of his councils, and for failing to crack down on the defeatist newspapers.

Let us frankly face the facts, however, that the defeatist poison penetrates and tends to paralyze the war policies of our government in Washington. We must learn how to locate the seats of this poison, in order to eliminate them.

Look first of all at the Pacific front. Our armed forces in the Pacific have already demonstrated that they have a fighting spirit fit for any task given them. But what about the policies which direct the fighting spirit? They are not yet serious fighting war policies!

I charge that powerful appeasement forces in the State Department in Washington are deliberately withholding one million of the most effective soldiers in Asia, keeping them out of the fight against the Japanese, and thereby releasing that many Japanese soldiers for action against our boys in the South Pacific.

I charge that it is on the advice of reactionary officials in the State Department that Chiang Kai-shek is keeping his best armies out of the war. The army under General Hu Chung-han, with 440,000 troops, is engaged not in fighting the Japanese, but in blockading the Chinese Eighth Route Army in the north and northwest, and hampering that army in its fight against the Japanese; the army under General Tang En-po, with 500,000 troops, is engaged not in fighting the Japanese but in blocking the Chinese New Fourth Army in central and eastern China, and hampering that army in its fight against the Japanese. These two Chinese armies, the best equipped and trained in all China, totaling almost a million men, are being confined to blockading the Chinese Communist armies and territories, because the State Department in Washington has informed Chungking's representatives that our Government would be *displeased* if complete unity was established in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists. These officials continue the old policy of "war against the Communists" in China, they tell Chungking it must continue to fight the Communists if it wishes U. S. friendship, and they thereby accept responsibility for withdrawing a million Chinese troops from the war against Japan, and keep China back from full unity in this war.

What suicidal nonsense is this, by which persons who speak for our own government keep the best Chinese fighters out of the war and create a gap which must be filled by a million American boys?

This is not a way to fight a war of survival, this is a sure way to continue to lose the war.

Our attitude toward Europe is equally ambiguous. Our State Department continues to do business with Mannerheim Finland, Franco Spain, and Vichy France, three puppet regimes of Hitler, to feast the representatives of these Nazi agencies in the highest Washington society, to send vital materials to them, and to

appease them in every way while they conduct active war against the United Nations.

This two-faced attitude of the State Department toward Europe finds its highest expression in the campaign being waged through the defeatist press against the opening of the Second Front in Western Europe. Of course it is impossible to carry on a policy of appeasement of Mannerheim, Franco and Laval, and at the same time energetically prepare the immediate Second Front in Europe. Find those figures in our government who push through this appeasement policy, and there you will find the high opponents of the Second Front. They are the men who keep our men, guns, planes, and tanks in idleness while our fate is being decided at Stalingrad, where men, women, and children hold off the full might of a Nazi-occupied Europe without counting the cost to themselves.

The only way to stop losing this war is to begin seriously to fight it. And to fight it we must overcome the influence of Munichism, of appeasement, of defeatism, in the United States itself. This Munich influence is not among the people, and it does not proceed from our Commander-in-Chief; it is entrenched in some high officials of the State Department, some members of the Cabinet, in a disorganized Congress, dominated by a clique of Vandenbergs, Wheelers, Brookses and Dieses, several powerful industrialists, and above all, in the newspapers of Patterson-McCormick, Hearst, and Roy Howard, which poison the mind of the country with defeatism day after day. The people must be roused and organized in support of the President against this cabal of the Munichmen.

These days we are being shown the most astonishing depths of depravity to which the defeatist newspapers will descend in their fight against the Second Front. I wish to impose upon you for a few moments to turn the microscope upon an example of this moral and intellectual rottenness. I pick up Roy Howard's newspaper for Sept. 29, where this defeatist speaks through his hired scribbler, William Philip Simms. At the moment of crisis of the battle of Stalingrad, this miserable voice finds it possible to whine that he "would appreciate a little more cooperation from the Russians." In that phrase we can see the spirit of a Laval or

Doriot, the spirit that rotted out the heart of the French Republic and delivered that nation over to Hitlerite bondage.

"A little more cooperation from the Russians," cries Roy Howard through the pen of Mr. Simms! At such a sound, every decent American should vomit, in revulsion at the monstrous thought that this could be America's answer to Stalingrad. "A little more cooperation from the Russians," while certain gentlemen in high places in the United States and Britain carefully calculate the last and final buttons on the uniforms of our boys which will make it "safe" to throw them into the battle.

Nothing could be further from the spirit of America's youth, in and out of the armed forces, than the rotten defeatism, appeasement and cowardice expressed in this slogan of Roy Howard.

The spirit of our boys in the Army, Navy, Marines and Air Force is expressed in opposite slogans:

"Let's give some fighting cooperation to our heroic Russian Allies!"

"When do we begin to fight?"

"Open up the Second Front in Europe *now!*"

Let us not drop Roy Howard's man Simms, however, without looking deeper into the cesspool of his mind. What kind of cooperation does he want from the Russians that he is not getting in the most magnificent battle for freedom in all history? "Perhaps this may require explanation," remarks Mr. Simms. Indeed it does. And what is Mr. Simms' explanation? He explains that he wants the Russians to teach the Americans and British how to fight. "The one place really to learn war is in war," says Mr. Simms, and "Moscow still refuses" to permit Americans to learn how to make war in that "one place." That, says Mr. Simms, is why we have no Second Front. Our officers and soldiers don't know how to fight and the Russians refuse to teach them! Therefore there is nothing to do but wait until Timoshenko gets time and leisure to open up a school for us!

I wonder what American Army officers think of this kind of argument? I think I know. I think the vast majority will "give the works" to anybody who tells them they cannot open up a Second Front because they do not know how to fight. They have

already learned the great lesson the Russians have taught the world, that the way to fight is to fight, to push aside all the hesitators and appeasers and if necessary to shoot them, to go to battle and put everything you have into it, to engage the enemy, to kill him, to get into the battle without delay, to fight, fight, and fight again until the Hitler Axis is crushed.

Yes, it is true, the one place really to learn war is in war. But who is holding us back from learning war by making war? It is the Roy Howards, the Hearsts, the Patterson-McCormicks, and their fellow-appeasers and one-time friends of Hitler, who now join together in their obscene outcries against the Second Front. The Second Front is the practical school in which British and American soldiers will learn how to smash Hitlerism. We are all learning and will learn from the mighty achievements of the Red Army and the Soviet people, but we will not allow the worthy idea of learning from them to be used for the purpose of delaying our *joint action with them* in a two-front war.

Young people of America have no part or parcel of the appeasement conspiracies. Defeatism is the property of old and corrupt reactionaries and their hired men. No young person could possibly live in their stifling atmosphere. Young people are particularly immune to the counsels of cowardice and capitulation. A thousand times they prefer to risk their lives in combat with Hitler's hordes than to risk the living death of the Vichyfied America, the slavery of a Hitlerite world. Our young people are demanding the chance to fight. They are the front lines of the movement for a Second Front *now*. They will not permit their future and the future of the world to be gambled away by the Munichmen of appeasement and defeatism. They want to know: When do we begin to fight?

The Young Communist League, dedicating tonight its service flag, has as high a percentage of its members in the armed forces as any group of Americans. And this is not the first time the Young Communists have given their best members to the armed struggle against the Axis. Not less than one-third of the Lincoln Battalion, composed of Americans who gave their lives to stop the Axis in Spain in 1936 to 1938, were from the Young Communist League. This first American expeditionary force against the

Axis, defending the Spanish Republic from the Hitler assassins, gave their lives in order to prevent the present war; if their warnings and their example had been heeded and followed, the Axis would have been broken before it could challenge the entire world. But their blood was not spilled in vain. They left an imperishable and glorious tradition, fully in the spirit of the Stalingrad of today. They helped to hold the Axis hordes outside the gates of Madrid for thirty-two months. They were fully representative of the youth of America today, a youth which is ready and eager to strike Hitler's gangs *now* in Western Europe, and guarantee that they will not have to stop them on American soil later on.

There is no room for any issue in our country today except the issue of how most quickly and effectively to crush the Hitlerite Axis. There is no room for partisanship or special interests. There must be national unity of all men and women regardless of race, creed, or class, who are ready to subordinate all else to victory. There must be international unity among all the United Nations, who win or lose, stand or fall, together. And at this moment all this is summed up in one issue, whether our country can meet the crisis of war with honor, whether we win through to freedom, or go down into slavery, whether we have the quality of victors or whether we shall be shamefully defeated without even having fought—all this is summed up in the one issue of the immediate opening of the Second Front in Europe.

We ask our Commander-in-Chief: When are we going to fight?

(Excerpts from a speech delivered to Young Communist League Rally, New York, October 2, 1942.)

III. AN INTERVIEW WITH SUMNER WELLES

IN *The Worker* of October 4 I made charges that persons whom I designated as "reactionary officials in the State Department" were encouraging the maintenance of a situation

in China harmful to the war effort of our country and its allies. I spoke of strained relations between Kuomintang and Communists, resulting in the immobilization of large numbers of the best troops of that country.

Upon the invitation of Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, I visited him in his office on October 12, in company with Mr. Robert Minor, and heard from him, and from Mr. Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant to the President, a detailed refutation of my charges in this respect. The information received from Mr. Welles and Mr. Currie convinced me that my charges had been made on the basis of incomplete information. I believe it is established that no responsible official of the State Department is contributing to disunity in China, and that the policy of the U. S. Government is being exerted in the opposite direction.

I am therefore more than happy to retract those charges without reservation. What I had thought of as a heavy door that needed pushing open proved to be but a curtain of lack of information. Since many persons in the U. S. and in China also are without that information which I lacked before visiting Mr. Welles, I believe our war effort will be benefited if I make public that portion of Mr. Welles' remarks which was given to me in written form.

Mr. Welles' memorandum follows:

"With regard to the specific 'charge that it is on the advice of reactionary officials in the State Department that Chiang Kai-shek is keeping his best armies out of the war,' the simple fact is that the nearest approach to 'advice' given by any officials in the Department of State in this context has been an expression of an opinion that civil strife in China, at all times unfortunate, would be especially unfortunate at a time when China is engaged in a desperate struggle of self-defense against an armed invader. The implication of this expression of opinion was that the Chinese Government should try to maintain peace by processes of conciliation between and among all groups and factions in China. And the course which Chiang Kai-shek has been pursuing is *not* 'keeping his best armies out of the war.' Both the armies of the National Government and the 'Communist' armies are fighting the Japanese. No Chinese armies are

actively engaged in large-scale offensive operations against the Japanese—for the reason, principally, that there is lacking to all Chinese armies types and amounts of equipment which are essential to such operations; but this situation is one which both the Chinese Government and the American Government are endeavoring to remedy as equipment becomes available.

"With regard to the specific charge that 'the State Department in Washington has informed Chungking's representatives that our government would be *displeased* if complete unity was established in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists,' what this statement alleges is the exact opposite of the fact. The State Department in Washington has at all times taken the position, both in diplomatic contexts and publicly, that the United States favors 'complete unity' among the Chinese people and all groups or organizations thereof.

"With regard to the specific charge that 'these officials continue the old policy of "war against the Communists" in China,' this government has had no such policy, either 'old' or new. This government has in fact viewed with skepticism many alarmist accounts of the 'serious menace' of 'Communism' in China. We have, for instance, as is publicly and well known, declined to be moved by Japanese contentions that presence and maintenance of Japanese armed forces in China were and would be desirable for the purpose of 'combating Communism.'

"With regard to the specific charge that officials of this government 'tell Chungking it must continue to fight the Communists if it wishes United States friendship,' the simple fact is that no officials of this government ever have told Chungking either that it must fight or that it must continue to fight the 'Communists'; this government holds no such brief; this government desires Chinese unity and deprecates civil strife in China; this government treats the government of China as an equal; it does not dictate to the government of China; it does not make United States friendship contingent; it regards unity within China, unity within the United States, unity within each of the countries of the United Nations group, and unity among the United Nations as utterly desirable towards effectively carrying on war against the Axis powers and toward creation and maintenance of conditions of just peace when the United Nations shall have gained the victory which is to be theirs."

(Statement issued October 15, 1942.)

IV. HOW THE PRESS TREATED THE WELLES MEMORANDUM

I HAVE been astounded at the way the great metropolitan dailies of New York treated the well-considered and historically valuable words of Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles concerning China.

Mr. Welles had given a statement on American foreign policy of the most tremendous and far-reaching significance; I gave the statement to the public through the newspapers, accompanied by a little incidental thing, that Browder had retracted some charges which had been based upon the absence of such a clarification before, and that in the light of this declaration the charges had to be withdrawn. The newspapers thought that my retraction of charges was very important and merited considerable space, but the declaration of policy by the Under Secretary of State was thrown into the waste basket.

I don't understand that scale of values because whatever one may think of the individuals involved, Mr. Sumner Welles speaks for the greatest governmental power in the world and I am spokesman only for a minority party. Well, that is only one of the strange and queer things which our press gives us every day. I don't know whether they threw Mr. Welles' statement into the waste basket because they didn't understand the significance or because they did understand and disapproved. Maybe it was both—those who didn't understand its importance threw it into the waste basket, and those who did understand didn't want anyone else to know of it. But it is an important statement. I don't know how many of you read it; I know no one has read it who doesn't read the *Daily Worker*.

As Mr. Welles says, the policy that he states in his memorandum is a policy which comes directly out of the files of the State Department, in the registration of declaration after declaration of the American Government. But while this policy is not new, it is not generally known, and this memorandum is new; coming at this moment, it deepens and unfolds that policy of America which was latent before, which was implied before, but which

now is more than implied; it has been publicly stated, and by being stated at this moment becomes active where before it was not active.

What does Mr. Welles say? Both the Nationalist Government and the so-called Communist armies are fighting the Japanese, that is, that both together form a part of the forces of the United Nations; that the Chinese Government and the American Government are preparing to arm adequately all of these forces for the war against the Axis; that the State Department would be pleased and the United States Government would be pleased if complete unity was established in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists. The form in which he states this is that it is the opposite of the truth to say that the State Department would be displeased. The positive form is to say that the State Department would be pleased if the Kuomintang and the Communists would completely unite.

There are many people in Chungking of all parties who must have been made happy to read that authoritative declaration that the powerful United States would be pleased if they will unite the Kuomintang and the Communists and dissolve the situation that keeps one or two million of the best soldiers immobilized.

Mr. Welles says that this government is very skeptical of the so-called menace of Communism; he says that this so-called menace is an instrument of the Axis to defeat us in this war; he says that it is in the interests of the United States as well as the interests of China completely to unify that country, and specifically unify the Kuomintang and the Communists. He says that this is a general proposition of American policy in this war—that the United States regards unity within China, unity within the United States, unity within each of the countries of the United Nations group, and unity among the United Nations as utterly desirable toward effectively carrying on war against the Axis powers and toward creation and maintenance of conditions of a just peace when the United Nations shall have gained the victory which is to be theirs. That is the kind of unity, that complete, all-embracing unity that he hopes China will achieve, that he recommends for the United States and for all the United Nations and among the United Nations.

In the face of such a declaration I was more than happy and did not hesitate one second to respond instantly to Mr. Welles that I accepted his words as valid without reservation and that I would take the first opportunity to make this as broadly known as possible and I would correct any false impressions that might flow out of the speech I made on October 2. My statement to the press was carrying out that engagement which I undertook with Mr. Welles, which I did with a whole heart and truly without reservations.

I was able to accept this statement without reservations because I know we are living through a moment in history when words such as this, once they are uttered, never can cease to have effect on real life. Because these are not mere words. They are not the products of wishes and ideology. They are the product of the iron necessities of this war, if we expect to win it. They are the beginnings of a realization of a win-the-war policy for America, including the State Department, that we are in a war which we must lose if we do not find the correct policies, if we do not mobilize every available force in this war, if we do not stop once and for all this sinister and suicidal immobilization of our own forces. If we do not throw everything we have into this war, we may lose it, and that consciousness is forging a foreign policy for our country which is bringing out and developing all the unused latent implications of the democratic phrases in which our nation's foreign policy has been stated in the past, but which have not hitherto been fully implemented and have been sabotaged by crafty reactionary special interests.

We are now bringing all of the democratic potentialities of our country into active operation, taking them off the paper and putting them into practice. That process is only the beginning. We have far yet to go, but once that process is well begun, and I think it is, it will guarantee victory for the United Nations in this war.

(*From a speech delivered at New York Workers School gathering October* 16, 1942.)

V. NOW IS THE TIME TO FIGHT

WE ARE in this global war, the war which will decide the fate of all mankind. If the Axis wins, there will be no United States. There will be universal slavery.

It is eleven months since Pearl Harbor. Victory must still be won. We are far from victory as yet and the record of the past ten months is not one with which America can be satisfied. Victory requires the full effort of each and all of the United Nations. The United States is not yet exerting its full effort.

This is your problem and mine and it will be solved only to the degree that you and I take it up and solve it. This is a people's war. It is a United Nations' war and only as we fight it unitedly with all our Allies can we win the victory.

If Hitler and his Axis partners can take up his enemies one at a time, as he has succeeded in doing so far, then there is a grave danger that Hitler may win the war. This fact does not seem to be clear before the country as yet.

So far only one of the United Nations is fighting this war with everything she has. This is the Soviet Union. At Stalingrad and on the rest of the Eastern Front the Red Army is holding back the full force of 300 Nazi divisions, with a Hitler-occupied Europe behind them. Hitler has only forty divisions of second and third grade troops in Western Europe. And Hitler's troops in Western Europe are so weak that even the conquered peoples are beginning to rise and fight them successfully without any help from the West.

Where are we? Some people are wailing about the loss of a cup of coffee. Some are wailing about the hardships of gasoline rationing. But, most important, defeatists are still permitted to go up and down the land virtually unchallenged. They are still allowed to stand before the people as candidates for public office —men whose ambition it is to negotiate a "peace" with Hitler in hopes that Hitler might take them in as junior partners.

Where are we? There is nothing wrong with American fighters. They have proved their qualities wherever they have had a chance at the enemy, such as at Bataan and the Solomons. American fighters are as good as any in the world. They're raring to

go against the center of the Axis: Hitler Germany. The one cry that goes up from our army camps, whether in this country or in England, is the question. "When do we begin to fight?" "When do we open up that Western Front?"

People who are afraid to fight and afraid to die are destined to be slaves of Hitler. But Americans are not of that breed, Americans are going to fight. Why, then, are we still sitting on the sidelines, cheering our heroic Allies of the Soviet Union? Why aren't we in there fighting against Hitler? . . .

The urgent need of establishing a Second Front in Europe in 1942 was proclaimed simultaneously from Washington, London and Moscow after a series of conferences and agreements between these capitals and centers of the military struggle against the Axis. The declaration of June 11 established the Second Front in Europe in 1942 as the central strategy of the United Nations.

And yet in the past four or five months we have been partaking in the strangest debate that this country or history ever witnessed. Most of our newspapers have been debating whether or not we can or should open up the Second Front in Europe. We have chains of newspapers through the United States telling us that the Second Front is impossible, and then when they are compelled to change their tune, they tell us the Second Front must be left to the military "experts."

America has not yet realized that those who are telling us that the Second Front is impossible, or that it must be left to the military "experts"—who may decide it is impossible—are telling us that victory is impossible, are trying to prepare the way to negotiate a Vichy "peace."

One is either for the Second Front, or one is for delay and eventual capitulation to Hitler. There is no other course. If we are for victory over the Axis, we must be for the Second Front. There is no room for any discussion on this except, possibly, as to the time and force of the blow. The time is already late. The time is now. The blow must be powerful and concentrated on the decisive front in Europe. It must be a concerted blow, coalition warfare of all the United Nations.

. . . Examine some of the objections to the Second Front raised by our newspaper military "experts," the typewriter strategists,

and others. They declaim against the "popular clamor" for the Second Front. They say it is unfortunate pressure on our General Staff which should be left free to make its decision without pressure.

Who ever before heard of a general staff which was embarrassed by the expression of the people's demand to fight? A general staff which wants to fight is always happy when the people and the army clamor for action.

A general staff is embarrassed and disturbed when the people and the army are passive and are doubtful about fighting. It is a slander against the American General Staff to say that they are embarrassed about the demand for a Second Front. I don't believe it. I believe in the majority of the leaders of the American Army and I believe that they want to fight just as much as we want to fight.

We have known of generals, American generals, who were embarrassed by the demand to fight. Lincoln had such a general. His name was McClellan. He marched his armies up and down for two years and somehow he always managed to evade a collision with the forces under General Lee in the South.

Lincoln complained that McClellan had the "slows" and finally he had to replace him. He had to make several changes before he finally got Grant in the Supreme Command and found a general who was ready to fight and ready to lead his army to victory.

I don't think we have many McClellans in the United States Army today. But if we have, I hope President Roosevelt learns from the experience of Lincoln and doesn't wait two years, but cleans them out right now. . . .

Well, what about the other objections to the demand for a Second Front? Two weeks ago we had a strange objection raised in the convention of the American Federation of Labor held in Toronto. The representative of the British trade unions, Jack Tanner, spoke at that convention on behalf of the British labor movement and spoke for the Second Front in Europe.

William Green, President of the A. F. of L., replied to him and disagreed with him. Green said, in effect, "Yes, we are for the Second Front—but when it is safe." This is a new slogan for

the war—"safety first." I'm ashamed to speak of this. It dishonors everything in American history. Imagine George Washington saying he would fight the enemy when he found that it was safe. Imagine Grant or Sherman saying that they would fight when it was safe. Imagine Douglas MacArthur saying that he was looking for a safe place to fight.

No, that is not the American slogan. The American slogan was better expressed by that hero of our country who said, "Damn the torpedoes! Full speed ahead." . . .

While we are talking here tonight a patriotic American is speaking over a nationwide hookup. His name is Wendell Willkie and he is expressing some views on this subject. Willkie is not a military expert. He is a prominent civilian, a political leader. He may be a Wall Street executive, but this war is bringing workers and capitalists together on many of the vital questions of the war.

Wendell Willkie has been speaking the mind of the common people of all the world when he called for the Second Front and said, in his quaint Hoosier way, it might be necessary to prod the military gentlemen a little bit.

The peoples of the United Nations understand today that the Second Front is the keystone to victory. It is the keystone to the general offensive of the United Nations against the Axis to crush it and bring this war to a speedy conclusion. The masses of the occupied countries are already rising up to create a Second Front of their own. They got tired waiting for us. Are we going to join them? Or are we going to sit it out a while longer, until Hitler suppresses their risings again? . . .

Who is responsible for our slowness and delays? The *Chicago Tribune* will tell you all our troubles come from the President. But it is not the President who is responsible. It is that coalition of Copperheads in the United States who have been jogging the President's elbow, pulling his coattails and stepping on his feet to make it difficult if not impossible to carry on this war. It is men like "Curly" Brooks, the candidate of the *Chicago Tribune*, like Ham Fish, Vandenberg, Martin Dies, Hoover and their ilk who are obstructing the opening up of the Western Front, who are endangering our national war effort and victory.

And these men follow the line of the Copperheads of 1862, who made difficulties for Lincoln and who, through their representative, McClellan, at the head of the Union army, gave victory after victory to the Southern slaveholders. They created distrust and dissatisfaction in the North. And then they went out and asked the dissatisfied people to vote for them. They claimed they would "change" things in Washington, that they would "prosecute" the war more effectively. And the Copperheads carried the elections in 1862 with this kind of trick.

The modern Copperheads are trying to repeat the same trick eighty years later in the midst of this war of national survival and liberation. They who are responsible for obstructing the war effort try to place the responsibility for their obstruction and dissension on the President and on all those win-the-war forces who have been trying to go forward.

This is why we must redouble the people's efforts to defeat the defeatists, especially now on November 3. This is why we must strengthen national unity around our Commander-in-Chief and press forward for the establishment of the Second Front in Europe now. This is the supreme need and task of the hour. It is the key to victory, the key to developing the alliance of the United Nations, the key to winning the "century of the common man."

(Excerpts from a speech delivered in the Civic Opera House, Chicago, October 26, 1942.)

VI. TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

THIS twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power is witness to the most profound change of the attitude of the people of the United States as a whole toward the U.S.S.R. and its great leaders. For the first time there is almost universal understanding of the Soviet Union as a stage in the rise of mankind to higher civilization. There is a high and rising evaluation

of the Soviet Union as the most powerful friend and ally of the United States. And there is love for and gratitude toward the Soviet Union as the power which has so far saved this country and world democracy from destruction by the Axis aggressors.

Nothing in modern history has so profoundly stirred the American masses as the heroic defense of Stalingrad. Americans know their own fate is being decided in that battle. Americans are ashamed that the full force of our own country has not yet been thrown into the scale through the opening of the Western Front in Europe. For the great mass of Americans now understand full well that they can emerge from this war a free people only if they fight this war as a part of the United Nations, side by side with the Soviet Union, in full partnership, unitedly sharing its costs and burdens in full as they will jointly share the fruits of victory.

There are still some reactionary cliques in America which cling to their old dreams of helping to destroy the Soviet Union and making partnership with Hitler in dividing up the world. They are not large in numbers, but they are powerful. They are the most bitter opponents of the Second Front and are the advocates of a negotiated "peace" with Hitler. They still dominate much of the American newspaper world. They represent some of the most powerful industrial monopolists in America. Their influence holds back the immense potential power of the United States, and prevents it from being thrown into full action to smash Hitlerism now. But these native American fascists are rapidly losing their power over the nation, and have already lost their control over the minds of the people.

The American people and government are committed to alliance with the Soviet Union for this war and for the post-war period. American patriots will not tolerate in public life any expression that runs counter to this will of the people. This is being demonstrated more and more every day in a thousand different ways. The Soviet-American alliance has been confirmed in the hearts and minds of the American masses. On Nov. 7 it will be the entire nation which celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the rise of the Soviet Union, including the official leadership of the United States as well as the masses of the people.

This does not mean that the United States has turned or is turning to socialism. Such an interpretation would be radically false. There is no intimation in the United States of a mass abandonment of its capitalist system of economy and society. There is the general belief that if the United States rises to its tasks in this war, and fulfills its responsibilities in the crushing of Hitlerism, it will go into the post-war period as a capitalist nation.

But this also is no contradiction to a further fact that the American people are beginning to understand that the socialist society of the Soviet Union is the source of its unparalleled achievements in the war which restored for the United Nations the perspective of victory. Socialism, even though not generally accepted for the United States, is no longer looked upon as something alien and hostile to the American way of life, which was the view which had long prevailed over the minds of the great majority of Americans.

On the twenty-fifth birthday of the Soviet Union the American working class and people are more and more raising their voices to demand an immediate offensive on the Western Front against Hitlerism. Wendell Willkie expresses, on this issue, the sentiment of the American masses, who believe that President Roosevelt is fully committed to the same demand and are ready to strengthen his hand by all means, so that all restraining and hesitating influences can finally be brushed aside.

Americans want to fight. They want to fight in full coordination with the Red Army, which they respect and love. They want to fight now. They will never forgive those groups and individuals responsible for holding them back so long from the fight. Such is in truth the spirit of the great majority of Americans as we come to the historic date of November 7.

For the American people the date November 7 takes its place alongside of our own July 4, as part of the same forward movement of the human race. Just as Americans have always affirmed the universal significance of our revolution of 1776 and of George Washington, so now we have come to recognize the universal validity of November 7, the Soviet revolution of 1917 and Joseph Stalin.

In the fires of the common war against Hitlerism, in the blood of the best sons of both countries given to a common cause, in the gathering of the peoples of the world into the United Nations, in the final winning of victory through joint struggle, this American-Soviet friendship and alliance will be so fully sealed that it will be a great fortress for the collective security and progress of all peoples in the post-war world.

(*The Worker*, November 8, 1942.)

VII. ONE YEAR SINCE PEARL HARBOR

WE ARE approaching the anniversary of Pearl Harbor. Our country has been fully in the war for almost a year. At last we have taken the initiative with the blow in Africa. It is a convenient time for stock-taking, for adding up our accounts, to see where we stand.

In the Pacific, after many catastrophes, we have established a line of defense which holds over months, and have even given a sample of magnificent counter-offensive action in the Solomons. The total military score for the year, however, remains a staggering loss. We have but a relative handful of land forces in contact with the enemy, and naval action remains essentially in the phase of defense and protection of communication routes.

On the main front, Western Europe, we have as yet engaged the enemy only in the air, and in naval safeguarding of the sea routes. We have now secured French Africa from the Axis. In the course of the first year of war, however, we have not yet been able to establish that Western European front which is the key to the whole war, the obviously essential measure for victory. The great significance of our move into Africa is that it obviously prepares the Second Front—perhaps very soon.

Our first year of active war, in short, has been a year of improvised defense, and of *preparations for war*. Now we move toward offensive war.

One great achievement alone stands out in this first year, a

political and diplomatic achievement which laid a firm foundation for victory—the cementing of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and the formation on that basis of the United Nations.

It is clear that our country entered the war appallingly unprepared. It is further clear that we are not yet more than partially mobilized for the war.

Our lack of preparation was only incidentally a lack of the materiel of war. It was first of all moral and political unpreparedness. Our national mind, heart, and character were unprepared and ill-prepared for this Armageddon which decides the future of all mankind.

Let us remind ourselves, for a moment, how ill-prepared was our national mind. We did not, as a nation, know the most important facts about the dangerous world in which we lived. We did not even know the most simple facts of the relative strength of the various governments of the world. We did not even know that we were ignorant. We thought we knew, but our opinion was illusion compounded of misinformation, prejudice, and wishful thinking. It collapsed into dust at the first blows of war. We found ourselves in war-to-the-death in a world hitherto completely hidden from our eyes by clouds of illusion. We had to begin, painfully and step by step, to reconstruct completely our understanding of the world.

We had thought of France, in alliance with Britain, as the preponderant military power of Europe. But France, rotten with treason at the head of the state, collapsed even more swiftly and miserably than had semi-feudal Poland; the British army was driven from the continent without its arms. Hitler conquered all Europe west of the Soviet Union at lightning speed and nominal cost. Our "experts" had misled us. The true relation of forces was the opposite of our opinion.

We had been taught to consider the Soviet Union a weak and minor power in the European constellation. When Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, even after our Government and Britain had taken their stand in her support, our "experts" told us he would conquer that country in a few weeks or months at most. But the Soviet Union has alone held up the full military power of Hitlerized Europe for almost seventeen months now, has

killed or incapacitated 8,000,000 of Hitler's murderous hordes, and has presented us and our Allies with the possibility of victory. Once again our "experts'" opinions were proved wrong, but this time we can be happy that they were wrong.

We had been taught to sneer at Japan as a military power, and to look upon the British-Dutch Empire as our stronghold in the Pacific. But after Pearl Harbor, Midway, the Philippines, we were astounded to witness a few hundred thousand Japanese soldiers sweep that centuries-old structure away in a few weeks and occupy the whole South Pacific from India to the gates of Australia. Once more our "experts'" opinions turned out to be but silly illusions, disastrously silly.

More disastrous, however, even than these illusions about relative power, was our confusion as to who were our enemies and who our friends. We Americans as a nation helped Hitler's puppet, Franco, destroy the Spanish Republic, the same Franco whose network of spies, the Falange, works freely for Hitler throughout the United States and Latin America. We supported the traitors at the head of France, and continued to do business with them until last Saturday; we went delirious in our glorification of Hitler's ally, Baron Mannerheim of "poor little Finland," and give his agents the freedom of Washington even to this moment; and we took this course because, as a nation, we had swallowed entire the gigantic Hitler lie that the Soviet Union was our enemy. We had been morally "prepared" for war against the Soviet Union, but we had been systematically "unprepared" for the coalition with the Soviet Union by which alone we could defeat Hitler. We even trusted Japan up to the very hour her planes bombed Pearl Harbor!

Some persons will say: "Why speak of the past? That is all changed now. Why raise dead issues?"

It is necessary to speak of the past, however, because it is not yet dead. We have, as a nation, revised our wrong opinions, but only very incompletely. We have not yet fully learned the lessons of this past. The slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor" is important precisely because we must still learn the full lessons of those events.

Allow me to cite a few examples of current continuation of

this pre-war thinking in illusions instead of reality, which leads to disaster for our nation. In a recent meeting of big industrialists in New York to consider war policy, the government's efforts to organize and plan the war economy were denounced as "socialism," and the chairman summed up the sentiment of those present by saying:

"If we're going to come out of this war with a Marxist brand of national socialism then I say negotiate the peace now and bring Adolf over here to run the show. He knows how. He's efficient. He can do a better job than any of us and a damned sight better job than Roosevelt, who is nothing but a Left-wing bungling amateur."

Here we have a simon-pure American example of the same treason that destroyed France. And it is deeply embedded among the big industrialists who control our war economy. This is not representative of all American industrialists (for example, at the meeting mentioned, the direct Morgan and Rockefeller interests did not join in these treasonable expressions) but it does represent the business-as-usual capitalists who are fighting against the essential planning of the war, and who are responsible for the present economic chaos. If they must submit to governmental authority for the war, they call that "socialism," and prefer the defeat of the United States and its conquest by Hitler.

Clearly, all such talk about the "danger of socialism" is merely a cover for defeatism bordering on treason. The recent Report of the Tolan Committee to the House of Representatives, on October 20, proposes a completely centralized national administration of industry and manpower, working upon a single plan for victory in the war. Its proposals are embodied in the Kilgore-Pepper Bill in the Senate and the Tolan Bill in the House. The committee bluntly declares that "our war effort is in jeopardy," that "this war can be lost in Washington," if such a central administration is not established. The committee is composed of conservative Democrats and Republicans, with not a "Left-winger" among them. Indeed, Congressman Bender of Ohio, supporting the report, complains that "some points are not made strong enough." And Mr. Bender, leader of the old-line Republican Party of his state, is a confirmed anti-New Dealer, but clearly

moved by one single consideration—patriotism, the will to victory in the war, which he sees is in grave danger unless the Tolan Committee proposals are adopted and carried out energetically.

Indeed, the Tolan Committee proposals are truly national, and deserve the support of capital equally with that of labor, of the farmers equally with that of the small industrialists, businessmen and middle classes. It shows the only way in which our economy can be mobilized to meet the strains of all-out war without a breakdown. But our business-as-usual industrialists, who cannot abandon their old pre-war prejudices, fight these proposals to the death, and are ready to surrender our country to Hitler rather than see them adopted.

The patriotic men and women of all classes must unite to save our country from such influences, and thereby save it from destruction at the hands of Hitlerism. Victory in the war is the single over-riding consideration that must govern everyone alike, regardless of what sacrifices may be demanded to that end. Such proposals as those in the Kilgore-Pepper and Tolan Bills must be supported by all, whether they are adopted by the Executive or by Congress.

Another example of this pre-war thinking which damages our war effort is the campaign of certain newspapers about a supposed "menace of Communism" in the United States. This campaign takes the form of saying: "Yes, we are allies of the Communist-led Soviet Union, and that is all right; but we must all the more suppress the Communists here at home, for they are not allies, but dangerous enemies."

Now, it is unfortunately still true that most persons do not see how dangerous this argument is, they do not see where it leads; they see that American Communists are a very small minority in the country, and think it makes little difference one way or the other if the Communists are suppressed. But this argument is equally as dangerous for our war effort as the openly pro-Hitler arguments before quoted. This danger is not only in that it endorses Hitler's central slogan that he is the savior of the world from the "Communist menace." It has immediate, concrete results that help Hitler in a military way. Allow me to show a few of these results to you.

Look at China. The Chinese Republic is greatly weakened today in face of the Japanese invaders by the fact that its unity is incomplete. There are two powerful parties, the Kuomintang or government party headed by Chiang Kai-shek, and the Chinese Communist Party, which leads two powerful armies in semi-autonomous regions; these two parties, after years of civil war, patched up a truce in 1937, a kind of national unity, in face of the Japanese invasion, but their relations remain very much strained. The Kuomintang has, on at least one occasion, deliberately prevented the Communist-led armies from inflicting a heavy defeat on the Japanese, because they were more afraid of "communism" than of the Japanese invaders. Today two of the strongest Chinese Kuomintang armies are occupied in blockading the Communist-led armies instead of being used against the Japanese.

All this injures not only China, but also the United States; our government, helping China, does not like to see its help wasted in internal strife between Kuomintang and Communists. But when Americans speak to Chinese leaders about this, and propose to end this senseless quarrel within China, they are answered: "But you also, in your own country, take exactly the same position against the Communists that we take in our country. We are only following your example. If it is necessary for you to fight the Communists so strongly, where the Communists are weak, how much more necessary is it for us to fight the Communists here where they are strong?"

Our government has but recently made a serious effort to influence the Kuomintang to make a real peace with the Communists, so that the war can be strengthened against Japan by a million or two of the best soldiers in Asia; but it is greatly to be feared that this appeal will not be successful, because the Chinese do not take it seriously when over the same wires they get news that the U. S. Government is trying to deprive American Communists of their citizenship on the argument that it is impossible for them sincerely to swear allegiance to any government except a Communist one, and when American newspapers continually shriek about the "menace of Communism."

Thus, by our own example at home, we are directly con-

tributing to the situation in China, where two groups of Chinese armies are watching each other suspiciously and taken away from the struggle against Japan. In the further course of the war, if this is not changed, hundreds of thousands of American boys will pay with their lives for this stupidity.

Or let us take another example, Yugoslavia. Two armies have been fighting against the German and Italian invaders, the Partisan Volunteers led by a united front of all popular parties, including the Communists, and the Chetniks headed by General Mikhailovich and supported by the Yugoslavian Cabinet in London. Recently we learned that Mikhailovich was fighting against the Partisan Volunteers, on the pretext that he had to "suppress the Communists," and had entered into treasonable relations with the Italians for that purpose.

This is a terrific blow against the United Nations, and for the Axis, and the Yugoslavian Cabinet is itself sharply divided on the issue. But American newspapers, trained in the necessity for "suppression of the Communists," unquestionably support Mikhailovich and deny his treason. The American Government is seriously disturbed by this development, but not our newspapers, who know, without investigation, that anyone suppressing Communists must be in the right. And when American representatives fly into Yugoslavia to ask Mikhailovich to stop fighting the Communists and to fight Germans and Italians instead, the wily general will probably read to them a copy of Attorney-General Biddle's decision on the Bridges case. Thus Hitler continues to be strengthened militarily in Europe by the "anti-Communists" in the United States.

Now let us take a look at France. Sooner or later, and we must hope sooner, Britain and America are going to open up the Second Front, and hundreds of thousands of American boys will be fighting to the death with German troops on French soil. We are already calling upon Frenchmen to rise and help throw out the Germans. Conservative correspondents have united in the judgment that the only political party in France that has maintained its organization and extended its influence despite German and Vichy suppressions is the Communist Party of France. When our boys go into France are we going to issue

the slogan to the French people: "Arise to throw out the Germans and suppress the French Communists"? If we do we are simply going to help Hitler again as we have stupidly been doing ever since he emerged from his Munich *bierstube*. For the French Communists are an essential and invaluable sector of the coming French Army of Liberation. They will be as good fighters on our side as are the Russian Communists.

If we really want to smash Hitler's Axis and do it as quickly and efficiently as possible, we need the Communists of China, of Yugoslavia, of France as our allies, even as we need the Communists of the Soviet Union. Yes, we need the Communists of the United States also for victory, and the Communists of all lands, not least within Germany itself, where the Communists are hard at work preparing to blow up the Hitler regime from within.

Let's see how Hitler's slogan of the "menace of Communism" works close at home. I have a memorandum dated July 23, 1942, circulated in Detroit among management and labor circles by an important official, which contains the following paragraph:

"There are many Communists in the plants and they cannot be trusted since their attitude is likely to be guided by whether Russia remains in the war on the side of the United States, or not. Russia may or may not remain an ally of the United States. She deserted the Allies in the last war and may do it again in this war."

Here we have the clearest example of the political significance of the "anti-Communist crusade" as it is carried on in the United States. This is the sort of stuff Radio Berlin spreads to Britain and America, and against which our government has warned us many times. It spreads suspicion and distrust against our most powerful ally, the very one which restored to us the perspective of victory by single-handedly stopping the Hitlerite hordes. It sows disunity and suspicion among the war workers, and throws doubt upon the patriotism and loyalty of every one who expresses friendship and admiration for the Soviet Union. It strikes directly against the most zealous guardians of our war production in the plants. In every way this kind of thing is doing

Hitler's work in America, just as surely as his agents who landed from U-boats with explosives not one half so dangerous as this.

We are in this war as a part of the United Nations, at the head of which stands the coalition of Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States. We can win this war only if we fight it as a United Nations' war.

We are now entering the stage of active fighting in which American boys will be giving their lives to smash the enemy, not in the hundreds but in the tens of thousands. We must unite the entire country behind them, we must produce everything they and our allies need, we must stop all arguments which are not directed to the one question—how to win this war as quickly as possible.

Unity to win the war requires that we rise above all differences of political opinion. Democrats, Republicans, Communists, Socialists, Prohibitionists, all must work together without regard to their particular "ism," and stop fighting one another over the old labels. The only test is what one is doing to win the war. Any one who places private interests, his class prejudices, or his political opinions, in a position of higher importance than the winning of the war, is thereby moving toward treason to his country and to humanity.

The Communist Party of the United States meets this test. It has proclaimed its policy, and carries out this policy, to subordinate its own program of socialism to the needs of national unity that includes all classes. It actively mobilizes the workers for complete support to the war effort. It helps to work out democratic solutions for the problems of the war. It offers its cooperation to all sincere supporters of the war to victory. It works for the extension of American national unity, and of the United Nations, for the orderly solution of post-war problems. The Communist Party is entirely and without reservation a party of national unity for victory. And we have a contribution to make which no other group can substitute, a contribution at home and a contribution in strengthening our country's position abroad.

This fact is being recognized broadly in our country and throughout the world. Thus, in India, the British authorities

have recently legalized the Communist Party and released all its leaders from prison even though it supports the independence movement, because the government learned from experience that the Indian Communists were the best mobilizers of the population against Japan. In Canada, the government has recently released all the Communist leaders who had been held in concentration camps, because it learned that it needed them for the war effort. In Latin-American countries the Communists are in the forefront of the fight for alignment with the United Nations, and in Chile the Communists, who are part of the coalition supporting the government, lead in the fight for declaring war on the Axis. In Cuba the Communists are part of the governmental coalition, which supports the United Nations. And so it goes in country after country.

This trend of development toward all-embracing unity which includes also the Communists is a part of the general awakening to the tasks of the war. Wherever persons and groups and nations come to the realization of the gravity, dangers, and difficulties of the war they want all the help that is available for victory. And nowhere can they find better helpers than the Communists. Only in the United States is this fact not so generally recognized, at least not by all the departments of the government, for some of them work at cross-purposes.

Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles, who has faced some of these problems concretely in his work, has recently made an important pronouncement of policy on this question. On October 12 he declared that continuation of the strife between Kuomintang and Communists in China would be unfortunate; he indicated that the United States wished to see such problems settled by processes of conciliation; that the United States would be pleased to see complete unity accomplished; that the so-called menace of Communism was looked upon with skepticism as a pretext of the Axis; that our Government "regards unity within China, unity within the United States, unity within each of the countries of the United Nations group, and unity among the United Nations as utterly desirable toward effectively carrying on war against the Axis powers."

That is a policy to which we can declare our unconditional

support. It is a policy which should be made known throughout the whole of our population and over the world. It is a policy which needs to be carried out fully by all departments of the government and in the armed forces. For it is a policy designed to bring victory at the earliest possible moment, to reduce the costs of the war, and to insure a just peace when victory has been attained.

It is not my intention to paint for you a bright picture of the situation, nor to pretend that the problems of the war have been solved or that victory will come easily. No, the Axis will be crushed only at terrible cost, and with the full exertion of all our powers. Every step in the development of policy adequate to victory must itself be fought for, it does not come automatically, heavy obstacles must be overcome. Correct policies when established must still be fought for in practical application. And finally when we have mobilized all possible resources they must be thrown into battle against the enemy, and the enemy must be crushed in deadly struggle. Africa is a first step in that direction.

There is no other way.

But Americans do not look for an easy way. They are ready for the full tasks which alone bring victory. No burden is too heavy, no sacrifice too great, which is necessary for victory. We will never be Hitler's slaves nor try to find a corner for ourselves in a Hitler-dominated world. The Axis must be destroyed. That is the only goal which means victory. And for free men everywhere in the world the issue is victory or death!

(*Speech delivered in Detroit, November* 12, 1942.)

VIII. STORM SIGNALS—THE PEOPLE MUST KNOW AND ACT

YEARS after the great French Revolution, a certain French Abbé was asked, "What did you do during the great Revolution?" And the Abbé replied, "I survived." A similar question,

I think, will be asked in the coming years with respect to the war, only not of individuals but of entire nations: "What did you do during the great war?" And the nation which is able to answer as the French Abbé answered is going to be fortunate. Because truly this war is a test of the capacity of nations to survive, for fascism, Nazism, is engaged in the physical destruction of whole nations and peoples. And the world outside of the Soviet Union is only beginning to learn how to deal with Nazism.

Those who have read my book *Victory—and After* will remember that while there is a certain fundamental confidence in the eventual outcome of the war, I do not in this book engage in any excessive optimism. Indeed, I very specifically hold out the possibility and even the probability that the education of America to the necessities of this war would be accomplished through a succession of setbacks and blunders, and I am sorry to say that the course of events seems to be bearing out this perspective. Notwithstanding the magnificent Soviet offensive and the initial success of our African operation, we have not yet won the war. And one of the most dangerous things in this war at the present moment is a certain wave of irrational optimism that is sweeping the country, at least as far as public expressions of opinion are concerned. Many people are even so convinced the war is already won that they are beginning to engage in private schemes of dividing up the world and settling the post-war problems, picking out who is going to sit on the throne of which country when the peace treaty is finally signed, an act which they seem to think is just around the corner.

Thus, Otto of Austria is holding court in a hotel on 59th Street, right on Central Park, and I understand he has already placed an order with an American firm for iron crosses, decorations for the people whom he is going to appoint to the various Orders of Nobility in the restored Hapsburg empire. Chief of State Darlan of French North Africa is operating under the protection of the Stars and Stripes with the same confidence with which, not many months ago, he operated under the swastika. General Franco pronounced long speeches in Madrid in which he declares his benefactor, Adolf Hitler, is going to rule

the world and that that is a good thing, and his speeches are hailed by the press of the United States as a very comforting assurance that all is going well in our relations with Spain. General Mannerheim, a few weeks after he has received the Order of the Rising Sun from Hirohito and a special decoration from Adolf in Berlin, enters into negotiations with the ruling circles in this country under conditions in which he will be recipient of similar blessings as the future ruler of "poor little Finland." One could go on and on with examples of the type of mentality that is attempting to determine how America shall participate in this war and how we are supposed to win it. We have even seen boasts in the public press about how special ambassadors of the United States are winning the war for us painlessly by special missions in which they carry suitcases full of gold pieces.

Perhaps I am a little bit behind the times and fail to appreciate all these modern methods of warfare, but I cannot believe that we are going to win the war, or that we are in any way advancing the war with this kind of policy. One thing is certain, this policy is cutting off our country from the confidence of the peoples of Europe. Perhaps if I were a narrow partisan I should be pleased with this development, because, unquestionably, as a by-product of this, there will be a further expansion of the mass influence of the underground Communist Parties throughout Europe. Whole sections of the population that were holding themselves aloof from political commitments while waiting for the American and British forces to enter Europe, when they expected to crystallize themselves as a people's movement around the Stars and Stripes, are abandoning hope of that development and are crystallizing themselves for independent action under their own working class leadership, including the Communists.

I would prefer to see a crystallization of the broadest national front and people's coalition, representing the United Nations' war for the destruction of the Axis. But if the peoples of Europe are being demobilized by the mistakes and stupidities of those who are directing the policies of our country, we certainly can be glad that they are not being left entirely without leadership. The best example of this is in Yugoslavia.

Two months ago, in fact even as much as two weeks ago, we were being assured by the most authoritative spokesmen of American opinion and policy that the hero of Yugoslavia and one of the heroes of the United Nations is General Mikhailovich. This week even the *Saturday Evening Post* carries admissions about the role of Mikhailovich which make it clear that this man and his supporters in the Yugoslav Government in London represent people, ideas and policies which are a hundred times closer to Hitler than to the United Nations. These admissions show that we are dealing with a man who traffics with both sides and who can send dispatches to the United States claiming credit for military victories against the Axis while actually engaged in military cooperation with the Axis to kill the people who won those victories against the Axis.

Of course, in the case of Yugoslavia the process of the amalgamation of the Mikhailoviches with the Nazi regime is so rapid that the farce is already played out and even our most reactionary newspapers have to begin to break the news gently. And I venture to predict that in the very near future not only will the Mikhailovich myth completely disappear, but, along with it, the present Yugoslav government-in-exile. Already a real national front and people's government has appeared in Yugoslavia itself. And while it was born in struggle against the Nazi-fascist occupationists and against the treachery of the emigré government in London which still has the support of England and the United States, yet it represents the broad coalition of all the peoples of Yugoslavia as represented by their most important political parties. It has a mass base consisting of all the classes in Yugoslavia except the large landowners. Under the blows of the Nazi campaign of extermination, the Yugoslav peoples have achieved a unity and a force which are driving the invaders out of district after district, while the sheer moral weight of their position is making it impossible to continue all this stage-play of the Yugoslavian government-in-exile and its Quisling puppet, Mikhailovich, inside Yugoslavia.

Thus the Yugoslavian people are fighting the war, gathering their forces and together with the heroic Partisans in Poland, France, etc., are opening the Second Front in Europe. This

people's army of liberation in Yugoslavia is today engaging more German forces than all the power of the great United States one year after we entered the war. These Partisans, who embrace fighters of all political beliefs and affiliations, who armed themselves with guns they took away from the German invaders, kill more Nazis today than has the United States to date. Likewise the Communist-led armies in China have conducted more warfare against Japan in this past year than has been waged by the United States. The Communist-led armies in China have not received a gun or a dollar in money from the Chiang Kai-shek Government for over three years. The People's Army in Yugoslavia has not received a single bit of help from England or the United States. They have conducted more war, each of them alone, against the enemies of this country than this country has conducted after spending $46,000,000,000 for the war. And today certain leaders and forces are busily engaged in conditioning the country to a policy in the conduct of the war which means not to strike at the heart of the fascist beast, putting him out of business as quickly as possible, but which seeks to prepare as quickly as possible a negotiated peace with the Axis along the lines laid down by Herbert Hoover just a day or two ago. One after another, most of our newspapers, including our liberal papers, greet the Hoover speech, which was a direct call for a negotiated peace with Hitler, as constructive statesmanship. Did you hear any rebukes of Herbert Hoover? Only from the "disreputable" Communists.

It is evident that we are not yet adequately learning to make war; we are not seriously making war with all forces at our disposal; we have not yet developed real coalition warfare with our Allies. This dark picture is causing quite a bit of confusion among liberal circles in the United States. Our liberals are sharply divided: One section swallows the policy of relying on deals with the Darlans 100 per cent in the name of military expediency and sharply attacks anyone who criticizes this method of making war; another section falls into complete panic and finds a voice in the speech of Pearl Buck last week in which she said that this war was not a war for freedom any more and that we would have to have another war later on to do our fighting

for freedom. What we are going to do about this war she doesn't say.

Both of these sections of liberal thought in America are even more discouraging than the facts themselves. Both sections of them—those who want to swallow the Darlan incident and say it is a sweet pill, and those who want to fall into panic and give up hope and everything—are equally bad because you can't do anything with either, and if you follow either you are lost completely.

Yet I must say I have more respect for Pearl Buck than I could possibly have for a Kenneth Crawford, because Kenneth Crawford is just licking the boots of the Biddles, of the "liberal" red-baiters; whereas Pearl Buck, while she may not see any solution to the problem, is at least screaming a protest against something that is unacceptable. Screams are not very constructive but they do have one quality, even though it is only a negative virtue—they are like the screeching of a maladjusted engine, indicating that something needs to be remedied. The panic of Pearl Buck and her kind of liberals has that negative value.

But what is the correct way to approach these very negative features of the development of our war policy? The correct way is to understand that these things do not change the character of the war as a people's war of national liberation. Further, these aspects of our war policy can be changed by the intervention of the people, and these things must be changed because such policies lead to defeat and not to victory. The development of events is inevitably going to prove this to the people. The one thing that we have in this war which is our weapon against all such distortions and which will correct all such distortions is the will of the people to victory, their unity and activity. The American people in mass do have that will to victory and they are going to get rid of all policies which delay, postpone or endanger that victory.

This confidence we can and must have. It is true the way is not going to be easy and it is not going to be clear. We saw in the elections on November 3 how the bad organization of the war effort was being exploited by the reactionary forces in this country, the very same forces that had helped to bring about this

bad organization, in order to prepare the ground for their appeasement and negotiated peace policies. The same thing is going on today on a much larger scale preparatory to the opening of Congress. We see the rapid accumulation of all the elements of a political and economic crisis in this country deliberately being manipulated against the war effort by powerful defeatist organizations and interests in the United States.

For instance Mr. Henderson's resignation from the Office of Price Administration was a public announcement of a fact that has been privately known for some time—that the whole structure of price control in this country has broken down. The reshuffling of the heads of the various agencies in charge of the war economy was brought about by the fact that the war economy is getting tangled in the chaos that is contributing directly to the growing economic crisis in the country.

On this background, the political coalition representing the dominant elements of the Republican Party, the Vandenberg-Taft-Hoover clique, and the poll-tax Southern Democrats, is sharpening up its axe to run wild against labor and the Administration in the coming session of Congress, expecting to unleash one of the severest periods of class struggle and obstructionism that this country has ever seen. Moreover, in the big centers of war production, which are only partly organized and are suffering from dislocations, a strike sentiment is growing. Clearly this is not a very promising background for entering the year 1943 in the prosecution of the war.

What is behind the mounting wave of resentment of labor against the conduct of the war economy? Our newspapers in New York today carried several severe warnings, as if labor were in some way rebelling against the war or the burdens imposed by the war. In the past two months I have been out to most of the main industrial centers and I have talked to the workers and their leaders. I think I have a thorough picture of what is going on in the ranks of labor in war production and I can say that labor is totally patriotic, supporting the war and ready for any burdens that are required by the war. But labor is fed up with the senseless conduct of this war that is forcing unnecessary and intolerable burdens upon the workers as well as upon the

general public, and labor is determined to change this state of affairs.

Those workers who are inclined to seek strike action as a solution to their problems are, of course, misled, because that is no way to solve these problems under conditions of war. Strikes will not help at all and Communists everywhere are resisting this strike sentiment with all of the influence that they have. But that strike sentiment may over-ride the Communist influence and the influence of all of those best elements of the leadership of labor that are trying to prevent this resentment from taking the channels of strike action. One reason why that sentiment may over-ride us and sweep over us is because many powerful industrialists, especially the N.A.M. crowd, are busy trying to provoke a strike movement.

There is unmistakable evidence that the most reactionary employers, acting from an organized center, are deliberately putting across such provocative policies and are dragging certain patriotic employers along with them, making the tendency general. Take the case of the bomber plant that Ford is putting up with government money outside of Detroit. The Government Housing Authority tried to go in there and put up housing for the workers employed in the Willow Run plant. They took their surveyors out there, but Henry Ford's private police ran the surveyors off the land at the point of guns and the Government Housing Authority withdrew and has done nothing about it since. Meanwhile the workers in the Willow Run plant are forced to live in trailers, in barns, in pigpens, in tents. And the plant is still not producing anything for the war. Technically it is in production. Actually nothing reaches the armed forces from it. And that is the institution where Charlie Lindbergh works. But we have no investigations and nothing is done about it.

Consider more general manifestations of the treatment of labor. There is a general policy in industry today to penalize workers for increasing production. Many employers, in plants which have cost-plus contracts with the government, deliberately slow the workers down on the job. On the other hand, some employers that have ordinary contracts want their workers to

speed up production, but the moment they get the production onto a higher level, they penalize those workers that increased production by reducing their wages, so that if workers don't want their wages reduced, they have to keep production from being speeded up. What kind of policy is this? This policy of the employers is equivalent to sabotage of war production.

The American workers responded with great enthusiasm to the policy of the government calling for increased production. The workers know how to speed up production; they know how to increase production without increasing the intensity of labor too much, and they were ready to do it until instance after instance proved to them that if they do it the employers would penalize them. And with that experience many workers are stopping the increase in production, but only because they find out it is not for the government, not for the war; it is only for the private profit of monopoly corporations which, far from helping the war, is disorganizing the economy of the country and building up vast resources of power and profit.

Consider another angle of what has been going on for the past six months since the issuance of the wage stabilization order. Many employers have taken the position that they cannot adjust any of the grievances of the workers in their plants except through Washington. In the first place they drag out the negotiations now just as long as it is humanly possible and then finally they conclude them with the declaration that it is impossible to arrive at a settlement until they get the approval of Washington.

Thousands and tens of thousands of these cases are piled up in Washington, which is completely unprepared to handle them, and they lay over for two, three, four, five, six, seven months with no answer, and then some good friend of the boss goes around and says to the workers: "Well, you voted for this guy in Washington, didn't you? You are getting what you voted for." Then another good friend of the boss comes around and says to the workers: "Don't you wish you were back in the good old days when you could strike?" Then the workers in one place pull a strike and the bosses come immediately and settle with those workers. Yes, many bosses are putting a premium on strikes today. These employers will settle nothing with the patriotic

workers who refuse to strike; but the workers who begin to join this strike sentiment and express discontent with Washington—these workers can go on strike for three hours and get their grievances settled the same day, while nine months of peaceful negotiations failed.

All of this is an expression of a conspiracy against the war and is organized directly from a defeatist clique in the National Association of Manufacturers, which involves even employers who are against it. They are involved because they do not have any leadership of their own and even when they know they are doing wrong they are afraid to break with their fellow-employers; besides, it fits in so well with all their previous training and they have not been fully conditioned as yet to be really patriotic employers and really fight for the policies of their government and for an effective war economy. It is a very serious situation.

The Communists are holding back the working class today from strike action, but the country had better understand that the Communist Party is very small and against the concerted power of all of these forces the Communists cannot do the job alone. Nobody can straighten out this situation until we get the government in Washington to begin to take a sharp and clear lead in the solution of these problems. Every patriotic citizen in America who wants to win this war as quickly as possible had better begin to give some attention to this volcano that is rising in American social, economic and political life.

These are great dangers to our war effort at the present time. We have sounded the alarm on these things and we have given suggestions of policy that will remedy this situation. We are not trying to intensify the class struggle; we want to help consolidate national unity for winning the war, but we know that national unity requires something more than the mere submission of labor to intolerable conditions and practices, because we know that these things are deliberately brought about as measures of sabotage of the war.

We are now entering critical days. But I am not pessimistic; I think the country is going to solve these problems. But I don't think they will be solved automatically; it is going to require a struggle to bring a solution to these questions and I think that

for this solution we will require the concerted action of all Americans of good will, all Americans who place patriotism first, all Americans who want to defeat Hitler and the Axis and place that as the first consideration. All such forces must unite and find a way to express themselves and to place their active support behind those policies which are known, which are before the authorities in Washington, which are not yet adopted because of hesitations and timidity. Labor and the people can influence and can give courage to those men in the government who do want to win the war, and do want the correct policies and who will adopt the correct policies when the people make their will known and felt.

This is the picture. The task in the next period is to get that mass support of all elements of the population, especially of organized labor, to the correct policies that can bring us through this crisis, policies which can be adopted very quickly and which will bring order out of chaos in our economy and put power behind the military effort which we are directing against the fascist enemy.

(From a speech delivered at New York Workers School gathering, December 18, 1942.)

IX. THE DECISIVE TURN IN THE WAR

THE WAR has entered into a new phase. Some of the main features of this phase were stated in the President's message to Congress, and quite correctly. The relation of forces has turned against the Axis and in favor of the United Nations.

Public thinking about the problems of the war has reacted to this new phase in a peculiar manner. First, there has been a wave of shallow optimism which considers the war practically over except for the celebrations and therefore immediately turns toward "business as usual"; second, there has arisen among liberal and intellectual circles an opposite and equally shallow pessimism

which suddenly is overwhelmed with the unsolved political problems of the war, throws up its hands in despair, repudiates all responsibility for the war, predicts a new war immediately after this one and sits back to await the realization of its lugubrious prophecies. My remarks today are mainly directed against both these harmful tendencies in our country's political thought.

Perhaps it would be well to define exactly those factors which enable us to speak of the turn in the war unfavorable to the Axis. What are these factors?

First, and by far the most decisive, is the series of offensives by the Red Army before Stalingrad, in the Don Basin, in the Caucasus, and in the Northwest, which began on November 20 and roll on with rising momentum. The Nazis are losing, in dead and prisoners, more soldiers than the total engaged on all other fronts. Whole armies are being annihilated. For the first time Nazi officers and men are surrendering en masse. In contrast to last winter's offensives, which rolled back the invading armies, this winter's offensive is breaking through their lines, chopping them up, annihilating them, and breaching their strategic positions.

Second, in North Africa the British have struck General Rommel's Army and sent it scurrying back from Egypt, through Libya, in a wild race in which the Nazis have but one thing to boast of, that they can run faster than the British can follow. American forces, occupying French North Africa, prepare with the British the destruction of the last Axis hold upon the southern shores of the Mediterranean, and open up Italy and the Balkans to invasion. The long-prepared Second Front in Europe can now be launched at any one of a dozen points of its entire coastline, while Hitler must fortify and guard twice the area of a year ago.

Third, the people of the occupied lands have begun to rise and create their own "second front" against Hitler. The Partisan armies of Yugoslavia have liberated half of their own land and set up their own Government of National Liberation, despite the treason of Mikhailovich. In Poland partisan armies are rising and engaging the Nazis in ever larger actions. In France signs multiply of an imminent rising of the people's forces. The Nazi-

occupied lands are seething volcanoes of hatred against the invaders, with rising struggles which more and more break out on a mass scale.

Fourth, the Axis coalition is disintegrating, with Italy beginning to seek a way out of the war, with the first signs of revolt within Germany itself, with the few remaining neutrals, such as Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, moving further away from Hitler and closer to the United Nations as they begin to see the clear outlines of inevitable Axis defeat.

Fifth, the Japanese have been halted in the Pacific, and the clear possibility has been shown that the opening of adequate supply lines to China and a serious land and air offensive in and from that country can deliver a crushing blow to the Eastern member of the Axis.

Sixth, and last, American and British war production, despite all weaknesses and delays, now overtops the Axis and still has tremendous potentialities of expansion, while Axis production has already passed its peak and is declining. The marvelous recuperative powers of Soviet war production, which is stronger than a year ago despite the loss of vital industrial areas, is being shown in the present equipment of the winter offensives, of which only a small fraction represents help from abroad.

All these factors add up to a decisive turn of the war in favor of the United Nations, creating the possibility of victory in 1943 over Hitler in Europe.

What is wrong, then, with being optimistic about the status of the war? Why do I warn against the current spirit of optimism as shallow and harmful?

The reason is, first, that the *favorable* turn in the relation of forces must still be realized by *the maximum utilization of all the forces on our side.* It will do us no good to have the margin of forces on our side if we fail to use them. And it is precisely this shallow optimism, which already looks upon the war as won, which is now the greatest danger to our victory, for it brings about a relaxation of the nation's efforts, especially in the field of economic and political problems, it is manipulated by forces of appeasement and greed to disrupt the national unity for the war.

At this moment when the war turns in our favor, it is especially necessary to make clear that it is still possible to lose the war, that at this moment above all we must demand the greatest exertion, the fullest mobilization of every force at our disposal against the enemy. The turn of the war only makes the enemy more desperate, more ferocious, more implacable. This enemy has threatened that, faced with defeat, he will carry the whole world down into ruin with him. We have no reason to doubt the seriousness of this declared intention, but we have every reason to do what we can to make it impossible. And we are not yet doing everything.

Consider again those six factors which have turned the war in our favor. Think for a moment what would be the status of the war if one should abstract the first item, the Soviet offensive; clearly, without that factor, the war would be disastrously unfavorable to us. That is to say that the United States and Britain have not even begun as yet militarily to engage a considerable proportion of Hitler's forces, not to speak of defeating them. The Yugoslav Partisan armies killed more Nazis in 1942 than did the U. S. forces, even as the Chinese Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies killed more Japanese than we, despite our enormous resources and our sixty-billion-dollar war budget. Do we really think that we will win this war without large-scale fighting?

That is a dangerous thought which we should get rid of as quickly as possible, because it leads to mistakes and disasters. That is the thought which delays the opening of the Second Front in Europe, and every day of delay increases the cost of victory in lives and treasure. That is the thought which leads to the slogan "victory at leisure," to dilatoriness, to slackness, to weakness, to defeat. Those who speak as though the opening of the Second Front were some sort of "favor" which we should do for the benefit of the Soviet Union when we get around to it are not serving well our own country. The delay in opening the Second Front has hurt us more than it has the Soviet Union, and it has hurt the United Nations most of all.

Consider for a moment the second factor, North Africa. After a brilliantly executed landing we seem to have bogged down dangerously in political confusion which is seriously straining

our cooperative relations with Britain, and is weakening our great influence in France and other occupied countries. This and similar dangers flourish in the atmosphere of shallow optimism, of the thought that victory is already a "bird in the hand."

Examine now the third factor, the rising of the peoples of the occupied lands. Here also we find not only evidence of the war's turn in our favor, but also grave dangers which we still must learn how to avoid. Consider, for example, Yugoslavia. General Eisenhower, our Commander in North Africa, is reported as sending his congratulations to Mikhailovich, who negotiated with the enemy while fighting against the Partisan armies which brought us our victories there. This is even more dangerous than the deal with Darlan, for it has not even the color of "military expediency"; it acts as a notification to the peoples of all occupied lands that the United States does not yet distinguish clearly between its friends and its enemies. Perhaps we could "afford" such "luxuries" if the war was already won, though I would question that very seriously; but surely it is a deadly mistake at this moment when, to win the war, we need the full confidence and active cooperation of all the rising people's armies throughout Europe.

Or take the fourth factor, the disintegration of the Axis coalition. That is a heavy item in our favor, but we will lose its advantage if, at the same time, we permit the relations among the leading powers of the United Nations to become strained. And it is no secret that China has withdrawn her military mission from Washington out of dissatisfaction with the consideration given China in our war policies; nor is it a secret that the relations between London and Washington are less harmonious than for some years past; and while the Soviet Union has made no complaints, and considers her relations with Washington and London as being improved and consolidated, yet we in America should be disturbed that the President has found it necessary, for the second time, to issue special orders that our lend-lease commitments, now in arrears, shall be expedited, and that anti-Soviet incitements still emanate not only from irresponsible newspapers but also from official sources.

In our fifth favorable item, the halting of Japanese advances in

the Pacific, we also can find elements of weakness and danger. We have already mentioned the unsatisfactory relations with China. There are two sides to this: not only has China reasons to feel aggrieved, but the U. S. also has questions to raise with China, for example, why are her best armies used not against the Japanese but to blockade the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies, which conduct a continuous struggle with the Japanese? U. S. diplomacy has spoken on this question, and at least prevented a worsening of that damaging disunity within China; but the basic problem remains unsolved. Then the question of India remains in deadlock, to the deterioration of our relations with all the Eastern and colonial peoples. We have not yet taken any serious steps to rally to our side the Pacific peoples subjugated by Japan, with a basic program for their national liberation. In all these weaknesses there is implicit the danger that we will not be able, as soon as we should, to pass over to a serious offensive against the Japanese, or that we may even suffer new setbacks.

Finally, there is our remarkable achievement in war production. We should have remarkable production, for we have a remarkable economy. But here also there are dangers and weaknesses, the most basic of which have been clearly defined by the Tolan Committee in Congress, the remedy for which is embodied in the Tolan-Kilgore-Pepper Bills for an Office of War Mobilization which will integrate under one planned direction the handling of production, manpower, prices and rationing, and technological mobilization. Shortsighted management policies which penalize workers for increased productivity are playing havoc with labor morale, equally with the jamming of the collective bargaining machinery, and the threat of anti-labor legislation. The President's Seven-Point Program against inflation, presented last April, has been sabotaged by Congress on those points requiring new legislation, the new tax structure is frankly based on the principle of soak-the-poor, price control has broken down, and the clear signs of an unnecessary and dangerous inflation are appearing. There are grave dangers on our production front, just as we are entering the period of our greatest military effort. All shallow optimism and complacency become most dangerous here.

Yes, it has become necessary to combat and dispel the moods of unreasoning optimism that have arisen on the basis of the favorable turn of the war. That favorable turn is an unquestionable fact, and it should serve to fortify our confidence in the ultimate victory. But the darkest days of the war, its heaviest burdens and most grievous losses, are still to come for us. The most difficult times are ahead, and we must not soften up or relax, we must not grow dilatory or careless. On the contrary, now above all we must unite our nation and gather all its forces to meet adequately the supreme test of modern war. Above all we must master the unsolved political problems of this war of survival, of national liberation.

Now what about our pessimists, the faint-hearted liberals and persons of the intellectual professions, who have become frightened at the difficulties and dangers of this period, have fallen into a panic and announce their despair to the world? Pearl Buck was their most eloquent voice when, in a recent speech, she declared that this war had ceased to be a progressive war of the United Nations, that it had degenerated into an imperialist scramble for loot on our side as well as that of the Axis, and that we must look forward to a new war after this one. Fortunately, these pessimists are a distinct minority and the masses, especially the labor movement, do not take their direction. But this pessimism is a menace to public morale, it feeds on very real problems and difficulties, and it must be energetically combated for it helps the camp of reaction and defeatism. The calamity howlers can sometimes do much damage, even when they are a small minority.

Imagine the results if the labor movement would listen to and follow such pessimists! Surely labor suffers from enormous provocations, and has accumulated unsolved grievances. If labor should lose confidence in the United Nations, in the basic soundness of the policies of our Commander-in-Chief, in the progressive and liberation character of our war effort, then the strongest factor which holds labor back from a great national strike movement would be removed; our war production program would be disorganized, sharp class struggles would rend the national unity, and our country's contribution to victory over the Axis would be

jeopardized. Hitler and his Axis partners would gain a new lease on life.

Can anyone, can even our pessimists, believe for one moment that such a logical outcome of their pessimism when applied in practical life would be of any benefit to any peoples anywhere in the world, or to labor in America? Clearly, it could have nothing but disastrous results for all.

Strikes and strike movements or threats do not help to solve any problems under the conditions of this present war of survival. But strike movements cannot be controlled and liquidated by counsels of pessimism, but only by constructive statesmanship which channels the legitimate forces behind them into new forms of action, finding solutions to these problems without resort to open conflict. Clearly, such new methods of solution are possible only because of the just and progressive character of our war effort, which generates a national unity that reaches into all classes, that mobilizes the national will to enforce these new methods.

It is not going to be easy. The recent convention of the National Association of Manufacturers, under the inspiration of Lammot du Pont, issued a call to employers to take advantage of war conditions to smash the labor movement, to dissolve the New Deal legislation, and to defeat the policies of the President. The reactionary Republicans, in coalition with the poll-tax Southern Democrats, probably control for the moment a majority in Congress which is willing to follow the lead of the N.A.M. Serious problems are inherent in this situation.

It is my conviction, however, that constructive solutions can and will be found for all problems and difficulties which stand in the way of victory. The solutions must be found in the understanding and patriotism of the vast majority of the people, especially the workers, roused to action and organized.

The pressure of the people, roused to express their will, will dissolve the power of the threatening reactionary coalition in Congress against labor and the President.

The American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Railroad Brotherhoods can and must move to closer unity among themselves, and with the mass

of working farmers and their organizations, on the program which they already hold in common, and arbitrate lesser differences among them.

Labor must seek closer collaboration with the patriotic sections of management, with the help of the government, for solution to the problems of production, for a broad development of Labor-Management Production Councils, and for the peaceful solution of disputes and grievances.

Labor and the people must study more profoundly the political problems of the war, and bring an informed public opinion into play to strengthen the arm of the President and the various departments and organs of the government.

Labor must be given more adequate and responsible positions in the leadership and administration of the country's tremendous war effort.

More organization and activity of the people provide the basic solution to all the problems of a people's war.

The common man must step forward to claim his century.

Already the common men of the world, through their united efforts, have turned the tide of war against the Axis. The most difficult times are ahead. Rejecting alike all complacency and shallow optimism and the panic of an equally shallow pessimism, labor and the people will bring the nation to victory, to the triumph of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

(Speech delivered at the Philharmonic Auditorium in Los Angeles, Cal., January 17, 1943, and broadcast over Station KFWB.)

X. THE GHOST OF MUNICHISM IN THE UNITED STATES

THERE is deep significance for today in the fact that we combine in this meeting the commemoration of Abraham Lincoln, America's foremost contribution to the world leadership of democratic liberation, and of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin,

founder of the Soviet Power, which at this moment is liberating the world from the menace of Nazism.

In the joining of these two commemorations in one we are expressing the understanding, now general among the American people, that the destinies of our two countries are intertwined, that close and ever closer relations of cooperation inevitably arise from the deepest of common interests.

At this moment the common interests of the United States and the Soviet Union are expressed in the goal of victory over Hitlerism. When the Axis is destroyed that common interest will lies in the reconstruction of a world order in which peoples can peacefully work out their own destinies.

Achievement of victory over Hitlerism is the supreme common task today. In the name of Lincoln and Lenin we devote all our capacities to that goal.

Great events are taking place. Hitler's armies on the Eastern Front are being encircled and annihilated, one after another. All history contains nothing to compare with the mighty deeds of the Red Army under the guiding genius of Stalin. They have turned the tide of war definitely in favor of the United Nations. They have brought victory within reach.

We must be profoundly dissatisfied, however, with the contribution which our country, the United States, has so far made to this victory.

The conference at Casablanca gives us promise that America's might will be thrown soon into the scales of war. It is high time that this were so. Laggards cannot win this war; victory does not come "at leisure."

At this moment when the black clouds of doom gather over Hitler and his armies, Der Fuehrer has gained one brilliant victory. To our shame we must confess that Herr Schickelgruber's single victory was won in the United States, in Washington, in Congress. By a vote of 302 to 94, the House of Representatives endorsed Martin Dies, the clearest and most consistent exponent of Hitler's policies and slogans within the United States.

If the Congress of the United States is still an important policy-making body of our government, this latest endorsement of Martin Dies must be looked upon as one of the most sinister

threats to victory in the war, and to the future of our country. For Martin Dies has declared that he hopes for the defeat of our Ally, the Soviet Union; he has slanderously denounced Joseph Stalin, Commander-in-Chief of the Red Armies, as the chief enemy of our country; he has echoed all the slogans of Hitler and promoted them; and now the majority of Congress has renewed its declaration of confidence in that same Martin Dies and all he stands for.

It is small comfort to remind ourselves that Martin Dies does not represent the vast majority of the people of our country. It is small comfort to repeat that he does not represent the Administration of President Roosevelt, whose correct war policies are supported overwhelmingly by the people. For this Congress has the power, and a reactionary defeatist coalition of Hoover Republicans and Wheeler Democrats is influencing a majority of Congress to use this power, under our Constitution, to throw confusion into the war effort, to disrupt the national unity, to negate the declared policies of the President, and to serve notice on our Allies that they cannot depend upon the United States honoring the commitments which have been made by the President.

Is there anyone who can dismiss all this as merely the exaggerations of a special pleader, because I have for years been insisting upon the importance of friendship between our country and the Soviet Union? Today this importance is recognized by conservative circles of all political ideologies.

The New York *Herald Tribune* is a conservative Republican newspaper. It has always hitherto supported Martin Dies. But now it has called for a halt of this "play into Hitler's hands." And yesterday, enlarging upon its argument in connection with our fumbling diplomacy in North Africa, this conservative newspaper says:

"How can the oppressed Europeans believe in democracy if we give them the impression that we believe so little in it ourselves? There are but two choices before the democracies now. One is to cooperate with Russia in rebuilding the world—as there is an excellent chance of doing, if we believe in the strength

of our own principles and prove it by applying them. The other is to get involved in intrigues with all the reactionary and anti-democratic forces in Europe, the only result of which will be to alienate the Kremlin. . . ."

I could spend hours in quoting from the most serious spokesmen of all political groupings, to show the general acceptance of the fact that the future of the world, and of our own country, depends upon friendship, understanding and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. But the majority of Congress on Wednesday, by a vote of 302 to 94, voted no confidence in this whole line of policy by giving their confidence to Martin Dies, who is the embodiment of hostility against the Soviet Union in the full spirit of Hitler.

Evidently, the majority of Congress does not wish, or does not consider important, the friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Those who wish to cement that friendship are put on notice that they must defeat the majority of Congress on this question. One cannot eat one's cake and have it, too; nor can we travel in opposite directions at the same time. No more can we have Martin Dies as the symbol of our policy, and also have friendship with the Soviet Union. It is a contradiction in policy and interest.

It is very interesting to examine the thought expressed by the *Herald Tribune* before quoted. That conservative organ has come to the conclusion, reluctantly we may be sure, that we of the United States may ally ourselves with the forces of democracy in Europe *only* on condition that we ally ourselves with the Soviet Union; if we reject the alliance with the Soviet Union, then inevitably we will find ourselves plunged into intrigues with all the reactionary and anti-democratic forces in Europe. This means, further, that when our government engages in intrigues with those reactionary forces, all intelligent men everywhere understand this to mean that we are thereby abandoning our alliance with the democratic forces of Europe, especially with the Soviet Union.

There is a profound truth in this thought of the *Herald Tribune*. Recognition of this truth is sweeping away one of the

biggest lies of all history, the lie that socialism or communism is "undemocratic" or "anti-democratic." The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is so much the foremost champion of all the democratic forces of Europe that the United States, our country which for a century and a half stood in the vanguard of world democracy, can now be allied with those democratic forces in Europe *only on condition* that we are allied with the Soviet Union. That is not my statement, that is the statement of the New York *Herald Tribune*, one of the outstanding conservative newspapers of the United States. This is a mere restatement of the thoughts clearly expressed in the editorial which I quoted verbatim.

Our country, in the midst of life-and-death war, has not clearly defined its policy. Our Commander-in-Chief points in one direction with the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations, and alliance with the Soviet Union; but powerful forces in the State Department point in the opposite direction by its entanglements with Vichy, with Franco, with Mannerheim, with Mikhailovich, with Otto of Austria, with Bethlen of Hungary, while Congress emphatically contradicts the President by voting its confidence in Martin Dies. And the same Congress emphatically refuses to express its confidence in the President.

Our national policy is ambiguous. It points both ways. And the conflict is not only within Congress and between Congress and the Executive; it is within the Executive Department itself. The President considers it necessary to conciliate a hostile Congress; even more serious, he considers it necessary to tolerate the same hostility within his own cabinet.

In the State Department we have the ineffable Mr. Adolph Berle, Jr., spinning his webs of intrigue in Europe and Latin America. This is the person whom a prominent visiting Britisher is reported to have sized up in these few words: "He is not only anti-Soviet, he is also anti-British; he is not only anti-British, he is also anti-American."

At the head of the Department of Justice we have Mr. Biddle, whose chief virtue is weakness of character which prevents him from following his mischievous theories to their logical conclusions. He introduced a brief in the Supreme Court on the Schneid-

erman case (and argued it against Mr. Wendell Willkie), which bases itself on the conception that the Soviet Union is essentially hostile to the United States in particular and to democracy in general. He issued an order for the deportation of Harry Bridges, with a legal argument lifted bodily from Hitler's "Anti-komintern," the illiteracy and obscurantism of which can be matched only in Nazi Germany. He tried to imprison Senator Stanley Nowak of Michigan on the same basis he wishes to deport Harry Bridges, but had to drop it with a bald "admission of error." He shares the basic theories of Martin Dies, but is jealous of the Texan's prominence.

Yes, our national course is ambiguous. The President has charted a clear and correct policy, but it is challenged not only by Congress but also by members of his own Cabinet and executive appointees. Instead of a showdown and clarification, the nation drifts along with compromise and appeasement of irreconcilable policies.

In the North African political muddle, that followed a brilliantly executed military occupation, we experienced our first sharp example of the disastrous results of an ambiguous policy. It requires the personal intervention of Roosevelt, flying 6.000 miles to Casablanca, to begin to bring some order and sense into that mess. The release at last of twenty-seven French Communist Deputies, and some 900 other prisoners, did much to clear the moral atmosphere. But even on this question of the North African prisoners, it seems we have not heard the last word. Some 25,000 French patriots, Spanish Republicans and other anti-fascists are still held behind barbed wire, and Mr. Hull has still not clarified his cryptic hints that Francisco Franco may wish to be consulted as to their fate.

In the question of the North African prisoners we are learning the first lessons on the political problems of Europe. By the way in which we handle this question the United States will be judged by the peoples of occupied Europe. Uncle Sam is preparing to enter Europe heavily armed and ready to shoot on sight; the peoples of Europe are anxious to know if Uncle Sam's eyes are keen enough to distinguish clearly between friends and enemies! In the shadow of the Stars and Stripes in North

Africa 25,000 anti-fascist fighters still languish in prisons and concentration camps!

We cannot leave such questions to be settled at leisure. The war goes on, and time waits for no man or nation. If our national policy in its application remains ambiguous, then the results it will bring to our nation will also be ambiguous.

There is a loud-mouthed cult in our country which is willing to admit every weakness and error so long as it can blame it on the President. These are the demagogues of reaction. But there are too many honest democrats, progressives, and even labor men, who weaken the President's position by leaving all problems for him to settle, by failing to take energetic action themselves to help solve all these problems. This was the main factor which enabled the President's foes to gain strength in last November's elections, for the President's supporters sadly neglected that campaign with the excuse that "F. D. R. can take care of it." Now they chide the President for conciliating his enemies, but they are themselves among the first conciliators. No one has any right to criticize the President who is not himself in the midst of the hottest and most uncompromising fight to halt the mob of reaction now controlling the majority of Congress and threatening the whole country and its war effort.

The President has himself given more than a hint of the course all democratic Americans should follow. Speaking at a recent press conference, the President quoted from an interview given by General Giraud from North Africa. Giraud had declared his intention, following the example of de Gaulle, of uniting all Frenchmen from conservatives to Communists, with the only condition that they unite to fight Hitler and not to play politics. The President expressed the opinion that would seem to be a good line for any country to follow. He evidently meant that would be a good line for the United States also.

I wish to support emphatically this proposal of the President, on behalf of the Communist Party of the United States. We have thousands of Communists and friends of our party in the armed forces of the United States, ready and anxious to fight Hitler and not to play politics. But too many of them are being transferred out of fighting units, and into non-combatant duties at

home, and even into polite substitutes for concentration camps. We have raised this question with the authorities, but have not been able to obtain clarification of the problem. Until the Communists are permitted to fight Hitler and his accomplices on the same basis as all other Americans, we must continue to discuss this problem publicly, and press for action in the spirit of the President's expression on French unity.

Some well-meaning persons advise me not to keep raising the question of discrimination against the Communists, but to simply keep our mouths shut, to grin and bear it in the interest of the war and national unity; after all, they say, the Communists are only a small group in a big nation.

My intelligence compels me to reject such an easy way out of the problem. If the Communists of the U. S. are but a small group in a big nation, that is all the more reason to insist that correct principles be applied by the nation in relation to the Communists. If the United States is so fearful of its own small proportion of Communists that it must have special laws against them, special committees of Congress to hunt them out of governmental service, and special segregation of them into labor service in the armed forces—then it will certainly be impossible for such a fearful United States to have a realistic relationship of alliance with the Communists of Europe and Asia who are much more powerful, and without whom it is impossible for the United States to have an alliance with the democratic forces of the world. When we fight for the full admission of American Communists as citizens of the country without discrimination, we are fighting for a correct world policy which is necessary for victory in the war.

American democracy needs more confidence in itself in order to win the war. It needs to snap out of the hypnosis induced by Hitler and Martin Dies, in which the cry of "Communist" raises hysterical fear and sets the democrats to examining one another for hidden "reds" and protesting each his own innocence of the "terrible" charge of which few know the meaning. American democracy must grow up, and stop believing in ghosts and witches.

Above all, American democracy must throw off the fear of

victory. Yes, there is being deliberately cultivated in our country the fear of victory over the Axis because that victory is being advanced today primarily by the armies of the Soviet Union. That fear is stupid and senseless, in the first place, because America still has the opportunity despite all past delays of striking decisive blows against Hitler and winning an honorable position in the victory by the side of the Soviet Union. We need fear only our own failure to strike in time with our full force. Such a failure, truly, would endanger victory, would have terrible consequences for our national safety and the common cause of the United Nations.

That fear of victory came before a Congressional Committee last week in Washington, in the person of Herbert Hoover. That spector from an almost forgotten past mumbled a new slogan for America: "Let's not do too much, too soon."

Hoover wants to drag out the war for two, three, four or more years, with America doing little fighting. Above all, we must not strike in 1943, he intimated. He sees the good side of the war in the opportunity it gives for him and his cronies to try to transform it into chiefly a form of martial law against the American working class, with unlimited profits for the capitalists. Hoover is still clutching close to his heart the banner of Chamberlain and Munich.

But the last shreds of the ghost of Munich were scattered to the four winds during the past weeks, by the events at Stalingrad, Schlusselburg, the Caucasus, Kursk, and all the long list of smashing victories of the Red Army. Any attempt to resurrect the shameful policy of Munich can result in nothing but disaster for those who try it. That old world which produced Munichism is dead beyond recall. All those who try to follow that path now will find that it leads immediately to the grave.

We are in war, a war to the death. We are fighting to save the world from reversion to barbarism. We are fighting to save civilization from destruction by Nazism. We are fighting for the possibility of future progress for humanity. We are fighting a just war.

All that means that we must fight with all our might, not in some tomorrow but now. We must fight with a full heart, for

the destruction of the enemy, his complete annihilation, the wiping of Hitlerism forever from the face of the earth. We must fight with complete good faith toward our Allies, and with full confidence in them. We must strengthen the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance in the fires of war so that it will be an indestructible instrument for an ordered peace. We must forge the United Nations as the guarantee of liberty and independence for all nations.

All this must still be won.

It can be won only by fighting.

Thanks to the Red Army the war has turned in our favor.

Let America also strike now, for victory in 1943.

(Speech delivered at the Lyric Theatre, Baltimore, February 2, 1943.)

XI. THE KEY PROBLEM IN AMERICAN POLITICS

GENTLEMEN, Friends, I am always glad to talk to serious thinking people. Due to great pressure of work, I came here without specific preparation for what I want to say to you today. Therefore, it will be a rather informal and perhaps somewhat disorganized presentation.

The thought which I want to present is the importance of clarifying certain relationships within our domestic political life in America, if our country is to play its proper role in the reorganization of the world, as the result of victory in this war. I believe that it is possible for the United States to make a very great contribution to the welfare of the world and, of course, to our own future. But I think that there are obstacles in the way of this which are not yet generally recognized and to which I want to call attention.

To come as directly as possible to the central point, let me refer to the Congressional Committee headed by Martin Dies, which has just received a new mandate from Congress and which clearly is intended to continue its work in this next crucial

period with the same spirit in which it has worked for the past four years. This Dies Committee is not yet understood in its full significance by the country. And when a Communist speaks against the Dies Committee, this is usually interpreted as sort of a self-defense measure on the part of the Communist because Dies advertises himself as the Communist-baiter par excellence. But it is in no spirit of defense of any special interests of the Communists that I want to speak. I want to call your attention to the Dies Committee in its functions as a menace to our nation as a whole, as a poisoner of the political and intellectual life of our country, as an agent for propagation of the basic ideas of Hitlerism, and as a menace to the future world order.

Is it really a peculiar interest of Communists to combat an institution which speaks in the name of our government, which propagates the idea and creates the psychosis in the country that puts every decent man on the defensive, if he is accused by any loud-mouthed demagogue of being a Communist or of associating with them? That is the situation we have in our country, which is supported, endorsed and put forward by the majority in the House of Representatives.

Let's see what that means in relation to the international problems of the United States today. American armed forces are preparing to enter Europe, to liberate the nations occupied by the Nazis. In each and every one of these nations we will have to establish relations with the population we are liberating, and in each and every one of those nations the democratic forces of the people are organizing themselves in conscious collaboration with, and inclusion of, the Communists of those countries. If, in America, Communism is outlawed and made an object of suspicion, discrimination, organized attacks by Congressional committees, witch hunts, and so on, how can this country, which has thus demonstrated a fear of a small group of Communists in the United States, have the proper relations with the peoples in Europe where they will be dealing with strong Communist elements in those populations? Or, are we going to have one policy for our domestic life in the United States and a different policy for Europe with relation to Communists?

To make the question a little more concrete, what are we

going to do in relation to France? Our armies may be in France within a few weeks. The French people are organizing their own armed struggle against the Germans today within France, on the basis of an all-inclusive national front of the organized collaboration of everyone ready to fight Hitler—from extreme conservatives to Communists. The Communists are definitely included in the organized leadership of the movement. Not that they have any monopoly of the leadership. They are included. General de Gaulle has just included in his Council a French Communist Deputy, Fernand Grenier, as the official representative of the French Communists. It is generally agreed by conservative observers that the French Communist Party today is the strongest political organization within France, in the sense of an operating organization with mass support.

Now, how can the United States of America have a correct attitude toward that national front of the French people that includes the Communists if we have an organized Congressional institution backed up by laws and public attitude which outlaws Communism? It is clear we cannot. We will either have a correct attitude in France (which contradicts our own attitude at home), or (if we are consistent with our attitude at home), we will suppress with our arms the liberation movement of the French people, or force it to expel from its midst the organized French Communists, which means to disrupt the whole French democracy.

Clearly, that is impossible, because even General Giraud has now endorsed the policy of de Gaulle in the inclusion of the Communists in the national front; and when such conservative representatives of France join hands with the Communists it is clear that the only logical answer to the situation in France is either to deal with the Communists as a recognized party of the community there, or to substitute pure and simple military occupation of France by American troops when we go in, and dominate that country's affairs.

We have the same problem presented to us in Yugoslavia. I think that with France and Yugoslavia we can take it as established that this is typical of all Europe; it is not a peculiar national situation in any one country.

In Yugoslavia, we have a national liberation movement of all former political parties, arising from within the occupied country without any help from outside, which has brought together all of the active forces of the population, including the Communists. They have established their own armies that successfully fight the Nazi invaders. They have reconquered about half of the territory of Yugoslavia. They have set up their own Constituent Assembly to head and direct the armies and the civil government that they set up in the reconquered territories. The head of their national government is the same man, Ivan Ribar, who was the head of the Constituent Assembly in 1918 that established Yugoslavia as an independent nation. They openly include the Communists in the government and in the leadership of the army, and, ostensibly because of that fact, General Mikhailovich has made war against this people's liberation government inside of Yugoslavia, and has collaborated for that purpose with the Germans and the Italians. But our government and the British Government still continue to hold Mikhailovich as their representative inside of Yugoslavia.

Here is another example of how this anti-Communist phobia or psychosis in the United States predetermines our government's attitude toward vital questions of European policy and actually places our government in collaboration with our national enemies, in opposition to our friends.

I don't know that I need to present to you any evidence of the all-inclusive popular character of that Yugoslavian government, set up directly by the people themselves. The newspapers have been telling you that this is a Communist affair, inspired and instigated by Moscow as an expression of "Red imperialism." I assure you that this is not true and cite you evidence, not of Communists, but of well-known non-Communists and anti-Communists, including all responsible Americans of Yugoslavian origin, such as Louis Adamic and other men of that type, who are agreed on the basic facts of the situation as I have described them to you, and who support the Constituent Assembly government and its armies within Yugoslavia.

There are many people who dismiss these questions as problems which are in that field of foreign relations which should

be determined by "experts" in the government; and they say, "How do you expect us to have an intelligent attitude on such problems of the inner life of other countries? In so far as it has to be handled by America, it must be done through the 'experts' that are put in charge by our government."

I think this has already gone far beyond the stage where it can be left to "experts." In the first place, unfortunately, most of the "experts" on such questions are men who are the propagators of this extreme anti-Communist phobia which obviously makes impossible any objective, judicial handling of these all-important problems in Europe.

We have reached the stage today, in the evolution or exercise of our foreign policy, when the whole country must be awakened to the fact that we face the possibilities of serious catastrophes in Europe if this kind of unintelligent attitude continues to prevail in determining the policies of our government. On many occasions our President has given a clear lead for a correct policy. But it is impossible for him in his position to conduct the whole struggle for this policy. The citizenry generally—the rank and file—must take up the struggle for the correct policy that has been enunciated.

Today, Congress has set itself squarely against the far-sighted policy that the Chief Executive represents. Congress, unless the country speaks up on this question, has the power to sabotage, to distort, and to defeat the policy of the President. The key to the correction of this whole situation must come from within the population of the United States, from those men who assume to help direct and mold the moral and political thinking of the country. It is impossible thoroughly to correct our relations toward the democracies in Europe without simultaneously correcting our democratic life within our own country. And, as a national question, it is necessary to include the clarification of the position of Communists within the United States, no matter how small a group they may be, as the precondition for our having a correct foreign policy for the war and for the reorganization of the world after the war.

Without any qualification whatever I declare that it is logically inconceivable that we shall have a normal, peaceful world order

unless we have a correct attitude toward the Communists of every country, including our own. It is impossible to reconstruct Europe without the conscious, organized, friendly collaboration of the Communists—not merely the Communists of the Soviet Union but the Communists of every country. And it is impossible to have that collaboration on a healthy basis if our own political life inside the United States is based upon an irrational, even hysterical fear of the few Communists in the United States who are constantly misrepresented and thoroughly misunderstood.

The United States has the fewest Communists of any modern country in the world in proportion to its population. It has the highest developed hysterical fear of those Communists. We have that because there has been an organized development of that phobia. It has rooted itself in the heart of our government. It is officially represented by Martin Dies and his committee.

Unless we can have the political and moral conscience of America awakened to the full significance of this question, we cannot have any clear and accurate perspective of the proper development of the war; and, above all, we can have no adequate perspective of a peaceful world when this particular war is ended.

This is a political and moral question of the first magnitude. So long as we meet it by merely answering all of the indictments of Martin Dies by simple denials that the men whom he is accusing of being Communists are really Communists; so long as we continue that defensive attitude in which all non-Communists faced with the accusation of "Communist," say, "Were I to admit that you were right, that I am a Communist, you would be entitled to do anything you want to me"; so long as we meet it on that basis instead of a straight head-on challenge of the whole concept that Communists must be excluded from our democratic life; so long as there is not an understanding that there is no freedom for any American if these same freedoms are denied Communists, just so long is this country going to fail to meet the tests of this war, and more especially is it not going to be prepared to meet the tests of the peace.

I don't speak of any aspect of this question which is peculiar

to the Communists. I only want to point out that in this case, as in so many cases in the past, it just happens that the key problem for the entire population of the earth is presented to you first of all as this problem: What are you going to do about the Communists? And, as you decide with relation to the Communists, you later find out, step by step, you must decide it similarly for everybody. Once you have given one inch to the devil of Nazism—given one finger to the anti-Comintern theories and propaganda of Hitler—you have surrendered your whole soul to him. You may not know it at first but before you are through you will find that one slight concession has involved you in difficulties from which you cannot escape.

The time has come when America must begin to really cut itself loose from this whole elaborate structure of anti-Communist phobia, which is the principal instrument whereby the Nazis almost came to the point of ruling the world. Now, when the Nazi military effort is having its back broken, the time has come when this Nazi moral and psychological "secret weapon" must also be broken and purged from the life of America and of the world.

(Speech delivered at a Luncheon Meeting of the Wranglers Club, New York, February 15, 1943.)

XII. FREE THE ANTI-FASCIST PRISONERS IN NORTH AFRICA

THE question of the fate of anti-fascist prisoners in North Africa, tremendously important on its merits, becomes a key question as to the whole course of the war because it has become a symbol of United States policy in general. The democratic world is evaluating America's choice as to its wartime role by the standard of what we do with the anti-fascist prisoners in the first territories occupied by our armed forces.

When American and British troops occupied North Africa

the whole democratic world greeted the action with unrestrained enthusiasm. On November 17 President Roosevelt issued his statement calling for the release of the anti-fascist prisoners. On January 11, Mr. Sumner Welles for the State Department explained that "this government is using every effort to bring about as prompt a release of prisoners and refugees as the military situation will permit."

"The military situation" was placed as the obstacle to the release of the prisoners, two months after American troops were in effective occupation of all French North Africa. How could the "military situation" be injured by the release of tried and tested anti-fascist fighters? How could it be benefited by the continued imprisonment of such men? How could concentration camps for Spanish Republicans under the shadow of the Stars and Stripes help us prosecute the war?

This question has been left unanswered. It is the first and most glaring ambiguity of the development of American war policy on foreign soil. We told the world that sentimentally we would like to release the prisoners, *but* as a matter of realism we must recognize that it may not fit in with our practical policy.

In February, following the President's return from Casablanca, a partial adjustment was announced between these conflicting elements in our national policy; the release of some 900 prisoners, including twenty-seven French Communist Deputies. This obviously had been accomplished only by the tremendous pressure of the President's personal visit to the scene of action.

At the same time, however, it was announced that the main group of prisoners and internees, numbering some 25,000 persons or more, had not been and would not be released. Among these, a most significant group is composed of the remnants of the Spanish Republican Army.

Why are not the Spanish anti-fascists released? When this question was put to Secretary Hull, his reply was interpreted by all newspaper men present as a statement that their fate was dependent upon negotiations with Francisco Franco, fascist dictator of Spain, signer of the Axis Pact. The following day Mr. Hull said he had been misinterpreted, but offered no further clarification.

But last week the American Ambassador to Franco Spain praised that fascist dictator as a "wise" man and a friend of the United States. This throws a new and vivid light upon Mr. Hull's cryptic statements, and requires us to re-examine a sentence of Mr. Welles' statement of January 11, in which he forecasts eventual *"repatriation* and release of prisoners and refugees in North Africa." If Butcher Franco is such a "wise" ruler, and deserving of U. S. friendship and confidence, then of course our government will consider it the natural and inevitable thing that we shall negotiate the "repatriation" of these Spaniards to their homeland into the clutches of Franco, who has already disposed of hundreds of thousands of such prisoners by shooting.

It is impossible to believe that the United States Government can bring itself to complicity in such a horrible undertaking. The enraged conscience of all progressive mankind would bring quick and severe retribution to such an act.

It remains an obvious fact, however, that the *practical policy* being followed by the United States officials in North Africa does not prevent such an outrageous crime being committed, but would facilitate that crime if not restrained by *prudence* in face of an outraged public opinion.

We have no kind of guarantee in American policy for the release of the prisoners, but must depend upon an increased vigilance and awareness of the American public, and its increasing pressure upon Washington.

We have no guarantee in American policy, because more and more the declared policies of the President are being transformed into their opposite in the course of application. The majority of Congress has been organized against the President, around the red-baiting program of Martin Dies. The Copperheads are running wild. American war policy is undermined and rendered ambiguous.

We find our nation is not only incapable of releasing the Spanish prisoners in North Africa, despite the directive of President Roosevelt, but also that it is incapable of keeping in prison the Nazi agent Viereck. We bungle both ways; our errors have the fatal quality of keeping the anti-fascists locked up and turning a Nazi fifth columnist free.

I submit, in all modesty, that this is not a very good fashion of waging war. It does not indicate that we have firmly set our feet on the road to victory in the war. The greatest task in the United States is still to fight for a correct and effective war policy.

The most patriotic activity today for Americans, therefore, seems to me to be the fight for the liberation of the Spanish prisoners in North Africa, immediate and unconditional liberation.

That is the first step in the fight for clear and unambiguous war policies by our government which would automatically, as a matter of course and without debate, settle such questions correctly.

In a few weesk our American armies will be on the soil of Europe striking against the strongholds of the main enemy. They must be better armed politically for that task than were the forces who landed in North Africa.

This is a necessity for victory in the war. It is a necessity for the survival of our country.

(Speech delivered at Manhattan Center, New York, March 4, 1943.)

XIII. A MENACE TO VICTORY

HERR HITLER and his armies are having a hard time on the Eastern Front. Since Nov. 20 they have lost not only all their 1942 gains, but also key points which they had held since 1941, not to speak of their crack armies and huge quantities of war materiel far exceeding the amount sent by Britain and America to the Soviet Union. This year opens, as in 1942, with the distinct possibility for the United Nations of a military decision over Hitlerism in Europe, on condition of waging serious coalition warfare, that is, war on both fronts, West as well as East.

It must be admitted, however, that Hitler is doing better on the diplomatic than on the military front. At the moment

when his armies before Stalingrad were being cut to pieces, he again appealed to the "gentlemen of the West" for help against the "menace of Bolshevism"—and the generous response he has received must have surprised even Josef Goebbels. After the failure of Hess' mission, I understand Goebbels had refused to follow Jan Valtin to America, but is now reconsidering his decision.

For the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, by a three-to-one vote last month, declared its confidence in Martin Dies, after the gentleman from Texas had again repeated his platform of undying hostility toward the Soviet Union and toward all Americans friendly to the Soviet Union. The banner of Martin Dies is the "menace of Bolshevism," exactly the same as the banner of Hitler. Martin Dies publicly proclaims his hope for the defeat of the Soviet Union in this war. The same Congress that demonstratively voted confidence in Martin Dies just as demonstratively is expressing its lack of confidence in our war-time Commander-in-Chief. This is clearly a major diplomatic victory for Hitler. It restores his hopes of staving off military defeat in 1943, bolsters up his wavering allies and helps him consolidate his home front.

The Hitler-Dies victory in the U. S. Congress is no isolated incident. It sets the key to which most American newspapers and radio commentators have been singing ever since Hitler sent out his latest SOS. Even the form of our debate tonight is an unconscious response to the aims of Hitler's latest diplomatic offensive.

Clearly, the war is at a crisis, a major turning point. The Red Army of the Soviet Union presented us with the possibility of victory this year—and we suddenly learn that exceedingly influential circles in our country are fearful of this victory even more than they formerly were fearful of defeat.

This fear of victory is creating confusion and chaos in our war effort. It threatens to cancel our victory at the moment that victory comes in sight as a realistic possibility.

Fear of victory arises inevitably in all those circles which refuse to see the Soviet Union as a long-time friend and ally of the United States, and which have always considered the Anglo-

Soviet-American coalition a mere expedient of the moment, unfortunately necessary but to be discarded at the earliest possible moment.

It is about time the United States Government should make up its mind on this matter. At present the government is of two minds; the President advances one policy, Congress and a part of the President's Cabinet an opposite policy. We are in war, a war for survival, and we cannot fight this war half-heartedly without inviting defeat. It was similar half-heartedness, arising from the same thought, which destroyed the French Republic. If our own country cannot resolve this ambiguity in the national mind, we risk the same fate. The war is not yet won by far, and if we are afraid of victory then surely we will not grasp that victory with strong hands, but would even fumble it if we could imagine the impossible would happen and victory be handed to us on a platter.

This fear of victory is the product of a phobia, an unreasoning fear of the Soviet Union because that country has organized its internal life according to a system different from our own. A phobia is a very bad guide to policy and action. When an individual is dominated by an unreasoning fear, he loses his adjustment to the world of reality step by step, until finally he is pronounced insane and is locked up. When a nation is dominated by an unreasoning fear, it loses the capacity to follow a consistent policy, it confuses its friends with its enemies and finally goes the way of Vichy France.

The fear of sharing victory with the Soviet Union is an example of a phobia, an unreasoning fear. It is the anti-Bolshevist phobia, the fear of Communism and the Communists. Its abnormal, unreasonable character is easily demonstrated. A simple laboratory test can be made by anyone trained in scientific thinking, a test which will be conclusive. I suggest it for your experiment.

Find among your acquaintances the most extreme example of this attitude of fear of the Soviet Union, if possible a man or woman of education and culture, trained in clear thinking on most of the affairs of life. Talk with that person about the international situation until you have elicited an expression of the

current idea of fear about what "Stalin is going to do next." Then ask a simple question: "What do you wish that Stalin shall do: shall he stop the Red Army at the borders of the Soviet Union, or shall he drive on to Berlin?"

I promise you that you will get no clear answer to this question. The person suffering from Communist-probia will not even pay any attention to your question; he will blandly continue to use the two "menaces" interchangeably, first that he will go to Berlin, secondly that he will not go to Berlin, as examples of "why" it is "impossible to trust Stalin." If you press the question he will become angry, and hint you must be something of a Bolshevist yourself, and equally as untrustworthy as Stalin. A reasonable question like this is an impertinence to the man who suffers from the red-phobia. Invariably the phobia-ridden person becomes angry when a reasonable question is put to him requiring him to define his fear. Unreasonable fears cannot be defined and the phobia-ridden person fights against their definition; any fear which rejects definition is an unreasonable one, that is to say, an insane fear.

In addition to the phobia, which is a form of insanity, there is another fear of the Soviet Union which is a "reasonable" one, although those who hold it also avoid revealing their reasons. For example, all those persons who speak of the Atlantic Charter as "globaloney," and who wish the United States to emerge from this war as the big boss, controlling the airways of all the world, dispensing the "American way of life" over the globe according to the Lucean formula, absorbing the British Empire into a greater American Empire, etc.—such brazen ideologists of super-imperialism are at best lukewarm in their friendship for the Soviet Union, are not desirous of strengthening the collaboration and alliance of our two countries, for, among other things, the Soviet Union takes the Atlantic Charter seriously. One of the first acts of Soviet power was to liberate fully the nations and national minorities formerly enslaved by Tsarism and to build a multi-national state of free and independent republics.

It also granted national freedom to Finland and Poland, despite the anti-Soviet position of their ruling circles. Throughout the years, when the Western democracies followed the path of

"non-intervention" and Munichism, it steadfastly aided and championed the cause of national liberation of China, Spain, Ethiopia and of all peoples. Now, as in the past, in epic deeds and not in platonic words, the Soviet Union takes second place to no one in humanity's fight to destroy Nazism-fascism, to ensure that the peoples enslaved by Hitler's Axis shall win their national independence and have the right freely to determine their own destiny and way of life. Yes—the Soviet Union will surely not be "cooperative" toward those who sneer at the Charter, and openly talk of how they hope to rule the world after this war.

As a matter of fact, it is those Americans who dream of ruling the world in the style of Hitler who are worried about the Soviet Union. Clearly it is not going to be easy to conquer the Soviet Union. It was a big mistake to imagine it possible to "utilize" the Soviet Union to get rid of a rival for world rule, Hitler, while "utilizing" Hitler to smash the Soviet Union. Those who reasoned thus overreached themselves; they were too clever by far. For it simply does not work out that way in life. The Soviet Union is growing stronger in the course of winning the war, not weaker. And with the crash of Hitlerism will go all the dreams of world conquest wherever such illusions may be held, even if they are in the pretty head of a new American Congresswoman. The plain truth is becoming evident that the Soviet Union has at least as much chance of surviving this war as has Britain or the United States. We can only choose whether we wish to cultivate friendship or hostility toward the Soviet Union as a major world power.

The United States and the U.S.S.R. are allies in the common struggle to smash Hitler and Hitlerism. The President has declared that "the defense of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against aggression is vital to the defense of the United States of America." Yet our government still maintains diplomatic relations with, and aids and abets Hitler's vassal, Finland. We still send supplies to and collaborate with Hitler's puppet, Franco, who has his "Blue Divisions" on the Eastern Front and a hostile army at the rear of our gallant troops in North Africa. We still allow our State Department to engage in anti-Soviet

intrigues with the emigré Polish government and with fascist representatives from Hungary, Rumania and Austria.

This is a people's war of national liberation. Our government leaders rightly proclaim that we are fighting for the "Century of the Common Man," for the "Four Freedoms," for the "Bill of Rights"—including the right of Americans of different creeds and political persuasions to worship and believe as they wish as they defend our country. But at the same moment the War Department is weeding out from the combat units of our army staunch American citizens and fearless anti-fascists—American Communists. This is being done on the theory that, as Communists, they are "potentially subversive." And why are they allegedly "potentially subversive"? Evidently because as American patriots they advocate and strive to promote the friendship and collaboration of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union in defense of our common interests, to win the war and to defend our national security, peace and prosperity in the post-war period.

In reality what is dangerous for our national war effort today and what is actually "potentially subversive" is the thinking of those army officials who are responsible for segregating American Communists in the army into labor camps and non-combatant duty. For behind this attitude toward Communists in the army lurk the shadow of Munichism and the hopes of certain pro-fascists to break America's relations with the U.S.S.R., to switch America's role in this war, as Goebbels calls for, from an ally to an enemy of the Soviet Union.

The defeat of Hitler opens up, inevitably, a new expansion in the world of what Lincoln described as "government of the people, by the people, for the people." There will be less, not more, of rule over one people by another. We may reasonably hope that the promise of the Atlantic Charter, of self-determination and self-government for all peoples, will be realized in life by all nations without another long period of indefinite postponement. We may reasonably have that hope, based on victory over the Axis, because when imperialist domination over nations and peoples in its Hitlerian form is smashed, then the peoples everywhere will demand self-government. The Atlantic Charter gains its chief importance as an official registration of this basic

political fact. The Soviet Union is only an advanced expression of the genius for self-government that is rising among most peoples, not excepting the United States.

In such a post-war world what has the United States to fear of a strong Soviet Union? Nothing whatever, even though one conceives of our country being wedded to capitalism as thoroughly as the Soviet Union is to socialism. For the Soviet Union is fundamentally based upon the principle of self-determination of nations, and its inner organization prevents the rise of any aggressive forces within it directed against the rest of the world.

Some commentators have professed to see the germs of future conflict between the U. S. and the Soviet Union in the current situation in Yugoslavia. That would be strange, indeed, regardless of the opinions one might hold about the inner problems of Yugoslavia. It is not a fact that the Soviet Union is intervening in Yugoslavia, but, assuming that charge were true, upon what grounds would the U. S. object to it? The German Nazis have invaded that country and its former government has fled abroad. Why should not the Soviet Union strike the Nazis wherever they can be reached, and in whatever form the Soviet Union finds convenient? Is that not what the U. S. is doing in North Africa, and expects to do soon in Western Europe? Or do we expect to deny to our Soviet Ally the same belligerent rights which we most jealously reserve for ourselves, the right to strike the enemy where and how we think it is most effective? Do we still insist that the Soviet Union is "permitted" to fight the Nazis only within Soviet borders? Is it only the U. S. and Britain that can search out the enemy?

But the real issue in Yugoslavia is more serious, and throws a bad light upon ourselves, not on the Soviet Union. Within Yugoslavia the people have been rising up and fighting against the Axis occupationists. They have rendered great services by this to the United Nations. But they have had to fight not only the Germans and Italians, not only the Quisling Nedich government, but also General Drazha Mikhailovich and his Chetniks supported by the Royal Government-in-Exile in London. Mikhailovich has been helping to slaughter his own countrymen, in cooperation with the Axis, and has refused to fight the Axis.

But London and Washington have supported, and continue to support, Mikhailovich. Here is no longer an issue of which persons or classes might be preferred in the government of a country which is fighting the common enemy; it is an issue where we are supporting persons who are treasonably collaborating with the enemy.

The Yugoslavian people, in the midst of struggle against the Nazi invaders, have set up their own government through a Constituent Assembly representative of all political parties of mass following; they have installed elected officials in all areas regained from the Nazis; they have built their army up to 300,000 soldiers; they have armed themselves with material seized from the invaders. They have invited the U. S. and Britain to send official observers to their territories to confirm their status, and receive the proof of the treason of Mikhailovich.

If the United States continues to support the traitor Mikhailovich, and refuses recognition to the Yugoslavian people's government and army, then I fear very much not only for the post-war period but even more for the victory itself. This is not a mere difference of opinion with the leaders of the Soviet Union. This is a policy which cuts the United States off from all contact with the broadest democratic people's movement of the whole of Europe. It is an extension to the whole continent, as a deliberate policy, of the previously-established appeasement of Franco in Spain, Mannerheim in Finland, Pétain in France. It threatens to emerge soon in a new scheme, being hatched behind the scenes, for U. S. sponsorship of a restored Greater Austria under Prince Otto of Hapsburg.

If this kind of policy becomes established as the policy of the United States Government in the prosecution of the war, then victory is a long way off and many disasters will intervene. Then, too, our alliance with the Soviet Union will not become closer, but, on the contrary, will become more and more strained. There would arise the dire possibility that we could lose the war, even while the Soviet Union is winning it. And, in such a case, the Soviet Union will be the representative of the democratic mass movement of Europe, and the United States will have cast its lot with the second-hand fascists, the seedy aristocracy and the reac-

tionary unprincipled profit-grabbers of Europe. In that case the Soviet Union will have the sound moral position before the peoples of the world, and the United States will have sold its birthright for a mess of pottage.

That is the only course of development which could bring a serious clash of policy between the Soviet Union and the United States. But that is also a course which would be a betrayal of the United States itself.

President Roosevelt has indicated a line of policy based squarely on the Atlantic Charter, and the consolidation of the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance at the head of the United Nations. He is fighting for this policy. But in Congress and in his own Executive departments he faces powerful opposition from appeasers and Copperheads. He is at times forced to retreat before them. Therefore the United States war policy is not secure and stable. It is ambiguous. This is the greatest danger for our country in this war. This the great danger for the post-war period. It is the danger of defeat through lack of moral strength.

I am not one of those, however, who becomes pessimistic because of the many dangers through which our country is now passing. The appeasers and Copperheads have strength in the government only to the degree that they have been able to camouflage their true policy and intentions before the country. They have been successful in their camouflage so far only from lack of aggressive leadership from the President's lieutenants and from the organizations of labor and the people. Everyone had fallen into the bad habit of depending upon the President to do everything. But the President is running a great war effort, and has not had time and energy for the domestic political struggle. That has been the Achilles' heel of American democracy in the war period. It is a weakness tht can and must be remedied.

When the larger issues are once clearly placed before the people, there is not the slightest doubt that in their overwhelming majority they will firmly support the policies of Roosevelt, of the Atlantic Charter, of the United Nations, of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. And that will bring us victory, with a post-war world in which, whatever its problems, there will be no

debate whatever about imaginary questions, born of unreasonable fear, such as that we are debating tonight.

(Speech delivered before the Yale Political Union, Yale University, March 3, 1943.)

XIV. THE CARROT AND THE CLUB, OR THE COPPERHEAD CABAL

VICTORIES over Hitler's armies by the forces of the Soviet Union have, since November 20, reached such proportions as to astonish the world. In 100 days Hitler lost all ground he gained in 1942, plus decisive strategic points, railways, and much territory held since 1941, not to speak of over a million of his best soldiers, thousands of planes, tanks and heavy artillery, and untold quantities of war materiel. For the United Nations victory was brought within reach.

The appeaser and Copperhead newspapers of the United States during these months of the Red Army advance have quickly descended from heights of enthusiasm for the defense of Stalingrad; with Soviet victory a few more degrees of chill came over them; until in the early part of March they burst into a veritable orgy of recrimination and abuse against our Ally who is winning victories for us.

It seems as though that part of reactionary Big Business which expresses its views in the defeatist press stands in deadly fear of victory, when it is won through the Red Army—a fear which is more vocal, more unrestrained, than their fear of a victory for Hitler.

The Copperhead Cabal has stepped into the open to do what it can to avoid the dread possibility that Hitler might be crushed in 1943. Their desperate outcries are directed to prevent the opening of the Western European Front by the British-American forces which, by dividing Hitler's armies between two fronts,

will quickly bring the Nazi "New Order" down in ruins and defeat.

Before I analyze this sortie of the Copperheads, permit me to state for the record that I predict their failure. The logic of events, the great offensive of the Red Army, the rising movements in the Axis-occupied countries, and the growing sentiment of the masses of the people in the United States and Britain for invading Europe without delay, bring the opening of the Second Front nearer. Any other course is suicidal for the democratic governments of the West.

Our American Copperheads are, however, obsessed by a suicidal mania akin to that which dominated the "200 families" ruling France. Interestingly enough, they found their frankest voice during these crucial days within the official family of our President, in the person of William C. Bullitt, formerly Ambassador to the Soviet Union and France, and now Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, the man who will be remembered in history as an accomplice of Munich and as the negotiator of the surrender of Paris to the Nazis without a fight.

Mr. Bullitt lifted the diplomatic veil to give us a hint of the real discussions going on in Washington behind the scenes. Let us examine his words as reported by the United Press March 12:

"When a foreign government will not move in the direction in which we want it to move then there is only one way to make it move—the old way of getting a donkey to move by holding a carrot in front of its nose and club behind his tail, and intimating politely to him that he can have either one he wants. And the carrot has to be a real carrot and the club has to be a real club. . . . But the day that Germany collapses we shall still have on our hands a war with Japan—a hard war which may be long —and the Soviet Union will be at peace and we shall want Soviet support against Japan. Under those circumstances . . . the real carrot and the real club will be in the hands of Stalin."

Does this pretty little parable require any interpretation? It is clear enough, but anyway let us put it in plain English. Mr. Bullitt wants "a foreign government" (the Soviet Union) to do something it has not agreed to do. That "something" is not

disclosed, but is hinted at. The "carrot" held before the Soviet "donkey" can obviously be nothing else but the Second Front in Europe; the "club" with equal obviousness can only be the withholding of the Second Front, plus perhaps the cutting down or off of lend-lease supplies. Mr. Bullitt sees in the collapse of Hitler a terrible danger to the United States—the loss of "the carrot and the club." Mr. Bullitt proposes that the United States shall refuse to fight the war against Hitler any further, despite its pledge of the "Declaration of the United Nations" and the June 11, 1942, agreement on the "opening of the second front in 1942," and the repeated declarations of President Roosevelt for the offensive—unless and until the Soviet Union promises to do something they have not yet promised to do. In short, Mr. Bullitt demands "renegotiation" of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition upon a new and undisclosed basis. The short term for such "renegotiation" is *renege*, and the name for persons who make such proposals is renegade.

Mr. Henry A. Wallace, our Vice-President, has another word for it. He calls it double-cross, and warns that out of such double-dealing can emerge a Third World War. But even Mr. Wallace, despite his obvious good faith and sincere alarm about the intrigues going on around him, showed in his speech at the Ohio Wesleyan University, March 8, that he also is weakening under the pressure of the Copperhead Cabal; gone was the inspiring thesis of his May 8, 1942, speech on the "Century of the Common Man," with its tracing of the "people's revolution" across the centuries, and in its place a muddled philosophical jargon of abstractions unrelated to history and the experience of mankind.

Our American Ambassador in Moscow, Admiral Standley, is a close friend of Mr. Bullitt (and also of Hamilton Fish). In the light of Mr. Bullitt's thesis of "the carrot and the club," we can better understand "the bluff Admiral," his sensational charges made in the newspapers that the Soviet Government "hides" American help from the people, and that he doesn't know what the Russians are talking about when they speak of a Second Front.

Mr. Welles for the State Department declared that the Am-

bassador had spoken without consultation. From Moscow the Admiral confirmed that he had expressed his personal opinion, not his government's policy.

Unquestionably, the Soviet Government will draw its own conclusions from all this. Of one thing, however, we may be sure from past experience. The Soviet leaders never allow themselves to be provoked; they have had their experience with Bullitt before this, and "have his number." They know that Bullitt has done lots of damage, but he has never called the turn of history; he always bets on the wrong horse. The Soviet Government will forgive us for the antics of our Bullitts and Standleys, the moment we make good on our pledged program of the Second Front and real coalition war to break Hitler's back this year.

There are, of course, the most serious dangers inherent in this light-minded playing with the fate of the world. We cannot laugh off the Bullitts and the Standleys, when such a substantial organ of ruling class opinion as the *New York Times* vacillates from week to week, plumping for the "carrot and club" thesis and then demanding the immediate opening of the Second Front, as it is torn between prejudice and patriotism, between greed and good faith.

Mr. Neville Chamberlain in his day had a slightly different version of "the carrot and club" thesis. Mr. Bullitt's type of wisdom, borrowed from Chamberlain, will suffer even quicker bankruptcy and oblivion. He made the fatal mistake of revealing his face to the American people. And Americans have never knowingly followed a double-crosser and renegade in a critical moment of national history. They will reject Mr. Bullitt with his carrot and his club today.

We can trust our Soviet ally, because it has sealed its pledges with the blood of millions. It is now our turn to win Soviet confidence in the United States by demonstrating equal good faith.

The Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is based upon the pledge of a common war with all human and material resources against Hitlerism.

The Soviet Union is conducting that war with all resources.

The United States and Britain still engage not more than

eleven divisions of Nazi troops in North Africa, while Hitler continues to shift troops and equipment from the West to the Soviet front. (Since the start of the Soviet winter offensive alone, Hitler has transferred over thirty divisions from France and other Western points to the Eastern front.)

The supreme interests of victory, the honor of our country, as well as its vital interests, demand the immediate opening of the Second Front.

A double-cross of the Soviet Union is at the same time treason to the United States.

Now, as never before, it is imperative for labor and the people to organize the most active support for the declared program of our Commander-in-Chief to strike soon and hard against the Nazis in Western Europe!

The Second Front must be opened now!

(The Communist, April, 1943.)

XV. THE EHRLICH-ALTER CONSPIRACY IN THE UNITED STATES

I WISH to speak about the Ehrlich-Alter case in the United States.

This case originates in a conspiratorial effort of American citizens, organized on American soil, to overthrow the government of the Soviet Union, an Ally of the United States, at a moment when our own government has declared the defense of the Soviet Union is vital to the national interests of the United States. The Government of the United States had pledged itself to the Soviet Union, in the agreement of December, 1933, that it would prevent the operation from United States soil of any organization directed toward the overthrow of the government of the Soviet Union. But the U. S. Government has closed its eyes to this

conspiracy, has tolerated its continued operations, and now permits a mass campaign in this country in defense of the conspiratorial agents who were apprehended and executed in the Soviet Union.

We do not know the evidence upon which a Soviet court condemned Ehrlich and Alter. But we have enough evidence of the conspiracy in the United States, of which Ehrlich and Alter were agents, to confirm the findings of the Soviet court.

If Ehrlich and Alter were true to the teachings and decisions of those men in the United States who are their sponsors, then we know that they were as guilty as Benedict Arnold. And their American sponsors testify publicly that their agents were true to them.

A chief leader of the anti-Soviet conspiracy in the United States is a certain Mr. N. Chanin. This gentleman operates as a leader of the so-called "Jewish Labor Committee." For years he has collected money in this country to be used for secret conspiratorial work inside the Soviet Union. What was the nature of that secret work? Mr. Chanin has himself described it, writing in the magazine *Friend,* issue of January, 1942:

"The last shot was not yet fired. It will still be fired. And the last shot will be fired from free America—and from that shot the Stalin regime, too, will be shot to pieces."

Mr. Chanin was expressing the political line of the Social-Democratic Federation of the United States. This line was publicly expressed in a detailed thesis, published under date of July 1, 1941, in a pamphlet entitled *War Aims, Peace Terms, and the World After the War,* by the Rand School Press. It is signed by leading members of the Social-Democratic organizations of emigré Germans, Austrians and Russians, as well as by the Americans, all long associated with every effort to overthrow the Soviet Government. The central thought of this declaration is the destruction of the Soviet Union. It calls for the destruction of the Soviet Government in the course of the war; in case that government "should survive the war," it demands preparations for removing this "source of danger" by the "armed force" of Britain and America; it links the Soviet Union with Nazi Ger-

many as equally "totalitarian regimes"; it declares for a new League of Nations to which Russia shall be admitted "once she has been freed from totalitarian rule."

This group of American conspirators, with their allies from the emigration, appointed as their representatives in the Soviet Union Messrs. Ehrlich and Alter, and heavily financed them through the channels of the Polish government-in-exile which are most extremely anti-Soviet and anti-Semitic. These agents, Ehrlich and Alter, were informed that "the Stalin regime, too, will be shot to pieces," and that the "last shot will be fired from free America."

Evidently Ehrlich and Alter took the teachings and decisions of their paymasters in New York at their face value, and tried to put them into action.

But everyone who goes into the Soviet Union for the purpose of destroying the Soviet Government is in grave danger of being himself destroyed. That is what happened to Ehrlich and Alter, in company with a few million Nazis and their Rumanian, Finnish, Hungarian, Italian and Spanish vassals.

The Government of the United States has declared that America's national interests also lie in preserving the Soviet Government from all the current attempts to destroy it. Our country is devoting a few billion dollars in lend-lease materials to carry out that declaration, we signed the Pact of the United Nations, we pledged to open the Second Front.

But Mr. Chanin, together with Mr. Dubinsky, Mr. Abe Cahan, and others of Russian origin who think they should rule the Soviet peoples from afar, from New York, raise a great howl about the loss of their two agents inside the Soviet Union. They organize "protest meetings," denounce the Soviet Government in the most unmeasured and slanderous terms, and even inveigle a few misguided governmental figures to lend their names to this outrageous campaign.

It would be well to recall that these same gentlemen put up a protest even more unconditional in defense of Mr. Leon Trotsky. They were the defenders of Zinoviev, Bukharin, Tukhachevsky, and the rest of the "fifth column" in the Soviet Union, whose extermination deprived Hitler of his Quislings. Now they defend

Ehrlich and Alter in the same terms, though without the same energy and confidence.

And how do they "defend" their two agents? Do they say that Ehrlich and Alter in the Soviet Union were actually helping the Red Army win their glorious triumphs which saved world civilization from destruction? They do not dare make such a claim, for it would fly in the face of all their own declarations.

Do they claim that the Soviet Union is not intelligent enough to know its friends from its enemies, and that it executed the wrong men? They do not dare make such a claim, for they themselves are not friends but enemies of the Soviet Union.

What they really say, boiled down to its essence, is to claim for their agents in the Soviet Union the status of "extra-territorial rights" accorded to Ambassadors, together with the right, not accorded to any one, even Ambassadors, of organizing to overthrow the Government of the Soviet Union in the midst of life-and-death war.

Senator Mead loaned his name to the Chanin-Dubinsky-Cahan conspiracy in connection with a public meeting last Friday. Mayor La Guardia did the same. Several labor leaders also allowed themselves to be smeared with the mud of this political underworld. Of course, none of these men knows Ehrlich and Alter as anything but names. None of them has been told that Ehrlich and Alter were working in the Soviet Union to prepare "the last shot"—to come from America—by which the "Stalin regime" was to be "shot to pieces." None of them speaks for the American trade unions in expressing hostility to the Soviet Union.

It is not my role to speak here in defense of the Soviet Union. Our great Ally needs no defense from me. I speak in defense of my own country, the United States, which is more endangered by this miserable conspiracy hatched on its soil than is the Soviet Union. For it is a conspiracy against the United Nations, against victory itself.

Let me ask Senator Mead, Mayor La Guardia, and those responsible labor leaders who fell into the anti-Soviet net of conspiracy, to turn for inspiration rather to Thomas Jefferson. If they have no personal knowledge of Ehrlich and Alter, and they

have not, they could at least have maintained the position Jefferson took when he faced the conspiracy of Aaron Burr, the traitor who had even more respectable friends than Ehrlich and Alter. Jefferson told us how to handle such conspirators in the following immortal words:

"I did wish to see these people get what they deserved; and under the maxim of the law itself, that *inter arma silent leges,* that in an encampment expecting daily attack from a powerful enemy, self-preservation is paramount to all law. I expected that instead of invoking the forms of Law to cover traitors, all good citizens would have concurred in securing them. Should we have ever gained our Revolution, if we had bound our hands by manacles of the law, not only in the beginning, but in any part of the revolutionary conflict?" *(Writings,* Vol. XII, p. 183.)

In the case of Ehrlich and Alter, there is no reason to deplore their execution, except upon the part of those who share their aim to destroy the Soviet Union and its socialist system.

The whole democratic world has reason to rejoice that the socialist state has always had the courage to strike hard and accurately and ruthlessly at its counter-revolutionary conspirators.

But there is reason to deplore the rise of anti-Soviet agitation in the United States. This agitation comes at a moment when the whole war is at a turning point. The Nazi armies are being whittled down, pushed back, and prepared for the final blow of destruction, by the amazing heroism and fighting capacity of the Red Army and the genius of its leadership headed by Stalin. Herr Goebbels made his frantic appeal to the "gentlemen of the West" who understand "the menace of Bolshevism." The New York *Times* and William C. Bullitt have launched their campaign for the "carrot and club" method of dealing with the Soviet Union, and openly threaten to carry America to the side of Hitler. The hullabaloo about Ehrlich and Alter is a part of this response of the appeasers and defeatists to delay the Second Front and to prepare the ground for negotiations with Hitler. It is a part of the preparations for what Vice-President Wallace warned against as a "double-cross" of the Soviet Union.

The people and Government of the United States, however,

have learned the lesson that the Soviet Union is not our enemy, as the anti-Soviet agitators try to make it appear, but on the contrary the great country of socialism is our natural ally, and all the stronger our ally because it is a socialist country.

The people of the United States do not want any "protests" to our great Soviet Ally, but they want expressions of deep friendship and appreciation for the immeasurable benefits the Soviet Union has conferred upon us by cracking the Nazi armies, and saving the world from Hitler domination.

The people of the United States want to have nothing to do with anyone who conspires to overthrow the Soviet Government; on the contrary it wants a long-term treaty of alliance and friendship between the Soviet Government and our own, it wants a real coalition war.

For this, however, it is necessary to clean out the Ehrlich-Alter conspiracy from American soil. For this conspiracy is directed toward breaking the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

The future of our country, and of the world, is at stake.

(Speech delivered at Aperion Manor, Brooklyn, N. Y., April 1, 1943.)