

The Communist

20c

SEPTEMBER

1943

THE SECOND FRONT IN EUROPE

•

LABOR DAY 1943

ROSE WORTIS

•

TOWARD A NEW ANTI-FASCIST YOUTH ORGANIZATION

MAX WEISS

•

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A "FREE GERMANY"

HANS BERGER

•

AFTER THE DOWNFALL OF MUSSOLINI

ANTONIO LOCASCIO

•

OUR NATION'S DEMOCRATIC HISTORICAL PATH

SAM DON

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Labor Parties 1827-1834

by **Alden Whitman** **.25**

A new study of labor's initial steps in independent political action during the formative years of workers' organizations in the United States.

The War of National Liberation

by **Joseph Stalin** (In two parts) each **.15**

A collection of the wartime addresses of the Soviet Premier and Marshal of the Red Army, covering two years of the war against the Axis.

Constitution of the U.S.S.R. **.10**

A new edition of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with all amendments as adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

Whither Germany?

by **Paul Merker** **.10**

An authoritative study of the economic, social and political structure of German fascism, and the inner contradictions which are undermining it, written by a former member of the German Reichstag.

Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings **.25**

Jefferson's writings on democracy, slavery, education, world affairs, etc., arranged and with an essay on his life and work by Dr. Philip Foner.



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER



CONTENTS

The Second Front in Europe	771
Labor Day 1943	Rose Wortis 775
The War and the Trade Unions	789
Toward a New Anti-Fascist Youth Organization	Max Weiss 792
The National Committee for a "Free Germany" and Its Significance	Hans Berger 806
After the Downfall of Mussolini	Antonio Locascio 816
Our Nation's Democratic Historical Path	San Don 824
The Schneiderman Decision (Part II)	Robert Mnior 836
Notes on Brazil	C. Mota 852

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

NEW AND FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS

- A New Italy Arises!** \$**.05**
By **Giuseppe Bert**
- Congress and You** **.10**
By **Frank Ryhlick**
- Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity** . . . **.05**
By **William Z. Foster**
- The Schneiderman Case** **.05**
United States Supreme Court Opinion with an introduction by **Carol King**
- Anti-Semitism; What It Means
and How to Combat It** **.05**
By **William Gallacher** and **Earl Browder**
- Marxism and the Woman Question** **.10**
By **A. Landy**
- Soviet Russia and the Post-War World** **.05**
By **Corliss Lamont**
- Behind the Polish-Soviet Break** **.03**
By **Alter Brody**

●
SPECIAL

VICTORY—AND AFTER

By **Earl Browder**

Just published in a new half-million edition, this fighting war program for the nation is now available for broad distribution **complete** at the low price of 10 cents per copy. It presents brilliantly the position of the Communist Party on the war and its problems. **Ten copies for a Dollar.**

Regular paper edition **50¢**; cloth **\$2.00**.

●
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

THE SECOND FRONT IN EUROPE

THE present situation is such that victory of the freedom-loving peoples over Hitler Germany is possible in the nearest future. A change has been attained in the course of the war. It is sufficient to cite such facts as the brilliant results of the Red Army's winter offensive, the German reverses at Stalingrad, on the Don and in the Caucasus, the rout of the armies of Hitler's "allies" on the Soviet-German Front, the defeat of the Germano-Italian troops in Tunisia, the Allies' successes in Sicily, the fall of Mussolini, indicating the bankruptcy of Italian fascism and the prospect of knocking Italy out of the war, the failure of Hitler's summer offensive against the Soviet Union, and the success of the Red Army's offensive in the Orel direction.

The enemy camp is experiencing a profound crisis. The prerequisites have been created for the final defeat of Hitler. Never before since the beginning of the war were conditions as favorable for victory over Hitler Germany as today.

The history of wars knows what lost opportunities imply. In such cases victory slipped away, the war became drawn out, the peoples were doomed to endless, unnecessary sacrifices. And today millions

of people throughout the world ask with profound concern: is everything being done for taking timely advantage of the possibility of victory over fascist Germany? And this puts the problem of the second front in Europe in bold relief.

Hitler's predatory attack on his neighboring European countries and later on the Soviet Union called to life the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. The purpose of any military coalition is joint armed struggle for victory over the common enemy. The anti-Hitlerite coalition was formed for armed struggle against fascist Germany and her associates to bring about their rout and to secure a lasting, just peace.

It was to be expected that the coalition members would jointly attack the enemy.

The ways of common struggle of the members of the anti-Hitler coalition are predetermined by the geographic, military and strategic situation of Germany and by the total historical experience in the struggle against German aggression. The task consists in taking Hitler Germany in an iron pincers from west and east to force her to fight a war on two fronts, dispersing her forces and reserves between them.

It is already the third year that the Soviet Union has alone been shouldering the full brunt of the

* Editorial in Issue No. 5 of *The War and the Working Class*, Moscow.

struggle against the main forces of the Hitler war machine. It was precisely this absence of a second front in Europe which enabled the Germans to gain temporary successes at the initial stages of the Soviet-German war. The absence of the second front in Europe saved fascist Germany from defeat in 1942. More than this, the absence of the second front gave Hitler the possibility in the summer of 1942 of throwing all his reserves on the Soviet-German front, creating a considerable preponderance in strength on the southwestern direction to reach Stalingrad and the approaches to Grozny. Lastly, this year the Germans dared to begin a new summer offensive only because the absence of a second front in Europe gave them the possibility of concentrating all their forces in the east.

Yet in June of 1942 it was announced that "full agreement has been reached with regard to the urgent tasks of the creation of a second front in Europe in 1942," as published in two official communiqués on negotiations between Molotov and the leaders of the British and American governments in London and Washington. Nevertheless the second front was not created in 1942.

But it was already ascertained then that at any rate there would be a second front in western Europe in the spring of 1943. However the spring came and the second front in Europe was not opened. The Anglo-American troops confined themselves to mopping up North Africa of the Germano-Italian forces.

In his report in the Commons in February, 1943, on the results of his meeting with Roosevelt and the Casablanca decisions, Churchill stated: "We now have a complete plan of action which comprises apportionment of forces as well as their direction, and this plan we are going to carry out according to our policy during the next nine months."

Thus at the Casablanca Conference on the joint plan of Allied military operations in January, 1943, it was decided that during the first nine months of the present year the Anglo-American Allies intend to carry out an "exhaustive plan of action," which naturally included the opening of a second front in Europe. This nine-month period is nearing its close, yet there is no second front in Europe.

Fighting actually in single combat against all of Hitler's monstrous war machine and its allies-in-plunder in Europe, the Soviet people have made heavy sacrifices on the altar of the struggle for the common cause of the Allies. The number of German soldiers and officers destroyed on the Soviet-German Front is many times more than that on all the other fronts where the struggle is being waged against Hitler.

It is wrong to underestimate the importance of the military operations conducted by our Allies, the great importance of the numerous raids on Germany by the Anglo-American air forces, as well as the significance of the aid the Allies are rendering us in war materials and provisions. Nevertheless on the

Libyan front the Allies had against them a mere four German divisions and ten Italian divisions; and in Sicily only two German and several Italian divisions. These figures show that the troops of our Anglo-American allies have not yet had real encounters with Hitler Germany's troops, and that the organization of the second front has not yet been carried out.

There is no need to enlarge upon the discussions of the people who are trying to prove that there allegedly already exists not only a second front, but also a "third" and almost even a "fifth" and "sixth" (including submarine, aerial, etc.). The second front in Europe is that front which, as Stalin said as far back as the autumn of 1942, would divert, say, sixty German divisions and some twenty divisions of Germany's allies. It implies such military operations by our Allies on the European continent as would force Hitler Germany to divide her available forces and divert one-third or at least one-fourth of her ground troops to the western front.

The second front in Europe would radically change the situation and immediately ensure a great preponderance of our strength over the Hitler army on the Soviet-German front, and this means also that the opening of the second front would decisively cut the duration of the war, and that the second front in Europe would become the key to victory over Hitler already in 1943.

There are many excuses to justify the delay in the second front in

western Europe, such as the discussion about the mythical "Atlantic Wall," about the allegedly "insoluble" shipping problem, the "hazards of invasion." Yet it is known that the "invincible" "Atlantic Wall" exists only in the imagination of those who want to believe these inventions, and no more.

The shipping argument favored by some has long lost even a semblance of its conviction and has many times been disproved by facts and published figures about the tremendous growth of shipbuilding in the Allied countries, particularly in the United States. Following the successful landing of the Allied troops and armaments in North Africa last year and the brilliant successes of the landing operations in Sicily, all reference to shipping difficulties should have disappeared.

As regards the "hazards of invasion" referred to repeatedly for more than a year, such an argument cannot in 1943 be offered to an army which for more than two years has been bearing the full brunt of the struggle against the Hitler war machine and which does not hesitate before any sacrifices in the struggle for the common cause of the Allies.

There is no denying that there are circles—true very small—which are not at all interested in the speedy conclusion of the war. But it stands to reason that in such important state matters too much freedom must not be given to armaments manufacturers and others who put their private, selfish interests above all, and not the interests of the broad, popular masses,

and not the interests of the occupied countries suffering under the Hitler yoke.

Two years ago, at a congress of British trade unions, it was stated that one of the ministers at that time, Moore-Brabazon, made a suggestion in the sense that the Russian and German armies should be allowed to mutually exhaust themselves meanwhile, and that his country would not lose by it. Soon afterwards the British Government rid itself of such a minister. Consequently his statement did not go by unnoticed and apparently not without a proper estimate.

The bankruptcy of Italian fascism testifies not only to the collapse of Hitler's biggest ally in Europe. Although the process is not yet finished and all sorts of coat-turning is still in progress in the Italian state, the events in Italy give a new and the strongest spur to the military-political disintegration in the Hitlerite camp and facilitate the putting of an end once and for all to the plans for the domination of Europe, for world domination.

This year Hitler Germany has encountered unparalleled difficulties on the Soviet-German front, where the Red Army is delivering one strong blow upon another on the enemy. The occupation of Sicily is about to be completed by the

Allies. Italy has no other way out than complete surrender; moreover, it must not be forgotten that the remarkable successes of our Allies in the Mediterranean have become possible primarily thanks to the two years of heroic struggle of the Red Army against the main forces of our common enemy and thanks to the selfless and strongest pressure of our army on the whole Soviet-German front of late.

The question of the second front in Europe is of such great importance because on its solution depends whether the war will or will not be prolonged, whether new, tremendous sacrifices will or will not be prevented.

The opening of the second front in Europe this year will mean that with the conditions favoring it at present the anti-Hitler coalition is filled with the determination to put an end to Hitlerite tyranny and the war forced upon the peoples by Hitler, that the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition will not permit the prolongation of the war, will not permit new, tremendous sacrifices. To this end it will be backed by the powerful strength of the peoples filled with an unbending desire to put an end once and for all to the hated Hitler regime and to the war forced on them.

LABOR DAY 1943

BY ROSE WORTIS

Labor's Tasks for 1943

FORTY-NINE years ago, by an Act of Congress, the people of the United States gave official recognition to the vital role of labor in the building of our nation, our gigantic industries, and our democratic institutions.

The idea of setting aside a day to dignify labor arose during the period of great upsurge among the workers in the early 'eighties. The craft unions had constituted themselves into a national organization—the American Federation of Labor. The Knights of Labor were at the height of their influence. Both organizations, the A. F. of L., then known as the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, and the Knights, urged upon the unions that a special day be set aside for labor demonstrations.

On May 8, 1882, Peter J. McGuire, founder of the Carpenters' Union, and close co-worker of Gompers during the early years of the A. F. of L., proposed to the New York City Central Labor Union that it designate an annual Labor Day. The suggestion was followed and the Central Labor Union held a great parade of labor on the fifth of September of that year. The Knights,

who were meeting in general assembly on the same date in New York City, urged the designation of a special date for Labor Day and joined the parade. In 1884 the General Assembly of the Knights voted that future parades of labor should be held regularly each year, on the first Monday of September.

Following this, efforts were made in a number of states to declare the day a legal holiday. First to adopt such a law was Oregon, in 1887. New York, New Jersey and Colorado followed in turn.

In 1894 President Cleveland signed an act adopted by Congress to make Labor Day a national holiday. By 1910 most of the states had adopted the day as an official holiday, a day when the nation pays tribute to labor.

Since 1910 the prestige of the labor movement has grown together with its strength and influence. Labor has reached a higher stage of maturity, and has become increasingly conscious of its responsibilities as the unifying force of the nation in the present struggle against fascism.

Labor Day 1943 will see all sections of the population expressing public recognition to labor for its contributions to national unity in

this hour of national danger; for its achievements in war production; for the exemplary heroism of its sons in the armed forces; for its decisive role in building the national morale; and for its staunch patriotism, loyalty and devotion to the highest ideals and aspirations of our nation in this war for survival.

Labor Day 1943 takes on a special significance. It marks the turning point of the war in favor of the United Nations. It ushers in a period of great trial and great decision in which labor will be called upon to play an ever more decisive role.

Crucial battles are in progress on the Soviet-German front. The offensive of the Red Army is fast developing into a German rout. The magnificent capture of Orel, Belgorod, and Kharkov has destroyed the theory that the Red Army is incapable of offensive action during the summer months. The Anglo-American operations are being extended to the European continent by means of land invasion (though still on a small scale, and not in the most decisive field) and the air offensive over Germany, Italy, and conquered European countries.

At the first impact of the Anglo-American invasion forces in Sicily the whole rotten structure of fascism is beginning to crumble. The peoples of conquered and enslaved Europe are aroused to action against their oppressors.

This is the decisive moment for Britain and the United States to strike at the heart of Hitler-dominated Europe in unison with the

Red Army offensive on the Eastern Front.

This is the time for the opening of the long-delayed Second Front to which we solemnly committed ourselves in the conferences with Premier Molotov in June, 1942.

The Soviet trade unions, speaking through their official organ *War and The Working Class*, sharply call to our attention the urgency of the present moment and the responsibilities of labor and the entire people to press for decisive military action. The publication states:

"The enemy camp is experiencing a profound crisis. The prerequisites have been created for the final defeat of Hitler. Never before since the beginning of the war were conditions as favorable for victory over Hitler Germany as today.

"The history of wars knows what lost opportunities imply. In such cases victory slipped away, the war became drawn out, the peoples were doomed to endless, unnecessary sacrifices. And today millions of people throughout the world ask with profound concern: is everything being done for taking timely advantage of the possibility of victory over fascist Germany? This puts the problem of the Second Front in Europe in bold relief."

The mass of the American people are of the same mind. We know that the need of the hour is a full-scale two-front offensive. Under the powerful united blows of the Red Army in the East and the Anglo-American invasion forces in France, the shaking structure of Hitler's "New Order" will go crumbling to the dust.

American labor must join its powerful voice with that of the British trade unions and the Soviet trade unions to demand the immediate opening of a Second Front in Western Europe, not "to appease Russia," as some newspapers demagogically say, but to save thousands of American lives and bring the war to a speedy, victorious conclusion. We must see to it that the victory already within our grasp shall not be snatched from us through delay and procrastination. It is to be hoped that the Quebec conference between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill will move decisively in this direction.

Labor's Tasks on the Home Front

To assure the greatest speed in the full development of the military offensive, labor must also take the offensive on the home front against the defeatists. These agents of Hitler are making a concerted drive to disrupt national unity, create chaos on the home front so as to delay the final doom of fascism and lay the basis for a negotiated Hitler peace.

To defeat this conspiracy of the enemies within the gates, labor must use its power and influence to strengthen the anti-fascist unity of the nation; to extend and forge the most active, militant unity of the working class in the trade union movement, as the keystone to national unity; and to establish the closest ties with the trade union movement of our allies.

Labor, by its united action and bold leadership, can rout the defeat-

ists and appeasers and influence the direction and execution of the government's war policy, can determine the course and strength of national unity.

These are the major tasks confronting labor on this Labor Day when it takes stock of its accomplishments and charts its future course. Organized labor, representing the bulk of the productive forces of the nation, hand and brain, has distinct responsibilities on the production front. Its policies and activities influence the millions not yet organized. It sets the example for other sections of the people.

Much has been accomplished in advancing war production in which labor and the nation as a whole can take just pride. In the period of two years, in face of great obstacles, labor has achieved high production records never known in our country.

Thousands of planes and tanks, hundreds of ships, are rolling off the assembly lines and docks. They are already blasting the battlefronts and cities of the Axis. Labor has contributed of its talent, initiative, capacity for planning, and readiness for sacrifices to make our nation truly the arsenal of democracy.

However, the war of the United Nations requires armaments on a scale that would have seemed fantastic in the last World War. The present war involves not only the mass destruction of armies but also of weapons of war. Our President has made a solemn promise to our nation and our allies that we will soon strike the Axis from all sides; that Sicily is the beginning of

the end. This should serve to stimulate the productive capacity of the nation to much greater heights. Production for an immediate Second Front: this must become the guide, the inspiration to labor's efforts on the production front.

The reports of the War Production Board concerning certain fields should cause deep concern to labor. There is a dangerous lag in production schedules in some industries. Plane production has increased only by 175 planes in the past two months and is behind schedule. Labor-management committees, which contributed much toward increasing production and gave rise to a new form of cooperation between labor and management, are on the decline. The incentive wage plan, a great stimulus toward increased production, has been put into effect in but few industries and plants.

With the passage of the Smith-Connally Bill, there are serious dangers of the development of strike movements instigated by defeatists, whose chief aim is to lower work morale, to divert the attention of the workers from their supreme task of providing the armed forces with fighting equipment. In some instances employers, influenced by the propaganda that victory is at hand, are developing an attitude of complacency and beginning to turn their attention toward readjusting their plants to civilian production!

W.P.B. Chairman Nelson, in a recent broadcast to the nation, called for the production of 10,000 planes per month before the end of this year, and a 40 per cent boost in

output of combat munitions by early next year. American labor, with its high skill and ingenuity, its high degree of patriotism, will roll up its sleeves to fulfill these demands of the nation.

An inspiring example has been given to the labor movement by the United Steel Workers of America. Upon the invasion of Sicily this great union decided to increase production by 25 per cent. The workers of our Allies are forging the weapons of war at an ever more rapid tempo. Plane production in the Soviet Union has increased 75 per cent. Other war material has increased many times over. The British workers are setting new records in production.

Labor Day this year should serve as an occasion for arousing the workers and management to the full sense of their responsibilities to the needs of the war. The labor-management committees, now dormant or dissolved, must be revived and revitalized. Incentive wage plans should be initiated throughout all war industries. Production schedules must be revised upward, commensurate with present needs.

To these urgent tasks labor, representing the most advanced, the most conscious anti-fascist section of the people, must dedicate itself on this Labor Day.

*Unity of All Who Want to Win
the War*

To achieve maximum production labor needs the greatest degree of unity in its own ranks. In the course

of the war emergency old divisions in many unions along lines of Right and Left are gradually disappearing. Some Catholic workers, members of the American Catholic Trade Union Association, are beginning to find common ground with progressives, including Communists, on issues relating to support of the war. Examples of this we see in some locals of the automotive, transport, and shipyard unions. There can be only one line of division today: between those who want to win the war and those who are temporizing with the enemy.

Notable contributions toward unifying labor's ranks are the advances made by the trade union movement in fighting Negro discrimination and anti-Semitism. Negro workers are being integrated in the industries and unions in ever larger numbers, especially in C.I.O. unions. Outstanding Negro leaders are emerging in the trade union movement.

The June 7 Madison Square Garden Rally, initiated by the Negro Labor Victory Committee, the all-union support for the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill passed in the House, are an expression of the growing unity between the Negro and white workers.

Labor was the first to raise its voice against the anti-Negro riots instigated by the fifth column to disrupt the home front. Labor closely cooperated with the Negro community in the recent outbreak in Harlem. It is now actively joining with all progressive forces, Negro and white, to put an end to the shameful conditions obtaining in

Harlem, which were the underlying cause of the disturbances. Labor is beginning to realize that the responsibility for the outbreak in Harlem rests, not on the Negro people, but on the white people, on the progressive New York community, for permitting such conditions to exist.

The growing collaboration between Negro and white workers in the war plants, in the trade unions, in the communities, has been a serious blow to the Hitlerite sham of white supremacy. It has given the Negro people a new perspective in their struggle for equality. This is evidenced most clearly by the recent survey conducted by the *Pittsburgh Courier* on the question as to whether Negro people should cooperate with the trade unions; the poll showed 96.4 per cent to be in favor, 2.4 per cent opposed, and 1.2 per cent uncertain.

However, the progress made thus far is only a beginning. We still have a long way to go to eradicate from the life of the American people this poison of racial hatred. We need but mention Detroit, Beaumont, Mobile, etc. There are still many A. F. of L. unions that bar Negroes from membership, even to the point of curtailing war production. The stoppage at the West Coast Kaiser shipyards a few months ago against the promotion of Negro workers is a blot on the shield of labor. Thousands of Negro workers are prevented from making their full contribution to the war.

Even in the C.I.O. there is not always present the needed alertness to take against the hideous practices

of race discrimination and baiting. Thus, while the U.A.W. and especially its outstanding leader, R. J. Thomas, are carrying on a vigorous fight against Negro discrimination in their own industry, they did not show the same leadership in the recent Axis-inspired anti-Negro riots in Detroit. Under the impetus of this war of national liberation these racial barriers are slowly being broken down. This process must be hastened—in the interests of victory. With labor and progressive America taking up the struggle in collaboration with the Negro people, the prospects for full Negro equality, for unity between Negro and white, are brighter than ever before.

Labor Unity

Since Pearl Harbor, the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and Railroad Brotherhoods have, despite the unfortunate division in labor's ranks, been drawn closer together through their common approach to the basic problems affecting the labor movement and the war. There is general agreement on all major questions of policy, although the joint organization on a national scale is still lacking. Jurisdictional disputes have been reduced to the very minimum. The withdrawal of the C.I.O. shipyard workers' union from the Kaiser plant eliminated the most aggravating jurisdictional dispute which constituted a serious obstacle to the war effort and to labor unity.

Despite some of its inadequacies, the Labor Victory Committee (which is a mere advisory commit-

tee) has served as a force for bringing greater unity in labor's ranks. In the fight against the Smith-Connally Bill, for subsidies, for enforcing the President's Executive Order, and on other vital issues, the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods have acted as a unit. In many localities united action between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. unions has developed to a more advanced stage in the form of permanent united victory councils, conferences, joint delegations, agreement for united support of candidates for political office, etc. In Ohio joint committees, officially sponsored by the leadership of the state labor bodies, are functioning in nine cities. Similar developments are taking place in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Missouri, and other states. As a result of these joint actions and committees much of the antagonism against labor from other sections of the population has been eliminated. Labor is winning for itself a place of leadership and honor in the life of a good many communities in our land.

Danger Signs

In the past months, however, the defeatist forces in the labor movement, led by John L. Lewis, William Hutcheson, Matthew Woll and David Dubinsky, have initiated a drive to disrupt labor unity. Their latest maneuver is to bring Lewis back into the A. F. of L. They attempt to substitute this spurious unity move with the arch-enemy of the war effort for genuine unity between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O.

Lewis's sudden urge to rejoin the A. F. of L. has but one aim—to facilitate his conspiracy against the war effort and the Commander-in-Chief. Lewis's readmission into the A. F. of L. would bring about a new relationship of forces in the labor movement in favor of the reactionaries and defeatists. It would split labor's forces and tend to weaken labor's influence in the prosecution of the war and in the political life of the nation.

The enemies of labor are leaving no stone unturned to disrupt this growing cooperation between all sections of the labor movement. Therefore the main task of the win-the-war forces today is to expose and defeat all anti-unity maneuvers, to mobilize the millions of workers to achieve the utmost unity in labor's ranks.

The Executive Council of the A. F. of L. is now meeting in its final pre-convention session at Chicago. As a result of pressure from A. F. of L. locals and the national Administration, the Executive Council has referred the Lewis application to the October convention. This is only a partial victory. The danger has not been eliminated. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to intensify the struggle to keep Lewis out of the A. F. of L. Of special importance in influencing the course of the A. F. of L. are the state conventions which are to take place in some of the key states shortly before the national convention is held.

The heated discussion at the August meeting of the Executive Council and the subsequent action

in referring the matter to the convention bring to light the division in the Council between the Hutcheson forces and the majority of the Council members supporting the war. Further evidencing this division was the reaffirmation of the no-strike pledge, the discussion and action with regard to Congress and the coming election. The Council gave special attention to the question of a campaign for A. F. of L. members to register in political elections. Green also modified his earlier position with regard to defeating all Congressmen who voted for the Smith-Connally Bill, now recognizing that the real test is the general labor record of each Congressman, especially his position on the war.

The Council failed in its responsibilities to labor and to the nation when, at this critical juncture, which demands the fullest unity of labor as the backbone of national unity to defeat the enemy on the battlefield and the home front, it turned down the C.I.O.'s proposal for united political action submitted by Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C.I.O. Political Action Committee.

However, the very fact that the proposal was officially on the Council agenda is in itself a step forward. It should be noted, too, that the rejection was couched in friendly language. The door was left open for cooperation with the C.I.O. on individual issues. At a press conference during the Council sessions, William Green stated that, while the Council did not favor joint action with the C.I.O. on a national scale, in the localities

A. F. of L. unions will cooperate with the C.I.O. and other progressives in various campaigns. That these possibilities exist is evidenced by the fact that such cooperation is already in progress in many cities throughout the country. The deliberations of the Council meeting reflect the growing demand for labor unity on the part of the A. F. of L. unions in the various states and cities. A. F. of L. leaders, central bodies, state federations, are beginning to realize, on the basis of their own experience, that further division in labor's ranks spells defeat for labor and the people. They are beginning to realize that unity in labor's ranks is the only condition for safeguarding the workers' rights, for strengthening the war effort and the unity of the nation. And they are proceeding to translate this realization into action in their respective communities.

The action of the Council must serve only to stimulate closer relations and more effective action between C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods. This is the only way that the opposition to unity, coming from the Hutchesons, the Wolls, and the Dubinskys, can be broken down and labor unity realized in life.

Political Action

Organized labor today counts more than 12,000,000 members. Together with their families, it represents close to 40,000,000 citizens, the preponderant majority of the number that elected President Roosevelt in 1940.

There is no question as to where these millions stand on the burning issues of the day. The recent Gallup Poll gives the President a 71 per cent support among the workers. When we take into account the support among the workers for the Willkie Republicans the situation seems even more favorable.

Despite labor's almost unanimous support for the win-the-war policies of the President, we see the spectacle in which Southern reactionaries and Republican defeatists captured control of Congress and many state legislatures in the elections of 1942. This occurred because of the division in the ranks of labor and the win-the-war forces and because labor did not put forward its political strength in the elections. The reactionary bloc in Congress terrorized many of the weaker elements in the win-the-war camp. Congressmen elected with labor's aid either absented themselves from the sessions or went along voting for that vicious anti-labor, anti-war measure, the Smith-Connally Bill.

The most shameful pages in the history of our nation were written by this wrecking crew in Congress during the most serious crisis in the life of the nation. The whole Administration program presented by the President to strengthen the military and home fronts, with few exceptions, such as the Subsidy Bill, was defeated by Congress. This was the fate of the seven-point stabilization program, the taxation program, appropriations for O.P.A. and other war and social agencies. Instead, Congress gave us the Smith-

Connally Bill and the infamous Kerr Amendment.

Encouraged by reactionaries in Congress, nine states adopted anti-labor laws, which practically make it impossible for the trade unions to function. The floor of Congress became the platform for anti-Negro and anti-Semitic propaganda. Congress became the inspiration for widespread fifth-column activities on the outside, such as the race riots and strike provocations.

The sinister purpose behind the Smith-Connally Bill, characterized by the President as a strike, rather than an anti-strike, measure, is becoming clear to some of those who supported the bill under the illusion that it would bring uninterrupted production. Lewis was the first to make use of the thirty-day strike notice in an effort to disrupt C.I.O. unions and paralyze production, as in the case of Allis Chalmers. This is only the beginning. The ruling of Attorney General Biddle granting the right to minorities to petition for elections opens the way for fifth columnists, no matter how insignificant their number, to create turmoil and dissension in important war plants. Had labor been more united, more alert, and more active, had the millions organized in labor's ranks voted in the last elections, the defeatists could have been routed.

The passage of the Smith-Connally Bill has forced the labor movement to recognize its responsibilities for the setbacks suffered in Congress and the need to begin to take a more active part in politics. In the June issue of *Labor*,

the Railroad Brotherhood Journal, we read as follows:

"We fussed about minor issues and, worst crime of all, we didn't vote. In the last elections, we permitted Norris to be defeated in Nebraska, and 'Pappy' O'Daniel to be elected in Texas. We could have elected Norris and we could have defeated O'Daniel, *but we were too busy to go to the polls*, too busy even to register so we might go to the polls.

"As a consequence, the reactionary Senators elected last November were largely responsible for the passage of the Connally Bill last week. *Labor* repeats, we got what we deserve. Our forefathers were willing to die that men might have the right to vote. We have become soft and lazy so that we will not register.

"The passage of the Connally Bill was a slap in the face for the organized workers everywhere. If it will kindle our anger, it will prove a blessing in disguise."

There are encouraging signs that labor is becoming more conscious of the need for political action. Of tremendous importance in advancing labor's role on the political scene was the last Board meeting of the C.I.O. Held a few days after the passage of the Smith-Connally Bill, the Board unanimously reaffirmed its no-strike pledge and its unflinching support to the Commander-in-Chief. It outlined the following program of action to initiate a real crusade against the defeatists in Congress and to begin preparations for the 1944 elections:

"1. Immediately to start mobiliz-

ing the full force of the C.I.O. for political action both in the local and state-wide elections in the fall of 1943 and for the crucial national campaign of 1944.

"2. In each state and in each community to secure united political action with the A. F. of L. and Railway Brotherhoods, preferably through united political committees such as the Philadelphia United Labor Committee or through other means of collaboration.

"3. To involve in such united actions the broadest possible consumer, farmer and progressive groups and organizations.

"4. In the 1943 election and in preparation for 1944 to weld the unity of all forces who support the Commander - in - Chief behind a single progressive win-the-war candidate for each office.

"5. To work toward the formation of a national united labor league which will include all C.I.O., A. F. of L., Railway Brotherhood and unaffiliated labor unions who agree with our objectives and weld labor into the mighty political force which its numbers, strength, organizing ability and program entitle it to play in the life of our nation."

This program goes to the very core of the problem. It proposes the organization of labor in the political subdivisions, the Congressional Districts, the wards, together with all other citizens in the communities. It signalizes labor's coming of age. It means that labor is going into politics in earnest, in the fight for its life, for the freedom and independence of our nation. Labor is throwing its organized strength of millions of workers to cement

greater national unity and to weed the defeatists and fifth columnists out of the legislative halls and councils of the nation.

Since the C.I.O. Board meeting two important political conferences of the C.I.O. were held—in Philadelphia and in Chicago, under the leadership of Sidney Hillman. Two others are in preparation, in the South and on the West Coast. The C.I.O. is setting into motion the machinery for labor's political activities. The Philadelphia and Chicago conferences rejected the demagogic proposal for a third party sponsored by the Dubinsky Social-Democratic forces of the New York A.L.P. in collusion with Trotskyites and Thomas "Socialists," with the blessing of Lewis and the Republican Party. A third party at this historic period, the conferences declared, would split the labor-progressive forces and make impossible the rallying of all the people around the President in 1944 (since in most states candidates cannot run on more than one ticket). It also would open the way for the election of a Republican President and a negotiated Hitler peace.

These developments in the C.I.O. were greeted with great enthusiasm by C.I.O. and A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhood members. The conferences have stimulated increased political activity in many unions and the growth of community councils. The conferences have set for themselves immediate tasks: to develop the initiative and to strengthen the activities of labor in the political field, to organize the voters for mass public expression to

be transmitted to their respective Congressmen on the actions of Congress, and to guarantee mass registration in the 1943 elections.

An outstanding, nationally significant example of the beneficial effects of these developments on the labor movement and the community generally is to be seen in the state of New Jersey. There was a serious danger that the division in the Democratic Party would give this important industrial state to the Republicans in the 1943 gubernatorial elections. Such an eventuality would have been a serious setback to the win-the-war forces. Through the efforts of labor (and the efforts of the Communist Party), which ignored the slanders of the Social-Democrats and the confused liberals, and placed the real issues before the people, this calamity has been avoided. Labor and all the win-the-war forces now stand united around the Democratic candidate, Vincent J. Murphy, Secretary of the New Jersey A. F. of L. State Federation. The Democratic Party has recognized the vital role of labor in building national unity by placing a trade unionist as a people's candidate at the head of its ticket. The designation of Murphy has brought enthusiasm into the labor movement. Typical of the endorsements of Murphy were the remarks of Irving Abramson, President of the State C.I.O., at a trade union conference of C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Brotherhood Unions:

"This conference is the nearest thing to a State Convention of the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad

Brotherhoods. The unity at this meeting is the forerunner of the unity we must have in 1944."

All sections of the population must be drawn into the campaign, given representation on the campaign committees. Murphy must become not only a labor but a people's candidate; his election a people's victory. As a result of the developments recorded above, there are very good prospects that New Jersey will head the pro-Administration states in 1944.

The political developments in New York state are of equal importance.

When the American Labor Party came into existence in 1935 it had as its main basis progressive A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions, and played an important role in deciding the outcome of several local, state and national elections. In the past few years, however, the Dubinsky Social-Democratic clique of the I.L.G.W.U. has seized control of the party state machinery to the exclusion of all other unions, including the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The A.L.P. has become the vestpocket edition of the Dubinsky-*Forward-New Leader* clique, echoing their anti-Soviet, anti-United Nations and anti-Roosevelt policies.

The statement issued recently by Sidney Hillman, advocating the restoration of the A.L.P. to its original trade union base and inviting the affiliation of all unions, has helped to expose the demagogic issue of Communist control of the A.L.P. It has helped to clarify the atmosphere and has no doubt contributed

to the defeat of these forces in the disputed counties, especially Kings, their former stronghold. The victory of the win-the-war forces now clears the way for uniting the A. F. of L. local unions for the A.L.P.

These developments in New York, like those in New Jersey, will strengthen the win-the-war forces for the coming struggle against the defeatists in Congress and prepare the ground for the victory of the progressive forces in the crucial elections in 1944.

Labor's International Role

American labor has tended toward a positive position in regard to many questions involving international relations. After the last World War, the A. F. of L. was opposed to intervention in the Soviet Union. At the 1917 convention the conservative President Gompers spoke with warmth and sympathy for the newly won freedom and aspirations of the Russian people. The A. F. of L. supported President Wilson's policy of affiliation to the League of Nations. It greeted the restoration of friendly relations with the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding the harmful position adopted by the A. F. of L. leadership in its policy of anti-Sovietism and of "non-intervention" in regard to Spain, labor early recognized the danger of fascism as a world menace. Conventions of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. spoke out for the policy of collective security. The A. F. of L. called for a boycott of Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and Japan.

Today the masses of the organized workers stand four-square for the policies of the United Nations and for closer collaboration with the Soviet Union. The anti-Soviet, Red-baiting campaign led by Dubinsky, Lewis, Antonini, and Matthew Woll is in conflict with the mass sentiments of the American workers. This is amply demonstrated in the enthusiastic response to Russian War Relief, the tremendous reception accorded the Jewish Soviet delegates, Professor Michoels and Itzik Feffer, and the strong sentiment for international labor unity among the A. F. of L. members and many leaders, as well as the official decision of the C.I.O. favoring affiliation with the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee.

The labor movement, by its very nature, is international in character. The pioneers of American trade unionism were trained in the international labor movement. May Day, international labor day, had its genesis in America. In the early period of its existence, the A. F. of L. established international ties with the Amsterdam Trade Union International and its component unions. These relations were interrupted only for a time during the post-war period and resumed in 1936. International relations with the trade unions of Great Britain exist today in one form or another. The key problem in the labor movement now is for the A. F. of L. to abandon its stupid, anti-workingclass prejudice against the powerful all-Russian trade unions with a membership of 27,000,000. The problem today is American

trade union affiliation to the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, in order to strengthen the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and labor's role in the decisive period of the war.

The matchless heroism of the Soviet people unmasked Hitler's slander against the Soviet workers. The great Soviet trade unions have astounded the world by their miracles of production and their valor on the battlefield. Millions of American workers stand in admiration of their heroic Soviet Allies, their comrades-in-arms. It is a heinous crime to allow a handful of defeatists—Hutchesons, Wolls and Dubinskys—to foist their policy on the labor movement in relation to international unity, not only to hold back the A. F. of L. but to hinder the C.I.O. and the Railroad Brotherhoods from establishing organizational ties with the Anglo-Soviet Committee.

Leading British members of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee and of the British Trade Union Congress came to these shores to call on our trade unions to add our strength to this committee. The C.I.O. responded. The Executive Council of the A. F. of L. rejected affiliation and prevented the C.I.O. from being accepted.

One year has passed, a year that marked the turning point of the war. It was the year of the great victories of Stalingrad, Tunisia, Sicily, Munda, Orel, Belgorod—the year of the beginning of the military defeat of fascism.

The Soviet unions, as well as the British miners', engineers' and rail-

waymen's unions, are again proposing that the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee shall be extended to secure unity of action of the labor movement of all the United Nations to speed victory over Hitlerism. Jack Tanner, president of the Amalgamated Engineers Union, embracing 600,000 workers, has also raised the question of forming an international metal federation or committee to coordinate and promote joint action of unions in the metal industries of the U. S. A., Great Britain and the U. S. S. R.

The Federation of Latin American Workers, meeting in Havana in July, decided on immediate affiliation to the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee.

These are proposals aimed at strengthening international labor unity, particularly now, in order to enhance labor's role and influence in the prosecution of the war against Hitler and the Axis, in helping to shorten the war and in shaping the organization of the post-war world.

Will the American trade unions permit the reactionaries to keep them on the outside, isolated from the world labor movement?

The coming A. F. of L. convention will be watched by the labor movement of the entire world. The A. F. of L. unions especially should make their voices heard at this convention. It is their great international responsibility, their solemn obligation to speak out for international labor unity.

World labor, divided, cannot exert its full influence in the councils of the nations. International

labor unity, a powerful organization of labor on an international scale, will enable labor to throw its full strength in helping to determine the course of the war toward rapid and decisive victory and a lasting peace. This is the direction in which the American workers are rapidly moving, despite the obstacles placed in their way by the defeatists in their own ranks.

* * *

This Labor Day celebration coincides with the twenty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party.

As labor progresses to greater maturity, as labor advances, it is also beginning to appreciate the role and contributions of the Communist Party through its national leadership headed by Browder and Foster, as well as through the rank-and-file Communists working in their respective trade unions and communities. The lies and calumnies circulated by the Red-baiters that Communists want to capture and dominate unions, that they want to use the unions for some sinister purpose, have been exploded by life itself.

A new relationship is developing between the mass of the organized workers and the Communist Party. This was evidenced in labor's active participation in the campaign for the release of Comrade Browder, the splendid response of labor to Comrade Browder's book, *Victory—And After*, which

was accepted by many trade unions as an essential contribution in helping them to solve some of the new wartime problems. It is exemplified in the recent party recruiting campaign, in which the largest number of new recruits came from the organized labor movement. It is evidenced in the endorsement of the *Daily Worker* by many progressive A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders.

These developments reflect the growing realization, in the face of the slanders and attacks by the defeatists, that the Communists constitute a great patriotic force in the national unity, a force of uncompromising fighters for the national interests of our people, far-sighted and ready to subordinate everything to the supreme needs of victory over Hitler and the Axis; that the Communists work consistently and devotedly for strengthening labor and national unity, for strengthening the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, for launching the vital Second Front, for winning the war, and for achieving a just and lasting peace and post-war reorganization.

These developments are bringing closer the day when enemy propaganda against the Communists will not be tolerated in the trade union movement, when Communists will be permitted to function openly side by side with other progressive and patriotic forces in strengthening the role of labor and the entire people in this greatest of battles for the smashing of fascist tyranny.

THE WAR AND THE TRADE UNIONS

THE working class and its mass organizations play an important and responsible role in the struggle of the democratic countries against predatory Hitler imperialism. The workers constitute the unifying foundation in the formation of the powerful national front in every country, without which the mobilization of all national forces for victory would have been unthinkable.

To the trade unions, the most popular and mass organizations of the working class, belongs an honorable role in this matter.

The Soviet Union and its allies are conducting a war of liberation, a just war calculated on freeing the enslaved peoples of Europe and the U.S.S.R. from Hitler tyranny. But this does not exhaust the character and peculiarities of the present war, in which the democratic countries are united for the sake of a just liberation cause. For the first time in history a bloc of democratic countries has been formed in this war in which a prominent place belongs to the Soviet State.

Long before this war the Soviet Union became an important factor

in international life. Ever since the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in Germany the U.S.S.R. has constantly exposed the true essence of predatory Hitler imperialism and called upon the democratic countries to give a joint rebuff to the menace of fascist aggression.

To have a national existence and state independence and to retain the progress of mankind at the level attained by man, Hitler tyranny must be destroyed. All freedom-loving people are vitally interested in achievement of this aim, which is their common, sacred cause.

Standing in the front ranks of the fighters against Hitler tyranny is the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, born of the war against German fascist barbarism. Clearly the tasks of the working class and its organizations in the present war are entirely different from those in the First World War. The principal division of forces in the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition at present are based, not on social and class contradictions, which in the countries of western Europe and America have not disappeared, not been abolished. They continue to exist in these countries, manifesting themselves in the most diverse forms, making themselves felt in different ways.

The national interests in the

An editorial from Issue No. 4 of *The War and the Working Class*, Moscow, which contained also articles by Sir Walter Citrine and other members of the British trade union delegation attending a meeting of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, held in Moscow in July.

struggle of the freedom-loving countries for their freedom and independence must determine the principal political line of action of the different classes and parties in this war in the interests of unity and the maximum national effort for victory over the hated enemy. For the organization and achievement of this the working class must render and is rendering full support.

Only the allies and semi-allies of the Hitler agents, of the fifth column, can now oppose such principle of policy.

The trade unions of the U.S.S.R. have taken a most active part in the building up of the military might of their country and the entire organization of defense and struggle of the Red Army against the accursed fascist enemy. They have been and are leading the people's movement in the Soviet rear for all-out support to the front with everything necessary for victory over Hitler Germany.

Millions of members of the Soviet trade unions in the armed forces at the front, in the factories, plants and fields in the rear are waging a sacred struggle for their country and for the cause of all the freedom-loving peoples.

And in other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition too there is a marked surge of creative enthusiasm among the broad masses of the people. The example of the U.S.S.R. has played its part also in the efforts of the British workers to step up the output of war production. In the United States the last two years have been distin-

guished by a growing activity of the workers in production. The direct result of this activity of the workers is an unprecedented increase in the war production of the United States.

The trade union organizations of the allied countries have done much for mobilizing the masses of the working class for carrying out their tasks, primarily along the line of strengthening war production, and also to satisfy the daily needs of the people. But what has been done is as yet inadequate.

The trade unions of Britain and the United States unite a minority of the workers engaged in production. The trade union movement of the United States is still split into a number of organizations, as yet not always able to combine their efforts in the common interests of the working class. Attempts to organize on the example of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee collaboration between the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the United States encounter the resistance of some reactionary leaders of the American trade unions.

The workers of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States now see their principal political task in the rout of the fascist aggressor. Nothing short of the defeat and unconditional surrender of Hitler Germany and its associates can satisfy this desire of the peoples in the Allied countries.

With the aim of realizing this task the labor organizations in the Soviet Union and Great Britain found it necessary to combine their efforts in the struggle against the

common enemy and must together with the labor organizations of the United States and other countries aim for the further unification of their forces in the common interests of the working people.

There is all the more ground for this, since the war forced upon the world by fascism, with its hardships, privations and sufferings for the peoples, demands most urgently that our victory over the fascist camp lead to a stable and lasting peace, a peace which will secure the freedom and progress of the peoples.

It must not be forgotten that already during the war, when the need for mutual relations and the unity of the forces of the peoples makes itself felt as never before,

important prerequisites are being created for the post-war relations between peoples. The workers in the democratic countries have had many an occasion to convince themselves of the extent to which they are interested in exerting every effort to bring about the utmost unity of their forces for the speediest defeat of the common enemy and creating favorable conditions for the broad and friendly collaboration of the freedom-loving peoples after the victory is won.

The trade unions have accumulated tremendous political experience during the present war. This experience must yield its fruits at a time when the problems of the organization of peace and post-war reconstruction become most urgent.

TOWARD A NEW ANTI-FASCIST YOUTH ORGANIZATION

BY MAX WEISS

THE coming convention of the Young Communist League is being prepared as we approach the climax of the great war for national liberation. The problems which will confront the convention flow directly from the requirements of victory in the war. Their solution will contribute immeasurably toward bringing about a fuller mobilization of the youth of our country for the fulfillment of their great tasks in helping to win victory.

The convention will examine the tasks of American youth in helping to speed the opening of the Second Front on the continent of Europe so that our nation may win speedy victory in full unity and coalition with the United Nations. It will give careful attention to the tasks of youth in helping to hold the home front in order to strengthen national unity of all patriotic youth and their organizations, in support of our Commander-in-Chief, President Roosevelt, and our nation's war policies and to combat the treacherous conspiracies and fifth-column diversions of the defeatists.

Flowing directly from the desire of the Young Communist League to make its maximum contribution

to the mobilization of the masses of youth for the fulfillment of these tasks, the convention will consider a proposal of outstanding importance, a proposal

“. . . to change the program and name of the Y.C.L. and to broaden its leadership in order to help create a new united anti-fascist youth organization.”

This proposal has been advanced because American youth find themselves in a historically new situation today, a situation that is without precedent or parallel in the life of any previous generation of American youth.

This new situation has given rise to a host of new problems which already confront American youth as well as new problems which will inevitably confront them after victory has been won.

This new situation and these new problems have brought about historic changes in the thinking and consciousness of the masses of American youth.

* * *

What is this new situation? What are these new problems? What

changes have taken place among American youth?

Everything that is new today flows from that single great fact which dominates every other consideration—the war.

The present generation of American youth is a war generation. The youth of 18 who puts on the uniform of our country, as well as his sweetheart who bids him farewell, has known no other world since he or she was 14 years of age than a world at war. From the very first moment in the life of young American manhood and womanhood when it begins to develop consciousness and understanding beyond the adolescent stage it knows only a country and a world that are at war. The war, with all its issues and problems and future perspectives, dominates their lives and their thinking, with a completeness that is all-pervading.

This war generation of American youth has been almost completely organized into two great columns of fighters for victory; fighters in uniform and fighters in overalls. Even the schools are adjusting their curricula to become "feed lines" for the entry of students into the armed forces or into war production.

The first new fact about this war generation of American youth is that millions of them, including tens of thousands of girls, have entered the armed forces. This has had the most deep-going repercussions among them and has created a whole new complex of adjustments in their lives, in their thinking, in their relationship to the rest of the population, in the role which

they play in all considerations of public policy. It automatically forecasts in broad outlines the nature of the problems which will confront our nation and these youth in the armed forces upon their return from the trenches, upon their demobilization, rehabilitation, and reabsorption into the schools, factories, and farms of the country.

The struggle over these questions is already going on now in quite open forms on the many immediate issues which have come up for consideration in all the governing bodies of our nation. We have only to look at the efforts of the defeatists to set the youth in the armed forces against the labor movement and against the victory policies of the Roosevelt Administration. Illustrative of these efforts is the reprehensible campaign waged by Rickenbacker, Clare Booth Luce and others to impregnate the youth in the armed forces with anti-labor moods in preparation for their return after the war.

A second new fact of historic importance about this war generation of American youth is the employment of the overwhelming mass of youth of working age, including 'teen age youth and girls, in industry. These youth belong to a new generation that has never known unemployment, a generation that is entering into industry and into the organized labor movement from the first moment of its mature life. They enter into industry under conditions in which labor is a matter of patriotic honor and pride. Hence, they display an attitude to work and to the trade unions, the organi-

zation of workers, which is unprecedented in our country. Already the number of youth in the unions runs into the millions. The great possibility exists, in fact, to make this first generation of employed youth also the first generation of organized trade union youth in the history of our country.

At the same time, a whole series of new social problems has been created for youth as a result of the mobilization of millions of youth in the armed forces; of the mass influx of youth into the basic industries in the boom war centers; of the entry of mothers into industry. A wholesale uprooting of youth from their home communities, from their families, friends, organizations, clubs, and churches has taken place. The entire normal life of millions of young people has been disarranged.

One of the most dramatic outward manifestations of these new social problems has been the disturbing growth of juvenile delinquency in all the chief war production centers of the country. While it would be wrong to be deceived by the lurid exaggerations of unscrupulous newspapers bent more on circulation than on disseminating the truth, it would be equally wrong to take any cold comfort from the fact that the total number of "juvenile offenders" is small in comparison to the mass of youth. We are confronted with a problem of the first magnitude in the phenomenon of wartime juvenile delinquency.

The war has brought forward the role and problems of youth in a

new way not only on the military and industrial field but also on the political field. The most significant evidence of this fact is the widespread and rapidly growing movement to lower the voting age to 18. In the state of Georgia the age level has already been lowered to 18. This reflects a growing recognition among both youth and adults that youth have a right to participate in the councils of state. This recognition has been developing over a long period of time. The war brought it to a sharp focus and crystallized it into a movement to lower the voting age. It underscores as never before the new political role of youth, the political maturity of youth, the desire of youth to assume every responsibility of citizenship.

This growing political maturity of large masses of youth reflects the changes that have taken place in their moods, sentiments and thinking. These changes have resulted in a deepened patriotic, anti-fascist consciousness and understanding.

This is a war for national liberation. The national independence of our country is at stake. What millions of youth prior to the war took for granted, this generation of youth is fighting and dying to preserve. As never before, therefore, that noble sense of patriotism and true love of country which American youth have always had have been deepened and have taken on new and added meaning.

The war of the United Nations is a war against the fascist Axis.

For the first time, therefore, millions of youth see clearly that fascism is the enemy of the nation. They see the true face of fascism revealed in the devastation which it has carried with it into peaceful lands, in the slavery which its "New Order" has established in the occupied countries, in the medieval barbarism and savagery which are its battle standard, in the horrible fate which awaits the people of every country in which fascism is allowed to raise its flag and establish its rule.

For the first time millions of youth see our great Soviet ally and its heroic Red Army and people in a new light. They begin, as never before, to understand the need for the closest friendship and collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two most powerful democracies in the world, as the key to victory and to a just and durable peace.

With millions of young people now in the trade unions, large masses of them begin to see, as never before, that the labor movement is the most progressive social force in modern society, the most consistently democratic force in our country's life, the backbone of our nation's war effort. The labor movement has begun to exert a profound influence upon the thinking and activities of large masses of hitherto unemployed or unorganized youth. They begin more and more to look to the labor movement as their champion, as the spokesman for their needs and aspirations. They begin to draw sustenance and

strength for their own deepening anti-fascist consciousness and understanding from the growing strength and increasing political maturity of the labor movement. They begin to understand, as never before, that both the present and the future of youth are intimately bound up with the development of a strong labor movement, that there will be no "lost generation" after the war if there is a strong labor movement which plays its full role in the life of our nation.

Large masses of youth begin to understand for the first time, because of the very wartime requirements of our country, the need to fight for the full integration of the Negro people in the life of our nation, for the abolition of Jim Crowism, discrimination, segregation; for the strengthening of Negro-white unity; for full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

For the first time large masses of youth see what the productive resources of our country can accomplish when efforts are made to achieve maximum production and employment. They begin to see what it should also be possible to accomplish in times of peace. They will not accept a post-war world of mass unemployment. They are concerned as never before with the future, with the need to work for a new future for themselves and for their country, a future in which their dreams and aspirations for a better land and a better world will be realized.

The problems of the post-war world will bring the masses of

youth face to face with the task of building this new future for themselves and their country. The key to this future is the strengthening of United Nations unity now and its continuation and consolidation in the post-war period.

The general nature of certain domestic problems, as well as the general direction of policies providing for a progressive solution of some of these problems under the given relation of forces, have already been indicated in the report of the National Resources Planning Board, made public by President Roosevelt. They have been indicated in the policies advanced in the most recent speech of President Roosevelt for providing the servicemen demobilized after the war with a "stake," with the guarantee of a job as well as the means of livelihood till the job is gotten, with the possibility of resuming interrupted education.

The post-war world will bring youth face to face with the task of building this new future by fighting for the defense and extension of democracy at home against all attempts of reactionary forces to curtail or destroy it. For it is quite clear that the defeat of Hitler and the Axis will deal a powerful blow to the defeatists and the forces of reaction in the United States; reaction will be weakened. But its very weaknesses will make it more desperate in its assaults against the democratic interests of the youth and the entire people.

Ever larger masses of youth are deeply conscious of, and increasingly alert to, these already visible

problems of the post-war world.

This deepening of the patriotic, anti-fascist consciousness of large masses of youth has been brought about, primarily, by the impact of powerful economic, social and political forces as well as by new developments of an international character. At the same time, the fact that these changes have taken place among youth is in no small measure due to the pioneering work of the Young Communist League.

The Young Communist League was the first youth organization to raise the banner of struggle for correct policies on all these issues around which there has finally developed a deeper understanding among youth. In many cases, and sometimes over long years, the Y.C.L. was the only youth organization to champion those policies. Not only this. The Young Communist League also did important pioneering work in organizing the unorganized youth in the basic industries. It therefore contributed modestly but significantly in helping to establish a basis for the growth of that force which has played such a decisive role in helping to deepen the anti-fascist consciousness of large masses of youth—the organized labor movement.

With a full appreciation of the great contributions which the Young Communist League has made toward helping solve these new problems, it is at the same time true that a new type of organization, much broader than the Young Communist League and capable of uniting within its ranks hundreds of thousands of advanced anti-fas-

cist youth, is required by the times. Only such an organization can cope with the new situation in which youth finds itself today and help solve the new problems which already confront youth as well as those which will confront it after victory is won. These requirements press upon us insistently and dictate the action which the National Council of the Young Communist League proposes to the convention.

* * *

The proposal "*to change the program and name of the Y.C.L. and to broaden its leadership in order to help create a new united anti-fascist youth organization*" is not the product of any momentary inspiration. It has its origin in what has been a basic policy of the Young Communist League for many years. It is necessary to understand what is old in the proposal as well as what is new in it; to see its continuity with the past as well as its significance for the future.

In 1935, soon after the rise to power of Hitler fascism, the Young Communist League advanced this basic policy for the first time. It concretized this policy by proposing that a united anti-fascist youth league be created through the organic merger of the Young Communist League with other advanced anti-fascist youth organizations and forces into a new organization.

This proposal was put forth because of the urgent necessity to achieve the greatest possible unity of the advanced anti-fascist youth in order to help beat back and de-

feat the fascist menace to the peace, happiness, lives and security of American youth and the nation which came to the fore when Hitler took power.

In advancing this proposal, the Young Communist League also took into account, at that time, the fact that great changes were beginning to take place, even then, among the masses of youth. For even at that time there were beginning to emerge those new factors which the war has brought to such a sharp focus on such a mass scale today.

At the same time the Young Communist League understood that it must begin to make its own direct contribution to the building of such a new united organization. It therefore began, as far back as 1935, to change the content of its work, the form of its activities and the structure of its organization in order to enable large numbers of non-Communist youth to belong to it and to work within it. It began to make clear that membership in the Y.C.L. did not require support to the principle of a future socialist society as a condition for membership.

It has been on this basis that the Y.C.L. has been working for the past eight years. As a result, the Y.C.L. even as it exists today, is not, if we wish to speak accurately, a Communist youth organization. Its activities are those which all advanced anti-fascists — Communist and non-Communist alike—can support and in which they can participate. The practical effect of not requiring as a condition for membership support to the principle of a future socialist society has been

to modify in *practice* the program of our organization in so far as it based itself on this principle. It was quite inevitable, therefore, that in its growth the Y.C.L. should, more and more, recruit young people who did not have a socialist outlook; in actual fact a substantial part of the membership of the Y.C.L. today is not socialist in its belief or outlook.

The call to the convention emphasizes this fact when it states that

“ . . . in the character of its work, in the form of its activity, in the composition of its membership, the Young Communist League has been transforming itself into a much broader type of organization which unites within its ranks patriotic, anti-fascist youth regardless of political belief or party affiliation.”

These facts, even if they should be considered by themselves, would be sufficient to warrant taking such action as would result in bringing the name of our organization, its program, and the composition of its leadership into correspondence with the type of organization that the Y.C.L. really is. For such action would be necessary registration of the changes which have already taken place within the organization.

It would be wrong to think, however, that the changes proposed for the convention are a matter of simply recording in a formal way what already exists within the Y.C.L. as it functions today. It would be wrong to think that the changes proposed for the convention are a matter of simply broadening the

Y.C.L. still further in the same way as previous conventions broadened it out.

The proposals which are advanced for consideration of the convention are such as will speed up the process already under way in the Y.C.L. for many years, advance it to a higher stage and thus help to bring into existence something *qualitatively new*.

For that is what will be the political result of making such fundamental changes as those that are proposed. We will in actuality have, as a result, the beginnings of a new organization and not merely the old organization with some slight modifications.

This does not mean that it will be a new organization that will spring “full fashioned from the brow of Jove.” Not at all. It is the Y.C.L. as it exists today which is transforming itself into a new organization. Consequently, it will be a new organization which does not, from the beginning, embrace all or even a majority of the forces among the youth which must ultimately be involved in a united anti-fascist youth organization. It will, therefore, have to take whatever steps are necessary after the convention to involve these forces.

We must never forget that the full development of a united anti-fascist youth organization cannot be achieved in a one-sided way by the unilateral action of the Y.C.L. alone. The Y.C.L. alone can only take the first step in this direction. It is proposed that the forthcoming national convention of the Y.C.L. shall take this first step.

That is why the call to the convention states:

“. . . the National Council has discussed proposals . . . to change the program and name of the Young Communist League in order to help create a new united anti-fascist youth organization.” (Italics mine.—M.W.)

* * *

What should be the character of the new organization into which the Young Communist League should transform itself?

The following general considerations should guide the delegates to the convention in formulating the program to be adopted there:

1. It should be an organization which places in the center of all its work the mobilization of the masses of youth to help win the war for national liberation, to smash fascism. This must be the very heart and core of the activities in which the organization engages. In the first place, this means helping in every way possible to speed the opening of the second front in western Europe in order to make 1943 the year of victory over Hitler. It means doing everything possible to strengthen national unity in support of President Roosevelt and our nation's war policies and to expose and combat the treacherous conspiracies and fifth-column diversions of the defeatists. It means doing everything possible to increase the service of American youth to the war effort through the development of activities for the welfare of the servicemen; for the

promotion of the training, health, fitness and trade union organization of working youth in order to increase their productive efficiency for victory; for organizing the mass participation of youth in civilian defense, voluntary farm labor, donation of blood, sale and purchase of war bonds and stamps, collection of waste materials and scrap; for the full and complete devotion of all its strength and energy to the supreme cause of victory over Hitler and the Axis.

2. It should be an organization of young people dedicated to character building and education in the spirit of our democratic ideals, drawing strength and inspiration from the labor movement and the great democratic traditions of our country and the example of those patriots who founded it and led it through the crises of history, faithful at every stage to the interests of our people.

3. It should take its stand by the side of the working class, which is the most progressive social force in modern society, the most consistently democratic force in our country's life, the backbone of American democracy. The satisfaction of the immediate needs and the future aspirations of youth are bound up with the strengthening of the labor movement and the full development of its political role in our national life. Therefore it should support the building of the labor movement, help defend it from attack by its enemies and encourage all working youth to become active members of the labor movement. While giving attention to other sections of youth,

it should have the main base of its membership among the working class youth.

4. It should dedicate itself to serving our nation, the labor movement and the youth by encouraging young people to undertake their responsibilities and obligations as citizens of a democracy, by stimulating their energetic participation in all civic affairs, by helping to draw youth fully into the economic, social and political life of our nation.

5. Basing itself squarely on the democratic institutions of our country, it should pledge to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States; to expose and fight against all subversive efforts of fascists and reactionaries to attack, undermine or destroy American democracy from without or within, to defend civil liberties, religious freedom and equal rights for all people, condemning all concepts of race or national superiority and condemning all the other doctrines of prejudice, bigotry and intolerance.

6. It should be concerned with every vital need and interest of youth, championing their economic, social and political rights, helping to assure their security and happiness by safeguarding the American home and family and by guaranteeing youth's opportunity for education, for work and for recreation.

7. It should work for the full integration of the Negro youth in the life of our nation, for the complete abolition of all forms of Jim Crowism, discrimination and segregation,

for the strengthening of the unity of Negro and white, for full social, economic and political equality for the Negro people.

8. It should help enrich the lives of young people by encouraging their study and knowledge of mankind's heritage in the arts and sciences, by promoting their participation in wholesome cultural, recreational and social activities, by developing the most widespread fitness and sports activities.

9. It should strive to inculcate a high standard of personal morality and ethics, a devotion to the principles of clean living, helping to train healthy minds in healthy bodies.

10. It should reject all teachings of national exclusiveness and help develop a vibrant and living spirit of internationalism, helping to build a fraternal fellowship with the youth of all lands who fight for freedom against fascism, oppression and tyranny. It should work to strengthen the United Nations coalition, particularly to promote and develop friendship and collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two most powerful democracies in the world, having different social systems but a common national interest in cementing their friendship and collaboration. Such American-Soviet collaboration is the key to victory and a just and durable peace.

11. It should dedicate itself to working for the unity of the young generation, of labor and of the people which alone can achieve these aims.

12. It should dedicate itself to

working for the continued extension and expansion of democracy in every sphere of the economic, social and political life of our country in order to help realize in all its fullness our dream of a land of full opportunity for youth, an America in which insecurity, poverty and want have been abolished, an America that is peaceful, free, prosperous and happy.

It is clear that an organization based on such principles as have been quite generally outlined here will be an organization to which youth—Communist and non-Communist—can belong regardless of party considerations and on the consideration only that they support this program.

Such an organization would be open to the full, free and democratic discussion of all policies, programs, theories, proposed by the various political parties for the achievement of the objectives set forth in its principles. Such discussion should be encouraged through the medium of lectures, forums, debates, literature and other forms of free expression of opinion. This means, quite naturally, that there will also be full freedom for all youth within the organization who desire to study Marxism and Marxist theory. For one does not have to be a Marxist or subscribe to Marxist theories to understand that Marxism, the advanced science of the international working class, is a most important and vital current of modern democratic thought.

When the young people who belong to this organization, after study

and experience, reach conviction in their own minds and decide to join or support any political party they will naturally do so. But the organization itself will be non-partisan.

As for those youth who are Communist, that is, who accept the full program of the Communist Party on both immediate and ultimate questions, there is no need for any special Communist youth organization. The only special Communist organization to which they should belong is the Communist Party itself. Of course, like all other youth, Communist youth will belong to many different organizations depending on their personal interests, whether these be athletic, cultural or something else. Since they are above all interested in making the kind of contribution to the welfare of the youth and the nation which the program that has been outlined makes possible, they will quite logically find their place in such an organization.

For more than ten years this conception of the relationship between the Communist Party and youth organizations—in particular, the Y.C.L.—has been expounded as the policy of the Communist Party by its General Secretary, Earl Browder. The Communist Party has not regarded the Y.C.L. as its "Youth Section" or its "auxiliary" in which youth are "prepared" for membership in the Communist Party in some sort of "preliminary" way.

This was made quite clear, for example, in the message sent by Browder to the 9th National Convention of the Y.C.L. in May, 1939:

"Your organization is not subordinated, not auxiliary to the Communist Party. It is an entirely independent organization, standing on its own feet. Membership in the Y.C.L. does not commit one to any party program or discipline. Each one will choose his party program and discipline for himself when he feels that he is sufficiently mature in understanding and experience to make a wise and permanent choice."

From time to time this basic principle repeatedly made clear by Earl Browder has not been adhered to in certain lower organizations of the Communist Party or Y.C.L. But this has been true only because that principle has not been uniformly understood in these lower organizations, with a resultant distortion, on occasion, of the normal relations between the Communist Party and the Y.C.L.

It is certainly true that thousands of youth who joined the Y.C.L. later joined the Communist Party and that many of them became able leaders of the Communist Party. All Communists will naturally hope that thousands of youth who will join the new organization will also later join the Communist Party, and that many will become leaders of the Communist Party. But it is also true that thousands of youth now in the Communist Party never belonged to the Y.C.L. and that thousands of youth who belonged to the Y.C.L. never joined the Communist Party. This will probably also be true in respect to the organization we are discussing.

Acceptance of a Marxist outlook

and principles by youth depends upon their living experience wherever they are—in the political struggle, in the shop, school, farm, community and upon the independent role of the Communist Party itself and the activities of its members wherever these members happen to be.

Communists believe that ever larger and increasing numbers of young people and, in the long run, a majority of American youth will ultimately see that only by equipping itself with the science of Marxism and enriching this science with the great experiences of the American labor and democratic movement can the American working class find its proper path to a final solution of all problems. But to the extent that any particular organization has the political responsibility for this, it is the responsibility of the Communist Party itself and not any other so-called "preparatory" organization.

The changes that are proposed for the convention will help to remove certain obstacles which have, hitherto, impeded the building of a broad anti-fascist youth organization. There can be no question of the fact that the name and program of the Y.C.L. were such as to imply that membership in the organization automatically committed one to acceptance of the immediate and ultimate program of the Communist Party and that they therefore operated to prevent from joining it thousands of youth who supported its immediate program and activity. It is equally true that the changes will help blunt certain weapons

used by defeatists and reactionaries who pointed to the name of the organization as "evidence" that the Y.C.L. was the "youth section" of the Communist Party and not an independent organization.

The chagrin of the defeatists at having their weapons blunted is shown in the fact that the defeatist press has attempted to distort the meaning of the proposed changes as a maneuver by the Communists to build a new organization through which the Communist Party will "lure" youth to its folds in some machiavellian fashion. This is an insult to the intelligence of American youth, who are not naive simpletons who can be "lured" into anything. It is, at the same time, a slander and a distortion of the attitude of the Communist Party to the youth movement and to every organization within the youth movement, organizations whose independence, integrity, democracy and discipline it has always respected.

The defeatist press has also attempted to distort the meaning of the proposed changes as an "admission" that the Communists have been "discredited," that they have failed to attract youth "under their own banners" and now want to do it under a different name.

How ridiculous this charge is can be seen from the fact that it is precisely in this period that, small as it is, the Young Communist League has experienced its greatest rate of growth and has been witness to a constant rise of its influence and prestige.

For example, among the Negro

youth the very name of our organization today—Young Communist League—has been accepted by them as an iron-clad guarantee that it can be counted upon to fight relentlessly and uncompromisingly against Jim Crowism, discrimination and segregation, for unity of Negro and white, for full social, economic and political equality for the Negro people. The Negro youth identify the Young Communist League with the struggle for Negro rights. The Young Communist League prides itself on this fact.

This badge of honor, won in the struggle for Negro rights, must be guarded jealously. It must be kept bright and clear as a most treasured possession. The changes which are proposed for the convention must be such as will result in building an organization which will be able to fight even more effectively than the Y.C.L. has been able to do for the full integration of the Negro youth in the life of the nation, for the abolition of all forms of discrimination and segregation, for the firmest unity of Negro and white youth, for full social, political and economic equality between Negro and white.

* * *

It is clear that an organization such as the one we are discussing in this article will be completely independent of the Communist Party, both organizationally and politically. It will determine its attitude to the proposals and policies of the Communist Party on the basis of the merits of those poli-

cies. It will determine its attitude to all other democratic political parties and forces in the same way. It will be non-partisan and will have fraternal relations with all patriotic, anti-fascist groups and organizations.

This does not mean, however, that the organization can or should be neutral on the question of Red-baiting or in the face of the fascist-inspired anti-Communist crusade. Quite the contrary, by its very nature and in full compliance with its non-partisan, democratic character, it must militantly champion the principle of the full citizenship of the Communist Party in the democratic life of our country.

This is not a task for the Communists alone. Anti-Communism is as much a fascist, anti-democratic doctrine as is anti-Semitism, anti-Negro prejudice or anti-Catholicism.

The task of fighting against race prejudice, against Jim Crowism, segregation, discrimination is not the task of the Negro people alone; it is the task of Negro and white.

The task of fighting anti-Semitism is not the task of the Jewish people alone. It is the task of all democratic forces, Jewish and non-Jewish. As such, the youth organization we envisage must undertake this task as one of its most important responsibilities.

The task of fighting anti-Catholicism, a doctrine spread so insidiously by the fascist fifth column, is not a task which falls to the lot of Catholic believers alone. It is the responsibility which falls upon the shoulders of all democratic forces, Catholic and non-Catholic

alike. The new organization must take up this struggle.

In the same way the task of fighting anti-Communism, with all that this implies in the way of Red-baiting and exceptional anti-Communist laws and practices, is not a task which should be left to the Communists alone. It is the obligation of all democratic forces and must be undertaken by every organization which directly stands upon patriotic principles of democracy. As such, the youth organization which we discuss must militantly champion the rights of Communists to full citizenship in our democratic life.

Incidentally, this makes it clear how superficial is the view that the changes which are proposed have been advanced out of a desire to avoid Red-baiting. There can be no retreat in the fight against Red-baiting, except by those prepared to abandon democracy's cause.

* * *

We have said that the general principles which should form the basis for the new organization into which the Y.C.L. is transforming itself are supported by hundreds of thousands of youth. Among such youth are young people who are now in existing organizations like the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., settlements, Catholic Youth organizations, etc.

Will this result in any kind of competition between the organization whose creation we are discussing and these established youth organizations and youth serving agencies? Absolutely not.

Each of such organizations which

are traditional in American life has a specific function which cannot be substituted for by any other organization. This can be seen most clearly when we understand, for example, that the function of the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. is to educate youth in Christian principles; that the function of the Catholic Youth organizations is to educate youth into a spirit conforming to the doctrinal requirements of the Catholic Church; that the function of the Boy Scouts is to develop outdoor scouting activities, etc. None of these specific functions can be substituted for by any other organization. There is room for, and need for, the growth and development to many times their present size of each of the traditional youth-serving organizations now in the field.

At the same time, there is the possibility and the need for the mass growth and development of an organization based on the type of program discussed in this article, a program quite distinct from and more advanced than those on which all other youth organizations are based.

All of these organizations, each in its own way, will help to make a specific contribution to American democracy. What is needed, in fact, is not only such a new organization as that into which the Y.C.L. is transforming itself but also the establishment on a national scale of a center of collaboration through which all patriotic, democratic youth organizations, including this new organization, can collaborate and coordinate their activities in the fight for victory and a just peace.

The establishment of such a national center of collaboration of the youth organizations of the country is one of the major tasks which confront the youth movement of this country. Such a center of collaboration would give enormous impetus to the work now being done by youth in support of the war, would help cement national unity and would enormously multiply the contributions of youth to victory. The organization we envisage will work to help establish such national cooperation between all youth organizations in order to bring about the maximum mobilization of the energies of all youth for victory in the war and for guaranteeing the future of the youth after victory has been won.

We call upon all far-sighted young people who see the need for building such a new, broad anti-fascist youth organization on the basis of the program outlined here to cooperate with the Y.C.L. in helping to establish and build it. We publicly solicit such cooperation and are prepared to consider and discuss any serious proposal which will help to advance the objectives outlined.

The National Convention of the Young Communist League will be a historic landmark in the life of the American youth movement. It will be an important step in the direction of building a new, broad, anti-fascist youth organization of hundreds of thousands of patriotic, democratic youth, consecrated to victory and to a happier future for youth after victory has been won.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A "FREE GERMANY" AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

BY HANS BERGER

NO ONE is yet in a position to provide an over-all picture of the real situation in Nazi Germany. The "National-Socialist" dictatorship, especially under war conditions, has no barometers such as a free press, free organizations, or representative bodies which could serve to indicate the temper of the German people. The outbreak of a broad people's movement under the Nazi dictatorship will therefore always be characterized by "surprise," "suddenness," even though signs of greater or less importance have already marked the direction of such a development.

If one analyzes all the indications, slight or otherwise, reported from the most varied sources, one comes to the conclusion, in estimating the inner situation in Nazi Germany today, that *the political crisis of the National-Socialist dictatorship is being accelerated.*

The prestige of Hitler and of the dictatorship has been shaken decisively in all classes and strata as a result of the mighty defeats during this summer on the Russian front and in Sicily, by the ousting of Mussolini and the development of an anti-fascist people's movement

in Italy, and by the fearful bombardment of German cities.

Since the military and political victories of the Nazi dictatorship in the past were, in addition to terror, the source of great strength of the National-Socialist dictatorship in its influence on broad masses of the people, so the military and political defeats of Hitler and the dictatorship are beginning to destroy this influence at its base.

Hitler, the "supreme commander," is made responsible for the military defeats. Hitler, "the Fuehrer," chose the policy of attacking the Soviet Union and declared war on the United States and thus brought about the coalition of the three mightiest states of the world against Germany. Hitler, "the Fuehrer," led Germany, at whose feet all Europe lay defenseless after the victory over France, into its present catastrophic situation. The dream of the great victories, of the "New Order" in Europe and of the world under the whip of German imperialism, is coming to an end. The time of bitter awakening has begun and proceeds apace.

As a result of military blows, conditions are ripening in Nazi

Germany which awaken in every class and section the conviction: It cannot go on this way any longer; since victory has become impossible, another solution must be found. This situation is breaking up the forced unity of the German people, established with blood and terror and the most repulsive demagoguery and systematic stupefaction.

It can therefore be expected that the anti-fascist workers will become bolder and more active and their anti-fascist activity find a greater response and support among the masses. They are, of course, in the main those workers who forewarned the Germans of this development in which they find themselves today and who were, in consequence, persecuted as "traitors" to their own country, outlawed, and many of them killed. The masses of the city and rural petty bourgeoisie, more securely harnessed to the chariot of victorious German imperialism than even in the first World War, are beginning to doubt, to waver, and to look about for new leaders who could bring peace. In the top circles of the dictatorship, in the highest strata of the bourgeoisie, whose factories and shipyards in Hamburg and the Ruhr have been destroyed, in the leading circles of the army, in the Nazi bureaucracy, a desperate search has also begun for a way out of the catastrophe and efforts are under way to shift the responsibility for it from one group to another.

It is this situation also which has created a flood of uncontrollable rumors about upheavals and changes in the top circles of the dictatorship.

No one can say to what degree they are founded in the truth; anything is possible, but nothing is certain. Doubtless, these rumors also are harbingers of the sharpening crisis in the National-Socialist dictatorship.

But no matter what changes in the top circles of the National-Socialist dictatorship may follow, no matter what "palace revolutions"—in which genuine people's revolutions indeed often begin but never end—may take place, the rulers of Germany are trying to prepare a way out of the approaching catastrophe by the following methods:

1. Desperate attempts to rupture the liberation war coalition. The rulers of Germany realize the feeling of the Soviet people about the fact that we and England have not yet decided to take advantage of the favorable situation created by the Red Army for the destruction of the Hitler regime through the opening of a genuine second front. The rulers of Germany realize, on the other hand, the fear in reactionary circles here of a victory in which the "Bolshevik Power" represents a mighty power, since the prestige of the Soviet Union among the peoples has risen tremendously, that will have a powerful voice, unmistakably audible, in all post-war decisions.

The rulers of Germany understand very well the reasons, besides the military ones, which have thus far hindered the full military power of *all* the Allies from being thrown into the coalition war against Hitler.

2. The attempt to make every

military success of the Allies against the Nazi armies as costly as possible, to draw the war out as long as possible in order to weaken the Allies, to tire the Allied peoples and to give time for disruption and undermining to those forces who want to smash the liberation war coalition.

3. Induce the masses of Germany to hold out by picturing defeat as the destruction of Germany and the extermination of the German people. Defeat of Germany means the destruction of its industry, the slaughter of millions of Germans, the partition of Germany, and the end of a national German state—that is what the German masses are told day in and day out, in order to counteract demoralization, war weariness, and the growing cry for peace. All the stops are pulled out in order to falsely portray Hitler's robber war as a war to prevent the destruction of Germany and the enslavement of every single German.

* * *

Under these general conditions there was recently founded in Moscow the National Committee for a "Free Germany," which directed a Manifesto to the German people showing them a way out of the threatening crisis.

Without a doubt this committee could never have been founded without the agreement of the Soviet Union. Publication of the Manifesto in *Pravda* and in the Red Army paper *Red Star*, as well as the several positive comments in the Soviet press on the founding of

the committee and on the Manifesto, testify to the great significance which the authorities of the Soviet Union attribute to this development.

The leaders of the Soviet Union have never, as the speeches of Stalin and the Soviet propaganda to the German army prove, viewed the German people as an updifferentiated reactionary mass beyond redemption. Stalin foretold shortly after the attack of the Nazi armies on the Soviet Union, that during the course of this war, the Hitler home front would represent an ever greater danger for the Hitler regime, and called attention especially to the fact that the treacherous rupture of the Soviet-German pact by the Hitler dictatorship would have catastrophic consequences, politically as well as militarily, for the Hitler regime.

The Soviet Union, whose policies are guided by Marxist-Leninist principles, has never been guilty of such confusion as has been handed out as political wisdom in our own country as well as in England. It rejected both the thesis of the "reactionary character of the German people," and the whitewashing attempts by the Germans, especially by the reactionary Social-Democratic emigrés. It rejected both the thesis that one must hate the German people, as well as the liberal-sounding thesis that hate is irreconcilable with Marxism-Leninism.

Marxism has hated and detested all backwardness, all barbarism, all despotism, all absolutism, all cowardice, all capitulation to the ene-

mies of progress, to the forces of barbarism. In this sense, Marx, Engels and Lenin were the greatest haters. In this sense there are no greater haters of National-Socialist barbarism than Stalin and the peoples of the Soviet Union. But Marxism-Leninism, however, does not hate blindly, but with open eyes. It analyzes and understands the reasons for the backwardness, the barbarism of a people; it sees in these facts, not the eternal characteristics of a people, but the result of specific historic situations, which transform a people into pitiful and blind tools of barbarism. Marxism-Leninism not only understands the reasons for the brutalizing of a people, but understands also the factors and the circumstances which can lead a people out of barbarism, out of the confines of its crimes, out of its own cowardice and indecisiveness. Applied to Nazi Germany this signifies the *anti-fascist German revolution*, in which Germany shall be cleansed of barbarism by the Germans themselves, and in the course of which the Germans shall be freed from their backwardness, from their subservience to fascism, from their reactionary ideas which fascism has hammered into the heads of the German people. Our armies can only help in this task—but in the final analysis a people can make the turn from the realm of barbarism to civilization only through its own efforts and, through self-cleansing, liberate the world from the danger which it has thus far represented.

The National Committee for a "Free Germany" is such a center,

that kind of instrument of the German anti-fascist liberation movement which leads to the German anti-fascist revolution. Without the developments of critical proportions in Nazi Germany, professional German officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers in prison camps in the Soviet Union would not have drawn up and signed, together with Communists and anti-fascist writers, from the capital city of the enemy, a manifesto calling on their own army, their own people, to revolt against the "supreme war lord" and for an anti-fascist revolution.

Whoever knows professional German officers understands that the Soviet Government could never have compelled them to do this, even if it had had that intention. The only thing that the Soviet Union could do was to permit them to transmit to the German people that understanding which they had themselves gained, and to organize a center for the systematic transmission of this understanding, for the support of the German liberation movement. Thus, the creation of this committee and the manifesto drawn up by it, as well as the composition of the committee, are a reflection of what is beginning to take place in the heads of the German prisoners in the Soviet Union and in the heads of the German people.

German officers were trained under Hitler to see in the Soviet Union "Germany's most terrible enemy," the "destroyer of Germany." But these officers had the opportunity to recognize and to learn that the Soviet Union was never an enemy

of the German people and of Germany, and that it endeavored always to live on peaceful and friendly terms with Germany. Therefore, the organization of the national committee for a "Free Germany" and the publication of the manifesto in the *Soviet Union* is of special significance. The German east front is the main theater of war. It is there that the German army suffered its most terrible losses. It is there that more than 200 German divisions are stationed today. If the soldiers and officers of these divisions come to the same understanding as the German war prisoners who participated in the organization of the committee, if they come to the same conclusions as the officer and soldier of war prisoners came to in the National Committee and in the Manifesto, then the task of overthrowing the Hitler regime will be facilitated.

German officers and soldiers are trained particularly against Communists. The fact that now German officers and soldiers organize a committee together with Communists forced into exile, have drawn up a manifesto with a common program for a way out of the threatening catastrophe for the German people, that among the signers of the Manifesto is the secretary of the Communist Party of Germany, Wilhelm Pieck, is significant in the destruction of National-Socialist influence. For, German Communists have pledged, side by side with professional German officers, to fight for a democratic Germany. German Communists who were branded as the enemies of their country by Na-

tional-Socialism have worked out a program together with German officers for the salvation of the German nation. The creation of a committee with its present composition, therefore, not only reflects the trend of developments in Germany toward the unification of all forces from all camps in the fight for peace, in the fight to overthrow Hitler, in the fight for a new democratic Germany, but the example of the composition of this committee will furthermore speed the process of unifying all anti-Hitler forces, all forces who in Germany are searching for a way out of the catastrophe.

Above all, the establishment of this committee will make easier the cooperation of the workers with the soldiers and officers for the overthrow of the Hitler regime—and that is a decisive point for every anti-fascist revolution in Germany, where the Nazi dictatorship has hundreds of thousands of carefully selected and particularly well armed special soldiers at its command.

The Manifesto of the National Committee for a "Free Germany" is no abstract post-war speculation, not some kind of a "plan" for post-war Germany, as are so frequently concocted here and there. The Manifesto does not tell the Germans that when the war is over and Hitler is overthrown, this or that should be done with Germany. The authors of the Manifesto show the *inseparable connection* between the fate of Germany and the post-war situation, on the one hand, and the *struggle for the ending of the war* and for the overthrow of the

Hitler dictatorship by the Germans themselves, on the other. The authors of the Manifesto have no illusions themselves, nor do they offer any to the Germans, about Germany's status, if the German people let themselves be led to the slaughter by the Hitler regime to the last bullet and the last bayonet. In opposition to the National-Socialist propaganda which tells the Germans, "We're all in the same boat," the Manifesto advises the Germans to throw the Hitler dictatorship overboard, and thus to salvage the ship of Germany for the voyage into the harbor of peace. The German officers and soldiers are urged to clear out of all occupied territory completely and to march back to their homes. They are urged to disarm the Gestapo troops. The German people and the German army are urged to overthrow the Hitler dictatorship, to punish the war criminals, to purge the land of National-Socialism, to establish all democratic liberties and to form a strong democratic government. The Manifesto explains to the Germans that this must be done soon, before Hitler's 300 to 400 divisions are defeated, before the armies of the Allies occupy Hitler Germany. For only in this way can the German people prove to the world by deeds that it has cleansed itself in the purgatory of the National-Socialist dictatorship, of the National-Socialist war of conquest, and thus has won the right to enter into peace negotiations with other peoples, as a sovereign people.

The program offers the possi-

bility of an amnesty to the millions of followers of National Socialism, who have been told by National-Socialist propaganda that they would be murdered on the day that the Hitler dictatorship suffered defeat. Active participation in the liberation struggle of the German people against Hitler and the Nazi dictatorship, however, is made a precondition for this amnesty. Inasmuch as the program explains that the new government of Germany will protect all rightfully acquired property, it dispels the fear of a Communist revolution from the minds of the petty bourgeoisie and peasants and from the minds of those in capitalist circles and unites the maximum mass following for the program of a bourgeois-democratic, anti-fascist revolution. It makes easier the alliance of the various classes and sections of the German people against the Hitler dictatorship, and thus furthers the greatest possible isolation of the dictatorship and its main supporters from the masses of the people.

* * *

In this country there was a strong publicly expressed reaction to the organization of the committee.

The Hearst press, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *New York Daily News*, the reactionary and defeatist circles everywhere naturally accused the Soviet Union at once, charging that this was an attempt by the Soviet Union to bolshevize Germany. Nevertheless, neither the committee nor the Manifesto which it issued, is Soviet Russian. The committee

consists of Germans. The program has a bourgeois-democratic character; it was prepared by Germans for the salvation of Germany, to end the war through anti-fascist revolution. But it is quite clear why this committee has been denounced by reactionary circles as an attempt to bolshevize Germany by means of the Red Army. These circles see the Soviet Union as the main enemy and they fear nothing so much as the defeat of Hitler and a strong Soviet Union. They therefore pick up Goebbels' slogan and, in order to create a diversion from the decisive struggle against Hitler Germany, sing the old tune about the threatening bolshevization of Germany and of Europe. The organization of this committee inspires reactionary circles to attempt the disruption of the liberation-war coalition.

Grinding the same axe are naturally the reactionary Social-Democratic German emigrés of the stripe of Stampfer and Grzezinski and, in alliance with them, the *Neue Volkzeitung* under the leadership of Gerhardt Segar and Rudolf Katz, who are all on good terms with the reactionary Social-Democratic Federation, the Jewish Labor Committee, and the groups around Dubinsky and Antonini. These circles have repeatedly stated their position, declaring that the day Hitler is overthrown the Soviet Union will be the main enemy, in case it should survive the war. The reactionary German Social-Democratic emigrés see their future role in "taking over Germany" under the sponsorship of American and English bayonets

after Hitler's overthrow, and making of Germany a new mobilization base against the Soviet Union, a "wall against Bolshevism." Although they themselves cannot publicly refute what the Manifesto states in the main to the German people, they come to Hitler's and Goebbels' assistance and declare that the whole German liberation movement is only a "pawn in Stalin's game," so that he may in this way make known his claims to decide postwar issues. These circles fear the unity of the German people and a democratic people's Germany. They fear an outcome of the war in which the German people would take to heart, not only the experiences of the Hitler dictatorship, but also those of the Weimar Republic, the republic of capitulation to Hitler.

Various other circles, among them many liberals also, have engaged in the most diverse speculations about the causes for the foundation of this committee, and have polemized against its organization with the most diverse arguments. The most important of these arguments contend that Stalin permitted the formation of this committee without agreement with England and the United States; further that this policy is in opposition to our postwar plans with regard to Germany, and, finally, that the organization of this committee demonstrates the intention of the Soviet Union to go "its own way."

These critics would be justified if this committee represented a policy in opposition to the interests of the coalition powers. That is, however,

not the case. To urge the Germans to revolt against Hitler, to call on the German armies to refuse to obey Hitler and the Hitler generals and to march homeward, is in the interest of the Allies and of all peoples. Many committees and many governments in exile, which we tolerate on our soil, and whom we give the opportunity of political activity, as, for example, the reactionary German Social-Democratic emigrés, utilize this freedom to fight against our ally, the Soviet, and thus harm the common cause of the coalition powers.

The argument is all the more hypocritical since it comes especially from those who have no serious concern with the fact that we still permit the Soviet Union to bear the main burden in the coalition war, but who immediately get terribly excited when, through the newly organized committee for a "Free Germany," a mighty instrument evolves for the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler.

Our Soviet ally which carries the main burden in this war is fully justified in making use of all political weapons which may facilitate the struggle. And who can deny that the success of the activity of the National Committee for a "Free Germany," on the basis of its Manifesto, would mean great assistance, not only for the Red Army, but for the armies of all the Allies and for all peoples? These circles, who make cynical remarks about the committee and who engage so readily in speculations and insinuations, appear to believe that it is a question of a German-Russian

war, in which it is our "task," to see to it that both powers destroy each other, that neither power should win too quickly, that this war should not come to an end too quickly through the development of a German anti-fascist revolution, before we are ready to "cash in" as a mocking third party. These circles seem to forget that it is a question of a coalition war in which the victory of one ally is the victory of all, and in which the political and military weaknesses of the Hitler regime work to the advantage of all peoples.

The Soviet Union has sacrificed millions of soldiers and millions of civilian population in this war. Many millions of its citizens suffer torment under the oppression of a frightful enemy. As a result of the military blows which Hitler Germany has received at the hands of the Allied armies, the preconditions for a broad anti-fascist liberation movement are developing in Germany. It would be blindness to the interests of its own people, as well as to the common cause of the Allies, if the Soviet Union did not grasp the opportunity to facilitate the formation and development of the revolt of the Germans against the Hitler dictatorship. Some would like the leaders of the Soviet Union, which is fighting against 211 divisions, to get up and tell the Germans: "Whatever you may do, you will be annihilated. Even if you withdraw your armies, even if you overthrow Hitler, even if you punish the war criminals, even if you purge Germany of National-Socialism, even if you make a true de-

mocracy of Germany, all that will avail you nought. We and our Allies will annihilate Germany, and you won't have a chance."

Is it not clear that such a policy by the Soviet Union would be grist to Goebbels' mill? Is it not clear that such a policy would have to be paid for with still more blood by the Soviet armies and by the armies of the Allies? The critics of the program of the National Committee for a "Free Germany" are cynically playing with the fate of the peoples attacked by Hitler and of the armies which are fighting against Hitler. Our soldiers in Sicily realize very well the difference between fighting against the Italians, who have sufficient morale not to fight any longer for Mussolini, and fighting against German troops, who have sufficient non-morale to fight for Hitler. The political strategy against Germany, which still has over 300 divisions, cannot therefore be of such a nature as will make it easier for the Nazi dictatorship to induce the soldiers and officers to hold out to the bitter end, it must rather be such a policy which does not put the fate of the German people on a par with that of National-Socialism, which is doomed to destruction.

The critics of the National Committee for a "Free Germany" and of the Manifesto do not view the significance of the organization of this center of the German liberation movement from the standpoint of winning the war in the shortest possible time and with the fewest possible sacrifices, but rather from the standpoint of their abstract

ideas, their speculations, their fears and qualms about the structure of the postwar world.

But since the formation of the National Committee for a "Free Germany" in the Soviet Union is a mighty instrument for the development of the German liberation movement, and is thus a factor for weakening the military and political power of the Hitler regime, how can any one seriously assert that the creation of this committee demonstrates the intention of the Soviet Union not to act in cooperation with its allies? Certainly, the only criterion by which we must judge all developments is the question of whether they help the enemy or weaken him.

The organization of the National Committee for a "Free Germany" is no substitute for the military struggle against the Hitler regime, as the Red Army has so splendidly shown. It does not make the Second Front superfluous; it only facilitates the military struggle. Since the Soviet Union permitted the organization of this committee in the U.S.S.R., it gives the German liberation movement a chance to develop faster and fulfill its obligations to the German people and to the other peoples in the task of destroying Nazism.

Furthermore, the organization of the committee under no circumstances demonstrates the "unwillingness" of the Soviet Union to solve the postwar problems in conjunction with us and England. Who can doubt that if the Germans found the strength to do what the authors of the Manifesto advise

them as the only way out, that this will be a tremendous power for bringing about the utter destruction of Hitlerism and the victorious outcome for the world peoples? What grounds could there be for believing that under such circumstances the Soviet Union, England, and we, and all allied peoples could not come readily to common decisions to provide such guarantees, even as far as such a Germany is concerned, which would make impossible once and for all time the repetition of a new German imperialist adventure? And the Soviet Union, which has had to pay the most horrible price in the war against robber German imperialism, and which has proved that it knows well how to destroy fascist reaction and imperialism root and branch, will doubtless be able to provide most valuable advice on how to prevent the recurrence of such a tragedy.

Stalin and the Soviet Government have acted wisely in permitting the creation of the committee on the soil of the U.S.S.R. They have acted in the interest of their people and in the interests of all peoples. The committee is today

still a small weapon in the frightful war, but with circumstances developing as they are, it can very quickly become a mighty ally in the emancipation-war of the peoples against Hitler and the Axis. Those who want victory will greet it. For it would be insane in such a frightful struggle not to take account of the possibility of a German anti-fascist revolution.

The friends of Hitler, the cynics, the speculators, those who fear the liberation movement of the peoples more than they fear Hitler, those who have made up their minds to play the role of the laughing third party trying to cash in on the blood bath of the peoples, will continue to slander and distort the meaning of the organization of this committee, the Manifesto, as well as the fact that the Soviet Union permitted the organization of this committee on its soil. But hundreds of millions will greet the formation of the national front center and spokesman of the German liberation movement with hopes of complete and early success. For such a success would signalize victory for the freedom-loving peoples.

AFTER THE DOWNFALL OF MUSSOLINI

BY ANTONIO LOCASCIO

MUSSOLINI has been ousted and the political consequences of this event are still unfolding in Europe. The first crack has occurred in the Axis. The man who first gave life to fascism, to this new, refined system of slavery and tyranny in Italy and in Europe, has been removed from the political scene. The people of Italy, with the help of the military blows of the Anglo-American allies, will continue their struggle until the whole fascist system is destroyed and the democratic revolution is completed. The downfall of Mussolini, occurring at a decisive moment of the war, is thus an event of an incalculable importance.

We will briefly review these recent events. A few days before his removal from the political scene, Mussolini went to Verona where he had a conference with Hitler at which he requested from Nazi Germany military aid which would permit him to hold back the Allied invasion. Pressed on the Eastern Front by the powerful Red Army, and its victorious summer offensive, Hitler could promise nothing to Mussolini at the Verona conference and could only propose that the Italian troops withdraw to the Po River line of defense, in other

words, that they abandon two-thirds of Italy to the Anglo-American armies.

Therefore, as far as the immediate future was concerned, Mussolini returned from Verona with empty hands, and with an extremely grave military decision, without precedent in the history of Italy.

In such a catastrophic situation, Mussolini was not able to carry through the decision by himself, especially since he had been personally responsible for many of the political acts in the past which had been disastrous for Italy. He called together the Fascist Grand Council and placed before them the reasons which had induced him to accept the military plan of Hitler to withdraw to the Po line.

The crisis in the leading fascist circles which had been smoldering for some time came out into the open at the Fascist Grand Council meeting. The news of the Verona decisions was known to the more responsible section of the hierarchy even before the supreme organ of the Fascist Party was called into session. It was known to the monarchist circles and to the supreme command of the army. It was already known that public opinion was against this new sacrifice of

the national interest of Italy, which Hitler had demanded and obtained from Mussolini. The attempts of the head of the Fascist Government to persuade and convince his closest collaborators in the Grand Council were doomed to failure. Despite his political defeat and the profound crisis in the Fascist upper circles, Mussolini did not resign of his own accord. After being accustomed for twenty years to exercising unlimited personal power, the contrary vote of the Fascist Grand Council was not a factor which would impress him.

But this time the crisis was of such a nature that it could not remain locked within the four walls of the leadership of the Fascist Party. Military and Monarchist circles intervened. The official announcement given by the King to the nation was that Mussolini, at a certain moment, presented his resignation. This does not mean in the least that Mussolini stepped down from power voluntarily. Isolated from those very leading circles in the country over which he had had unlimited control for twenty years, Mussolini was forced (we still do not know exactly how) to disappear from the political life of Italy.

It had become more and more obvious that Italy—which since June 10, 1940, had been shaken by a profound crisis which became particularly acute in the last few months—had no way out. The only path of rescue lay in a fundamental change in the political line and the structure of the state itself, in a new direction which would completely break with the past, in the

overthrow of Mussolini, in a separate peace with the Allies, in expelling the Germans from Italy, in the destruction of the Fascist regime.

After Verona, it became obvious to the great majority of the Italian people that this path was the only way out. Also, a considerable section of the military and monarchist upper circles realized that the die-hard Mussolini's pro-Nazi alliance was disastrous, and the only way they could extricate themselves was by getting rid of Mussolini first. Hence the overthrow of Mussolini from power and his departure from the scene.

The fundamental cause of the downfall of Mussolini as the leader of the government and the Fascist Party does not lie solely in the internal crisis in the Italian upper circles. It lies above all in the fact that fascism in the past two years lost 90 per cent of its mass base and therefore could no longer appeal to the people and not even to the Blackshirts, who were affected by the spirit of defeatism and revolt growing in the army and among the popular masses.

Fascism had gone through other crises, in which it was not able to count on the support of the Italian people, and it remained in power during those times by terror and by the use of armed mercenaries. But, in the past, Mussolini had always found a way out because the Italian people, though they did not support him themselves, remained passive, hostilely passive. Just as toward the end of the War of 1916-18, so now, the tragedy of war,

the privations and suffering undergone by the masses, have spurred the Italian people to take an increasingly militant stand against the war and to strengthen their struggle against fascism.

* * *

In recent months the anti-fascist movement has grown steadily stronger. For two years the National Front had been working underground. The first conference of the five parties, the Liberal Party, the Action Party, the Democratic Christian (Catholic) Party, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party, took place, no longer abroad, but inside Italy, in December of 1942, in Milan, demonstrating that the underground anti-fascist movement was growing enormously within the country. Strikes began to multiply in all principal cities, in spite of the laws forbidding them and imposing heavy penalties on the strikers. It is estimated that from March to July 300,000 workers came out on strike in Northern Italy alone and this movement was not only economic in character but insistently advanced the demand for immediate peace. In the period from January to July, 1943, hundreds of thousands of leaflets of various kinds were distributed. Two underground papers were regularly published in Italy, a Communist paper, *La Nostra Voce*, and a liberal paper, *L'Italia Libera*.

For a long time great work had developed in the army. General de Gaulle took the occasion some time ago to give to the London press a copy of an underground

newspaper, *La Parola del Soldato*, which was distributed in thousands of copies among the Italian occupation forces in France. Moreover, for more than three years the Italian Communists published without a single interruption a magazine of an ideological, political and organizational character, *Le Lettere di Spartaco*; this was published illegally for the party cadres regularly every month.

The powerful mass movement directed against fascism and war which has developed today in Italy did not arise spontaneously by some miracle. It has been forged in long years of illegal struggle and in the course of common action of the united front of Liberals, Democrats, Communists, Socialists and Catholics which has revealed all its power and strength. It must not be forgotten that in the last twenty years tens and tens of thousands of Communists have been tried by the special tribunals for their activity and sent to concentration camps in the islands. A few weeks before Mussolini fell the Fascist Government, confronted by the growing spirit of revolt among the people, arrested 11,000 "political suspects" among whom 7,900 were listed as Communists.

But this does not in any way mean that the present widespread movement against fascism and war is Communist or is even only a Left-wing movement. It is a movement of national liberation which includes all classes of society in Italy, from the leading industrial circles to the working class, which is mobilizing Italian patriots of every

religious and political belief. In this lie its strength and its ability to develop rapidly as a political movement of decisive importance in the present crisis in Italy.

* * *

Under what circumstances did this national liberation movement come into being in Italy? Naturally the fact that Italy had become a vassal of Germany, and Mussolini the servant of Hitler, is an element which has played a big role in orientating the national patriotic sentiments of the Italian people in an anti-fascist direction. Why should the Italian people fight for interests which are not the interests of Italy? Why should they fight for a foreign power, Germany, the traditional enemy of their country, which treated the Italians with bitter contempt? These sentiments were becoming more dominant in the minds of the people of Italy. But the Italian national front of liberation is not based solely on these sentiments, but has far deeper roots.

One of the principal reasons that fascism succeeded in making headway among the Italian masses, however limited, was their ability to present their policy to the people, from the treaty of Versailles on, as a national policy, for which all Italians worthy of the name were duty bound to sacrifice. All crimes were committed in the name of the national interests and the future of Italy. Liberty was suppressed, wages were cut, agriculture was ruined for the benefit of the large landowners, small landowners'

property was confiscated, industry was concentrated in the hands of a few magnates of finance-capital. In order to make the people believe in this great crime of fascism it was necessary to organize large popular mass organizations firmly under their control. An immense network of fascist institutions was set up into which were organized millions of Italians; the workers, the peasants, the children, sports organizations, students, women, etc.

But war is a harsh reality. Through the war the national policy of fascism which, according to fascist propaganda, was to have solved the social questions, instead underwent a trial by fire and it was not able to stand the test. Through the war Italy was to achieve a definite place in the sun, a great empire, markets in the Balkans, domination of the Mediterranean, and the nation was again to become great and respected. But the war exposed the miserable fascist fantasy and the utter bankruptcy of fascism.

In the space of a few months the facts demonstrated that not only was the fascist policy not a national policy but it was the most anti-national policy in the entire history of Italy. Instead of victory, it brought defeat. Instead of empire, it led to the loss of whatever territory Italian imperialism had acquired throughout many decades. Instead of strengthening the nation, it led to the loss of the dignity and the national independence for which the Italian patriots had spilled their blood for centuries. A regime whose program produced such re-

sults must necessarily develop a crisis.

When the deceit and the treason of the so-called national policy of Fascism were exposed it was in the order of things that a national front should be organized, not under the banner of Fascism, but against it.

* * *

This is the political significance of the Italian National Front, which includes the Liberal Party, the Democratic Christian Party (Catholic), the Action Party, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party. For these reasons it is a sign of utter stupidity to think that the Italian national front is a maneuver skillfully manufactured by the Left-wing parties or an attempt by the Communists to assert their own influence. Only men who are not able to see an inch ahead of their noses could think in this manner. The formation of the Italian National Front is, on the contrary, an event of historical importance, destined to influence the course of events not only in Italy but in all of Europe. The program of the Italian National Front springs from the logic of events; it is a process of the renewal of the democratic movement in Italy and the democratic reeducation of the Italian people.

Only the fascists, Italian fascists, and pro-fascist Americans such as Hearst, Pope, and their Social-Democratic allies like Antonini can present the Italian National Front as a "Bolshevik menace."

We have seen the same maneuvers in action against the French Committee of National Liberation,

and events have shown that they were destined to miserable failure.

It is by raising the slogan of the "spectre of Communism" that Mussolini remained in power for twenty years, and it is by raising the slogan of the "spectre of Communism" that the King and Badoglio (aided in America by the Hearsts and Antoninis) are attempting to maintain in power in Italy *fascism without Mussolini*. The Italian Communists are fighting to take Italy out of the war, to expel the Germans from the country, to destroy to the very last vestiges the fascist regime and to call, in agreement with all other parties, a Constituent Assembly which will set up a truly democratic regime in the country.

Those who spread the stupid fable of the danger of Bolshevism or social revolution are playing Hitler's game, attempting to divide the forces of the popular movement in Italy and to mobilize the reactionary forces in England and America against the new Italy and the Italian people.

Fascism has not yet disappeared in Italy even though Mussolini has fallen. Without Mussolini, the king and Badoglio are still continuing the fascist war against the United Nations. Any government which pretends to restore democracy to Italy but at the same time continues the war on the side of fascist Germany, against the democratic nations, is lying. The political position of the King and Badoglio, which in the first few days was somewhat ambiguous, has now emerged as a continuation of the fascist regime, with its old alliances

and internal policies. Naturally Badoglio knows that to continue the war is rather difficult because the Italian army has decided on their own account that the war is over and they absolutely do not want to fight and they are fraternizing with the people, who are demanding immediate peace. In Sicily it was only the Germans who were fighting tenaciously. The Italians surrendered *en masse*, almost without any fighting, and the 10th Regiment "Bersiglieri" greeted rather ironically the American officers, saying "Why have you come only now?—we've been waiting for you for a long time."

The King and Badoglio, supported by some reactionary elements around the Vatican, are playing Hitler's game, seeking to obtain peace terms other than unconditional surrender. Obeying Hitler's instructions, they ask that Italy be neutralized, in other words, that Allied troops should not set foot on Italian soil, and that Italian territory should not be used as a base of military operations against Germany. In this way, peace with Italy, instead of becoming a step forward for victory in the war of the United Nations to smash the monster Hitler, would become an obstacle which would prevent the Allies from delivering the mortal blow to Hitler Germany.

The policy of the King and Badoglio is in this sense the continuation of Mussolini's policy of war and oppression and the continuation of treason against the Italian people. Badoglio is availing himself of every means, including corrup-

tion, to gain his ends. He ruthlessly suppresses the people's demonstrations, promises liberty and democracy at the end of the war, but meanwhile he is not taking a single step actually to assure democracy and liberty to the Italian people. He dissolved all parties and established martial law.

For these reasons, the Italian National Front is demanding that the King and Badoglio step aside and that power should pass into the hands of a Provisional Government supported by the people which will put an end to fascism and war and bring full liberty and peace.

As *Milano Liberta* radio station broadcast on August 10:

"The Badoglio Government has reached its limit. It has let go an exceptional opportunity for retaining power by not having concluded a separate peace since July 26. It is too late *now*. The Badoglio Government must be ousted without any hesitation in order to save the country.

"The nation's will for peace must triumph. Power must be transferred to the anti-fascist parties, to the resolute opponents of war on the side of the Germans. The government of war must be superseded by a national government of peace and freedom to save the country from catastrophe.

"The people are determined to make no concessions in this respect. The people's democratic revolution which began on July 26 must be completed to save the country and restore a free, happy Italy."

* * *

The events that have taken place in Italy are inevitably destined to exercise a profound influence on the

Italians in America, destroying the last vestiges of the reactionary fascist propaganda and orientating these masses toward the support of the liberation struggle of the Italian people and turning them into an active source of mass support for the Roosevelt Administration and its win-the-war program.

It will be the Italian people, through their historic struggles for liberation, who will take the soil out from under the feet, not only of reactionary Italians but also of prominent Italian Americans who were fascist before Pearl Harbor, and direct on truly democratic new paths the masses of honest Italian American workers.

This will have a common advantage both to the cause of democracy in Italy and in the United States. For the committee of Antonini, Pope, and Hearst is attempting to barricade the path of real democratic unity among the Italian Americans and create a reactionary center in the United States for the purpose of mobilizing American influence against the National Front in Italy and the development of the democratic revolution in that country. But this attempt will not be successful, because life is working against them and events will bring failure to the attempts of these people—events which are already developing at so rapid a tempo that no Antonini and no Dubinsky will be able to hold them back.

A number of events at the end of July and the beginning of August are significant for the development of Italian American unity in

the light of the recent historical events. One of these is the fact that the Italian American Labor Council, which Luigi Antonini, until yesterday, dominated undisturbed, today has repudiated Antonini, and the Italian American leaders of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and other progressive trade union forces have undertaken to isolate Antonini and eliminate his influence. Another development is the orientation toward the political program of the Five Parties in Italy which is taking place among the Italian political refugees in America and will have a strong influence also on the political orientation of the Italian Americans. Finally, there is the fact that 300 Italian American trade union leaders, legislators, and leaders of various organizations have organized a committee of which Congressman Vito Marcantonio is temporary Chairman and which is preparing a mass unity rally in Madison Square Garden on September 9.

Fundamental changes are taking place among the 6,000,000 Italian Americans, and the various groups and organizations. In the space of two weeks the illusions of twenty years have been torn to shreds. The Italian American masses are turning in hostility against all those individuals and leaders who tried to "sell" them fascism during the past two decades and who tried to identify the national interests of Italy with Mussolini. The prompt and angry repudiation within twenty-four hours of Antonini's shameless and open alliance with well-known former

supporters of Mussolini and with Hearst was a historic barometer of the new temper of Italian American labor and the new understanding that was beginning to sweep the Italian American masses.

If the twenty-year rule of fascism in Italy has made it possible to underestimate the national revolutionary character of the events in Italy, it must be said that the impact of events in Italy on the Italian Americans, especially its anti-fascist labor sections, was so powerful and immediate that they reflected more truly and promptly the sweeping changes that were accumulating so swiftly beneath the surface in the moods and sentiments of the Italian American masses. Clearly new perspectives and possibilities of fighting anti-fascist unity have now opened up in the Italian American community.

The Italian Americans today have every reason to be proud of the people from which they come, proud of the heroic struggle against war and against fascism being conducted by the Italian people. The Italian people have disproven for the first time the legend that it is impossible to revolt in a fascist country—a legend which has had so much support even among some noted Italian anti-fascist leaders. The Italian people have demonstrated with facts how to bring to shame such people as Luigi Antonini who insisted that the Italian people should only be asked to start passive resistance and nothing else. The struggle of the Italian people, which has swept out Mussolini, is growing and advancing under the

slogan of peace and liberty toward crushing the war regime led by Badoglio and the King. The repercussions of this political earthquake are felt today in every country, even in fascist Germany, whose Nazi leaders have met the overthrow of Mussolini in complete silence.

The Italian people shedding their blood in the streets of Turin and Milan have destroyed the legend that fascism was a political system destined to conquer the world and to challenge the centuries. The struggles of the Italian people have become therefore an example and a lesson. Those struggles are not over yet. The Italian people look to us for help and support. The greatest immediate need is smashing military blows against Italy and Nazi Germany, taking full advantage of the historic opportunities provided by the brilliant Soviet offensive to crush fascism in a decisive two-front war that will hasten the collapse of the Axis.

Our wish is that the generous and hard-working masses of Italian American people will raise themselves to the heights of this example and at the same time will realize in the best traditions of the Italian Americans, democratic unity of the Italian American masses against the divisive anti-Communist and anti-Soviet maneuvers of Hearst, Dubinsky and Antonini and will break the ring of hostility and calumny which is spread around the Communist Party, to separate it from the rest of the nation and the American people, of whom they are as the blood of their blood and the life of their life.

OUR NATION'S DEMOCRATIC HISTORICAL PATH

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
FOUNDING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

BY SAM DON

NO GREATER historical contrast exists in the range of bourgeois - democratic revolutions than the paths taken by the American bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1776 (and the Civil War of 1861) and the German bourgeois revolutions of 1848-49. The sharp contrast in the specific paths of development of the United States and that of Germany as capitalist countries left its distinctive imprints on the social development, national ideology and culture of the two respective countries.

Lenin characterized the war of 1776 as "the great, really liberating, really revolutionary war." And Marx spoke of our flag, conceived and born in 1776, and grown into manhood in 1861, as the "flag, the Star Spangled Banner which carried the destiny of our class."

On the other hand, as Marx and Engels have pointed out, the German capitalist class has proved the most cowardly in its battles with feudalism and the most fearful of the democratic aspirations and role of the young German working class. The "revolutionary" German bourgeoisie elected the King of Prussia

as its "fuehrer." This act of the German bourgeoisie called forth Marx's famous statement, "that, then, was the result of the German revolution!"*

Revolution and Counter-Revolution is composed of a brilliant series of articles written by Marx and Engels for the *New York Tribune* on the German revolutionary movement of 1848-49. The articles are priceless for an understanding of the development of German imperialism and fascism.

German feudalism was by no means completely defeated, and the bourgeoisie established an alliance with it. Prussianism became an important factor in the political expression of the German bourgeoisie. It was Bismarck who car-

* "... The Imperial Constitution, with all its appendages and paraphernalia, was definitely passed, and on March 28, the King of Prussia was, by 290 votes against 248 who abstained and 300 who were absent, elected Emperor of Germany minus Austria. The historical irony was complete; the Imperial farce executed in the streets of astonished Berlin, three days after the revolution of March 18, 1848, by Frederick William IV, while in a state which elsewhere would come under the Maine Liquor Law—this disgusting farce, just one year afterwards, had been sanctioned by the pretended Representative Assembly of all Germany. That, then, was the result of the German Revolution!" (Karl Marx, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, International Publishers, p. 93.)

ried out the historical necessity of uniting the German nation and not, as Marx and Engels fought for, the progressive democratic forces which should have united the German nation to complete the destruction of feudalism and to clear the path for a democratic progressive development of the German nation. The Bismarckian development of capitalism in Germany helped Prussianism to dominate the ideology of Germany. It was this ideology which helped Hitlerism to impose social and moral corruption on large sections of the German people.*

Of all bourgeois-democratic revolutions, however, the American revolution of 1776 was the least burdened with feudalism. At the same time, it gave birth to the first modern people's revolution and developed as the consistent bourgeois-democratic revolution. Though practically every bourgeois-democratic revolution in the 18th and 19th centuries, in the struggle to become a unified nation, had to carry on wars against foreign foes who were the allies of their feudal class, a most distinguishing feature

of the revolution of 1776 is that it originated in a war against the foreign foe who tried to transplant European feudalism and colonialism on American soil.

These distinguishing features gave birth (next to the French Revolution's "Declaration of Rights"), to the most consistent revolutionary document of the 18th and 19th centuries—Jefferson's *Declaration of Independence* and the *Bill of Rights*.

The development of the material productive forces in class relations are basic raw materials for social development and great social changes. But it would be vulgar materialism and denial of the Marxist dialectical method to fail to appreciate the role of ideology and political thinking on the success and fruition of social changes. With no ideology as guide, the revolution of 1776 could not have so successfully materialized. There could have been no Valley Forge without the revolutionary ideology of Jefferson and Paine which brought forward the creative energy of the people. Our nation will, therefore, remain grateful to such giants as Jefferson, Paine and Franklin, who boldly and unhesitatingly absorbed the best of the great European revolutionary thinkers, applying it to American conditions, and thus helping create that ideology and that weapon which was a potent force in the success of our revolution. The ideological heritage of people's revolution is a most precious gift for the character formation and the thinking of a nation. 1776 gave the

* Marx's struggle for the unification of Germany was not in vain, and left its mark on the development of the German working class. In that struggle was laid the foundation for the great German Socialist movement, of the political party and trade unions of the German working class. However, from the first days of the development of the German working class, Marx and Engels were compelled to wage a ceaseless battle against Lassalle—Bismarck's Prussian shadow and agent in the ranks of the labor movement. It was Lassalleism, that Prussian curse in the labor movement which in the period of imperialism, through German Social-Democracy, demoralized the German working class and paved the way for fascism. The German working class will yet awaken and, aided by the military defeat of fascism, restore the dignity of the German nation and recall with reverence the two great teachers and organizers of the German labor movement.

American people the Declaration of Independence. 1789 gave the French people the Declaration of Rights of Man. The German people, unfortunately, were denied such gifts by the "Prussian victory" in the 1848 bourgeois-democratic revolutions. The German revolutionary events of '48 did not produce any people's revolutionary document to be a training ground and antidote to the stimulated imposition of the Nazi ideology.

Because of the special character of 1776, our revolutionary democratic ideologists such as Jefferson and Lincoln have, more than even their European teachers, left us that great ideological heritage of the people's right to "social changes," the people's right "to revolution." Without this ideological heritage the American people would not have been so successful in the Jeffersonian battle against the Federalists, Jackson's battle against the Biddle Bank just as the Declaration of Independence was Lincoln's battlecry against slavocracy.

The great decision of the Supreme Court on the Schneiderman case gives eloquent testimony to the undying spirit, present-day effectiveness, and constantly renewed force of the tradition of 1776. For the very heart of the Supreme Court decision is the statement that the "Constitutional Fathers, fresh from a revolution, did not forge a political strait-jacket for the generations to come. Instead they wrote Article V and the First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of thought soon followed."

As significant and as far-reach-

ing as the legal aspects of the Supreme Court decision are in restoring the sacred rights of nationalized citizens, the history-making importance of the decision must also be appreciated in the light of the Supreme Court's emphasis on freedom of thought. The Supreme Court did not confine itself to a mere legal review of the Schneiderman case. To strengthen its decision and to make it irrevocable, it invoked the basic principles which gave birth to our nation. Taking freedom of thought as a starting point, the Supreme Court recognized the right to the political citizenship of the Marxian "school of thought" in our body politic and philosophy.

The Supreme Court decision cannot be considered as an automatic inevitable development. Had the field been left open to the Hearsts and other obscurantists to establish their hegemony on the ideological front of our history, and to permit them to distort Marxism, the Supreme Court decision might have been of an entirely different nature. The truths propounded by the Communist Party, which through Browder has made a great contribution to the rediscovery of American history, and which has coincided with the people's war patriotism, with the advance of the political thinking of the nation, carried weight in the Supreme Court's decision. The decade-long struggle of the Communist Party to revive our revolutionary traditions helped in the maturing of the Communist Party and the American labor movement. The Supreme Court decision,

by reaffirming the right to political citizenship of the Communist Party, reflects that process.

It is well to recall here Comrade Browder's statement that:

"Beginning with the Party's Eighth National Convention, in 1934, was launched our systematic campaign to revive American revolutionary traditions, for rediscovery and re-evaluation of American history in general. This played an enormous role, not only in the further development of our party, but for the whole country. . . ."

The American working class and American "public opinion," no matter what their particular political viewpoint, can be immensely enriched in their thinking and political activities by reaching out to grasp the scientific treasure of Marxian thinking. They will be aided by the great contribution of Browder, who by applying the general laws of Marxism to the United States, revealed the inner laws of American capitalism, the dynamics of American history and its revolutionary implications. Browder has helped to establish the premises and laws which govern the specific development of the American labor movement and that of the Communist Party, when he declared:

"Everything that has marked off the development of America, as distinguished from that of Europe, finds its origin in this 'great, really liberating, really revolutionary war,' which planted deeply in the American people the aspirations

of democracy; its unexampled growth in wealth and productive resources, its welding of a population of manifold national and racial origin into a united nation, and its extension of the concept of the nation to embrace half a continent—all those features that made America pre-eminent among capitalist nations found their origin in the revolutionary war and the mobilization of the people to carry it to success.

"This war unleashed incalculable forces among the masses, which operate down to the present day."*

It is the recognition that the 1776 "forces among the masses [which] operate down to the present day" that haunts the fascist-minded ideologists, while for the Communist Party it is the source of its strength and leadership.

What arms the Communist Party with vision, principledness and gives it a stout heart? What makes it possible for us to serve so effectively our nation and the working class? It is among other things the fact that

"We have something, however, that all others lack, the key to unlock these great treasures in the scientific study of history, historical materialism, founded by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and Stalin. With this key, even our first tentative approaches to American history transform it into a living thing, full of meat and meaning for today, throwing light and under-

* Earl Browder, *The Communist Party of the U.S.A.—Its History, Role and Organization*, Workers Library Publishers, pp. 16-17.

* Earl Browder, *The People's Front*, International Publishers, Chapter on "The American Tradition," p. 251.

standing upon every problem which our country faces at this time."*

Marxism was never indifferent to the forms of capitalist development. Participation of the progressive forces, of the working class, in the struggles between capitalism and feudalism, helps to determine the course and direction of the development of the productive forces and the emergence and growth of political democracy. Already the 1847 *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels outlines two basic conceptions:

(a) The need for a democratic alliance of the working class with the progressive democratic forces of the bourgeoisie against feudalism.

(b) The formation of independent Marxian working class parties to enable the working class to defend democracy and its historic mission for a higher stage of society, for the further development of the productive forces and political democracy.

A historic approach and concreteness are the basis of Marxist methodology. Marx applied his general laws to the specific conditions of each country and period. Thus we see how Marx and Engels and their discipline, have singled out special features in the development of the American nation, of American capitalism and American imperialism. It is the understanding of these specific features which enables us to appreciate the historical course of the American labor movement.

Marx and Engels time and again took to task the early Marxian groupings in the United States for their inability and refusal to see the specific features in the development of American capitalism, its labor movement and the proper relations of these specific features to the general laws of Marxism, and the development of capitalism and class relationships.

Marx emphasized the absence of rounded-out feudalism in the development of American capitalism. As Engels, Marx's great co-worker and friend, declared: ". . . the United States are modern, bourgeois from the very origin; that they were founded by petits bourgeois and peasants who ran away from European feudalism to establish a purely bourgeois society."*

Both Marx and Engels stressed the rapid development of the productive forces in the United States, the creative energies, moral strength and the tradition of democratic liberties in the country. In a letter written by Marx in 1879, he declared:

". . . The United States have at present overtaken England in the rapidity of economical progress, though they lag still behind in the extent of acquired wealth; but at the same time the masses are quicker, and have greater political means in their hands, to resent the form of a progress accomplished at their expense."*

It is most essential to recognize that the growth of our nation since the revolution was accompanied by

* *Ibid.*, p. 268.

* *The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, International Publishers, p. 514.

sharp national and social clashes against those classes which wanted to make a compromise with feudalism; of counter-revolutionary attempts to restore the forms of feudalism and colonialism in the United States; of counter-revolutionary attempts to bring about a Prussian form of the development of capitalism in the United States.

Historically speaking, capitalist development in the United States was inevitable, but it was by no means written in the skies that its content and form should be of a progressive character. For that, as we have said, was decided in the sharp clashes in which the people's forces in alliance with the early capitalist ideologists routed the counter-revolutionary attempts at restoration.

The battle between Jefferson and Hamilton and the Federalists was the battle to decide the character of capitalist development in the United States and political democracy. True, we must not overlook the limitations of Jeffersonian "agrarianism." But these limitations should not obscure the basic fact that his agrarianism was first of all a fight against the attempts to transplant European feudalism on American soil. (Jefferson was also the first American statesman who took up the fight against slavery because he saw in it a basis for feudalism and a threat to the development and existence of American political democracy.)

Jefferson's Jacobinism was in fact a continuation of the 1776 Rev-

olution against the Tory-Federalist, counter-revolutionary attempts to establish in the United States the rule of a Prussian-like feudal-bourgeois aristocracy. Jefferson's battles to open up the West (The Clark Expeditions, the Louisiana Purchase, etc.) and Jackson's battle for the West were also the battle for land for free farmers against feudal landlordism in combination with merchant and nascent industrial capitalism (Jackson's fight with Biddle's Bank of America).

The treason of Aaron Burr, and of the 1812 New England Secessionists were attempts with the aid of the then British and Spanish Empires to bring about a fusion and compromise between reactionary bourgeois and feudal forces, hoping to nullify the gains of 1776, stultify the development of the productive forces and disastrously curb political democracy in the United States. These treacheries, hatched together with and at the instance of Spain and Britain, aimed to rob the United States of its West lands and turn them into lands of feudal and colonial exploitation. The foreign policies, therefore, of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson were also aimed at curbing the feudal colonial encroachments of Britain, Spain and France on the American continent.

Following the Jackson era, the struggle around the various compromises with the South, the issue of the West, of the new territories, whether they should develop as feudal-agrarian states or as free agrarian states—all culminated in the Civil War, on the basic issue of

* *Ibid.*, pp. 360-361.

the path of capitalist development and bourgeois-democracy in America.

Next in importance to Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation should rank the signing of the Homestead Act in 1862, which challenged the very basis of feudalism by giving land free to those who would settle and cultivate it. The outcome of the Civil War, and the Homestead Act, have in many respects completed the battle which had begun under Jefferson on the issue of the path of capitalist development in the United States, as well as on the crucial question whether American agriculture should develop the Prussian way or in a special American way, essentially free from feudalism. Lenin, in his writings on agriculture, paid special attention to the fact that American agriculture did not develop in the Prussian way.

When the Socialist Revolution was not yet on the order of the day in Russia, Lenin posed the question—What path would be more preferable for the development of agriculture in tsarist Russia, the American capitalist path or the Prussian path of the development of agriculture? Lenin proposed the American as against the Prussian way.

"These two paths of objectively possible bourgeois development may be described as the Prussian path and the American path, respectively. In the first case, feudal landlordism gradually evolves into bourgeois Junker landlordism, which dooms the peasants to decades of most painful expropriation and bondage, while at the same

time a small minority of *Grossbauern* (big peasants) arises. In the second case there is no landlordism, or else it is broken up by the revolution, as a result of which the feudal states are confiscated and divided into small farms. In this case the peasant predominates, becomes the exclusive agent of agriculture and evolves into the capitalist farmer. In the first case the outstanding content of the evolution is the transformation of serfdom into usury and capitalist exploitation on the land of the feudal lords—the landlords—the Junkers. In the second case the main background is the transformation of the patriarchal peasant into a bourgeois farmer."*

Browder has fixed our attention on the historical significance of the struggle for the path of the development of American capitalism. On the occasion of Jefferson's Bicentennial Commemoration, Browder made a most profound contribution to the study of American history when he declared that:

"... The policies of Hamilton were shortsighted and self-defeating, and if they had prevailed over Jefferson the consequences would have been the break-up of American unity, a basic compromise with feudalism and slavery, the stultification of American capitalist development to the level of Europe, and the subordination of the American continent to the older European civilization. Lincoln's role in the Civil War was but the completion of Jefferson's 'unfinished business,' and would have been unthinkable if Hamilton had triumphed over Jefferson. In a similar manner, to-

* Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 180-81.

day's fight for the abolition of the poll tax is the 'unfinished business' we inherited from Lincoln, together with the whole task of cleansing the nation from the stench of the slave market that still lingers in Negro inequality.

"Hamilton was the typical statesman of the upper bourgeoisie; shortsighted in the greed for huge and quick profits, fearful of the unruly democracy of the masses, and therefore eager for conciliation and reunion with the defeated forces of feudal aristocracy and reaction—the most deadly enemy of the rising new system of capitalism. The perfect modern counterpart of Hamilton in today's political alignment is Herbert Hoover with his yearning for accommodation to Hitlerism. Through Hamilton's politics, if they had dominated, the American bourgeoisie would have deformed and aborted their own American capitalism.

"... Jefferson confirmed the victory of democracy for a whole era by his resolute and unhesitating project of the Louisiana Purchase. That was, at the same time, the greatest single factor in setting the grandiose outlines for the following rise of American capitalism, especially after Jackson and Lincoln had performed their tasks as Jefferson's disciples."*

Browder's recent paper on Jefferson must be constantly studied as a guide to American history and as a classical application of Marxism in establishing the inner laws of the development of U.S. capitalism.

* * *

Our nation and its economic de-

velopment were shaped in a century (1776-1861) of great social battles. The "establishment of a pure bourgeois society" (Engels) the routing of feudalism, the opening up of the West for free farming and industrial expansion, the upsurge and rapid development of productive forces, with the development of a huge internal market unhindered by feudal restrictions in industry and particularly in agriculture, and above all the successful battles of the people for democracy—all of these factors have established the material-ideological basis for the people's hope of America as "the land of opportunity."

America evolved a different pattern in the development of class relationships and political parties than those that have taken shape in the leading capitalist countries of Europe. In the first century of our development as a capitalist country, therefore, there was a certain fluidity in class relationship and less of a rigidity in the working class-capitalist relationships as was the case in Europe. This contrast is particularly dramatized and evidenced in the absence of a mass political working-class party in the United States as they have taken root in the European countries. The objective conditions and social processes enumerated above have marked off the development of the American labor movement as distinguished from the development of the European working class. These distinctive features must be constantly borne in mind, for they are basic not only for an understanding of the origin and history of the

* *The Heritage of Jefferson* (containing three addresses on the occasion of Jefferson Bicentennial Commemoration meeting, April 9, 1943), Workers Library Publishers, pp. 34-5.

American labor movement, but also because of the effects which they still have on present-day political issues and alignments.

However, basic as these distinctions are, it would be wrong to see them one-sidedly, because the very "establishment of a purely bourgeois society" has intensified the inherent contradictions of capitalism in the United States. This has especially become apparent as American capitalism became monopoly capitalism, as the United States emerged as a leading imperialist country. Thus we see that from the earliest days, as soon as the capitalist form of production became dominant, America, the "land of opportunity," also became a class-land of unemployment, of economic crises, and growing bourgeois reaction. And with the development of monopoly capitalism in the "land of opportunity" the issue of social security and democracy became the main battle cry of the nation.

Marx and Engels centered our attention on the distinctive features of the American labor movement. At the same time they also emphasized that, with the concentration of industry in the United States, with the development of a world marked by America's growing participation in it, and with the "disappearance" of free land, the class relations in the United States would become more rigid and sharper. The American working-class would then begin to play a leading role not only in the country, but also to play its part in the world labor movement.

Parallel with the line of fluidity

of class relationships, we must also see the corollary forces of sharpened class battles in the United States. We must see not only the negative features of the American labor movement in relation to Europe, but also its positive features. Already in the early 1820's we note the rise of trade union organizations in the United States. The post-Civil War rise of the Knights of Labor reflected the rapid concentration of industry and the growth of the working class. (The Knights of Labor, a mixture of early forms of industrial unionism embracing, at the same time, middle class elements and farmers, dramatized in some respects the crossing of lines of fluidity of class relationships and sharpened class battles.)

On the eve of, and following the Civil War, local Labor Parties made their appearance, testifying to the early political strivings of the American labor movement. American labor has made great contributions to American democracy. The battle of American labor for trade union rights, for the right to strike, advanced some higher forms of labor consciousness and in some respects compared favorably with that of European labor.

Walter Lippmann, in his recent book, *U. S. Foreign Policy*, has made a valuable contribution to the strengthening of the coalition of the United Nations, particularly the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. relations, in America's war for national survival. A review of his book does not fall in the scope of the present article. We shall confine our reference to one of the author's main premises which

has a bearing on our discussion.

In his opening chapter, Mr. Lippmann declares:

"The country, as I shall try to demonstrate, had a secure foreign policy toward the great powers from the decade after the end of the War of 1812 to the end of the war with Spain in 1898. . . . But in the election of 1900 the nation became divided over the consequences of the war with Spain, and never since then has it been possible for any President of the United States to rely upon the united support of the nation in the conduct of foreign affairs."

In the main, Mr. Lippmann is quite right. The unity on foreign policies to which Mr. Lippmann makes reference corresponded to the growth and unification of our nation before the monopolist, imperialist period in the United States. National unity before 1898 was achieved through sharp battles against the foreign policies of the Tory Federalists, the Copperheads, etc., since the United States' foreign policies then were part of the same major issues of struggles against the establishment of a reactionary capitalist feudal oligarchy in the U.S.

Mr. Lippmann singles out the war with Spain in 1898 as the date which marks the beginning of division in the nation on issues of foreign policy. This was precisely the war and date which ushered in the monopolist imperialist era in the United States. At the turn of the century we witnessed, therefore, a sharpening of class relations in the country and a division in the nation around the internal and for-

eign policies which persisted and grew in sharpness through the war of 1917, through the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover periods of "prosperity" and crises and "dollar diplomacy."

The rise of the menace of fascism and the Nazi drive for world conquest has once again placed the issue of foreign policy as the dominant issue before the nation. For the first time since 1898 there is a people's unity through a coalition of the patriotic classes. National unity became imperative for the realization of the correct foreign policy to safeguard our true national interests and assure victory over the Axis. But this national unity, as in the crucial days of our nation's birth and growth, will be achieved only by waging resolute war against Hitler by rallying around the Commander-in-Chief, by routing the defeatists and demanding the "unconditional surrender" from the Axis policy-makers and ideologists at home—the Hoovers, Hearsts, etc.

Recently the American press, under the title "Home Front," published a series of syndicated articles written by Herbert Hoover. The title, which indicates the purpose of the articles, is not accidental. It revealed the main strategy of the appeasers—to destroy unity in the home front as a battering ram for breaking up the coalition of the United Nations. The Hoover-Axis strategy is: create political-economic crises on the home front, in national unity, as a means of overcoming the present and growing military-political crisis of the Axis.

Bearing this in mind, the following statement from Hoover's articles on the home front is very illuminating: "In the War of 1917 our nation was spiritually united, today it is spiritually divided."

When Hoover declares that in 1917 the nation was spiritually united, he means that in the imperialist war of 1917 the capitalist class was in the main united (while the working class was divided on the issues of the imperialist war). Today, in a people's war against fascism, in America's "war for national survival," it is the working class that is united, while, unlike 1917, it is the capitalist class which is divided—the main sections of the capitalist class in support of President Roosevelt, the other section represented by Hoover, which would rather see a Vichyite America than a victory of a peoples' war against fascism. Hoover sees in the unity of the working class a great threat to his main strategy of breaking up the home front. This unity is a barrier, to the Hoover-du Pont appeasement pressure upon the whole capitalist class and to his attempts to break up national unity.

The Hoover-Axis policy of attempts to demoralize and split the American labor movement is being carried out by John L. Lewis. And wherever Lewis cannot openly split labor, he stimulates factionalism as an opening wedge for the infiltration of "unsuspected" defeatist-appeasement policies.

Earl Browder sharpened the understanding of labor's responsibilities in the people's war when, dur-

ing the Lewis mine strike provocations, he declared that: When labor abandoned the right to strike, it was not a concession made by labor to the employers or the government. (If there could be any talk of making concessions for participation in this peoples' war, it could only be applied to such hesitating and irresolute forces as represented by some of the editorial writers of the *New York Times*, who consider it a concession when they participate in a war against fascism.)

Labor has the first and greatest responsibility in our war for national survival. It subordinates everything to one condition—the waging of unconditional war upon the Axis and their unconditional surrender.

* * *

The war and its present decisive stage place great responsibility upon American labor. The American labor movement, organized twelve million strong in the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods, represents today an impressive force in our nation. It is the fruit of heroic struggles of countless generations and realizes the fondest dreams of the greatest personalities born and shaped by American labor—William Powderly, Eugene V. Debs, Wm. D. Haywood, Tom Mooney, C. E. Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster and Earl Browder. American labor, with its present role in the war, in its demand for a Second Front and international trade unity in production, becomes ever more representative of the national interests of the

entire country. The immediate, as well as the future great responsibilities of labor demand greater political activity, initiative and leadership. To discharge these responsibilities, labor leadership must attain the stature of national statesmanship. This calls for better political thinking and a richer ideological life. The appeasers and defeatists are therefore not confining themselves to political-organizational actions alone. They realize that the success of their policies is predicated upon the "softening up" of the minds of the workers through Social-Democratic and fascist-like defeatist ideologies. Labor will not move ahead unless it joins battle with its enemies on the political-ideological front as well.

What is true of labor generally is particularly true of the role and responsibilities of the Communist Party. In fact, ours is the greatest responsibility in the political education of labor. A distinctive feature of the Communist Party is its ability to politically educate the millions. The Communist Party must now more than ever dedicate itself to the task of assisting labor to fulfill its present-day responsibilities to the nation and to the fruition of the creative forces of the labor movement.

The Communist Party, by its very Marxian theory and the entire course of its historical development, is well equipped to educate the working class. The Communist Party as a political party of the American working class embodies best the merger of the revolutionary traditions of our country with the long and rich history of the American labor movement.

Browder's leadership of the Communist Party, including his unlocking of the treasures of American history, have helped to enrich the thinking of the nation and the fighting capacity of labor. American labor needs a political party which arose upon the shoulders of the giants of the American revolution and upon the shoulders of the great personalities who built the American labor movement. The Communist Party, as the American Marxian working class party, is such a party today.

On the occasion of the 24th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party—whose history and development are the source of its present win-the-war policies—it will dedicate itself to the strengthening of its ranks in the service of labor in the great cause of winning our war of "national survival," for the complete destruction of fascism.

THE SCHNEIDERMAN DECISION

BY ROBERT MINOR

(Continued from *The Communist* of August)

Part II

I SHOWED that the Communist Party looks upon the state, or, as it is called in this case, "organized government," as the indispensable chief instrument through which to accomplish the colossal social changes that the Party contemplates; that this party, if it "disbelieved in organized government," could not be what it is—the most revolutionary party of all history—but would be no more than a futile sect. I showed that the concept of "withering away of the state" is not a view held by those who "disbelieve" in the state, but is a scientific concept formulated against them by Marx and Engels, and so successfully directed against them that there remain very few sane persons in this world who still "disbelieve in organized government." The "withering away of the state" was shown to be the inevitable concomitant, the corollary, of an achievement of organized government so successful in bringing social order as to reduce the repressive function to the vanishing point, thus leaving the highly complex social organization the character of "administration of things" — not

through "abolishing the state" but through the absence of social disorder. The "ordered liberty" for which the Attorney General so loudly clamors is no more than a synonym for "withering away of the state."

* * *

Now we come to the second of the two main questions of political theory that were raised in the Schneiderman case: the question of overthrow of government by force and violence. And on this point again it is my task to show that the Communist Party is the revolutionary party of modern society and not a futile sect; that its views in respect to violence in relation to the state, under the concrete conditions of today, as in the one comparable case of the past in the United States, call for the utmost use of the organized military violence of the country's armed forces in *defense* of the government.

In doing this, I must show that the doctrine of Marxism insofar as it relates to the subject of violence and the state has very little resemblance to anything that has ever dawned upon the minds of the gen-

tlemen in the U. S. Department of Justice.

* * *

The Attorney General contended that William Schneiderman could not have been attached to the Constitution because he "was a member of and affiliated with and believed in and supported the principles of" the Communist Party which, said the Attorney General's brief, "advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow of the government, Constitution and laws of the United States by force and violence. . . ."

* * *

Both of the greatest Presidents of the United States of the past declared themselves to be adherents of the political doctrine described by the Attorney General's brief as belief in "overthrow of the government, Constitution and laws" "by force and violence."

Leave aside for the moment any question as to whether their views were "right" or "wrong," and consider only what doctrines they declared.

Jefferson wrote this belief into the Declaration of Independence, and the fifty-six signers of this first law and most formal political doctrine of the United States gave their endorsement to this doctrine.

But Jefferson did not stop with that Declaration which was directed most particularly against the British king and Government. He wrote many times that he believed violent revolution would have a necessary

part in the future history of the United States.

Lincoln first pronounced his doctrinal justification of this view in a speech in Congress in January, 1848, saying:

"Any people any where, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a sacred right—a right which, we hope and believe, is to liberate the world."

Lincoln made this speech on the day the great series of European revolutionary wars of 1848 began with the uprising at Palermo, Sicily. The same day, January 12, 1848, in London, Karl Marx was at work on the manuscript of the *Communist Manifesto*, a part of which, separated from its main body, and treated in this case as though it were a whole doctrine in itself, is the famous passage:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

"Working men of all countries, unite!"

But Lincoln in his speech in Congress did not have in mind particularly the European situation. He applied his remarks directly to the United States, as the full text of the speech shows. He referred specif-

ically to Texas, and to the war then in course with Mexico, against a background of slavery. The universal character he gave to "a right which, we hope and believe, is to liberate the world" unmistakably included in its scope the dispute about slavery in the United States, and it was so understood and interpreted throughout the succeeding years in that struggle. The slave power was high in the saddle, and from this and the belief that the Constitution protected property in slaves, it was generally assumed that the "impending conflict" over slavery would find the full military force and political power of the national government defending the "rights" of the holders of this property.

There can be no question but that the founders and creative builders of this nation were frank exponents of the doctrine which the Epigoni of the law now call a "belief in the overthrow of the government by force and violence." And certainly Jefferson, Lincoln and all of their school meant it to apply as a matter of course to the United States—but *not unconditionally, for not under all circumstances would they apply it to this or any country.* And this is very important. A sharp distinction has to be made, and the Supreme Court quite soundly made the sharp distinction in the Schneiderman case, as it would have to make if it were a Jefferson case or a Lincoln case, saying:

"There is a material difference between agitation and exhortation calling for present violent action

which creates a clear and present danger of public disorder or other substantive evil, and mere doctrinal justification or prediction of the use of force under hypothetical conditions at some indefinite future time—prediction that is not calculated or intended to be presently acted upon, thus leaving opportunity for general discussion and the calm process of thought and reason." (p. 1766)

This is a very potent distinction.

A moment's reflection will show that neither Jefferson nor Lincoln nor Marx entertained for a moment the idiotic notion that their historical doctrines were dogmas requiring indiscriminate application regardless of effect upon the course of history.

Why is it important to make this distinction?

Because idiots in high places fail to make this distinction and thereby endanger the country.

Because the sound theory of Jefferson and Lincoln on this subject (quite similar to the view of Marx) is sometimes absolutely essential for clear understanding of the necessity *not* to overthrow, but to *defend* a government in the interest of human progress.

To *defend* a government by force and violence? Yes.

For the views of Jefferson and Lincoln on this subject, like the more developed views of the modern Marxist workers' movement, found their most frequent expression in the violent *defense* of a democratic state.

Washington and Jefferson by revolution overthrew the British government of the colonies.

For Lincoln history produced a quite different situation: a great revolution leading to the abolition of slavery and the release of the fettered forces of production was wrought under the name and authority of the existing national government in civil war precipitated by a slave owners' attempt to overthrow the government.

Marx and Engels, who based their theories on the hard facts of history, did not distort their history to fit a preconceived notion. They came to their views on this subject through a study of history in which the American Revolution and Civil War played a large part. That in the United States the cause of human progress won its victory in the 1860's, not in combat with the national Government, but in its violent *defense*, did not contradict, but helped to form their views. It is not accidental if they thought it possible that such an experience of the American nation might be *typical* for a popular government not burdened with the European kind of bureaucracy and standing army.

After the French experience of the Civil War in 1871, they came to the conclusion that: "One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz; that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes," and that "the next attempt of the French Revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another, but to *smash* it; and this is essential for every real people's revolu-

tion on the Continent." (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 36).

But it was also after the French experience of 1871 and the American experience of 1861-65 that they came to the view that this might not be so in the case of the United States and England.

Up to the time of their deaths Marx and Engels had not changed this view.

It was Lenin's opinion that England and the United States were possible exceptions even up to the war of 1914, and that *only between* 1914 and 1917 did this possibility vanish.

But the great historic events transformed the conditions of these two countries and thereby caused Lenin to conclude that the exception had to be cancelled out. Lenin commented on the fact that Marx "confines himself to the Continent," and said:

"This was natural in 1871, when England was still the model of a purely capitalist country, but without militarism and, to a considerable degree, without a bureaucracy. Hence, Marx excluded England, where a revolution, even a people's revolution could be conceived of, and was then possible, *without* the condition of first destroying the 'ready-made state machinery.'

"Today, in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, Marx's exception is no longer valid." The "ready-made state machinery," said Lenin, had been "brought in those countries, between 1914 and 1917, to general 'European' imperialist perfection." (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 37).

But there is not a single dogma in the whole of Marxism, and to assume that Lenin made a political dogma on the question of violent overthrow of the state in *any* country would be political idiocy. That he made no such dogma in Russia is vividly shown by history. For a certain period in 1917 Lenin and Stalin and the Communist Party of Russia insisted that there be no attempt at, and no advocacy of, the immediate overthrow by violence of the bourgeois provisional government. It was not at all through solicitude for that government. In April, 1917, Lenin described the Russian situation as one in which "dual power is manifested in the existence of *two* governments." One was the so-called Provisional Government, which Lenin pointed out was "based not on law, nor on the previously expressed will of the people, but on seizure by force," a bourgeois dictatorship inimical to the interests of the masses. The other "government" was the unofficial but far more potent "'supervisory' government in the shape of the Petrograd Soviets of Workers and Soldiers Deputies, which possesses no organs of state power but which derives its authority from a clear and indisputable majority of the people. . . ." (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 21 et seq.)

The old government of the tsar had been overthrown, and there remained a condition of civil war, but Lenin described the Russia of that moment as "the freest of all the belligerent countries in the world," with, among other things, an "ab-

sence of violence in relation to the masses." He advised and his party accepted a policy opposing any use of violence:

"In this transitional period [May 7, 1917], as long as the armed force is in the hands of the soldiers, as long as Milyukov and Guchkov have not resorted to violence, this civil war, as far as we are concerned, turns into *peaceful, prolonged, and patient class propaganda.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 95. My emphasis—R.M.)

But of the "*two* governments," one must be removed and the other take all power. The Soviets must take power.

"It must be explained to the masses that the Soviet of Workers Deputies is the *only possible* form of revolutionary government and that therefore our task is, as long as *this* government submits to the influence of the bourgeoisie, to present a patient, systematic and persistent *explanation* of its errors and tactics, an explanation especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses.

"As long as we are in the minority we carry on the work of criticizing and exposing errors and at the same time advocate the necessity of transferring the entire power of state to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, so that the masses may by experience overcome their mistakes." (*Ibid.*, p. 23.)

In the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* it is said:

"This meant that Lenin was not calling for a revolt against the Provisional Government, which at that moment enjoyed the confidence of

the Soviets, that he was not demanding its overthrow, but that he wanted, by means of explanatory and recruiting work, to win a majority in the Soviets, to change the policy of the Soviets, and through the Soviets to alter the composition and policy of the government.

"This was a line envisaging a peaceful development of the revolution."

And when, in a workers' demonstration, "a small group of members of the Petrograd Party Committee (Bagdatyev and others) issued a slogan demanding the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government," "the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party sharply condemned the conduct of these 'Left' adventurers, considering this slogan untimely and incorrect, a slogan that hampered the Party in its efforts to win over a majority in the Soviets and ran counter to the Party line of a peaceful development of the revolution." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, pp. 186-187.)

There must be no prettifying of history. In the Russian Revolution of October-November, 1917, there *was* a state; there *was* violence; and there was a *violent overthrow of a state*. That there was a *minimum* of violence in the actual taking of power, and that the more fully violent struggle came later in defending the new revolutionary state, does not alter the essential character of the event, but rather typifies such events.

But it is gravely necessary to understand this phenomenon, not simply from the policeman's-eye-view of a ridiculous witness who "only read" the party's theoretical

literature on this subject "to secure evidence, reading and underscoring those portions which, in his opinion, 'had to do with force and violence or overthrowing of this system of government other than by lawful means provided in the Constitution.'"

Why is it supremely necessary to clarify these matters? Because any shallow interpretation of a serious and established political doctrine gives aid and comfort to the powers of Nazi darkness whose main stock in political fraud includes such deceitful distortion.

An example in Spain in May, 1937: The Italian and German *agents provocateurs* in Barcelona were able to incite an *armed insurrection* with the aid of the Trotskyites, inside of the Republican city, by staging it as an attempt to "overthrow the capitalist government" of the Republic. The idea of "overthrow of capitalist government"—as a fixed dogma—had some dangerous successes among workers befuddled with "theories" of Trotskyites (who advocate overthrow of the state of Soviet Russia as well, and *always* serve reaction). Obviously this was *not* the Marxian course!

The Marxists, the Communist workers, were among the Republican forces that defended the Spanish Republic and put down the Nazi-instigated revolt by force of arms. Their course was in thorough accord with the Marxian doctrine in regard to force and violence in relation to the State: the progressive, popular State was *defended by force and violence*. And *this*

was the *only* possible application of the revolutionary Marxist view.

Much dogmatic nonsense is made of the word "epoch," in connection with this subject. The concept of the "epoch of imperialism" confused some people; they thought that the arrival of an "epoch" settled all questions, that they need think no more, that now at last they had a justified dogma that in the United States and England there must be a course of history identical in this respect with what appeared as a general pattern of the Continent of Europe. The worst enemies of Leninism now argue that the cause of the United Nations must be "also imperialist" because the present is an imperialist epoch.

But Lenin warned against dogmatic conceptions as to epochs. For instance, when in 1916 Rosa Luxemburg had made the mistake of reasoning dogmatically that there "can be no more national wars" "in the epoch (era) of this unbridled imperialism," Lenin sharply pointed out that such was not the Communist view of "epochs." He showed "how absurd it would be to employ the term imperialism in a stereotyped fashion by deducing from it that national wars are impossible." Referring to "possible and probable" national wars of liberation of Asiatic countries, he added that "national wars must not be regarded as impossible in the epoch of imperialism even in Europe." (Lenin: *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 202-5.) Nor did he exclude the greatest of the capitalist states from possible participa-

tion in a coalition that might be engaged in a great national war in Europe. (See Lenin: *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 225.)

Just because Lenin said that in August, 1917, the United States and England had slipped into a condition like the "all-European, filthy, bloody morass of bureaucratic-military institutions to which everything is subordinated and which trample everything under foot"—are we to conclude that all men are bound by this to a dogmatic idea that this remains so in all cases and under all circumstances throughout an "epoch" even though every one of us knows that today the United States and England are *not* in such a "filthy, bloody morass of bureaucratic-military institutions"? If we do we are not Communists, but helpless dogmatists paralyzed by phrases.

"What! No bureaucracy!"—we can hear the guffaws of the *Chicago Tribune*, the *New York Daily News*, Hearst, Bricker, Taft and Nye—for it is a fashion of all who oppose the nation's just war against Nazism-fascism to say that we are being swallowed by a New Deal bureaucracy. Senator Byrd has recently written for the Hearst press a whole thesis to prove, by sheer statistical numbers of persons in federal employ, that bureaucracy is subjecting the land to "government by Frankenstein." And, as this will be a slogan demagogically used by all Hitler's "anti-bureaucratic" admirers in the coming election, we must clear it up.

Certainly there is bureaucracy in our country, and bureaucracy is al-

ways a danger. But bureaucracy is not determined by the number of persons employed by the government. Many fools try to measure it by sheer numbers, and for a century this has been one of the favorite means of "proving" that all social progress is impossible. The degree of bureaucracy is determined, not by numbers but by *separation from the people*. To say that the social legislation and measures that characterize the New Deal constitute a swamping of the country's democracy under a flood of bureaucracy is a favorite slander by the reactionaries, but it is a slander.

And: "What! No Militarism!"—we can hear the squeal of the pacifist aids of the fifth column who think "militarism" means a big army, and that a large army is always militarism. But never did an authoritative Communist voice say that the size of an army itself was a reason for classifying countries on the European continent or elsewhere as bureaucratic and militaristic—and certainly not a great draft army of the people in a just war. Always Marx and all his successors have found the fault *not* in an army, but in a "standing" army, and in an officer caste corresponding to fixed class lines. Always the Marxists sharply distinguished between an army separated from the people—and an army organically a part of the people. It is in this relation that Communists have always favored universal military service. To say that the present splendid democratic military organization of our country is "militarism" is a con-

temptible slander. The draft by which the entire youth of America gives obligatory universal military service to the nation is not only not militaristic, but is an enormous bulwark of the democracy of the nation.

The United States and England, together with our allies, are engaged in a democratic struggle fully as justified as any ever known in their early history, and the forces of democracy are more alive within them than ever before.

* * *

The Supreme Court, in ruling that freedom of speech and thought on this subject is defended by the United States Constitution, expressed no more nor less than the most elementary truth of American history and present American national interest.

The Minority View

The minority view is well worthy of attention, if only because it serves to sharpen the meaning of the decision by contrast.

Chief Justice Stone, dissenting, refers to Marx's *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 as "the fountain head of Communist principles." But of the fountain head he quotes only *one-half of one sentence*—the words "*only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.*" It is probable that this expression about overthrow of "social conditions" is taken as synonymous with overthrow of *government* or *state*.

This is misleading.

In the most outstanding experience of America, the "forcible over-

throw of . . . existing social conditions" was not in the least synonymous with overthrow of the State. On the contrary, it was accomplished only by violent *defense* of the state.

The assumption of the dissenting minority of the Court is painfully out of accord with the fact that just thirteen years after the *Manifesto* was written, the political principles so magnificently expressed in it had their very first test under American conditions—when the outstanding American Communist leaders of the time were commissioned as officers in the U. S. Army, and the International of that time, under the leadership of the authors of the Communist Manifesto, was busily making use of the Manifesto, in five European languages, as its main literary instrument for work throughout Europe, the chief feature of which was to rally military and political support for the *Government of the United States*.

And what happened in America in the 1860's was precisely the "forcible overthrow" of the most firmly fixed "social condition" of the time. Curiously enough, the President of the slave-owners' Confederacy thundered about the right for the free owners of slaves to "overthrow government" by "revolution"—repeating Lincoln's earlier words even as Trotskyites now repeat and distort Lenin's clear and valid words to defeat Lenin's purpose. But it was not the United States government that was "forcibly overthrown." On the contrary, the Government was very forcibly *defended* by Lincoln, the

consistent believer in the doctrine of the right to overthrow governments; and in this he was magnificently aided, as he acknowledged in a letter to Marx, by the very people who formulated the political doctrines expressed in the Communist Manifesto, and particularly expressed in the sentence half of which Chief Justice Stone quotes, about "forcible overthrow" of "social conditions."

How could the Justices of the minority make so strange a misjudgment of the content of this historic document?

Clearly because they resorted to other material than the words and deeds of the authors of the Manifesto to judge the meaning of the Manifesto. After quoting but *half of one sentence* of the famous Manifesto, the minority undertakes to show the character of the doctrine contained in it—not through the words of the document itself, but through repeated quotations from another document—a book written by—*N. Bukharin!* It is the notorious work of Bukharin called *ABC of Communism*.

Chief Justice Stone found this book to be his best source for quotations attempting to show, first, that the Marxian doctrine holds that under all conditions the peaceful realization of the aims of the workers is impossible; secondly, that this doctrine necessarily precludes any civil rights for the bourgeoisie and requires that one must deprive them of all freedom, must "chain them hand and foot"; and thirdly, that "it is necessary above all things, to undermine and destroy the army

in order to overcome the bourgeoisie.”

That all three of these “doctrines” are, from the point of view of Marxism, distortions, that they are at the very best one-sided, incomplete and misleading, and that all three stem out of Bukharin’s false idea of the State for which he was roundly denounced by Lenin in twenty-five years ago and which Stalin called “semi-anarchist nonsense,” was obviously not known to the Chief Justice. The truth is that the Bukharin book had gained such notoriety by its stupid distortions that the most common means of taunting Bukharin was to call him “the author of the *ABC of Communism*.” (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 9.)

It would have been better if the footnote to the dissenting opinion, instead of conceding that Bukharin “had later been expelled from the Russian Communist Party,” had said that he recently confessed to the crime of treason, admitted that he had participated in the assassination of several Soviet officials, that he had been conspiring to “arrest” Lenin and Stalin (really to murder them) and to overthrow the Soviet Government even prior to the time he wrote the book, and that at the time he was brought to trial for treason the book was publicly mentioned in the press as an example of the degeneration of its author into an espionage agent of the German Nazi government.* Bukharin’s false ideas as to the State, as to the question of violent overthrow and

“withering away” of a state, were expressed in 1916:

“... It is absolutely wrong to seek the difference between the [Communists] and the anarchists in the fact that the former are advocates and the latter opponents of the State. . . .

“Social-Democracy** . . . now more than ever must emphasize its hostility in principle to the State. . . . The present war has shown how deeply the roots of the State have penetrated the soul of the workers.”

Lenin immediately attacked Bukharin, saying:

“That is wrong. . . .” “. . . the main point of the difference in the attitude of the [Communists] and the anarchists towards the State [cannot be] overlooked.” “[Communists] are in favor of utilizing the modern State and its institutions in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class, and are equally in favor of utilizing the State for the peculiar form of transition from capitalism to Socialism. This transitional form, which is also a State, is the dictatorship of the proletariat. The anarchists want to ‘abolish’ the State, to ‘blow it up’ (*sprengen*) as [Bukharin] expresses it in one place, erroneously attributing this view to [the Communists].” “The [Communists] . . . recognize that the State will ‘gradually’ die out, will ‘fall asleep,’ after the bourgeoisie has been expropriated.” (Stalin: *Leninism*, Vol. II, pp. 222-23.)

After Lenin’s death in 1924, when Bukharin published a claim that

* Bukharin and several co-conspirators were convicted and executed in March, 1938.

** I.e., the Communist movement as it is now called.

Lenin in 1916 "*had a wrong attitude to the postulate on the blowing up of the State. . . . and confused that question with the question of the dying out of the dictatorship of the proletariat,*" Stalin recalled and repeated Lenin's denunciation, pointing out that Bukharin's views amounted to a "semi-anarchistic mess." (*Ibid*, p. 223.)

That the minority of the Court derived from Bukharin's book a conception as to the Communist attitude toward the army which is not and never could be the attitude of Communists, is unfortunate at a time when the whole of the effort of free mankind for survival depends to some degree upon clarity on the subject of the army of our nation.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

On the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which Schneiderman had correctly testified would mean that "the majority of the people shall really direct their own destinies and use the instruments of the state for these truly democratic ends," the Supreme Court spoke in terms completely reflecting historic reality:

"In the general sense the term may be taken to describe a state in which the workers or the masses, rather than the bourgeoisie or capitalists are the dominant class. Theoretically it is control by a class, not a dictatorship in the sense of absolute and total rule by one individual. So far as the record before us indicates, the concept is a fluid one, capable of adjustment to different conditions in different

countries. There are only meager indications of the form the 'dictatorship' would take in this country. It does not appear that it would necessarily mean the end of representative government or the federal system."

In the principle involved there is nothing strange to America's dynamic history, if we allow that our revolutions have been only bourgeois. Marx's theory cannot be understood unless we know that it was not *simply* concerned with the dictatorship of the *proletariat*. It is but a part of a more general historical theory by which Marx saw, as Lenin said, "the necessity of the dictatorship of *any* revolutionary class for its victory." (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol VII, p. 241.) In Germany in 1848 Marx stated the matter:

"After a revolution, every provisional organization of the state requires a dictatorship, and an energetic dictatorship at that."

But, as the Supreme Court says, "philosophies cannot generally be studied *in vacuo*," and so we will look into concrete American experience on this matter as well. The general form of this view was expressed by General William Tecumseh Sherman when he was engaged in the desperate enterprise of saving American democracy by military means. He wrote to Lincoln: ". . . we will remove and destroy every obstacle, if need be, take every life, every acre of land, every particle of property, every thing that to us seems proper; that we will not cease till the end is at-

tained; that all who do not aid us are enemies, and that we will not account to them for our acts. If the people of the South oppose us, they do so at their peril; and if they stand by, mere lookers-on in this domestic tragedy, they have no right to immunity, protection, or share in the final result." (Sandburg: *Lincoln*, Vol. II, p. 391.)

And if we repeat that the cause for which he applied these methods was the cause of democracy, and that by winning that fight by these methods Sherman, Grant and their "Captain," Lincoln, served the freedom of mankind on a grander scale than any had served it before, we are but giving the first ray of light upon what Marx meant by "dictatorship" as an inevitable stage in the highest moments of crisis in the struggle against slavery and against *dictators*. Lincoln did not find that General Sherman showed a lack of attachment to the to the Constitution but tried in vain to get Sherman's permission to publish the letter.

* * *

The Supreme Court also showed that American history is not abandoned when it referred to Schneiderman's views on "nationalization of the means of production and exchange," saying:

"None of this is necessarily incompatible with the 'general political philosophy' of the Constitution as outlined above by the Government. It is true that the Fifth Amendment protects private property, even against taking for public

use without compensation. But throughout our history many sincere people whose attachment to the general constitutional scheme cannot be doubted have, for various and even divergent reasons, urged differing degrees of governmental ownership and control of natural resources, basic means of production, and banks and the media of exchange, either with or without compensation. And something once regarded as a species of private property [i.e., property in slaves—R.M.] was abolished without compensating the owners when the institution of slavery was forbidden. Can it be said that the author of the Emancipation Proclamation and the supporters of the Thirteenth Amendment were not attached to the Constitution? We conclude that lack of attachment to the Constitution is not shown on the basis of the changes which petitioner testified he desired in the Constitution."

* * *

This is a time when, above all times, the full validity of the Marxist world outlook must be insisted upon in the living terms of today's and tomorrow's history.

We hope no one will think we are arguing for a pacifist view of the questions that center around the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State, such as that of force and violence, of "withering away," etc. Pacifist views, which are invariably anti-Marxist, can only aid the subjection of the world to Nazi violence. No view of violence but that which sees the need now of the most extreme degree of the superbly organized violence of our Army

and Navy can serve the nation.

Is it not necessary to think freely of the fact that in the only two cases when the violent overthrow of the U. S. Government has been placed on the agenda of history the Marxist workers' party has answered by its defense with arms in hand in the uniform of the U. S. Army?

* * *

The Supreme Court did not doctrinally justify the Communists' or any other theory or political opinion. By the function of the Court it was not called upon to do so. Under the American system, the sound constitutional view is that the *people* and *not courts* decide what political programs are good and what are bad. The Supreme Court justified nothing but the Constitution and the constitutional application of laws.

* * *

But the rest of us, we who are not in the robes of justice but must when possible wear our country's uniform of war—and we recall that the Justice who wrote this decision laid aside for a time the robes of the court to wear the uniform of our Army—we *must be free to justify political doctrines*. Primarily, of course, it is a question of the right of free political association of the workers, the labor movement. Freedom of the labor movement for political association results in its arriving at doctrines that aid our country and all of progressive mankind in this war of survival—just as the past free political thinking first delivered in birth and then pre-

served the life of this nation.

In times like these the greatest nations live or die by use of guns—and *correct thinking*. A nation whose labor movement does not win for itself at all cost its full freedom of thought and for its members the right of doctrinal justification of the most advanced political theory, would be at the mercy of the worst political adventurers.

Opportunists speak of the labor movement as having two forms of struggle—the economic and the political. No, there are not two forms, but *three*. The third form is the *theoretical* struggle.

“Engels recognizes *not two* forms of the great struggle” that the Communists conduct—“(political and economic), as is the fashion among us”—“*but three, adding to the first two the theoretical struggle.*” (Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. II, p. 48.)

A distinguishing mark of the Communist Party is precisely its stubborn insistence upon bringing to the whole working class the habit and capacity of theoretical judgment.

There is now, irrevocably begun, a “sense of theory among the workers.” What is its origin? Its belated origin is to be found in the very depth and nature of the crisis in the national life.

And what is the practical immediate importance of the freedom of the American people in political thought, in theoretical development in what the Supreme Court called “doctrinal justification” of the political principles that free thinking produces?

It is in the fact that "practical economic" struggle alone in the present war crisis would destroy the United States as a nation. It is in the fact that the "political" struggle added alone to the immediate, narrow economic motivation would produce the politics of the *Chicago Tribune*, of John L. Lewis, the Trotskyite sabotage specialists, and of the Norman Thomases. It would be politics without the theory, that is, without the systematized thinking applied freely to the experience of our own country and others, without the sound theory which is absolutely indispensable to make us see the life-and-death reasons for the subordination of all things to the winning of the war.

Earl Browder in the article "The Strike Wave Conspiracy" in *The Communist* of June, 1943, and in his subsequent report to the Plenum of the National Committee of the Communist Party published in *The Communist* of July, showed with terrific force what would be the consequences of the political decapitation of the labor movement which would be the real effect of "illegalizing" the free thought of the labor movement in respect to Marxist views. We have the alternative of freedom for over-all thinking, which is to say *theoretical* understanding of the nature of the war and of national policy—or a so-called "practical" drifting of the trade unions in the current of day-to-day considerations, i.e., their victimization by every shady adventurer. All shady adventurers belong to the enemy sooner or later. The Attorney Gen-

eral's policy of solicitude for the "civil rights" of every vile preacher of Nazism and Trotskyite saboteur while he is attacking the right of political association and thought of the American trade union movement and Communist Party, has done much to weaken the no-strike policy of labor and to strengthen the openly operating pro-fascists in the great industrial centers.

Inseparable from the freedom of political thought is the right of political association. Interference with the American labor movement's right of political association could only mean (in practice, under the conditions of the United States today) the formal dissolving of all political organization *except* that of the political groups, juggling with either of two party names, most of whose leaders meet in the directors' rooms of banks and in rich men's clubs and who can run things without any formal right of political association. It would mean dissolving the popular political organizations of the masses which unify the nation with the Roosevelt Administration, with its social legislation and its policy of strength for our nation through alliance with the Soviet Union and the other democracies against the Axis. It would mean their dissolution in favor of carefully organized anti-Administration forces which would appear as "non-political," as operating not parties but a "free press"—such as the *Chicago Tribune*, the N.Y. *Daily News*, the Hearst and Howard press. It would mean decapitation of the trade unions by

stiffing their support of the nation's war.

To admit that the right of political association of the people is subject to debate would be to admit in effect the debatability of the question of Naziism, i.e., the Nazi cause as against the whole cause of human progress, and the life and character of this nation.

This question of the right to free thought and free political association is not on the agenda for settlement with words; it is being settled by "other, i.e., forceful instruments."

* * *

What is the Marxian doctrine in regard to violence in relation to the State? In the concrete life of today—and "there is no abstract truth; truth is always concrete"—this Marxian doctrine is that democratic states will die that are not defended by violence.

The greatest essential for our country today is for the crescendo of military violence, of an Anglo-American offensive in Western Europe, which absolutely must be achieved now, this summer, to be supported by a unified American people—and, most necessary of all, a unified labor movement living up to the no-strike pledge and lifting war production to the unprecedented heights that will give plenty to the offensive in Europe and the Pacific.

Our American generals are now indicating to the peoples of Italy and "the Continent" that the "filthy, bloody . . . bureaucratic-military institutions" now ruling over their countries must be "smashed"

—not for aims of a single class but for the liberation of their nations as nations. Such is the condition today on "the Continent."

Elsewhere—in the United States and England, the opposite condition prevails—the support of the Government in a national unity of which not the least important part is the labor movement. Certainly the exemption that Marx made of the United States and England is as much in the *practice* of the Communists and the labor movement, and is as fully justified by Marxist-Leninist theory, today as it was in 1861 and as it was put into words of Marx in 1871.

History does not reproduce in the same form any condition of the past; and today's enormous concentration and centralization of giant industry under the hegemony of finance capital is a new condition. But under the conditions of today the decisive forces and leadership of organized labor, and the Communist Party are pursuing a policy in which our country is treated as outside of the sphere of internal violence in the seeking of labor's aims. That the exemption may be extended even to "the Continent" of Europe after the destruction of Hitlerism—without the smashing of the state machinery of the republics that will be set up by the peoples on the ruins of the "filthy, bloody, bureaucratic-military institutions" of the Hitler-Quisling occupation—and as a result of successful application of the most extreme forms of military violence, of which we must have the highest maximum on "the Contin-

ent" in the immediate future, is within the logic and the hope of our efforts.

For what is the prospect of the extension of our alliance with England, the Soviet Union, and the other United Nations beyond the war and into the peace—unless it visualizes a long period of friendship and collaboration of the anti-Hitler coalition and peoples in the establishment of a just and durable peace and the organization of

security and economic prosperity in post-war reconstruction?

[Correction: In the first part of this article, published in the August issue, I said that the German Social-Democratic Party emerged from the period of Bismarck's anti-Socialist Law with "nearly a million supporters." I should have said nearly a million and a half. After the law was eliminated there was a rapid further increase.]

NOTES ON BRAZIL

BY C. MOTA

BRAZIL, as part of the anti-Hitler coalition, is engaged in this global war in which the fate of all nations and peoples is at stake. In this people's war for national liberation Brazil's full participation—the rapid mobilization of all the people and the nation's resources—is imperative.

This task is the sacred duty of the Brazilian Government, its people, labor, and each and every patriot. National unity around the Vargas Government will unfold and ensure this full participation. The very existence of Brazil, its development and progress, depend on it. It is in the light of this foremost task that the situation within the country must be viewed and the course charted. And it is in the light of this task that we must examine all prevailing conditions that are obstacles to the Vargas Government and to the people in their path toward full mobilization for the war.

Clarity on these questions will contribute toward forging the broadest national union, which will embrace all patriotic Brazilians, all opponents of Hitlerism, regardless of their political and religious beliefs, without which Brazil cannot give its maximum in the destruction of Axis oppression.

Clarity is required especially in

order to expose the treacherous role being played by the fascists, Integralistas and Trotskyites, who are trying to create confusion and strife, and to stir up hatred and distrust against Vargas' war policies, because these policies are aimed against Hitler and his accomplices. They are seeking to discredit the war measures of the War Government, and to undermine the will to victory of the people. They are engaging in treasonable activities and plotting provocations against the U.S.S.R. and against the Vargas Government which heads the national defense. These traitors must be exposed, combated and crushed. This is an urgent war necessity. This is necessary for ensuring victory.

* * *

Under the leadership of President Vargas, Brazil played a vital role at the Rio Conference in the building of Hemispheric unity against the Axis. Following this conference Brazil entered the war and became a member of the United Nations. The determined anti-Axis policy of Brazil, the largest country of Latin America, with an area nearly half of the South American continent, with 47,000,000 inhabitants (one-third of the popu-

lation of Latin America and half of South America), was decisive in influencing the foreign policy of the other South American countries. It helped influence all the South American nations away from the poison of Argentina's fascist policies of assistance to the Axis, under the cloak of "neutrality" and the pious slogan of "moral Pan American solidarity." It prevented the crystallization of a pro-Axis bloc of Latin American nations and helped to draw Chile away from the "neutral" policy of Argentina. When Argentina, acquiescing to Germany's demands and "promises" of "safety of navigation," stopped its ships from sailing to the U.S.A., and exerted her influence to have this policy endorsed by other Republics (in this instance, Chile and Brazil), her efforts met with failure. The Brazilian Merchant Marine continued to contribute its share to the war effort. The loss of thousands of Brazilian lives has but increased the war determination of the government and galvanized the anti-fascist will of the people for vengeance. It set in motion new forces and new energies throughout the breadth of the nation.

Upon an agreement with the U.S.A., Brazil took the necessary steps to meet some of the pressing demands of the war industries of the U.S.A. Brazil greatly increased its exports of strategic materials considered by the Army and Navy Board of Munitions as indispensable for the war. The source and supplies of these materials are in whole or in large part outside of

the United States, as, for example, bauxite, manganese, rubber, quartz crystal, industrial diamonds, byrril ore, mica, kapok, titanium ore, zirconium, etc.

The use of military bases at Natal, Pernambuco, Belem, coupled with the efforts of Brazilian labor and armed forces, contributed greatly to the successful transport of troops and munitions for the Allied offensive in Africa. Brazil has now approximately 600 airports, all of them being used by the U.S.A. in this war emergency. Several important factories, such as the Lagoa Santos Aircraft factory, the Curtiss Wright engine factory at Rio, the Air Force factory in Galeao and many others, are producing war materials for the defense of Brazil and for the United States.

The Brazilian people want to take an active part in the military theaters of the war and consider that the present war policy of the government must be supplemented by active military participation. As the Brazilian Ambassador to England, Jose Moniz Aragao, said: "Brazil is prepared to send an expeditionary force against the Axis." (*New York Times*, July 7, 1943.) Such a military participation would give a new meaning to and represent a higher stage of the anti-Axis Hemispheric Front.

Since its entry into the war, Brazil has shared with the U.S.A. in the defense of the Guianas, from which the United States obtains most of its imports of bauxite badly needed for its aircraft industry. Consistent with the traditional ties of friendship and cultural relations

that always existed between the Brazilian and French people, Brazil has expressed its enthusiastic support to the people of France. It could not be otherwise, if one takes into consideration the great influence that the French Revolution and the ideals of fraternity, liberty and equality had upon Brazilian political life. Imbued by these same aspirations, Brazilian troops garrisoned in French Guiana, backing the right of the people inhabiting that territory to handle their own affairs, supported their demands for the immediate removal from office of Mr. Weber, the Vichyite representative. It was in this same spirit that Brazil refused permission for Mr. Peyrount, former Vichyite Ambassador in Argentina, to leave Brazilian territory. Only after U. S. State Department intervention in his behalf, as reported in the press, was he then allowed to leave Brazil for Algiers.

* * *

In line with Brazil's anti-Hitler policy and orientation was the very warm tribute paid by Foreign Minister Oswaldo Aranha to the U.S.S.R. on November 7. The Foreign Minister of Brazil, voicing the sentiments of the nation, expressed the great admiration and gratitude for the heroic deeds of the Red Army which are held by all Brazilian patriots. Be it in public demonstrations, in meetings or in the press, the name of the Soviet Union—its heroism and epic deeds—is greeted and cheered with tremendous enthusiasm. For the first time in many long years news and infor-

mation regarding the U.S.S.R. is permitted to be printed and broadcast. The Dean of Canterbury's book *Soviet Power*, after being confiscated three times, was finally permitted to be published and its distribution has reached the third edition. Ambassador Davies' *Mission to Moscow* is also being published in Brazil. In the words of General Flores da Cunha, the publication of *Mission to Moscow* permitted the people of Brazil for the first time to have a real account of the Moscow trials.

* * *

The history of Brazil, since its discovery in 1500, has been a history of struggle, of rebellions against tyranny and foreign domination. The rightful aspirations of the people for liberty and independence, their political activity and militancy, are rich pages in the history of Brazil. In the recent years, a vicious anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaign has been the main weapon used by the reactionaries and fascists in Brazil against everything that is progressive and in the interests of the nation. It has been systematically used against the forces that opposed tyranny, and fought for Brazil's full national independence, its industrialization, the development of its great natural resources in the interest of the people and nation. As far back as in 1930, during the revolution that brought President Vargas to power, even Vargas was accused by his opponents of being a "Communist," of heading a "Communist revolution," of being "financed by Mos-

cow." Today the bogey of Communism is being used by the agents of the Axis, by the enemies of Brazil, to disrupt the national war effort and the unity of the people. It is still a dangerous weapon in the hands of the fifth column, but it does not play the same damaging role as previously.

Among other things, the dissolution of the Communist International dealt a devastating blow to the Axis forces in Brazil as well as in other countries. Commenting on the dissolution of the Communist International, the newspaper *Diario Carioca* in an editorial declared:

"There should no longer be any doubts, and all prejudices should vanish between the Soviet Union and all the United Nations; agreement between them will bring about a real coordination and hasten the victory of democracy. This resolution should be greeted with all enthusiasm."

Maciel Filho in *A Noite*, also praising the wisdom of this decision, said: "It greatly strengthened the ties between all United Nations." In *Jornal do Brasil*, Porto da Silveira characterized this decision as a "patriotic decision of those who will win the war and a guarantee of their attitude after victory." The President of the National Federation of Brazilian Industries referred to it as: "The beginning of a new era in the relations and exchange between peoples." Moreover these views are strengthening the growing sentiment and movement within the country, including in governmental circles, for establishing dip-

lomatic, cultural and commercial relations between the U.S.S.R. and Brazil.

* * *

The Vargas Government has recently taken several measures that will strengthen the bonds of good neighborly relations between Brazil and other South American countries. In accordance with agreements reached with Paraguay and Bolivia, the use of the port facilities of Santos was granted to these countries. The same agreement stipulates the conversion of the Parana River into a great commercial waterway, and the construction of railway connections between Brazil, Paraguay and Bolivia. The complete details and clauses of these agreements and the financial arrangements have not been made public. This program if carried through will bring new changes in the social, political and commercial relations between the peoples of South America. Brazil has canceled the seventy-one-year-old Paraguayan war indemnity debt, as a friendly gesture toward that country. As a contribution to the defense of the Hemisphere, a gift of 110 training airplanes built in Brazil was given by Brazil to the sister Republic of Chile.

* * *

Brazil's participation in the war against the Axis has brought about a new realignment of forces in the country. Due to the existing laws that have abolished Congress and all political parties and constitutional rights, this new political re-

grouping does not yet manifest itself in a unified or all-embracing organized form. Nevertheless, the crystalization and further development of the anti-Axis and anti-fascist forces within the country propels Brazilian national unity and is creating the conditions for overcoming existing difficulties and for bringing about national measures that will supplant these obstacles. Among those measures which would strengthen the camp of democracy and greatly enhance the influence of the Vargas Government, and facilitate the government's war effort, is the holding of elections for Congress. This proposal has been submitted recently for President Vargas' consideration by the Public Service Commission.

Meanwhile important internal changes are taking place. Many of these changes are still inadequate and in some cases fall short of a definite and consistent policy required by the war emergency. Nevertheless they represent *forceful steps in the development of national unity and for the successful prosecution of the war*. President Vargas' removal of the fascist Chief of Police, Felinto Muller, bitter enemy of the liberal and progressive forces, was received with great enthusiasm. The fact that Muller was ousted and this important post wrested from the hands of the fascist clique is an important victory for the anti-Hitler forces and for national unity. Even though Felinto Muller still holds an important post in the War Department, as a result of the pressure of the reactionaries and the fascist clique

which still retains certain influential governmental positions, this does not annul the positive results that were achieved with his removal, along with the sweeping out from the police department of 400 of Muller's stooges. On the contrary, it should further stiffen the determination of Brazilian patriots to influence the Vargas forces to pursue a firmer internal policy against the fascists, to give President Vargas the necessary support which the government needs to fight and defeat the fifth column.

Another important measure taken by the government was the creation of the aviation forces as an independent branch of the armed forces, outside of the jurisdiction of the War Ministry. The establishment of this important branch independent of the army, and under separate leadership, is in the present situation a definite blow to the fifth columnists who hold high positions in the War Department. It strengthened the anti-Axis camp by bringing about a better correlation of forces, and, taking into consideration the role that the armed forces play, particularly in the internal life of the country, one can more easily understand and appreciate this measure.

* * *

National unity is being demanded and forged in the interests of Brazil by the Brazilian people in a patriotic upsurge against the Axis tyranny. It is demanded by the government and prominent leaders in the civilian and military life of the country. This requires that the in-

terests of the country and the war be placed above everything else, that all issues be subordinated to that of destroying fascism and winning the war. It was in this spirit that the people of Brazil welcomed the statement given by Dr. Pimentel Brandao, Brazilian delegate to the Permanent Committee for Continental Defense, to the *Diario Popular* in Uruguay. Dr. Pimentel said:

"President Vargas wishes to govern with the majority of the Brazilian people. This is the policy of our government in this situation of war against the Axis. The President is seeking the cooperation of all the citizens in the war effort of Brazil and to that end considers that he has no political enemy who cannot again be his political friend."

This same plea for national unity inspired the speech of General Heitor Borges, one of the leaders of the League of National Defense, who, paying tribute to the heroism of the Red Army, called upon the Brazilian people to follow its example, spirit of sacrifice and will to fight.

Colonel Estillac Leal recently made a strong appeal for the reconciliation of the Brazilian national family. Referring to the leaders of the 1922, 1924, 1926, and 1930 revolutions and in particular to the followers of Prestes, he said:

"President Vargas is the leader of the nation, of the 1930 revolution, leader of those who in the Parana, Northeast, in Matto Grosso have generously shared their blood for democracy in our fatherland. Today, some of them are being forgotten,

others set apart by momentary passions, but all of them are with the President, rallied under the war clarion, still inspired by the same ideals, and with the same determination which all Brazil feels. They are firmly convinced that in this struggle they are fighting for liberty and democracy, not in the abstract but in the fullest essence of these two words."

In 1942 Luis Carlos Prestes, beloved champion of the Brazilian people and freedom, who still is languishing in prison, taking the opportunity of the interview he had in prison with Blas Roca, General Secretary of the Revolutionary Communist Union Party of Cuba, appealed to his countrymen for the subordination of all questions to the main problem of defeating the Axis in the quickest possible way.

Imbued by this same desire for national unity, Fernando Lacerda, outstanding Communist leader, in the name of the Brazilian Communists, pledged full support to the Vargas Government, stating:

"We Communists are on the side of the government, at the service of the people and working class, asking for our post in the defense of Brazil wherever the government may think best. We believe that no Brazilian patriotic force in our country can have any other position."

Lacerda further stated:

"Our attitude must be to close ranks and support the people and the Vargas Government, to cooperate with them, strengthening all policies of active participation of Brazil in the total destruction of

the Axis. We all should help the government to organize the national defense, to liquidate the fifth column and to create national unity."

In connection with the reorganization and creation of political parties (the Communist Party as well as all other political parties is banned), the Communist leader stated the following:

"In this grave historic hour that faces humanity and our beloved country, there should be no attempt to recreate any kind of illegal organization. The creation or reorganization of parties or any other illegal organisms, contrary to the existing laws—as long as these laws are not removed by the government itself as an obstacle to its strengthening and to a national anti-Axis union—will only help the work of the Axis and of the fifth column. It would create embarrassments and difficulties for the people and the government. It would give ammunition to the Axis agents in their efforts to sabotage all the necessary measures demanded by President Vargas to fulfill the present historical responsibility."

Stressing the fact that this was the position of the Brazilian Communists, as well as of the anti-fascist patriots in exile, and those still imprisoned, he emphasized that:

"It is the only correct position and one that will in this tragic hour bring to our fatherland the harmony between all patriots—within the government and outside it—and bring complete understanding to the Brazilian national family, through the annulment in practice

of all past divisions and of their disastrous results—a measure which will cement our anti-Axis union, strengthen the moral prestige of our government and lead us surely to the just and honorable road which our government has taken together with the other United Nations."

Fernando Lacerda, in concluding, appealed to all Communists, and anti-fascists, to the workers and intellectuals, to lend all their efforts to building and strengthening the broad, open, legal organizations which are authorized by the government and which are actively dedicated to win the war.

Following Lacerda's appeal, exiled patriots of different political beliefs presented themselves to the Brazilian Legation in Uruguay, where they offered their services to the country in its war against Hitler's Axis. It must be said that the majority of these leaders were once opponents of Vargas, many of whom had sentences imposed against them for their past political activities. They all knew that in returning to Brazil they would face the possibility of arrest by the fascist clique which holds key positions in the army and police force and that these forces would try to use these old sentences to imprison them and to knife national unity.

Exactly what was foreseen happened. Their arrest upon arrival was "enjoyed and commemorated" of course by the Trotskyites. However, this "rejoicing" did not last long. The former exiled anti-fascists were later released and freed on Brazilian soil and are now con-

tributing their full energies to national unity and the war effort. Among those released were Fernando de Lacerda, Jorge Amado, General Flores de Cunha and many others. Several anti-fascists who were sentenced after the 1935 revolt are now asking for retrials, such as the well-known anti-fascist journalist Pedro Motta Lima and Captain Costa Leite. A favorable outcome of these retrials will represent a new stage in the fight against the fifth column. It will help to erase past divisions which are detrimental to the prosecution of the war and will pave the way for amnesty to the hundreds of anti-fascist prisoners, particularly for Luis Carlos Prestes, who symbolizes this same life-and-death struggle against fascism in which the Brazilian nation is now engaged.

The release of Prestes for active participation in the war effort would tremendously strengthen the Vargas Government. On several crucial turns in the life of the nation, amnesty was granted to political prisoners. In behalf of the national interests, amnesty was once granted by President Vargas himself. Now that Brazil faces the gravest hour since the birth of the nation, to grant a general amnesty to Luis Carlos Prestes and all other anti-fascist prisoners will be in keeping with the Brazilian traditions and a real contribution to the war against fascism.

* * *

In this war emergency great responsibilities rest upon the labor movement. The exact number of

workers organized in the government trade unions is not known, as there exist discrepancies between the government and Labor Department statistics. These trade unions are organized under corporate structure, under supervision of the police and the close control of the Labor Department. According to long-existing regulations, discussion of politics within the trade unions is prohibited. Its elected leadership must have the approval and sanction of the Department of Labor. The right of strike was abolished many years ago. However, the problem of strikes today is not the problem that the workers face, as they themselves realize that in this war emergency increased production is necessary; stoppages of war production are detrimental to the war. Even though all workers of the main industries and particularly in the most important industrial centers, are automatically members of the trade unions, the attendance and participation of the workers in these trade unions is very limited. The workers while being nominal members of these trade unions have in practice shunned them in the last years.

Since the outbreak of the war, serious changes are taking place within the trade unions. They have come out in support of the war policies of the government and against the Axis and the fifth column. In trade union assemblies the regulations that prohibit political discussion or trade union participation in political problems are disregarded by the workers and by the government. The workers are thus able

to rally and express themselves against fascism. Although the workers individually are actively taking part in anti-Axis meetings, demonstrations and in many forms of win-the-war activities, the participation of the trade unions as such in the political war mobilization of the nation is still very limited. Responsible in large part for this present situation is the Department of Labor, which, through its established machinery and "army" of functionaries, superintendents and supervisors, honeycombed with Integralists and Axis sympathizers, still tries to stifle the unions from playing their democratic and independent role.

Of all government agencies the Department of Labor is one that has contributed least to the war. In spite of the fact that the country is at war a large number of its top functionaries act as if nothing has happened or is happening. In a speech delivered in connection with the role of government agencies and government employees in the war against the Axis, Benedicto Silva, director of the Budget Service of the D.A.S.P., correctly stressed that:

"It is essential that the war effort be understood better in the government departments and agencies. It is necessary to cleanse the ranks of the Government employees, removing known and concealed fascist agents, that are at the head of government agencies and are on all occasions trying to create obstacles to every anti-Axis measure. The government agencies must rid themselves of these spies, trai-

tors, saboteurs at the service of our enemies."

President Vargas recently has urged the workers to participate more actively in their trade unions. At the same time he emphasized that the labor movement will have to take an outstanding part in shaping the destinies of the country and in creating a war mentality so much needed in the country for a successful prosecution of the war. This active participation of labor will bring about the necessary measures that the war emergency requires, enabling the trade unions to become more effective and truly independent organizations of the working class, which can more effectively contribute to victory, in accordance with the appeal of President Vargas. The success of Brazilian national unity, the defense of Brazil and democracy cannot be achieved without most active participation and influential role of the workers and their labor movement.

* * *

The movement for national unity in Brazil assumes different forms and manifests itself in several ways. In addition to those developments already referred to, anti-Axis demonstrations have been and are being held in Rio, Sao Paulo, Bahia, and other cities in which the people, pledging their support to the Vargas Government, are calling for stern measures against the fifth column. The people of Sao Paulo in a powerful meeting of the "Amigos Da America" demanded the removal of all fascist agents from government positions. It concretely asked

the dismissal of Miguel Reale, fascist "theoretician," from the Administrative Council of Sao Paulo, to which council the Interventor of the State is subordinated.

Led by the National Federation of Students, the youth of Brazil are active in the war effort, in civilian defense and sale of war bonds. Student and youth meetings and parades in support of the United States, England and the Soviet Union are taking place all over the country. It was the National Federation of Students which led the 4th of July parade in solidarity with the U.S.A. In Sao Paulo the law students organized an anti-Axis week. In the parade that climaxed this anti-fascist week the banners of the United Nations and the pictures of President Vargas, Roosevelt, of Stalin and Churchill, were cheered by thousands of people. Upon the request of the National Federation of Students, Gustavo Capanema, Minister of Education, dismissed the Nazi, Herbert Fortes, from the Department of Education in the State of Bahia.

The organization of the "Amigos Da America" in Rio, Sao Paulo and other states, led by the well-known democrat Manuel Rabello, is giving great impulse to the anti-Axis people's mobilization. This organization and the League of National Defense have been very active in mobilizing large sections of the people behind the war policies of the government. The committees against the high cost of living that were created upon the suggestion of the President are an important factor

in the struggle against war speculation. These committees, organized in the neighborhood by the people jointly with government representatives, work out measures for combating the high cost of living. The women play an important role in these committees and their activities are not confined only to economic questions but in some instances they take up major political issues as well. The Free Masons have called upon all their members to fight the fifth column. Their meetings, hitherto prohibited, are now being held with permission of the government.

* * *

Fifth-column elements in certain governmental quarters and through their fascist organizations are busy with plots and schemes to weaken the government as part of their plan for a palace revolt against Vargas and the establishment of a pro-Axis "junta." This danger has been increased tenfold by the recent events in Argentina. Now that Hitler and the Axis face further defeats and are approaching their ultimate destruction, these enemies of Brazil, who only recently were pressing the Vargas Government to declare war on England, have started a campaign for a "special fund" for the development of a sabotage campaign against: (1) economic coordination; (2) war taxes; (3) "Communism." They oppose the establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations between Brazil and the U.S.S.R. just at the moment when the national interests and welfare of Brazil require the

most friendly relations and cooperation with this great democratic power.

Some of this sabotage and defeatist activity is carried on under the cloak of demagogic and "Leftist" arguments in order to try and confuse and mislead the masses. To achieve their objectives, the fifth column employs the following arguments:

1. They say that this is not Brazil's war; that the destruction of the Axis is not a problem that concerns Brazil. They try to create the belief that Brazil's national independence can be assured regardless of the fate of the world, irrespective of the outcome of the war. When faced with the anti-fascist indignation and wrath of the people, they try to cover up their treason by saying that the destruction of fascism is the concern of the powerful and industrialized countries and not Brazil—which amounts to nothing more than a policy of assistance to the Axis and of treason to the fatherland.

2. Brazil's enemies state that the main task facing Brazil is "not the destruction of fascism and the defense of Brazil's national sovereignty and territorial integrity" but the "overthrow" of the Vargas Government which heads and leads the people on the path to victory. They maintain that Vargas is "the main enemy" and thus foster a policy of coups d'état against Vargas—again treason, a policy calculated to aid the Axis.

3. The fifth column distorts, minimizes and denies all steps taken by the government toward winning the

war. They try to use internal economic difficulties and the lag in restoring full democratic liberties in an effort to prevent the people from rallying around Vargas' Government and its war policies. They viciously use these conditions to discourage the people, to foster splits, to sow intrigues in their endeavor to create barriers between the people and the government. Attacking national unity as a "utopia" and as a policy of "capitulation," they concentrate their vile attacks against the promoters and defenders of national unity.

The fascists in Brazil are very active among the bourgeois democratic elements who at one time, for one reason or another, opposed the Vargas regime. They attempt to take advantage of the isolation of these elements from the masses in order to alienate them from the life of the country. All honest and responsible persons, who love Brazil, should be aware of these fifth column and Trotskyite machinations and not allow themselves to become prey to these fascist agents, or become tools in the hands of the enemies. All Brazilian patriots must unmask, rout and smash the defeatists and the fascist fifth column. They must resolutely consolidate and strengthen national unity to support and implement the government's anti-Axis policies.

* * *

Brazilian national union also requires clarification of the false and dangerous conceptions prevailing among certain anti-Hitler groups to the effect that the problems facing

Brazil can be solved *only* by Vargas, and that the fate of Brazil is Vargas' sole responsibility. This conception amounts to washing one's hands of the destinies of the country and using the present internal conditions as an excuse. It is a defeatist position, cherished by all those with faint hearts who have lost all perspectives. Brought to its logical consequence, this harmful viewpoint is aimed at producing passivity among the people, and at preventing genuine national unity. It is tantamount to capitulation to the enemies of the Vargas Government and the anti-Axis coalition.

The attempt to place upon Vargas alone the solution of all problems in this war is not only a farce and a mockery, but is a childish conception, alien to the understanding of the social and political forces in Brazil as well as in the world. Great responsibilities rest upon President Vargas as the head of the government; nevertheless this doesn't absolve any patriot from fulfilling his obligations toward his country and people. Moreover, to try and shift the responsibility of the destiny of Brazil to others, to sit on the fence as a spectator, would be to paralyze the vast democratic forces of Brazil. This would be suicidal.

This is a people's war of national liberation. Brazilian National Union is not Vargas's sole problem. It is a war necessity. It is true that great responsibilities rest upon the President. It is also true that he is doing and can do a great deal more toward hastening its development. But it is also a fact which cannot

be ignored that powerful forces are working within and outside of the government to the contrary. These forces are determined to try and prevent the further march toward unity and victory over the Axis and are exerting all possible pressure and influence upon Vargas in this direction. Their pressure is backed by threats of a coup d'état of the 1939 style. To sit calmly and expect a consistent democratic policy on internal affairs to develop by itself is, among other things, a false evaluation of the correlation of forces in Brazil. This policy tends to divorce the people from the government. It shows lack of faith in the strength of the people. It negates the role of the working class and of the whole essence and need of national unity.

Moreover, what true Brazilian in this crucial period in the life of the fatherland will surrender his rights and obligations toward his country, his countrymen and toward the world? What true Brazilian, worthy of the name, will shrink from this duty? Victory over fascism, the military destruction of Hitlerism, and a consistent democratic internal policy, can be successfully carried out only by a united and active people, by mobilizing all patriots, the entire nation to support and influence the government's anti-Axis and pro-democratic course and policies. Only with such support around President Vargas and in behalf of the nation's war objectives can Brazil safeguard its independence, advance democracy, and honor and fulfill its obligations as a member of the anti-Hitler coalition.

Two New "International" Books

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA

By R. PALME DUTT

The long-awaited book by Britain's distinguished Marxist, generally regarded as the most authoritative and comprehensive study of India today. The author, for over twenty years the editor of the *British Labor Monthly*, has cabled a new introduction for the American edition, clarifying the problem of Hindu-Moslem unity in the light of India's struggle for national unity and independence in the interests of victory over the Axis.

Price \$1.50

LABOR AND THE WAR

Prepared by Labor Research Association

A handbook on labor problems in connection with the war, containing a veritable arsenal of valuable information on production and conditions in the basic war industries, manpower problems, war economy, the various war boards and commissions, trade union organizations, labor relations and labor legislation, international labor unity, etc. Prepared as the sixth volume in the *Labor Fact Book* series, it is indexed for handy reference.

Price \$1.25

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

"In this great conflict against the Axis, there are fundamental philosophic issues at stake. Indeed, all our ethical values are involved in the outcome. Dr. Selsam's book is a notable contribution to the understanding, the philosophic understanding, of both ourselves and our allies. It is the most complete and careful treatment of socialism and ethics that has been written by anyone at any time."—CORLISS LAMONT.

SOCIALISM AND ETHICS

By Dr. Howard Selsam

What is ethics? From what do men derive their judgments of right and wrong, good and evil? Is ethics concerned primarily with individual virtue or with economic, social and political institutions? How can capitalism and socialism be morally evaluated—democracy and fascism? Are there eternal moral questions? What is the true relation of the individual to society? What is freedom, what is progress? What is the role of the working class in the determination and achievement of freedom and progress? How should one morally evaluate national unity in the war of the United Nations against the Axis?

In this new book, just published, the author of **What Is Philosophy?** examines capitalist society in its historical development and in its present form and shows how and why Marxian socialism conforms with and embraces the highest moral ideals of the ages.

Socialism and Ethics is a fundamental contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory in a field long neglected. It is a book that belongs in every Marxist library.

224 Pages. Price \$1.90



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.