

The Communist

20c

APRIL

1942

FOR A SECOND FRONT IN EUROPE!

EUGENE DENNIS



THE COURSE OF THE WAR AND THE PRESENT TASKS

GIL GREEN



A WAR-TIME TAX PROGRAM FOR VICTORY

JEAN FRANCIS



THE NEW ROLE OF CHINA

JAMES S. ALLEN



NATIONAL UNITY AND THE COMING ELECTIONS

RALPH V. BARNES



LESSONS FROM OUR WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

A. B. MAGIL

WORKS OF KARL MARX

Critique of the Gotha Programme	\$1.00
Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte90
The German Ideology, by Marx and Engels	2.00
Letters to Kugelmann	1.00
The Civil War in France Paper \$2.25, cloth	1.00
Class Struggles in France 1848-1850	1.00
Civil War in the United States, by Marx and Engels	2.50
The Poverty of Philosophy	1.25
Correspondence of Marx and Engels	2.25
Capital, Volume One	2.50
Revolution in Spain, by Marx and Engels	1.75
Selected Works of Karl Marx, 2 volumes, each \$2.25; set	4.00
Founding of the First International, by Marx and others50
Manifesto of the Communist Party, by Marx and Engels10
Value, Price and Profit and Wage-Labor and Capital	1.00



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER



C O N T E N T S

In Tom Mooney's Name Let Us Build the Unity of American Labor	<i>Statement by the Na- tional Committee, C.P.U.S.A.</i>	195
Tom Mooney: One of America's Finest Sons	<i>Georgi Dimitroff . . .</i>	198
For a Second Front in Europe! To the Of- fensive Against Hitler!	<i>Eugene Dennis . . .</i>	199
The Course of the War and the Present Tasks	<i>Gil Green</i>	214
A War-Time Tax Program for Victory . .	<i>Jean Francis</i>	225
The New Role of China	<i>James S. Allen</i>	239
National Unity and the Coming Elections	<i>Ralph V. Barnes . . .</i>	250
Negroes and the National War Effort . .	<i>Frederick Douglass . .</i>	262
From Leipzig to Riom	<i>Hans Berger</i>	270
Lessons From Our War of Independence .	<i>A. B. Magil</i>	277

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 332 Broadway, New York, 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

William Sylvis and the National Labor Union, by Charlotte Todes	\$.25
Harriet Tubman: Negro Soldier and Abolitionist, by Earl Conrad15
Earl Browder on the Soviet Union05
The Molotov Paper on Nazi Atrocities05
Thaddeus Stevens, by Elizabeth Lawson10
Smash Hitler's Spring Offensive Now, by William Z. Foster .	.02
American Democracy and the War, by William Z. Foster .	.01
The Case of Earl Browder: Why He Should be Freed, by Joseph North01
Japanese Imperialism Exposed: The Secret Tanaka Document	.10
Thomas Paine: Selections, with an introduction by James S. Allen25
From Defense to Attack, by William Z. Foster01
Work Under Capitalism and Socialism, by A. Leontyev .	.15
Our Ally—The Soviet Union, by Robert Minor01
The War and the Negro People, by James W. Ford02



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

IN TOM MOONEY'S NAME LET US BUILD THE UNITY OF AMERICAN LABOR

*(Statement by the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.,
March 6, 1942.)*

TOM MOONEY is dead. Every working man, every working woman, every youth and child of this great nation has lost an irreplaceable friend and guide and leader. The American labor movement has lost one of its best organizers in the brave Tom Mooney, upon whose face we will look for the last time tomorrow.

* * *

The history of our country and its democracy—and the history of trade unionism, without which there can be no democracy in the modern world—could not be understood without understanding the role of the magnificent figure of Tom Mooney. In the world-wide labor movement for the past twenty-five years the character and role of Mooney have loomed upon the horizon as a symbol of all that was most courageous and true and far-seeing in the struggles of American labor.

In the midst of the great World War, the young Tom Mooney of 1916, member of the Molders Union and organizer of the Amalgamated Association of Street Carmen, be-

came a symbol of the cause of the working class and therefore the center of a world-wide struggle that reached across battlefields and inspired the men of all nations. In California the "open-shop" movement of war profiteers had set out to destroy the whole American trade union movement or at least all but the most exclusive of the unions of the skilled crafts. Brutally reactionary politics, sharing in the loot of unprecedented war profits, made use of the criminal courts of California as a means to destroy any who dared to introduce trade unionism into new fields.

Tom Mooney was sentenced to death by a frenzied reaction that was a combination of greed and exploitation of labor, corruption in politics and a corresponding stagnation in the labor movement. He was convicted on false evidence of a crime of which he did not share the slightest shadow of guilt, utterly strange to his life's record, his beliefs and those of the labor movement.

Tom Mooney's distinction was in the fact that he became the leader

of a movement for the spreading of the organization of the American Federation of Labor beyond the narrow field of the skilled crafts, that in doing so he brilliantly understood the historic significance of his work in the light of historic destiny of the labor movement. He pursued his course in defiance of reaction and stagnation in the labor movement itself. Where imprisonment and even death became the threatened penalty for performance of his duty to his union and his class, Tom Mooney went ahead without fear. The annals of the American trade union movement contain no epic more magnificent than the long struggle for a quarter of a century that grew out of the faith and the work of Mooney.

Son of an Irish-American coal miner, Tom Mooney had no educational opportunities, but found the priceless key to enlightenment and the advance of his class in the science of the modern labor movement. Studying by night after labor in an iron foundry, Mooney made himself capable of understanding the underlying principles of modern history and the emancipation of his people. Mooney became a student of Marx and Engels and a devoted follower of Eugene V. Debs. The emancipation of labor became the lode star of his life. His mastery of the strategy and tactics of the labor movement, in the light of his Marxist studies, made it possible for him to make his great contribution to the development of the trade union movement, not through sectarian fads, but through the inexorable development of the existing labor

movement to higher forms. Himself a member of the American Federation of Labor in good standing for more than thirty years, he resolutely adhered to his firm belief that the future of the labor movement would reach beyond the narrow bounds of craft organization and would embrace the whole of the working class.

Throughout nearly a quarter of a century of imprisonment, first under sentence of death and later for many years of imprisonment, Mooney became the friend and adviser of all honest elements of the labor movement. Even while locked in prison the powerful personality of Mooney was able to surmount all difficulties to the extent that he became a pillar of light in the movement for labor unity. His honesty inspired respect even where hate and fear still linger. Mooney's strength and incorruptible courage made it possible for him actually to become one of the strongest figures in the political movement of labor that mounted to great heights in California with the New Deal. In turn his example inspired great deeds on the part of labor. The growth of the trade unions was stimulated by influences on which must be counted that of Mooney.

Tom Mooney was a symbol of confidence in the working class and its destiny. Never sinking to the narrow bickering and division which the enemies of labor encourage in the unions, Tom always understood the first principles of unity; that those who start baiting against the "Left" are really injuring the entire labor movement by

disrupting its unity. Tom understood that the trade union movement has not only a past and a present but also a future. Tom understood that the labor movement of the nation is vital, as Lincoln said it was, through the ties that bind the working people "of all nations and tongues and kindreds." Tom Mooney understood that when the workers of a great foreign land triumphed over the Tsar of Russia and set up a great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Through all of the furious struggles with reaction Tom Mooney knew from beginning to end that the socialist state could not be otherwise than a friend and a strength to his own native land, America.

Tom understood, as perhaps no man could understand except one who has himself stood in the shadow of the gallows under unjust sentence, the meaning of the use of the criminal courts as a weapon of struggle against the labor movement. Even on his death bed, Tom Mooney became the chairman of the Citizen's Committee to Free Earl Browder and closed his life with some of the most brilliant work he had ever done in the struggle which he declared was essential for the welfare of America—for the liberation of Earl Browder, the General Secretary of the Communist Party.

Tom Mooney understood war, because Tom Mooney, born in the starvation and misery of an unorganized coal camp, understood that the political struggle is inevitably carried into the extreme of violence by the forces of class exploitation and reaction. Tom Mooney understood this war—a war of advanced humanity for liberation against the bloody beast of fascism. Tom Mooney called for the unity of labor; Tom Mooney called for an end to the division and splitting, of baiting of brother against brother in the trade unions. Tom Mooney understood the need for all of his native land America to unite to win this war by which alone, he truly and correctly believed, the great labor movement could continue and thrive and grow to still greater proportions.

* * *

In the name of Tom Mooney let us unify the 11,000,000 members of the labor movement in still stronger unity. In the name of the great hero of the labor movement let us win the victory.

National Committee, Communist
Party, U.S.A.,

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER,
National Chairman
ROBERT MINOR,
Acting Secretary

TOM MOONEY: ONE OF AMERICA'S FINEST SONS

(A Cablegram by Georgi Dimitroff, General Secretary of the Communist International, on the death of Tom Mooney, sent to his brother, John Mooney, on March 10, 1942)

PLEASE accept my heartfelt condolences on the death of your brother Tom Mooney.

In Tom Mooney we lost one of the finest sons of the great American people whose life was devoted to prolonged struggle for liberty and justice for the common people from whose ranks he came.

But Tom Mooney belonged not only to America. His indomitable spirit and courage, his great example of a steadfast fighter, found response in the hearts of all progressive men and women the world over.

Now when all freedom-loving peoples, rallied around the mighty coalition of the United States of

America, Great Britain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are engaged in a life and death struggle against the criminal forces of Hitlerism, the bright memory of Tom Mooney will inspire them to still greater and more determined joint efforts to bring about a speedy victory over Hitler's fascist hordes.

The victorious free peoples of the world will enshrine in their annals the name of Tom Mooney alongside the names of many noble heroes who gave their lives in the great historic struggle for the liberty, progress and happiness of humanity.

GEORGI DIMITROFF

FOR A SECOND FRONT IN EUROPE! TO THE OFFENSIVE AGAINST HITLER!

BY EUGENE DENNIS

SINCE the fall of Singapore there has been a growing realization in America and Britain that it is necessary to develop a strategy of attack and offense. As the *New York Times* put it in its "Review of the Week," of March 8:

" . . . With defense failing, the cry went up for a change of tactics. Men in the streets and men in high councils were seeking to shake off what has been called the 'Maginot Line complex,' the 'Singapore complex,' the 'ocean complex.' Increasingly the demand was being voiced and the promise made that the attack would soon be carried to the foe. . . ."

Evidence of the new spirit and orientation is numerous. This is attested to by the important changes recently made in the British Cabinet and in the reorganization of the Army and Navy Commands of the United States. This is borne out by the President's Washington Day message and by the recent statements of Willkie, Stimson, Knox, Donald Nelson, Philip Murray, General Marshall and Admiral King—all of whom expressed a common viewpoint: "We must carry the war

to the enemy." And this is graphically indicated by the sending of the second A.E.F. contingent to Northern Ireland, an A.E.F. to Australia, and by the resumption of large-scale raids by the R.A.F. on Nazi-occupied France and Germany.

However, it is not yet fully clear whether at this moment London and Washington are contemplating "offensive operations" only, as Hanson Baldwin advises, or whether a major offensive is being planned. Nor is it sufficiently clear where and how quickly the main blows of the projected Anglo-American offensive may be delivered, whether on the decisive European theater this Spring or Summer, or from Africa and the Near East, or from China and the Southwest Pacific.

But one thing is becoming increasingly clear: the situation requires—and makes possible—that the common war efforts of the United Nations must be reinforced and more closely coordinated in accordance with a unified global strategy, undertaking common fighting action, and concentrating against the heart and center of the Axis: *Hitler Germany*. And there is a

mounting sentiment and wide support for this in both the United States and England, especially for developing a major Anglo-American offensive in Europe this spring against Hitler, to synchronize with the mighty Soviet offensive already under way. The *New York Times*, for instance, in taking note of the powerful demand in the United States for changing the conduct of the war and for going over from the defense to the offense, observed:

" . . . The offensive most widely broached . . . was an all-out Anglo-American drive on Nazi-occupied Europe. Such an attack, the contention ran, could be sprung from the heavily armed British Isles or from imperial bases in Egypt and Libya. In conjunction with unrelenting Red Army pressure it would catch Hitler in the nutcracker of a two-front war. If launched promptly, it would forestall a possible Nazi Spring campaign against the Middle East. Proponents of the theoretical attack held that Japan's rapid surge in the Far East and Germany's raids in the Atlantic must not deflect the Allies from concentrating on a knockout blow against the Wehrmacht. To disperse allied strength between Europe and Asia, to immobilize it either on the American continent or in the British Isles, would be to play into the aggressors' hands. . . ." (*Ibid.*)

The policy expressed in this viewpoint is vital to the national security and defense of America. It is based on the common interests of all of the United Nations, and therefore of our own country. It is a genuine American and Allied pol-

icy which is both necessary and feasible for achieving victory over Hitler and the Axis. It is imperative and possible for at least three fundamental reasons:

First: Hitler Germany and its monstrous war machine is the main enemy of all of the United Nations; it is the leader, center and main base of the Axis. This has been emphasized repeatedly by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin. This is why, for instance, shortly after the treacherous attack of Hitler's Axis partner on Pearl Harbor, the President reminded the American people that:

" . . . The dreams of empire of the Japanese and Fascist leaders were modest in comparison with the Gargantuan aspirations of Hitler and his Nazis. Even before they came to power in 1933, their plans for conquest had been drawn. Those plans [Hitler's] provided for ultimate domination not of any one section of the world, but of the whole earth and all the oceans on it. . . ." (Message to Congress, Jan. 6, 1942.)

Secondly: Hitler must be defeated if the Axis is to be smashed. The Hitlerites—with their main base, forces, and resources in Europe—can be defeated and destroyed primarily in Europe, not elsewhere. This means to confront Hitler *now* with a two-front war, in Western as well as Eastern Europe. For as Lieut. Col. Kernan of the United States Army emphasizes in his recent book *Defense Will Not Win the War*:

“ . . . We must launch a major offensive in Europe. We must strike at Adolf Hitler. On no account must we let the war with Japan deflect us from our central purpose or our main effort. . . . ”

Thirdly: Hitler can be smashed this year if existing opportunities are utilized, especially if America and Britain speedily develop common fighting action in Europe with the Soviet Union and its stalwart Red Army, which is successfully continuing its offensive and hurling back the bulk of Hitler's hordes in decisive battles on the Eastern Front.

What are some of the factors which make feasible the realization of this possibility? Among these, mention should be made of the following:

For one thing, the war efforts and combined military strength and striking power of the United States and Britain are steadily growing and already have assumed formidable proportions, despite the serious, although temporary, reverses suffered in the Far East. Over 4,000,000 trained troops, with large tank and air strength and suitable supply bases, are available in the United States and England for immediate military action on the European continent. Because of augmented plane production and because Hitler is compelled to concentrate his main forces on the Soviet-German front, the R.A.F. alone already has attained air superiority over the Nazis in Western Europe; also the Nazis have, according to Allied estimates, only some twenty-

five divisions in Western Europe, the rest being tied down on the Soviet front. The gallant Serb army and guerrillas, over 100,000 strong, are already engaged in effective military operations. The anti-Hitler movement of the peoples of the occupied countries, from Norway to Greece, from France to Poland to Czechoslovakia, is growing in strength and would assume greater and more effective proportions if a front were opened against Hitler in the West.

Furthermore, and most decisive, is the fact that Hitler's war machine—while still strong and not yet routed and while still being equipped by the armament output of over seventeen European countries—has lost the initiative to the Red Army, has been put on the defensive, is being driven back on the main Soviet fronts, and is being compelled to use up vast reserves originally scheduled for the projected spring offensive. The extent to which the Nazi army has already been weakened on the Soviet-German front and consequently in the occupied countries as well, can be partially gauged by the fact that in the first five months of the war on the Soviet front, during the strategic retreat of the Red Army, the Red Army and Soviet partisans wiped out more than a million men a month and destroyed or captured over 15,000 tanks, approximately 13,000 planes and 19,000 heavy guns. And the effects of these huge losses on the lowering morale of the Nazi army and on the people of Germany are beginning to be increasingly felt.

In view of this, and because of the strengthening of the Red Army and the Soviet rear and system, as well as in view of the strengthening of the world anti-Hitler front, Stalin, in his historic "Order of the Day" on February 23, 1942, pointed out:

" . . . The day is not distant when the Red Army's powerful blows will drive the bestial enemies back from Leningrad, clear him from the towns and villages of Byelorussia and the Ukraine, from Lithuania and Latvia, from Esthonia and Karelia, will free Soviet Crimea, and the red banners will again fly victoriously over the whole Soviet land." And ". . . It is very likely that the war for liberation of the Soviet land will result in ousting or destroying Hitler's clique. . . ."

However, as Stalin also emphasized, there are "many difficulties ahead," the "enemy is suffering defeat but has not yet been routed and still less finished off" and "the enemy is still strong." This is primarily so because so far the Red Army has no direct support in the form of coordinated offensive operations by its British and American allies on the crucial European theaters of military activities.

Clearly the absence of a Western front in Europe, the absence of a world wide unified strategy and concerted fighting action of the anti-Hitler nations obstructs the realization of existing possibilities for defeating Hitler in 1942. It enables Hitler still to prepare to muster all his remaining reserves and resources for the crucial spring and

summer battles on the most important front, the Soviet-German front, where Hitler has concentrated his main forces and stakes everything. It also enables the Axis to prepare another diversion and to try and seize the initiative in the Near and Middle East or on the Iberian Peninsula. It adversely affects the prosecution of the war on the Far Eastern and African fronts, as well as on the decisive fronts in Europe. It jeopardizes the position and future of all of the United Nations.

* * *

What is it that stands in the way of developing concerted Anglo-American military action in Europe this spring together with the Soviet Union? What is it that stands in the way of utilizing the present opportunities for delivering fatal blows to Hitler this year? What reasons are advanced against the opening of a second front in Europe *now* against Hitler? Among some of the anti-Hitler forces who are sincerely desirous of defeating Hitlerism but who believe that neither the United States nor Britain can strike at Hitler in the West before 1942 at the earliest, the following arguments are brought forward:

It is claimed that the exigencies of the fronts in the Far East and Africa, and the need of reinforcing these theaters of the anti-Axis war, plus the urgency of strengthening the Allied forces in the Near East so as to frustrate or check a sudden

move of Hitler through Turkey, Iran or Syria—all this, it is said, makes it impossible for the Anglo-American military command to concentrate the necessary forces for developing large-scale or effective military operations in Western Europe at this time, or in the immediate future.

But this line of reasoning contains basic flaws which, if persisted in, will further endanger and weaken the position of all of the United Nations. It subordinates anti-Axis strategy to the terms and conditions prescribed by and most favorable to Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo. It serves to divide and disperse the war efforts of the leading coalition of the United Nations, namely, of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain, and prevents the maximum coordination and concentration of the main blows of the United Nations against Hitler Germany. It negates the fact that the very opening of a second front against Hitler in the West will fatally divide and weaken the Nazi forces, will prevent the Nazis from concentrating their forces as they would like, either in Europe, or for a new drive in the Near or Middle East, or in Africa. It overlooks the most elementary and central fact that with the military defeat and destruction of the Hitler regime and army, Japan and the entire Axis can and will be summarily routed and destroyed. *And not vice versa*. Evidently this is why Maxim Litvinoff, Soviet Ambassador to the United States, stated:

“. . . It is obvious that to deal

Hitler a knockout blow would mean to smash the Axis and greatly to simplify all the other problems confronting the United Nations so that their solution would take much less time and trouble. . . ." (Speech at the Overseas Press Club, February 27, 1942).

Closely connected with the aforementioned argument, is the view that the United States and Britain are still too unprepared militarily, that essential war production in these countries, especially of planes and tanks, is still far from that of Germany and the Nazi-occupied countries. Possibly this is true, although the *combined* armament output, not to speak of the resources and production of strategic war materials, of the Anglo-American-Soviet *coalition*, as well as of *all* of the United Nations, is now greater than that of the Axis and daily changes in favor of the world anti-Hitler front. Moreover, while the state of war production in the United States and Britain is still below par, is unnecessarily and seriously lagging, it should be remembered that this is not a static situation. Considerable progress has already been made in the United States, especially since the appointment of Donald Nelson as chief of the War Production Board and since the establishment of the Labor Victory Board; and still greater headway apparently has been made in Britain.

The opening of a second front in Europe at this time would give the greatest impetus to the whole national war effort, including the

crucial battle for production. The home front, particularly the vital front of war production, would more than keep pace with a new change on the military fields. The fall of Singapore jolted the American and British people; it increased, rather than weakened, their determination and their activity to strengthen the common war effort. The immediate unfolding now of that decisive front, or fronts, on Hitler's rear or flanks on the European continent, would rouse and gird the peoples of America and all of the United Nations as never before. It would result in a supreme war effort, would accomplish veritable miracles on the production, as well as the battle fronts.

Furthermore, it must be stated that the honest proponents of the viewpoint that America cannot engage in a major offensive because the battle for production to equip our own armed forces, as well as to fulfill our Lend-Lease commitments to our Allies, is only now really getting under way—these people cannot see the woods for the trees. They miss the most vital factors involved. For the *main* weaknesses of the United Nations today do not lie in the sphere of armaments and the present level of armament production, vital and indispensable as these are.

No. *The main weaknesses are political and strategic.* They arise out of the fact that there still is no single and unified strategy and command of the anti-Axis camp on a world scale which can coordinate and concentrate the armed might and preponderant manpower and

resources of the United Nations for common fighting action at the decisive points and especially on the decisive front, the European theater. There still is no *full-fledged alliance* of the United Nations as a whole, and in the first place of the leading coalition: of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

As for the important Far Eastern fronts, which cannot be neglected and should be strengthened, here too the *key* to reinforcing the struggle against Japan in the immediate months ahead and to ensuring ultimate victory is *chiefly political and strategic.* First, what is required is that China shall be treated as a partner and ally of vital and increasing importance, and that a new approach shall be made to the colonial peoples, especially to the Indian people; that they be fully and actively drawn into the armed struggle in defense of their lands and country and that recognition be given in deeds as well as words to their right to national independence.

Secondly, in the Far East it is necessary to strengthen and combine the present defensive tactics of military and naval action with the maximum utilization of existing opportunities simultaneously to engage in offensive operations, especially in China, as well as from Australia and India.

And thirdly, in relation to the Pacific, it should be recognized that before the conditions mature for sending large-scale military reinforcements to the Far East and developing a major Anglo-American

offensive there, the United States will have to augment further its naval strength and positions, as well as acquire air superiority in the Southwest Pacific and China. However, before this, before the United States and other United Nations can employ the powerful and unused military power and armed reserves *now* available in the United States and Great Britain, for major offensives in the Far East or Africa, *it is both possible and necessary* to employ this power most advantageously and effectively *in Europe*. For one thing, there is where Hitler must be smashed and there there are already formidable bases and centers of supply and war production, such as in England and within Ireland; and other bases and points for attack can be readily established, if Britain and the United States take the initiative and the offensive, in Norway, France or Italy, or in Portugal or Spain. Also it must be noted that America's lines of supply to Europe are shorter and more easily protected than are its sea lanes to the Southwest Pacific.

In this connection, the observations of M. Litvinoff merit the greatest consideration:

“. . . events are shaping in such a way that soon there will be no more fronts outside Europe along which decisive battles or even offensive operations of any sort will be possible, at any rate for a long time to come, till new considerable forces have matured in the U.S.A. But offensive operations of a decisive nature will be possible in Europe, and that against Public

Enemy Number One. . . . It may be of little use to have large, well equipped armies, say, somewhere in the West, if they are not in action while decisive battles are raging in the East. . . . Only by simultaneous offensive operations on two or more fronts . . . could Hitler's armed forces be disposed of. . . . I do believe that Hitler could in this way be destroyed by the summer. But the opportunity may be missed. The peace has already been lost owing to missed opportunities. It would be too bad if the war were to be lost because we let go opportunities again. . . ." (*Ibid.*)

While such questions pertaining to strengthening the Far Eastern front, to expanding vital war production, to equipping and training a larger army, navy and air force, and to meeting the hazards of long supply routes, etc., are serious problems to be faced and taken into account in the opening of a second European front by the United States and Britain, clearly these are not insurmountable problems. These are problems which can be favorably resolved by establishing closer collaboration among all of the United Nations, especially by establishing a rounded out military, political and economic alliance between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and England. These are difficulties which can be turned into their opposites when America and Britain display the necessary political and military initiative and together with the Soviet Union and their other allies develop common fighting action this spring and summer against Hitler's war ma-

chine on the vital Western, as well as the decisive Eastern, fronts in Europe.

Those forces in the anti-Hitler camp who think otherwise, who favor postponing an all-out struggle against Hitler Germany until 1943 and 1944, who want to limit the common war efforts and the developing alliance of the United Nations, who hesitate or are opposed to wresting the initiative from Hitler and the Axis, who champion the thesis of a defensive and protracted war of attrition, are gambling with the fate of our country and that of its allies.

The results of such policies are only too evident: First Holland, Belgium, Norway and France. Then Jugoslavia, Greece and Crete. Now Pearl Harbor, Hong Kong, Manila, Singapore, Sumatra and Rangoon. It is to be hoped that the first steps which the President has taken in "streamlining" and reorganizing the Army and Navy high commands, in reorganizing the war production agencies, etc., will be carried further. It is to be hoped that the Kimmels, Shorts and Knudsens, not to speak of the outright appeasers, who still remain in high places will be quickly replaced before it is too late.

For these are the men, steeped in the outmoded strategy and tactics of the Maginot Line, who have learned nothing from modern military science and history, or who learn too little and too late. These are the men who still tolerate "business-as-usual" and who consider the 1942 quotas of the President's Victory Production Plan

"impractical." These are the men who refuse to corner and strangle the rat Hitler in a two-front war in Europe this spring and summer, and instead would in effect enable Hitler to try and regroup his forces on the Soviet-German front and simultaneously again to try and seize the initiative elsewhere and embark on new adventures in the Near East or in Spain and Africa. These are the men who, in seeking to avoid the risks entailed in initiating and fighting decisive battles, would lose the war.

Clearly to win this war it is necessary, among other things, to replace these men and to strengthen the General Staffs, the Government and Congress with the most capable and resolute supporters of our President and our national policy, with the staunchest champions of everything-to-win-the-war, of national unity for a supreme war effort, of common fighting action and the closest collaboration of all of the United Nations.

* * *

So far, of course, we have directed our polemics primarily against those forces and leaders who are *honest* opponents of Hitlerism, who want to defeat Hitler and the Axis even though their present outlook and policies hinder this, and frequently lead to the opposite results. Many of these people are, in one way or another, influenced by the appeasers, by the Men of Munich, who exploit and utilize their traditional conservatism and outdated politico-military views to Hitler's advantage.

Whereas the position of these people, many of whom fall in the category of the "turtles" who were so aptly castigated by the President, is not identical with that of the pro-fascist appeasers, it must be recognized that the objective and practical consequences of their political and military line tends to work in the same direction. For their "go slow" and "defensive" policies hamper the realization of the main orientation being developed by the government; it militates against our national policy and objectives; it jeopardizes our national interests.

This brings us to the chief difficulty hindering the opening of a Western front. This difficulty, or rather obstacle, is also political in character and source: *it is the defeatist and damaging role and activities of the pro-Hitler elements among some of the monopolists*, of people like the Hearsts, Cudahys and Weirs, and their political spokesmen like the Wheelers, Nyes, Fishes and Lindberghs, and their lieutenants in the labor movement like the Lewises and Norman Thomases. These are the un-American types whom the President aptly termed the "Cliveden Set," the representatives of the most reactionary and anti-Soviet circles of the bourgeoisie.

These are the modern Copperheads who foster, manipulate, and exploit "business-as-usual" and "politics-as-usual" attitudes, practices and conflicts within and outside of Congress so as to weaken and obstruct national unity and the national war effort. These are the

appeasers who advocate and preach defeatism and pessimism, who seek to undermine the government, the armed forces and the national morale, and who utilize every military reverse and difficulty to plump for a "negotiated peace" with the Axis.

These are Hitler's un-American friends who, second only to der Fuehrer himself, fear and strive to prevent the opening of a second front against Hitler and the Axis in Europe—while they echo Hitler's call for the "opening of a Soviet-Japanese front" so as to try and divert the Soviet Union and the other allies from concentrating their main blows against Nazi Germany, so as to create new difficulties for, and to try and weaken the U.S.S.R. and all of the United Nations. These are the appeasers who bend every effort to obstruct the establishment of a unified anti-Axis strategy and joint fighting action, as well as a full-fledged alliance between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and England, and who endeavor to sow distrust and division among and to break up the world anti-Hitler front of the United Nations.

In this connection, it is likewise necessary to call attention to another aspect of that specialized "school" of anti-Soviet thought and action so perfidiously and systematically cultivated and promoted by the Cliveden Set here and abroad. This is a renovated version of pro-fascist appeasement which continually counsels that America and Britain should "concentrate" their main blows against militarist Japan, that American and Allied aid

to and collaboration with the Soviet Union should be drastically limited and curtailed, if not altogether terminated.

This corroding ideology which helped to torpedo the policy of collective security in the pre-war period and which today more than ever violates and menaces America's national interests is once more being smuggled into public life. It is being brought forward in devious ways, especially at this critical time when the mighty offensive of the Red Army is opening the way for the United Nations to join in common fighting action with the Soviet Union to deliver the mortal blows to the Nazi army and regime.

The current "line of reasoning" being circulated by this particular "school of thought" runs something like this (although it is seldom put so bluntly): "If Hitler is defeated this year, the Soviet Union may wield too much influence at the peace table. Therefore, America and Britain should conserve and build up their military strength still further and wait to strike directly at Hitler in 1943 or 1944." Also: "If Hitler's defeat is postponed and the war on the Soviet-German front is prolonged, then possibly the Soviet Union may be weakened, if not exhausted." And so on ad infinitum.

One of the disturbing, nay, one of the most dangerous things about this enemy propaganda is that the *Cliveden Set* is still freely permitted to poison the atmosphere with this treasonable ideology and campaign. But the most serious as-

pect of this "line of thinking" which predetermines certain political activity, is that *it has found covert support, for various reasons, in certain influential circles in high places.*

It is no secret, for instance, that some people in the State Department and in certain army and navy circles covertly support or, at best, are influenced by this viewpoint. Certainly no one can gainsay the fact that this outlook already has hindered the full mobilization of our country for an all-out military and political struggle against Hitler and the Axis. It has helped prevent concentrating the main blows of our nation against the main enemy, Hitler fascism. It has influenced America's relations with Vichy, Helsinki and Madrid to the detriment of our country and allies. It has retarded the extent and scope of America's collaboration with the Soviet Union and with all of the United Nations for our common objectives, for common victory over the Nazi-fascist Axis. Certainly no one can deny that this Munich mentality plays no small role in obstructing the speediest realization of the President's call for an "eagle" policy, for aggressive and offensive action which could find no better channel today than that of boldly moving to attack Hitler's Western rear and flank now, in time.

Whatever the motivation, or whoever the exponent, of such policies, it is as clear as Munich that such "thinking" and any course of action which would endeavor to postpone the defeat of Hitlerism

and try to "exhaust" and "weaken" the U.S.S.R., is as criminal and un-American as it is stupid. It is criminal and anti-American because if such a policy were to prevail, the American people together with all the peoples of the United Nations would have to pay far more dearly and painfully, would have to sacrifice millions of lives beyond that which is necessary today if America and Britain join in common military action with the Soviet Union by striking at Hitler from the West now, this spring and summer, when such united fighting action could deliver the fatal blows to Hitler's vincible armies. It is criminal and anti-American because such a policy would create added difficulties for our ally, the Soviet Union, and would endanger the national existence and future of all of the United Nations, in the first place of the United States and Britain. Any policy, and certainly this one, is criminal and anti-American which knowingly or objectively would or does prevent the maximum unity of military and political action of the United Nations, which tends to or actually enables the Hitler regime to prolong for one extra day or one extra hour its barbaric existence and murderous assault on the peoples and world civilization. And the peoples will exact a heavy penalty from anyone who is guilty of sponsoring, following or aiding such a policy.

Such thinking and policies are as stupid as they are criminal and suicidal. Life itself has answered the proponents of those policies

which purportedly have as their object the weakening or defeat of the Soviet Union. One answer was provided by the results of Munich and the attempts at that time to isolate the U.S.S.R. and to turn Hitler's aggression Eastward. This policy, as is well known, boomeranged on its sponsors and was largely responsible for unleashing World War II.

Another answer already has been indelibly written in history by the Soviet Union in the period since June 22, 1941. For, as all the world can now judge and as the epic offensive of the Red Army graphically confirms, Stalin was a thousand times correct when he stated on November 6, 1941:

" . . . Far from weakening, the setbacks of the Red Army, on the contrary, strengthened still more the alliance of the workers and peasants as well as the friendship of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

"More than that, they transformed the family of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. into a single, inviolable camp which selflessly is supporting its Red Army and Red Navy.

"The Soviet rear was never as strong as today. It is quite credible that with such losses as we have today, any other state would fail to withstand the ordeals and would deteriorate. If the Soviet system was able so easily to withstand the ordeal and still further to strengthen its rear, this means that the Soviet system is now the strongest system.

"Finally, the German invaders calculated on the weakness of the Red Army and Red Navy, believing that with the very first blow

of the German army and German navy they would scatter our army and navy and open the road for themselves for an unhampered advance into the interior of our country. But here, too, the Germans gravely miscalculated, overestimating their own forces and underestimating our army and navy.”*

And as for those “timid souls” among the bourgeoisie who are “frightened” at the prospects of an “early victory” over Hitler lest the Soviet Union would “dictate the peace,” it might be well for them to examine soberly the war aims which the Soviet Union has enunciated on more than one occasion. The objectives, approach and principles which guide the action of the Soviet Union in this respect were clearly stated by Stalin:

“We have not and cannot have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories, the subjugation of foreign peoples, regardless of whether it concerns peoples and territories of Europe or peoples and territories of Asia, including Iran. Our first aim consists in liberating our territory and our peoples from the German fascist yoke.

“We have not and cannot have such war aims as imposing our will and our regime on the Slavs and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our aid. Our aid consists in assisting these peoples in their liberation struggle against Hitler tyranny and then setting them free to rule on their own land as they desire. No intervention

whatever in the internal affairs of other peoples!”*

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the peace which will follow the present single and indivisible war of the United anti-Hitler Nations will be determined primarily and to a large extent by the character of the war and the relationship of forces existing internationally and within each country at the end of the war. Since the present war is a just war for national independence and freedom, and since today there exists a different relationship of forces on a world scale and internally within the various countries than existed at the end of the first World War, the character of the post-war peace which will result from the *common* victory of the United Nations will also differ from that of Versailles or Compiègne. It can and probably will be a just peace corresponding to the common cause of the United Nations and peoples, which is to destroy Hitler and Hitlerism, to render impossible the recurrence of fascist aggression and war, and to enable each nation to enjoy national independence and the right freely to work out its own destiny and aspirations.

Undoubtedly, to the extent that the solidarity and unity of action of the peoples and of the United Nations are consolidated and strengthened, especially to the extent that the developing alliance between the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union is reinforced with a rounded-out

* *Stalin Speaks to the World*, Workers Library Publishers, pp. 5-6.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

military, political and economic alliance, with joint leadership, with unified strategy, with common fighting action, with joint responsibilities and sacrifices to bring about the complete destruction of Hitler and the Axis—to that extent not only will the common victory of the United Nations be accelerated and secured, but also a common understanding can and most probably will be worked out to ensure a just post-war peace and collective security.

Finally, in regard to some gentlemen who are greatly worried over the present and future prestige and influence of this or that power: It is no secret that all the great and small nations of the world, especially the leading coalition of the United Nations, are being and will be judged by the peoples and nations of the world, and will exercise political influence primarily on the basis of their individual and collective contributions to the common cause of defeating Hitler and world fascism. Clearly those powers and states will enjoy the greatest prestige and will probably emerge the most influential in post-war world affairs who now, *today*, contribute the most, sacrifice the most, and provide the most consistent leadership in destroying Hitler and Hitlerism, in steadfastly championing the national independence and liberties of all peoples and nations.

Be this as it may, one central thing is clear: Victory over Hitler and the Axis *still has to be won*. *This is the paramount, the foremost and common task of all of the United Nations*. To win victory,

whether early or later, will require a supreme and combined effort of the entire world anti-Hitler front, of all peoples. It will require greater common war efforts, sustained common fighting action and a closer alliance of *all* of the United Nations, above all of the leading coalition of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and Great Britain. Anything which weakens or tends to prevent that unity of action necessary to win the war—whether the treasonable propaganda for a “negotiated peace” or efforts to divert the main attention of the people from prosecuting the war to speculative and divisive discussions around “blueprints” concerning post-war peace “terms”—must be decisively cast aside as detrimental to the common cause, both to the attainment of victory and to the eventual establishment of a just peace.

* * *

At this crucial turning point in the war, when an Anglo-American offensive, would catch Hitler in the coordinated with the great Soviet offensive would catch Hitler in the fatal grip of a joint Allied attack on two or more fronts—it is essential that all true patriots—Democrats and Republicans, Communists and independents, and especially organized labor—should more resolutely and unitedly support and implement the government’s orientation “to carry the war to the enemy.” This is of paramount importance. This is necessary to win the war. Even the *New York Herald Tribune* partially recognized the urgency of this when it stated:

“ . . . the problem before the United Nations of passing from defense to the offensive is becoming acute, and in its solution public opinion does have a vital part to play. . . . Only the people as a whole can convert this from a war to defend ourselves into a war to smash the enemy—which is the only kind of war that can now be won.” (March 2, 1942).

As in all other phases of the national war effort, here, too, labor is faced with exceptionally great responsibilities. Labor already is going over to the offensive, is developing greater unity of action to win the battle for production and to help build up our armed forces and civilian defense. It is playing an important role in helping forge and strengthen national unity for preserving our Republic and smashing Hitlerism.

But so far labor has not yet shown sufficient initiative in raising and helping formulate and shape many other vital aspects of governmental policy which are essential to win the war. To help influence more decisively and effectively the conduct and outcome of the war, it is imperative that the labor movement unitedly should make its voice heard and its influence felt on *all* problems affecting national policy, just as today it is increasingly doing on most matters pertaining to the crucial question of securing maximum war production. This applies especially to such life-and-death questions for ensuring America's participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring; effecting a full alliance, unified

strategy and common fighting action of all of the United Nations and peoples; combating and defeating the pro-fascist appeasers within and outside of Congress and certain government agencies, and within the trade union movement itself; strengthening the government and Congress with the most capable and consistent supporters of the President and of our national policy, with the most uncompromising enemies of Hitler and Hitlerism, with adequate representation for labor.

The statement by Philip Murray, on March 9, calling for increased war production in order “to provide the necessary materials for an early offensive against the Axis powers”; the statements of Green, Carey and Whitney at the Labor Dinner of the Greater New York Fund on March 12; and the recent actions of the C.I.O. Councils in New York, Newark and Milwaukee, as well as that of the state convention of the C.I.O. in Massachusetts, in calling for an alliance between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and England, and for the immediate launching of an Anglo-American offensive against Hitler Germany in Western Europe—are indications that important and wider sections of the labor movement are reacting to these central issues, are beginning to take the offensive on the political as well as the production fronts.

What is necessary now is that America's great labor movement should display *still greater political and organizing initiative, and act still more determinedly* to mobilize and solidify its own ranks and to rally and collaborate more closely

with all anti-Hitler forces in a united all-out war effort on the military, production and political fronts in furtherance of our national objectives. In line with this, it is essential that everything shall be done, in the shortest possible time, to help crystalize and give expression to the growing sentiment throughout the country for America's taking the offensive; to ensure that the American people, by their joint efforts, act in time so as to help effectuate the government's proposal to carry the war to the

enemy; to help guarantee that our country strengthens the alliance and common military action of all of the United Nations, especially to ensure that the United States, together with Great Britain and in conjunction with the Soviet Union and its powerful offensive, concentrates its main blow against the main enemy—Hitler and Hitlerism—by opening a second front on the European continent. For this is the surest and shortest road to winning the war, to victory over Hitler and the Axis.

THE COURSE OF THE WAR AND THE PRESENT TASKS

BY GIL GREEN

(Based on a report delivered to a meeting of New York Communist Party functionaries, March 5, 1942.)

I.

THE war is now entering into a new phase. To understand what this new phase is, it is necessary to see clearly what has been and continues to be the Axis strategy.

Knowing full well that the potential resources of the United Nations far exceed those of the Axis, Hitler's strategy is based upon delivering shattering blows in rapid fire succession before the industrial and military might of the United Nations can be fully developed and brought to bear on the fields of battle. In this way he hopes to hold the initiative, to force the United Nations to fight on his own chosen fields and at his own sweet time; to force them to spread themselves thin; to isolate one from the other, and thereby to destroy them piecemeal. The plight of the gallant MacArthur and his staunch band of fighters, isolated and cut off from outside assistance of any kind, is the objective that the Axis seeks to accomplish in respect to the fighting forces and resources of each one of the United Nations.

Already the Burma Road, the lifeline to China, has been severed. The Dutch East Indies have been conquered. India is threatened from

the East and may soon face a threat from the West. Turkey, Gibraltar, Dakar, the Azores, Iceland and the Panama Canal may become the scenes of the new Axis attacks as part of its central strategy to separate and isolate continents and nations, to make impossible a world pooling of Allied manpower and resources and the development of concerted military action.

When all this is related to the contemplated spring offensive of Hitler against the Soviet Union, one must draw the conclusion that the war is entering a new, more dangerous and more critical stage. It would be folly to hide the gravity of the moment by glib talk about great offensives to be organized next year or the following year. What will happen then will depend in the first place upon what happens in the very next few months. The immediate months ahead may very well decide the outcome of the war—the difference between victory and defeat.

But this new phase of the war is not only fraught with great danger. It is also pregnant with great opportunity. The three months that have passed since December 7 have not only been months of

reversal and defeat. They have also been months of great advances and awe-inspiring victories. The Soviet Union and its glorious Red Army succeeded in wresting the initiative from the German military machine. It has ever more firmly held on to this initiative and has been driving the Nazi hordes backward and backward in a military achievement unparalleled in all history. This therefore is the opportunity: the opportunity to defeat Hitler's whole strategy, to beat him, and on the decisive front. If Britain and America were to seize this opportunity and strike with all their power through the opening of a second front on the European continent, it would be possible to defeat Hitler Germany not in the far distant future, but in this very year of 1942. And if Hitler Germany can be beaten in 1942, this would be the beginning of the end for Japanese imperialism as well. For Nazi Germany is the center, instigator and spearhead of the fascist Axis conspiracy to conquer and enslave the world. Its defeat would break the Axis at its most dangerous and yet its most vulnerable point, thereby hastening the day of the complete victory of the United Nations. This is the golden opportunity that presents itself. To ignore it, to muffle this chance, is to toy with disaster.

Offensive action in Europe is of decisive importance and does not preclude offensive action in the Far East, although the struggle in this theatre of war will undoubtedly be of a protracted character. But before any vital change can be brought about in the

Far Eastern sphere of military action an important lesson must be grasped from the defeats suffered thus far. The lesson is: rally the colonial peoples; arm them; give them political rights and then, and then only, can the Japanese war machine be brought to a dead stop. Heroic China has shown the whole world how a people which has achieved national unity and is inspired by the vision of national independence can fight for its freedom. MacArthur's breath-taking, back-to-the-wall resistance against immense odds is also due in no small part to the fact that Filipino soldiers and Filipino tribesmen fight side by side with American boys.

Said the *Reynolds News* of London on January 18:

"We spent millions of pounds to make Singapore an impregnable fortress. But we left out one ingredient. We forgot to make allies of the Malaysians and Chinese who make up the mass of the population."

Since the fall of Singapore and the invasion of Burma there has been expressed both in Britain and American Government circles a growing recognition of the need for a change of policy toward the people of India and the colonial peoples generally. It is our hope that no time will be lost in giving these hundreds of millions of colonial peoples a new deal and thereby enlist them as active allies on the side of the United Nations. Just as the great Abraham Lincoln in order to preserve and save this Union became convinced of the need of free-

ing the slaves, so Britain and America, in order to win this war, must issue a modern Emancipation Proclamation for the colonial peoples of the world.

This is a new kind of war and must be fought in a new way. The immediate months ahead will be crucial and even decisive. The realization is beginning to dawn upon Britain and America that only a policy of the offensive, together with a great democratic unfolding of the war effort, can stir the masses to greater activity and turn the tide of battle. This certainly is one of the most important elements that helps comprise the new phase of the war. It is to be noted in the changes that have been made in the British war cabinet and in the proposals for an offensive which have appeared in statements of various government spokesmen in this country, as seen in the recent speeches of the President, Secretary of War Stimson, and W.P.B. head Nelson and in the letter of General Marshall to the Senate. A new offensive mood is sweeping the country, as testified to by Anne O'Hare McCormick in a recent column in the *N.Y. Times*:

"In the United States it has taken less than three months of unsuccessful war against an underrated enemy to turn the first dismay of the American people into a rising clamor for offensive action.

"Like a current suddenly turned on . . . the emphasis . . . has veered from promises of future victories to a cry for more speed and initiative now."

It would be a serious error, however, to draw the conclusion that

this recent emphasis on offensive action is already a guarantee that the opportunity ahead will be fully grasped. Even if the trend is in the correct direction we must remember that correct conclusions arrived at too late or executed too slowly may still spell defeat. This is particularly true because the appeasers are once again out in the open, trying to confuse the masses, endeavoring to keep America on the defensive, pitting the needs of one front against the other, and doing their damndest to sow suspicion and discord among the United Nations.

Secondly, even the government spokesmen who have waxed eloquent about the need for offensive action have not made clear what they mean by this concretely and whether action on the European continent is in their immediate plans.

Thirdly, we cannot ignore that there is not yet a unified world strategy based upon a full military and political alliance between the U.S.A., Britain, the Soviet Union and China. The U. S. and Britain often act as if they were senior partners, with the U.S.S.R. and China the junior ones. Senator Claude Pepper expressed this thought when he declared:

"It would seem that those who guide its [the Soviet Union's] gallant and heroic course would be an intimate part of every council and conference dealing with the grand strategy of this struggle which embraces the globe. May we not ask, therefore, that more room be made for the Russians at the War Table. . . . We who have profited so much from the unflinching and sacrificial

struggle of Russia and China have not given them their due."

There is only one guarantee that the lessons of the past months will be fully learned and promptly applied, and that is if these questions of central strategy become matters of concern and action for the people themselves. Since December 7 the labor movement has more or less been influenced by the concept that on matters of foreign policy or central strategy, on issues of the conduct of the war, there was no need for action on its part. This is not correct. The labor movement should take the lead on these questions as it does in Great Britain. It should consciously counteract the insidious and treasonable activities of the appeasers. It should press for a full-fledged military and political alliance between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. It should take the lead in establishing international labor unity by joining the Anglo-Soviet trade union council. It should inculcate all of its ranks with the spirit of the offensive and press for the opening of a second European front for victory over Hitler Germany in 1942. It should call for a strengthening of the President's Cabinet and for the inclusion within it of a representative from the ranks of labor. It should apply the lessons of the Far East to America and demand that an end be put to the discrimination which is so rife against the 14,000,000 Negro people in this country.

If the offensive is to be taken on the military fronts, there is one special task: the need for taking the

offensive on the assembly line and winning the battle for production. America has the plant capacity, trained personnel and the raw materials with which to outproduce Hitler, but with all the headway of the past months this battle, the battle that will help decide the outcome of all battles, is not yet won.

There are two reasons for this. First, the business-as-usual attitude of many employers who are more concerned with piling up huge profits than with production. These have resisted the formation of production councils composed of management and labor, have sought unfair advantages and attempted to misuse labor's voluntary surrender of the strike weapon as a means to destroy labor standards and rights.

That the Administration has begun to recognize this is to be seen by the recent speech of Donald Nelson, which is of great significance and will play a mighty role in tapping the initiative and productive capacity of American labor. This address calls for the setting up of production committees of labor and management in all plants; encourages initiative and proposals from the workers and promises that these will be carefully considered and acted upon. It advocates merit awards for exceptional labor and the development of friendly competition between plants, departments and men. It is suggested that every war production shop have a scoreboard giving the daily standing and how it compares to the established quota.

The action of the War Labor Board in abandoning the former

policy of competitive bidding for government contracts is also very important in that it will enable small manufacturers to receive government contracts even though the costs may be higher. Thereby war orders can be spread, and an end be put to the situation in which large corporations have a monopoly of war production contracts.

Here, too, it would be a mistake to believe that Donald Nelson's speech has solved all problems. This speech should be discussed in every shop and every union. The workers themselves should take the lead in making concrete proposals to management, in seeing that production councils are set up, that competition is organized and that the initiative of all the workers is tapped and put to use.

The second reason for the slowness on the production front is that many workers have not yet been made to feel the urgency of the need and have in some cases, due to provocation on the part of employers, permitted themselves to fall into working-as-usual methods. Regardless of how justified any grievances of the workers, there is no justification for strike actions today. Every strike only interrupts production, only serves the enemies of the nation. The workers today produce not only for wages; they produce for the nation, for the war, for the defense of everything they hold near and dear. Controversies and disputes there will be, but these must be solved by peaceful means, through collective bargaining, mediation and arbitration.

The Victory Labor Board can become an important instrument in harnessing all the talents and energies of labor for the war effort and in making possible a peaceful solution to industrial controversies and disputes. This will all the more be so to the extent that the Victory Labor Board takes energetic steps to stimulate and advance unity of action in the ranks of labor among the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods and as it becomes the articulate medium through which the labor movement raises all questions of war policy with the government.

At this time a great controversy is raging around the issue of economic demands, of wages and hours. The *Daily Worker* editorial article "A War Labor Policy," which appeared on March 4, provides a realistic approach to the solution of this problem. In answer to the demand of certain people for a policy of freezing wages at their present levels the *Daily Worker* replies:

"A policy of controlling wages can only be accepted as part of a general economic policy on the part of the government which includes democratic rationing, control of prices, control and heavier taxes on excess profits, taking into account the workers' voluntary savings through purchase of Defense Bonds, adjusting upwards the real wages of the low income groups, and ascertaining that the real wages of any group is sufficient to assure the highest level of productivity."

Democratic rationing and price control are today of far greater importance as a means of guaranteeing

an adequate standard of living for the workers than that of a rise in paper wages. Why? Because as we turn out more planes, guns, tanks and battleships, more and more workers, raw material and plant capacity will be diverted from the production of consumers' goods. It is estimated that in the year 1942 there will be \$80,000,000,000 to be spent on consumers' goods with only \$65,000,000,000 worth of consumers' goods available. The demand for food, clothing and luxury articles will therefore be much greater than the supply. This will have the tendency of boosting prices even higher than their present levels. As long as this tendency is not checked and stopped, the demand for higher wages on the part of labor cannot be ignored. However, the more basic solutions are:

1. Rigidly controlling prices, especially on retail commodities;

2. On items in which a scarcity is in sight, to organize a system of democratic rationing, as is now planned in respect to sugar. Otherwise the workers, and especially those from the lower income groups, will be unable to "receive the goods necessary to assure morale and maintain productivity and efficiency."

As the shortages develop in one or another line of consumers' goods, the Communists must explain to the workers the reason for this. It is part of our task to make the workers and the people understand that *all* will have to sacrifice if the war is to be won, for these sacrifices will be nothing in comparison to those imposed upon us if the war is lost.

Every union should discuss these questions, should demand immediate government action in respect to price control, rent control and rationing, for only in this way will it become impossible for the appeasers and enemies of the nation to utilize the difficulties of the war as a means of confusing and misleading the people.

An offensive on the military front and on the production front likewise calls for an offensive on the political front, against all appeasers, all fifth columnists, all enemies of the nation. Immediately following the attack upon Pearl Harbor, the Coughlinites, Hearsts, Lindberghs, Wheelers, Nyes, Fishes and Norman Thomases jumped on the bandwagon of national unity and proclaimed—in words—their support of the government and their loyalty to the nation. But no sooner did they feel that the moment was opportune to leave their holes than these weasels began to undermine the government's war policy and to throw confusion into the ranks of the people.

The question that we must ask ourselves is: why did they feel safe to engage once again in their sniping warfare? First, because at the time these people proclaimed their loyalty there were sections of the press and sections of the people who took them at their word and forgave them for their past sins. Secondly, because the labor and progressive movements thought that once national unity was achieved this signified that the appeasers were beaten—and for all time—and that there was no longer a need for vigi-

lance, no longer the need for struggling against them.

The result? The appeasers went on a rampage. They demagogically made use of certain weaknesses in the Civilian Defense set-up in order to ridicule the organization in the eyes of the people. They succeeded in ousting Mrs. Roosevelt, and in pretty nearly emasculating the whole non-protective phase of the civilian defense program. They similarly succeeded in defeating the President's proposal for \$300,000,000 for the unemployed resulting from economic dislocations. In true Copperhead style they strove to utilize the reverses and defeats in the Far East in order to demoralize the masses and destroy their faith and confidence in the alliance of the United Nations and in final victory.

At first certain Administration elements attempted to conciliate these forces by making concessions to them, as in the case of the O.C.D. But this policy of conciliation only whetted their appetites. When Mayor La Guardia, for example, made concessions to the reactionaries in the form of the removal of Commissioners Kern and Sayre from the Civil Service Commission, he only reaped a whirlwind in the form of the Queens "revolt" among the air-raid wardens, an action inspired and organized by the "Christian" Front and the Coughlinites.

The enemies of the nation cannot be conciliated, they must be fought, isolated and defeated. The Cliveden Set and the poison-peddlers, as the President aptly termed them, must be driven back into their holes,

must be removed from the political life of America.

It is in this relation that we must understand the true significance of the Browder case. Certainly President Roosevelt and every other sensible person knows that Earl Browder is in jail for no other reason than that he is the leader of the Communist Party. Why has he not been released? Because there still are people in Washington who believe that it is necessary for Browder to remain in jail in order to conciliate some of the appeasement, red-baiting, enemies of the government and the war. But you can't conciliate the Fishes and the Dieses. You can only fight them.

The campaign to release Earl Browder is therefore not merely a fight for justice, a struggle to bring back into our fold our most beloved and greatest leader—it is also a struggle against the whole concept of conciliation to the red-baiters and appeasers. To conciliate the enemies of the nation is to permit them to carry on their nefarious work of undermining and destroying national unity. The freedom of Earl Browder is therefore necessary so that red-baiting and appeasement can be buried for all time, so that national unity can be strengthened in the interests of the successful prosecution of the war. *Free Earl Browder!* This must be the cry that rings out throughout the ranks of labor and the nation.

In this fight against the enemies of the nation labor has a great responsibility. Labor should ferret out the Nazi and Japanese spies and saboteurs. Labor should demand

that the Deatherages and Dennises be given no posts of responsibility, and be ruthlessly removed from every position in which they can be of harm to the national effort. Labor should take the offensive against the appeasers, reacting to every issue in Congress, in the State Legislatures and in the City Councils.

In all this labor must strive to achieve complete unity of action in its own ranks. To the extent that it can accomplish this, it can play a qualitatively greater and even decisive role in influencing and determining the coming Congressional and gubernatorial elections. In these elections labor and the people as a whole must guarantee the defeat of every appeasement candidate and the victory of those candidates, regardless of political affiliation, who by their program and record are pledged to an all-out no-compromise struggle against the Axis and its agents and tools in this country. Every Congressman and Senator, every aspirant for political office must be made to realize *now* that appeasement politics or politics as usual are not only unwise but dangerous and bound to result in his own electoral defeat.

National unity is not something static, is not something that can be taken for granted. It must be fought for at all times, defended from those who wish to destroy it, and thereby raised to new and higher levels.

II.

When America picked up the gauntlet thrown down to her by the Axis, there were many who believed that this war would be easily

won without too great exertion or sacrifice—that victory was sure to come in time merely because our cause was just and our potential industrial and military power great. Even in our own ranks there was a feeling that once the sword was drawn everything would take care of itself; all we had to do was to merge ourselves with the masses and go along with the stream.

But the developments of the past three months, the heartbreaking reverses and defeats suffered by the United Nations in the Far East, the new outburst of appeasement activity in the nation, the numerous examples of business and politics as usual, show that complacency has not yet been completely eradicated and that national unity and a correct war policy are objectives that cannot be taken for granted, but must be fought for day in and day out until victory is achieved.

The period since December 7 has been crowded with important events and great activity resulting in a closer welding together of the nations fighting the Axis and in an increased mustering of the human and material resources of the nation for the war. The Declaration of the Twenty-six United Nations, the President's Victory Production Program, the growing unity and initiative of the labor movement in behalf of the national effort—all indicate the progress attained.

In this situation the Communists have a special role to play in the furtherance and strengthening of national and world anti-Hitler unity.

It is not enough that our

party, the Communist Party, point to the general trend that is positive, for the danger has grown, the time is short, and there are many submerged rocks upon which the ship of state can be wrecked. The role of our party is not merely to indicate which way the wind is blowing; it is that of a working class political party which endeavors to influence both the direction and velocity of the wind, which helps determine the course of events, the course of the war itself.

This means that our party above all must constantly educate the masses as to the just character of the war and the stake of our nation in its outcome. It must at each stage of the struggle analyze, note and endeavor to correct weaknesses, warn of the dangers and pitfalls ahead, and point the way to victory. Our party must bring this understanding to the working class and mobilize it as a conscious force supporting the government, building national unity, struggling against the appeasers and enemies of the nation and constantly pressing for a more resolute and determined course to win the war.

Today all party and Young Communist League members have great responsibilities. It is their job to be examples to the workers in their shops and to the neighbors in their community. But they have another task as well—to be conscious forces clarifying the masses, answering their arguments, explaining each development in the war, combating the tendencies toward demoralization, panic or thinking as usual, raising the morale of the people

and cementing the national unity.

This means that every Communist must be on the alert, must keep abreast of all developments, so that he can become a force for correcting weaknesses, for improving things, for getting things done, for activizing and mobilizing his fellow workers. This means first of all that every party member and Y.C.L.'er should be a reader and a *daily* reader of that great working class newspaper, the *Daily Worker*.

The *Sunday Worker* and the *Daily Worker* are not only instruments for educating and guiding our party members; they are the most important weapons that we possess in clarifying the masses and in stimulating them into greater activity. That is why the campaign to build our press, to double the circulation of the *Sunday Worker*, is not motivated by business-as-usual considerations on our part. The spreading of our press today has a new significance, is tied up with the winning of the war. For who can doubt that every worker who becomes a reader of our press becomes thereby a more intelligent fighter for the nation and for victory? And this is all the more important because the path ahead is strewn with obstacles and leads through dangerous detours. If in the course of but three months so much has happened, so many difficulties have been encountered, certainly at a time when the war is entering an even more crucial stage the voice of our party, its clarity and resoluteness, can be a most important factor in furthering our nation's success.

Nor should we underestimate the prestige of our party and its ability to influence the course of events. For instance, who can get the workers to surpass themselves in the battle for production? Certainly not the employers, whom the workers mistrust and for ample reason; nor the daily capitalist papers, that always angle the news against the workers and their unions. But when we speak up, many workers will listen; for they know us as the staunch defenders of their interests, as the best builders of their unions.

To whom will the Negro people listen? The gentlemen who say this is a war for democracy and yet condone the discrimination of Negro people all around them? No, these people only provide fuel for the appeasers. A large percentage of the Negro people will, however, listen to our party and its press, for our party is the party of James W. Ford, the party that fought to free Angelo Herndon and the Scottsboro Boys, and continues to fight day in and day out for the Negro people. Certainly it is no accident that the maiden speech of Communist Councilman Pete Cacchione in the New York City Council was a speech for Negro rights.

The *Sunday Worker* and the *Daily Worker* can speak to hundreds of thousands who know us by our deeds and to tens of thousands more for whom the events of the past months have been eye-openers—who now begin to grasp the truth about socialism, who begin to see Communists in a new light.

Of the utmost importance in

connection with all we have discussed is the question of building the party. Recruiting is not a task for the exceptional comrade, it is a task for every member of the party, for every member of the Y.C.L. and especially for those in basic industry. Every member in our ranks should ask himself or herself: What am I doing to recruit, from my shopmates, my neighbors, my friends or from my own family? Every comrade should remember that people who were not ready for party membership, or who were uninterested a few months ago, may be more than ready today. These are new times; masses learn in days and weeks what it formerly took them years to learn. This will become increasingly more true during this whole critical juncture of world history. But how many of our members appreciate this change, understand its significance and act accordingly?

Our party faces many problems; of mass work and of internal organization. The party branch is the key for the solution of many of these problems, for it is the branch that is the party for the individual member and it is the branch that is the party to the people in the community. Our branches must be live educational and mobilization centers, open to the public, speaking out on all issues of the day, whether it be on matters of foreign policy or on such questions as how best to carry through the tin can salvage drive in their own territory. The most important party functionary is the branch organizer—for he should not only be a leader of the branch, he

should also be a leader in the community, the spokesman of the party, the person best known and most respected by the workers in his community. A combination of these two qualities is difficult to find and that is why the good branch organizer is the unhonored and unsung hero in our party organization.

Our party today faces a dearth of cadres. Many of our younger men are answering the call to the colors, are being drafted. At the same time our tasks have multiplied. We therefore need more active people, more leaders. But when we say we have a dearth of cadres we mean only that these have not yet been found; but they do exist, they are in the lower ranks of our party. These must be found, promoted, and given greater responsibilities. This is especially true of our shop workers and our women comrades.

Of decisive importance in accelerating the process of training cadres is systematic Marxist-Leninist education. More of our members should study *The Communist* and promote its distribution, should delve into the classics of the founders and developers of socialism as a science. And, in this respect, more attention should be given to the building of the Workers' School, the great institution of Marxist-Leninist education. Every functionary, every worker who aspires to leadership, should take a course in the Workers' School or in its extension division.

A last point. Our party stands for

democracy and practices democracy. The leadership of the party rises from the ranks and always remains responsible to the ranks. This means that the leadership is not only subject to control from above, it is also subject to control from below.

We want freedom of criticism, as long as it is well founded and constructive. We want all party members to think about how to improve and build the party and to make concrete proposals and suggestions. Only together, only by harnessing the intelligence, devotion and ability of every member of our party can we do the job that must be done.

Let us permeate our own ranks with a new spirit of the offensive. Let us increase our efforts for the freedom of our great leader, Earl Browder. Let us activize our members, build our press and recruit thousands of more workers into our party. Let us find and promote new working class leaders from our ranks. Let us do our part in mobilizing the masses for the military offensive and the offensive on the assembly line. Let us help bring into being a new European front against Hitler and a full military and political alliance between the U.S.A., Britain and the U.S.S.R. Let us help rout the appeasers and the enemies of the nation.

Let us face our tasks confident in the correctness of our policies, determined that no sacrifice shall be too great in the noble task of bringing victory to America and its allies.

A WAR-TIME TAX PROGRAM FOR VICTORY

BY JEAN FRANCIS

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S Budget Message to Congress formulates the task of mobilizing the financial resources for the war and indicates means of solution in a general way. Congress is now engaged in further rendering the task concrete, and in working out the vital details. On these "details" the success of the national budget will depend to a large extent. Hence the people and their mass organizations must intimately concern themselves with the working out of the budget, to make sure that Congress realizes effectively the principles of war financing laid down in the President's Message.

The two main principles in the message are: (1) it is a war budget; this means that every fiscal measure in it has the one aim of mobilizing the country's financial and capital resources for paying the cost of the war; and (2) that "a fair distribution of the war burden is necessary for national unity." These are sound national principles, necessary for winning the war, and to them we must stubbornly adhere.

From these principles, a number of specific points assume particular importance. One is the proportion of taxes to borrowing. The budget

message suggests that the 1942-43 deficit be covered by \$9,000,000,000 in new taxation (additional to existing taxation) and the rest by borrowing. That may turn out the best that can be done; but, as a general rule, we should seek to attain a *larger proportion* of taxation to borrowing. This is so not because there is any special danger involved in an increased national debt; this debt will greatly increase, no matter how high the war taxes. The point here is that the main task of our fiscal war policy is to mobilize fully the country's capital resources for the war effort. And taxation has proven the most effective method.

The *kind* of taxation is the next important point. The President said: "Progressive taxes are the backbone of the federal tax system." It should also be the backbone of our war financing. Ability to pay must continue the guiding consideration.

Of a different sort is the President's suggestion that the time has come for adopting so-called "anti-inflationary" taxes. This is an economic fallacy. Inflation should be combated by (a) price fixing, price regulation and rationing, democratically controlled; (b) government control of all essential raw materials and their intensive production; (c)

a full mobilization of the national economy for war purposes. If this is done, no "anti-inflationary" taxes will be necessary. The sort of taxation which takes the form of a general sales tax, or further lowering of personal exemptions, or excise taxes on the poor men's necessities—is favored particularly by the most selfish interests of big business and is intended by them as a means of shifting the war burden to the masses. But the President calls for "a fair distribution of the war burdens." Hence this kind of taxation cannot be supported. Taxation should concern itself mainly with producing revenue for the war, with mobilizing the country's capital resources.

The President's attitude on payroll taxes is sound and fair. He said: "I oppose the use of payroll taxes as a measure of war finance unless the worker is given his full money's worth in increased social security." This is sound for two reasons: we don't need payroll taxes to finance the war, even though the adoption of payroll taxes would increase the government's financial resources; thus, secondly, if such taxes are considered at all, they should carry with them increased social security for the workers. There will be attempts in Congress to adopt the tax and reject the security. The people should see to it that both are handled inseparably. In other words, payroll taxes could be supported, not as a would-be means of combating inflation, but as a means of increasing social security which also provides additional revenue for financing the war.

With the suggested excise taxes—indirect taxation—there are obvious and serious dangers. Certain elements in Congress, whose devotion to the nation's victory program is still to be proved, are clamoring for all sorts of sales taxes—taxes on the people's essentials of life. This sort of taxation must be opposed resolutely. It violates most brazenly the government's principle of "a fair distribution of the war burden" because it hits mostly the low-income groups of our people. It increases the inflationary rise of the price structure. It is not needed for financing the war. If Congress wants to consider excise taxes on articles of real luxury, those consumed by the few, there can be no objection; here, the taxes would be siphoning off income from the middle and upper classes who are in the market for articles competing with metals, labor, etc., needed for war materials.

In considering these questions—the proper kinds of war taxation—let us keep in mind these facts. According to the latest report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, vital items in the cost of living have risen in 1941 from 5.7 to 36.1 per cent; it now costs 25.5 per cent more than a year ago to fill the average family market basket. And the rise is still continuing. The second fact is, according to Leon Henderson, that corporate profits have increased 169 per cent in the last two years. These two facts, by themselves, should be sufficient to rule out a general sales tax or taxes on consumers' necessities and to focus main attention on

addition progressive taxation of income and wealth.

As to expenditures, the President said that "in a true sense, there are no longer non-defense expenditures." He maintained that:

"It is part of our war effort to maintain civilian services which are essential to the basic needs of human life."

This should be sufficient answer to the fresh attempt now being made—under the false guise of war needs—to destroy our nation's relief and social services. It must not be forgotten that there were still over 5,000,000 unemployed last October and that another 2,500,000 may be added to them in the current months as a result of failure to mobilize rapidly the national economy to war purposes. Most of these "new" unemployed will, of course, remain jobless only temporarily, and many of the "older" unemployed should also, in time, find their way back to employment in the expanding war industries. All of which creates the urgent task of providing decent maintenance for the jobless as well as intensive training and retraining for their new employment. And these will be war expenditures—expenditures necessary for winning the war.

* * *

Against this background we must examine the Treasury tax program to raise \$7,610,000,000, as submitted by Secretary Morgenthau to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 2.

The Treasury proposed that this

revenue be raised from these sources:

Individual income taxes	\$3,200,000,000
Corporation taxes	3,060,000,000
Estate and gift taxes	330,000,000
Excise taxes (selected items)	1,340,000,000
Removal of "special privileges"	680,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$8,610,000,000
Less reductions effected through interrelation of taxes	1,000,000,000
	<hr/>
Net Yield	\$7,610,000,000

These are the main features of the Treasury tax program:

1. *Corporation Taxes.* The existing 7 per cent surtax on corporations with net incomes above \$25,000 would be raised to 31 per cent. The surtax on net incomes below \$25,000 would be raised from 6 to 16 per cent. The normal corporate rates of 24 per cent on net incomes above \$25,000, and the 15 to 19 per cent rates on incomes below \$25,000 would remain unchanged. The combined normal and surtax on corporations with net incomes above \$25,000 would thus be increased to 55 per cent. The increased rates were proposed in the *surtax* rather than the normal tax, since the surtax applies to interest on outstanding Federal bonds, while the normal tax does not. A special credit would be allowed against the 31 per cent surtax where the current profits have dropped in comparison with the average profits during 1936-1939.

Excess-profits tax changes. An increase of 15 percentage points in each bracket is proposed, so that the range would extend from 50 to 75 per cent. But no changes are proposed in the method of computing the amount of excess profits subject to the tax.

Postwar Credit. The Treasury proposes that whenever the receipt of an additional dollar of income would give rise to a combined excess-profits tax, normal and surtax of more than 80 cents, the tax above 80 cents would be held by the government for the account of the corporation and repaid to the corporation after the war for purchasing capital equipment or for additional employment of labor.

2. *Individual Income Tax.* The surtax rates are completely overhauled. The 6 per cent starting rate would be increased to 12 per cent, so the minimum rate on the lowest bracket would be 16 per cent (the 4 per cent normal tax remains unchanged). The surtax rates are steeply increased, reaching a maximum of 86 per cent at \$100,000, so that 90 cents (including the 4 per cent normal tax) out of every dollar above \$150,000 will be siphoned into the government's financial arsenal. With these rates, the taxes would be about doubled on the brackets up to \$8,000, the rate of increase decreasing thereafter. Because of the large increases suggested and the threat of inflation, the Secretary suggested that Congress give him the authority to impose a withholding tax up to 10

per cent on wages, bond interest and dividends. These sums deducted would be credited against the tax next year. This would not be a supplementary tax, but simply a way of collecting.

3. *Estate and Gift Taxes.* Increased rates are suggested. The effective rate on a net estate of \$200,000 would be raised from 17.9 to 23.5 per cent, on \$400,000 from 24.4 to 36.0 per cent, on a million dollar net estate from 30.7 to 51.3 per cent. Under present law, there is a specific exemption of \$40,000, in addition to a \$40,000 insurance exclusion, under the estate tax. The proposal would eliminate the insurance exclusion and provide a single specific exemption of \$60,000. The gift-tax exemption would be lowered from \$40,000 to \$30,000, and the annual exclusion of gifts would be \$5,000 for each donor instead of the existing exclusion of \$4,000 for each recipient.

4. *Selective Excise Taxes.* New and increased special excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, soft drinks, candy and chewing gum and other items are suggested to raise about \$1,300,000,000 of additional revenue. The most important items and their increased yield are shown in the following table:

<i>Article</i>	<i>Present Tax</i>	<i>Proposed Tax</i>	<i>Additional Yield</i> (in millions)
Gasoline	1½c per gal.	3c per gal.	\$242.2
Beer	\$6 per bbl.	\$8 per bbl.	117.1
Liquors, wines		about 50% increase	304.7
Soft drinks	None	1c per bottle	146.9
Candy, chewing gum	None	15% mfrs. sales price	45.3
Cigarettes	\$3.25 per M.	\$4 per M.	188.6

5. Removal of Special Privileges.

The Treasury proposed that certain provisions in the tax system "which grant to relatively few of our people special advantages and privileges at the expense of the great mass who must pay what is thereby lost" should be eliminated.

(a) Tax exempt securities. Abolition of the tax exemption now being enjoyed by outstanding state, local and municipal securities, to yield \$200,000,000 a year. Future issues would also be taxable. However, the tax exemption on outstanding Federal securities was not advocated by the Secretary because "tax exemption clauses appear in many of the outstanding issues of Federal securities and these promises must not be violated."

(b) Depletion Allowances. At present owners of mines and oil wells are permitted to deduct "percentage depletion" or cost depletion, whichever is higher. Even if the value of the mine or well had been paid by these deductions, owners were still permitted to enjoy this privilege. Revision of this deduction was recommended which would yield \$80,000,000 a year.

(c) Mandatory joint returns. The Treasury renewed its recommendation for compulsory joint returns which would yield about \$300,000,000 of additional revenue annually.

(d) Amendment of present laws affecting capital gains, life insurance company taxation and pension trusts. Revisions as proposed by the Treasury would produce about \$100,000,000 additional revenue a year.

6. General Sales Tax and Lowering Personal Exemptions.

Secretary Morgenthau emphatically opposed a general sales tax. His vigorous condemnation of the general sales tax rested on the soundest grounds. Said the Secretary of the Treasury:

"The general sales tax falls on scarce and plentiful commodities alike. It strikes at necessities and luxuries alike. As compared with the taxes proposed in this program, it bears disproportionately on the low income groups whose incomes are almost wholly spent on consumer goods. It is, therefore, regressive and encroaches harmfully upon the standard of living. It increases prices and makes price control more difficult. It stimulates demands for higher wages and adds to the parity price of agricultural products. It is not, as many suppose, easily collected; on the contrary, its collection would require much additional administrative machinery at a time when man power is limited."

Secretary Morgenthau also rejected the proposals to lower further the personal exemptions, declaring that "the very lowest income earners have all they can do to feed and clothe themselves and their families."

Such is the tax program advocated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Realistic and penetrating was his statement:

"Our task is more than the raising of a huge amount of new revenue. It is to make the tax program an instrument of victory. It is to frame the new revenue act so wisely and so soundly that it will facilitate the maximum production of war mater-

ials, hasten the mobilization of our resources, strengthen the unity of our people for the waging of total war and prepare for the new economic and social problems that will face us when the war is won." (Italics mine—J. F.)

Let us analyze the main features of the Treasury tax program in relation to the sound and necessary elements of a wartime tax program designed to ensure maximum production and national unity. Our wartime tax program must be based on a fair distribution of the war burden and should contain such measures as the following:

Wartime Corporation Tax Rates:

The Treasury's proposal to increase the regular tax rates on corporations (with incomes above \$25,000) to 55 per cent is sound, and in keeping with revenue requirements. The increase in the surtax from 7 per cent to 31 per cent reflects a sound understanding of the war needs.

The special surtax credit provision, however, should not be allowed. Under this proposal, a corporation whose current year's profits are less than its average 1936-1939 profits, would be allowed a credit (against the 31 per cent surtax) of 10 per cent of that difference, but the minimum surtax would be at least 11 per cent. For example, suppose a corporation has 1942 profits of \$100,000, and its average 1936-1939 profits were \$300,000. Its gross surtax would be 31 per cent of \$100,000, or \$31,000; but it would be allowed a credit of \$20,000 (10 per cent of

\$200,000, the difference between \$300,000 and \$100,000). Its net surtax would therefore be reduced to \$11,000, or only 11 per cent of its current profits of \$100,000. Since the tax is arithmetically lower when the amount of profits decreases, there is no justification for shrinking the tax still further by a credit allowance. Moreover, the fact remains that the corporation is subject to the 31 per cent rate only if its profits are above \$25,000. The fact that the corporation averaged still larger profits in 1936-1939 is no justification for special relief.

Wartime Excess-Profits Taxation of Corporations:

(a) *The basic deficiency of the Treasury tax program is its failure to propose the revision of the existing excess profits tax law which is ineffectual in recapturing the abnormal profits now being earned from war production.* An effective stringent excess-profits tax, designed to recapture the unparalleled profits being made by certain branches of industry, especially those engaged in war production, should be the cornerstone of a sound wartime tax program. If in September, 1941, the Secretary of the Treasury saw fit to recommend a 100 per cent tax on corporate profits over 6 per cent, today, after December 7, the least that should be done is that profits over 6 per cent of capital should be siphoned back to the Treasury.

Even a rate of 4 per cent would be more than twice the average 1.7 per cent return on capital earned by corporations during the years

1926-37. And when one recalls that corporations averaged only 5 per cent in the boom year 1929—a year of peace and unprecedented prosperity—can any one justifiably complain about even the 4 per cent figure, conscious that the nation is fighting for its life? Australia taxes all profits above 4 per cent of capital. Should it appear that a 100 per cent rate (on profits over 4 per cent) might lessen industry's incentive to produce, an 80 to 85 per cent rate could be established. And let us not forget that in England companies have been subject to an excess profits tax of 100 per cent since April 1, 1940 (the 1941-42 budget retained the principle of the 100 per cent excess-profits tax but provided that 20 per cent should be credited to the individual company for return in the post-war period).

Under the *existing* "excess-profits tax" law, no excess-profits tax is payable until current profits go above average 1936-39 profits and 7 to 8 per cent of capital—a "heads-the - corporation - wins - tails - the-Government-loses" alternative. If the corporation averaged 60 per cent on its capital during 1936-39, it pays no excess-profits tax on its current profits until it passes 57 per cent (95 per cent of 60) on its capital. The more prosperous the company was in 1936-39, the less excess-profits tax it pays—the ability-to-pay principle *in reverse*.

(b) Where the corporation's pre-defense profits (during 1936-39) averaged less than 4 per cent on capital, an additional special tax (at a rate, say, of 60 to 70 per cent)

should be levied on the profits above average 1936-39 profits and under 4 per cent of capital. This special tax would reach current earnings of railroads, steel companies (where overcapitalization is an important factor) and other corporations which earned less than 4 per cent during 1936-39 and are now reaping substantial profits. This type of tax was advocated by the Treasury last year (although the rate suggested was 10 per cent) and was adopted by the House only to be cast out by the Senate.

This is how these two proposals would operate. Assume a corporation, with invested capital of \$100,000,000 averaged \$3,000,000 during 1936-39 and has 1942 profits of \$14,000,000 (assume Congress fixes the excess-profits tax rate at 85 per cent and the additional special tax rate at 60 per cent). Four per cent on its invested capital would be \$4,000,000. The excess-profits tax would be 85 per cent of \$10,000,000 (\$14,000,000 less \$4,000,000), or \$8,500,000. The special tax would be 60 per cent of \$1,000,000 (\$4,000,000 less \$3,000,000), or \$600,000. The excess-profits tax and the special tax would total \$9,100,000.

The regular corporate tax rates (24 per cent normal plus 7 per cent surtax under *existing* law) would be levied on \$4,900,000 (\$14,000,000 less \$9,100,000)—amounting to \$1,519,000. Under the Treasury's tax program, the 7 per cent surtax would be increased to 31 per cent, so the 55 per cent tax (24 per cent normal plus 31 per cent surtax) on \$4,900,000 would be \$2,695,000.

[Note: If the corporation's aver-

age profits during 1936-39 were more than \$4,000,000 (i.e., 4 per cent of capital), it would not pay the \$600,000 "special" tax.]

(c) The great pool of swollen profits is concentrated in some of the largest corporations which have received the lion's (and the tiger's) share of the billions in defense-war contracts. To encourage small-scale production, the first \$25,000 of current profits should be exempt from excess-profits taxation. The regular corporate tax is an effective instrument for securing from small corporations their fair contribution to war finances. This \$25,000 exemption would also diminish administrative problems involved in the equitable determination of the amount of excess profits.

At present substantial "relief" provisions are permitted (supposedly for the benefit particularly of small corporations) to exclude so-called "abnormal income" in determining the amount of excess profits—provisions utilized to shrink the amount subject to the excess-profits tax. The \$25,000 exemption would in large measure eliminate the necessity of such "relief" provisions—and thus close a substantial loophole through which real excess profits escape.

In determining the amount of invested capital, credit for borrowed capital should be omitted, since the allowance for borrowed capital is adequately provided for by interest deductions (in computing net income).

To prevent corporations from escaping excess-profits taxation, the

deduction for officers' salaries should be limited to the average amount of officers' salaries paid during 1936-39.

Wartime Excess-Income Tax on Individuals, Estates, Partners, Etc.

The basic reasons for imposing an excess-profits tax on corporate income apply with equal vigor to excess-income of individuals, partnership income, estates, etc. If the added income arises from business profits, the legal form of operation (individual business, partnership, estate) should not permit income to escape excess-income taxation. This type of excess-income taxation would also curb business's incentive to change from the corporate form to the partnership or individual method—financial concerns have already been reported making the change (to escape the excess-profits tax undoubtedly). And if the individual's added income is derived from capital investments (stocks, bonds, real estate) surely unearned income should not enjoy privileges over earned income. Manifestly only the higher incomes (above \$8,000-\$10,000) should be subject to the individual excess-income tax. With Americans serving their country in the armed forces at \$21-\$30 monthly, and dying to preserve our nation's existence, it is hardly an unequal sacrifice to dedicate excess-income above \$10,000 to the Government's financial arsenal.

The individual excess-income tax with a rate fixed at the highest surtax plus normal tax rate (90 per cent under Treasury proposal)

would work as follows: If John Doe's net income during 1936-1939 was \$20,000 and his net income for 1942 is \$30,000, the upper \$10,-000 excess-income would be subject to the 90 per cent rate and the lower \$20,000 would be subject to the regular individual income tax rates (normal and surtax).

Individual Income Tax Rates— Increased Surtaxes Necessary

An all-out tax program to raise \$7,000,000,000 in additional taxes demands income tax rates not only to prevent the creation of wartime millionaires but which will also stringently limit the income available to the middle and upper classes. In England, the combined income tax and surtax amount to 97½ per cent on the highest incomes so that an effective ceiling is placed on the money any individual can enjoy, as shown in the following table:

BRITAIN'S WARTIME INCOME TAX

*(Figures for married couples with
two children)*

<i>Income</i>	<i>Income Tax and Surtax</i>	<i>Postwar Credit</i>	<i>% of Tax to Income</i>
\$4,000	\$1,204.40	\$193.20	30%
20,000	11,029.40	260.00	55%
40,000	27,449.40	260.00	68%
400,000	376,699.40	260.00	90%

Our surtax rates should be drastically increased to yield similar results so that comfortable incomes would be tapped for their fair contribution to the war effort. The Treasury's recommendations as to surtax rates are clearly in line with this principle. Certainly, the masses

of wage-earners, farmers and small business people understand that victory will have to be paid for, and will be dearly won; but effective national unity and an all-out, total war program require the full application of the democratic principle of taxation according to ability to pay.

Restoration of Corporate Undis- tributed-Profits Tax

The higher the individual surtax rates, the more urgent the restoration of the undistributed-profits tax on corporations. Corporate directors often choose to withhold earnings and accumulate surplus rather than increase dividends to the stockholders. Thus, by withholding dividends to stockholders with net incomes over \$1,000,000, a 79 per cent individual income tax under existing rates (90 per cent under Treasury's proposal) can be avoided by the wealthy stockholders. And the small stockholder suffers from the withholding.

During the Civil War in 1861-65, when as now our country was engaged in a life-and-death struggle, the principles of the undistributed-profits tax were incorporated in our first income-tax law, which provided that the gains and profits of corporations should be included in the annual taxable income of any person entitled to them, whether distributed or undistributed. Surely 1942 should measure up to 1861.

Either the corporate undistributed-profits tax should be restored, or stockholders should be required to include as taxable income these undistributed-profits.

Elimination of Amortization

The amortization allowance, granted to industry as a concession, gives corporations the privilege to take an annual deduction of 20 per cent on new plant and equipment (ordinary depreciation rates average 6 to 10 per cent). It is obvious that this privilege favors erection of new plants rather than the conversion of existing plants, and therefore runs counter to our production policy. The amortization privilege hinders the war effort and should be eliminated.

Profit-Limitations on Government Contracts

In 1940 industry demanded, as its price for cooperating in national preparedness, the suspension of limitations on profits imposed under the Vinson-Trammel Act. Congress yielded. Originally enacted in 1934 (peacetime), it had been amended in June, 1940, so that any profit in excess of 8 per cent on competitively bid contracts for ships and planes (7 per cent on negotiated contracts) was recaptured by the Treasury. The First World War experience is a striking testimonial to the need for limitations on profits on Government contracts in order to restrain excessively high prices and corrupt practices. Recent reports of Congressional committees testify to the swollen profits extracted from government contracts.

The profit-limitations provisions of the Vinson-Trammel Act (suspended October, 1940) should be revived and extended to all Govern-

ment contracts, with profits limited to 6-8 per cent.

Selective Excise Taxes

The problem of selective excise taxes has been discussed in the early part of this article. The Treasury proposes to raise \$1,340,000,000 in excise taxes, derived mainly from taxes on gasoline, beer, liquors, wines, soft drinks, cigarettes, candy and chewing gum. In making concessions which allow an undue piling up of excess profits, the Government is forced to turn to consumer taxation to obtain the necessary revenue. These taxes on consumption should be eliminated, and replaced by additional revenue from the pool of excess-profits and other corporation and ability-to-pay sources.

Integration of Estate and Gift Taxes With a Single \$10,000 Exemption

The President recommended that exemptions in estate and gift taxation should be lowered. At present an estate of \$120,000 completely escapes estate-gift taxation (\$40,000 gift exemption, \$40,000 insurance exemption, \$40,000 estate exemption).

In 1941 the Treasury recommended reducing the \$40,000 figure to \$25,000. With personal income tax exemption reduced to a \$750 figure, the existing estate-gift tax exemptions are shockingly unfair.

The Treasury's proposals to lower the gift-tax exemption from \$40,000 to \$30,000 and estate tax exemptions to a single \$60,000 exemption are entirely out of line with the realis-

tic changes made in the individual and corporate tax rates.

What is urgently needed is a *combined estate-gift tax system with a single exemption of \$10,000 (plus a \$10,000 life insurance exemption) with a single set of graduated rates drastically increased for all brackets.* The hundreds of millions of dollars that would be thus collected are eminently just contributions to war finances—inheritances would not survive an Axis victory.

Taxation of Governmental Securities

The President's budget message recommended legislation to tax all future issues of state and municipal securities. The Federal Government no longer issues tax-exempt bonds. Secretary Morgenthau now proposes to tax all interest on outstanding and future issues of state and local securities. This is a healthy proposal. However, the Treasury does not believe it is justified in taxing outstanding Federal securities because of contractual promises that such interest should be exempt.

At a time when every section of the population is called upon to make its maximum contribution to the war burden, it is unrighteous and unjust that *any* income from Government bonds should escape taxation. With the nation's existence in peril, are governmental bondholders to enjoy the unique privilege of having their interest payments shielded in tax-shelters? Today the war effort can countenance nothing less than the full taxation of all

outstanding and future issues of all governmental securities, including outstanding Federal securities.

Capital Gains and Losses

For too long a time have tax privileges been accorded capital gains, and favors conferred upon capital losses. The maximum tax on long-term capital gains, under existing law, is only 15 or 20 per cent, no matter how high the bracket of the taxpayer. Certainly speculation should not be encouraged by tax privileges. The Treasury's proposal to raise the maximum rate to 30 per cent is a distinct and worthy improvement. The war requirements, however, demand that capital gains should be taxed at full rates (like ordinary income).

Mandatory Joint Returns

In 1941 Congress voted down that mandatory joint return provision, although the House Ways and Means Committee strongly urged its adoption. The argument that joint return would destroy the institution of marriage, lead to immorality, and send women back to marital slavery was the sheerest hokum. The simple truth is that wealthy persons have been escaping the higher surtaxes by transferring their properties to their wives. Thus (under existing rates) a wealthy stockholder receiving annually \$50,000 from his stocks pays a surtax of \$19,380. But if he transfers half his stocks to his wife, he will pay only \$6,640 surtax on his \$25,000 and his wife, *by filing a separate return*, would pay the same,

thus saving \$6,100 in surtaxes (about one-third reduction). The tax of any family whose combined income is \$3,500 or less would not be increased by the joint return requirement.

Three hundred and twenty-three million dollars in taxes were lost by the defeat of the compulsory joint return proposals. With higher rates, the yield will even be greater. The nation cannot tolerate slackers in any field—production, military or finance. The Treasury has again proposed compulsory joint returns with special relief where the husband and wife are working. This compulsory joint return provision must be included in the 1942 revenue act.

Personal Exemption Under Individual Income Tax

Personal exemptions under the 1941-42 revenue acts have been cut from \$2,500 to \$2,000 to \$1,500 for married couples—from \$1,000 to \$800 to \$750 for single persons. According to studies in previous years, \$2,200 to \$2,500 was needed to maintain an average worker's family at the barest level of health and decency (statistics of Dr. Mordecai Ezekiel, Department of Agriculture economist; Heller Committee of University of Southern California). And those were the figures before the cost of living began to skyrocket. Yet there are clamors to reduce existing exemptions to \$1,000 for married couples and \$500 for single persons. Secretary Morgenthau emphatically rejected these clamors for further

lowering such exemptions, declaring that "the very lowest income earners have all they can do to feed themselves, and their families."

Any reduction in the already low personal exemption is, wittingly or unwittingly, a disservice to the war effort: a worker without calories cannot work effectively and his morale is undermined. Existing personal exemptions must not be lowered—in the interests of the successful prosecution of the war.

Computation of Personal Exemptions, Dependency Credit

Under existing law, personal exemptions are allowed as a credit against net income. This operates to reduce the top bracket of income and therefore the upper-bracket taxpayer gets a greater benefit than the lower-bracket taxpayer. Thus, the \$1,500 personal exemption results in a tax reduction of only \$150 (4 per cent normal plus 6 per cent surtax). However, to the man in the top bracket it means a tax benefit of \$1,215 (4 per cent normal plus 77 per cent surtax).

This discrimination in favor of the upper-bracket taxpayer should be eliminated by allowing personal exemptions (and credit for dependents) to be deducted in the *lowest* surtax brackets. This proposal has been endorsed by Colin F. Stamm, Chief of Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation (in 1941 hearings) and by Dr. Dewey Anderson, Executive Secretary of T.N.E.C., in his monograph, "Taxation, Recovery, and Defense" (page 263).

*Plugging Loopholes, Eliminating
Technical Inequities*

President Roosevelt called attention to the technical inequities and discriminations contained in the tax laws and urged the elimination of these defects in the tax system. A thorough revision of the tax laws should be made. We might also mention the necessity of reducing depletion allowance to close a wide avenue of tax escape. Concerns engaged in extracting certain of our national resources, particularly oil, have been granted unjustifiable and excessive allowances for depletion. The Treasury Department has recommended this change along with many other progressive reforms. Tightening of interest deductions, strengthening tax-free reorganization provisions are others which deserve careful scrutiny and correction. Labor, progressive tax-minded organizations and individuals can make a real contribution here.

The proposals here made are not exclusive—many more will come forward as the tax program gets under way.

*Conclusions as to Treasury Tax
Program*

From this analysis, we must conclude that the Treasury tax program is basically a sound wartime tax program which will stimulate maximum production, mobilize our resources, strengthen the national unity of our people.

In the words of the *Daily Worker* editorial of March 10:

“On the whole the Treasury Department’s plan moves in the right direction. It tries to raise the money needed to win, and it generally tries to raise the money according to the democratic principle of ability to pay.”

However, the tax program can be further strengthened, as the editorial points out:

“But it seems that the Government can make many improvements in its tax plan. The Government’s plan does not sufficiently carry out the principle of taxation according to ability to pay; nor does it fully apply President Roosevelt’s dictum that ‘*under war conditions the country cannot tolerate undue profits.*’”

The adoption of the measures proposed in this article would substantially strengthen the program in the required direction.

Business-as-usual interests, special groups and, most important of all, the appeasers will seek to shift the burden to the low income groups and away from those sources able to pay. Already Senator Taft has “predicted” that the new tax schedules proposed by Secretary Morgenthau will be “very much readjusted” by Congress to shift more of the burden of war costs from corporations and wealthy persons to the lower income groups. Already members of the House Ways and Means Committee have gone on record in favor of a general sales tax. Already Senator George, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has indicated that the Treasury tax program is unsatisfactory and that a general sales tax or, perhaps,

lowered personal exemptions will be considered, notwithstanding their rejection by the Secretary of the Treasury. Last year many of the Administration's progressive proposals were rejected by Congress. This must not happen this time. The American people, the united labor movement must bend every effort to defend and extend the Treasury's tax program, and prevent its sabotage by politics-as-usual forces and appeasement elements.

The American people and their organizations, especially the labor movement, should be on the alert, should voice their proposals and rally public support for a tax program based on the needs of the

nation's war effort and ability to pay.

The C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. have brought forward vital points of such a program. It is to be hoped that the two organizations unitedly, and the Labor Victory Board, will advance these constructive proposals and will help influence favorable governmental and Congressional action which will fully mobilize the financial and capital resources of the nation for the most effective prosecution of the war, based on the principle enunciated by the President that "a fair distribution of the war burden is necessary for national unity." *The tax program must be an instrument of victory!*

THE NEW ROLE OF CHINA

BY JAMES S. ALLEN

THE meeting of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek with the leaders of the Indian people symbolizes the great role to be played by the peoples of Asia in bringing about the total defeat of the Axis. Next to the historic offensive of the Red Army on the Eastern Front, the gathering of the representatives of two nations which constitute one-third of the population of the world fired the enthusiasm of all the peoples and reinforced their will to victory. For just as the epic Soviet victories are paving the way for the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain by joint military action to defeat Hitler in Europe in 1942, the meetings of the Generalissimo with the Indian nationalist leaders indicate the perspective for turning the tide of battle in the Far Eastern theater of war.

During the first months of war in the Southwest Pacific it had become abundantly clear that the strategy of the global war was making it imperative for the United Nations to release and mobilize the great pent-up forces of Asia against Japan, while directing their main blow against Nazi Germany, the focus of the Axis. The participation, on their own right and in defense of their own lands, of the native populations

of the Middle and Far East has become a military necessity for an indivisible victory and an indivisible peace. It has also become increasingly apparent, especially after the fall of Singapore and the reverses in the Dutch East Indies and Burma, that the mobilization of the peoples of all southwest Asia is not only linked directly to the requirements of the Far Eastern theater of war, but has become militarily necessary also from the viewpoint of stopping a threatened Hitler offensive into the Middle East from Europe and preventing the juncture of Axis forces in India or Asia Minor.

As this lesson was emerging rapidly out of the ruins of Singapore and Indonesia, there dawned also the understanding, in some cases very painfully, that the colonial powers within the United Nations had immediately to adopt a new approach to their subject peoples, taking fully into account their aspirations for national liberation, if mobilization of the native populations was to be completely and promptly effective. Thus, the very course of the war and the necessities created by it are beginning to produce profound changes in the old relations among the peo-

ples, which in themselves will contribute to victory and leave a deep impress upon the peace.

The great, writhing body of India now lies exposed to attack. And it is becoming almost universally understood that this massive force can be galvanized into action to play a decisive role on a world scale, once the bonds of dependence are loosened and its limbs are freed so that it can strike at the common enemy. In England, the problem of India—and of the smaller Indias of the Empire—played no small part in bringing about changes for the better in Churchill's Cabinet and in opening up wide for discussion the necessity for a new colonial approach, which by the inter-relations of global war has become closely linked with the paramount problem of taking the offensive against Hitler. From the viewpoint of the national preservation of England as well as of its allies, the problem raised by India now is assuming the importance which the arming of the Negroes and later the emancipation of the slaves held in our own Civil War. Just as the initiative taken by Lincoln at that time released the great power of the Negro people against the slave-masters, immediate and decisive action now by the colonial powers of the United Nations, chiefly Britain, coupled with America's influence and initiative, can release the tremendous might of the colonial peoples against the Axis. This is no less true in Latin America, whose further mobilization of resources and peoples can be greatly stimulated through the deepening and extension of the

Good Neighbor policy by the United States.

This truth is emphasized by the great role which China has come to assume as the leader of the Asiatic peoples. The untiring struggle of the Chinese nation for national liberation, its successful resistance to the Japanese invaders for almost five years, open up possibilities for victory which otherwise would not have existed. She now emerges as the protagonist of the liberation of Asia. These historic words uttered by Chiang Kai-shek at Bombay on February 21 cannot easily be ignored:

"I hope Britain, without waiting for any demand on the part of the Indian people, as speedily as possible will give them real political power so they will be in a position to develop further their spiritual and material strength.

"The Indian people thus would realize that their participation in the war was not merely to aid anti-aggression nations for securing victory, but also the turning point in their struggle for their own freedom."

The activation of India has become for China as well a matter of vital concern to its own national existence, which is now more than ever indispensable to the victory of the United Nations. The advance of the Japanese military-fascists to the Indian Ocean, and the loss of the Rangoon-Lashio railroad spur of the Burma Road, have left India as the main channel through which the United States and England can continue to supply China. The stimulation of India's industries,

arising from the full mobilization of that country, would also provide an important arsenal for China at its back door. New supply lines from India into China, arranged as a result of the Generalissimo's trip, emphasize how immediately and practically the fate of these two great countries is linked.

The leading role of China is now making itself felt from one end of the Asiatic Continent to the other, from Korea to Iraq and Turkey. A Free Korean government-in-exile has its seat at Chungking, while tens of thousands of Koreans are fighting in China's armies and other thousands are active against Japan in Manchuria and in their homeland. Millions of Chinese, loyal to the cause of their nation's independence, live throughout the Southwest Asiatic area and are taking up the struggle there. China's troops are in Burma and fighting the puppet armies of Japan in Thailand. The Chinese government has just concluded treaties of amity with Iraq and Iran (Persia), arranged for an exchange of ambassadors with Turkey, and is undertaking similar diplomatic activities in other countries of the Middle East. China has been spurred by the temporary military defeats of the United Nations in the Pacific, to take the initiative herself in welding the united front of the Asiatic peoples against the Axis.

That the great role of China is at long last being recognized by the Western powers of the United Nations is shown by Churchill's invitation to Chiang Kai-shek to take his place in the Supreme Military

Council of the Southwest Pacific and the reception given him by the British authorities in India. President Roosevelt's recognition, in his fireside speech of February 23, of the liberation struggles in Manchuria and Korea, and his assertion that "the Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic, but to the whole world," were indirectly a tribute to the liberating role of China.

These, however, indicate only the first steps toward the complete re-orientation which still has to be made by the Western anti-Axis powers in their attitude toward the Asiatic and colonial peoples. The forces of Toryism and conservatism, not to speak of the pro-Axis appeasers, are still reluctant to surrender voluntarily privileges and rights accumulated over many years of imperialist aggrandizement, even in the face of military disaster. This is more true in England than in the United States, whose leading financial circles from their own special viewpoint would welcome a change in the British colonial system and at least a measure of national freedom for great colonial areas. However, even here white chauvinism, which is directed principally against the American Negroes, constitutes an obstacle as well in developing the fullest cooperation with the Asiatic peoples (the comment, for example, of Hanson W. Baldwin in the *New York Times* of February 12—Lincoln's Birthday!—that the fall of Singapore is "a blow that has struck at the very basis of the white man's position in the Orient"). But

the hammer blows of war are knocking sense into many heads, and making them see the inevitable necessity of some important changes in the world of old if the war is to be won. The *New York Times*, for example, commenting editorially on Chiang's visit to India, writes:

"India and China are no longer supplicants at the white man's door. Not all the faded trappings of imperialism, not all the pomp of viceroys, not all the arrogance of the 'old China hands,' has much meaning for them now. . . .

"He [Chiang Kai-shek] may have achieved one of the most glittering diplomatic victories in history—a united front of India and China against Japan. Good old Colonel Newcome would turn in his grave at such a vision. Kipling's soldiers and civil servants would be appalled. But if this combination can exist, it will be acceptable in London as in Washington and it will suffice." (Feb. 19, 1942.)

This comment is indicative of the great changes being ushered in by the war, of pending transformations which arise from the military necessities of a war against the forces of fascist enslavement and retrogression. Not the least of these necessary changes is foreshadowed by the new importance of China and India in the development of anti-Axis strategy, for their full participation in the war will result in a really profound alteration of all world relationships. These changes are inevitably being produced by the maturing of the war into a fuller people's war. And the sooner they are recognized as inevitable and as im-

perative for total victory, particularly by the United States and Britain, the more quickly and with less sacrifice will victory come.

* * *

If the Generalissimo's trip to India has such profound significance, it is because China has come a long way toward nationhood during the last decade. The China of internecine wars, divided into warring principalities and autonomous provinces, of spheres of influence and extra-territorial privileges, is definitely a thing of the past. Free China is experiencing a degree of unity which that country has never enjoyed in its history, and the parts at present overrun by Japan are considered merely temporary losses which will be restored to a completely unified China with the inevitable defeat of Japan.

Since October, 1938, the Japanese invaders have been stalemated by the remarkable resistance of the Chinese nation. Sixteen months after Japan launched its new aggression against China in July, 1937, the military-fascist troops were unable to make any further important advances, and subsequently they have been pushed back on some fronts, and are continually being harassed in the occupied areas. How is it to be explained that China, with poorly equipped and disorganized troops and lacking any important war industries at the outset of the war, has been able to stop a fully equipped modern army, air force and navy, sustained by a highly developed industrial system?

It cannot be explained merely by

the wide expanses of the country and its complicated topography. These factors could be turned to advantage only if there existed the will and the force with which to resist the enemy. The Southwest Pacific area also presents wide expanses that could be utilized for maneuver and resistance to prevent the enemy from entrenching himself strategically.

Nor can the great feat of China be accounted for merely by aid from abroad, although this did play and still is playing a decisive role in buttressing China's magnificent resistance. From the very outset of the conflict the Soviet Union, whose support to the national liberation struggle of the Chinese people dates back to the early days of the establishment of the U.S.S.R., has supplied large quantities of material aid, far exceeding that given by all the other powers combined, and has given political and diplomatic collaboration to China on a world scale. Nor can one overlook the non-appeasement of Japan by the U.S.S.R., as shown by the present large-scale continuation of aid to China, by the smashing blows at the Japanese armies when in the past they attempted provocation on the Soviet Far Eastern frontiers and by the strong Soviet defenses in the Far East which even today, while the U.S.S.R. is engaged in a life-and-death struggle against Hitler Germany, is having the effect of immobilizing a large sector of Japan's armed forces. But it is also unfortunately true that, due to the former appeasement policy followed by the United States toward Japan,

considerable amounts of munitions from America did not begin to reach China before the spring of 1941, that is, after Japan had already been stopped for almost three years, and the total amount of material aid received by China from both England and the United States was far exceeded by the supplies which Japan was able to obtain from these powers.

The key to China's resistance is to be found in the National Anti-Japanese United Front, which mobilized the whole people—workers, peasantry, merchants and national bourgeoisie—and the resources of the country against the invader. This was by no means an easy thing to achieve. Since 1931, when Japan attacked Manchuria, the Communist Party of China, increasingly supported by the patriotic anti-Japanese elements of the country, called for the organization of a unified national war of salvation against Japan. However, until the eve of the second Japanese attack, anti-Communist and pro-Japanese elements continued to dominate the policy of the Kuomintang, the ruling party. Internal wars among the militarists continued; political struggle between the Central government and the local authorities persisted; civil war between the Kuomintang and the Communists, which began in 1927 when collaboration between the two parties ceased, reached such a stage that at its height in 1934-35 as many as one million soldiers were involved.

The self-sacrificing and statesmanlike role of the Chinese Com-

munists in bringing about an end to this state of affairs and establishing national unity, in the face of continuing provocations against them, is a great historic contribution to the whole anti-Axis front which is even now not yet fully appreciated. What is important is to recognize that the united front formed between the Kuomintang and Communist Parties in September, 1937, constitutes the backbone of the national united front in China. Without this agreement, which subordinated all differences and questions to the task of resisting Japan, the prolonged and ever-stronger resistance of China would have been impossible. This achievement, under the most difficult conditions of internal dissension, may well prove to India that its own obstacles to national unity between the Congress, the Mohammedan League and the "untouchables" are similarly far from being insurmountable.

The establishment of the United Front in China made possible the organization of a single national army, in which was incorporated the provincial troops and the Eighth and New Fourth Route Armies (formerly the Chinese Red Armies). The basic principles developed by the Eighth Route Army over many years of successful warfare against superior forces were increasingly applied throughout China, making possible the successful coordination of mobile warfare and tactical maneuvering against the enemy's flanks and rear with the activities of the partisan detachments in the rear of the enemy. Increasingly the

local population was organized and armed, thus establishing bases of partisan warfare in the rear of the invader, combining their actions with the activities of the regular armies. Democratic and anti-fascist the army, close contacts established political work was intensified within with the local populations, and the political and military work of disintegrating the enemy from within was undertaken. With the aid of heroic workers, the Government was able to evacuate a number of important arsenals and factories from territory about to be overrun by the Japanese. The scorched earth policy was applied. In the interior, thousands of small munition and equipment enterprises were established to supplement the armament acquired from abroad and captured from the enemy.

As a result of the National United Front, and in active resistance against the invader, the Central Government of China became a more representative government of national defense, rallying all groups and organizations devoted to national independence, and taking some steps to introduce and extend elementary democratic liberties for the people. Great difficulties had to be overcome, difficulties that still create obstacles: the economic backwardness of China, the need for modern armaments, inertia of the old government apparatus, capitulatory "peace" tendencies of pro-Japanese elements in certain circles of the Kuomintang, the constant recrudescence of anti-Communist activities and tendencies in these circles.

At times, the National United Front seemed on the verge of a serious split, as a result of open attacks by units of the Central Army upon the Eighth and Fourth Route Armies, their political workers and partisan bases, the most serious occurring as recently as January, 1941, against the Fourth Army. The strongest "pro-peace" wing at Chungking favoring capitulation to Japan was also the most anti-Communist (for example, Wang Ching-wei, who went over to the Japanese in 1938 and was later set up as the head of Japan's puppet government in Nanking), for these elements knew that a break in the United Front would create the best conditions for acceptance of Japan's obnoxious peace terms. During the most difficult period, after the outbreak of war in Europe, when Japan was redoubling its "peace" offensive through the Wang Ching-wei elements and Britain was engaged in attempting a Far Eastern Munich while internal friction was intensifying, it was the stubborn adherence of the Chinese Communists and the consistent followers of Sun Yat-sen within the Kuomintang to the principles of the anti-Japanese United Front which greatly contributed to saving China. Mao Tze-tung, the great leader of the Chinese Communists, advanced three guiding slogans for all honest Chinese patriots:

"Insist on protracted war and oppose all forms of surrender!

"Insist on unification and oppose a split!

"Insist on progress and oppose retrogression!"

It was in this spirit that all anti-Japanese groups participating in the National United Front have been able to overcome the most serious crises. These slogans can now beneficially be utilized as a model by all the United Nations.

The political guide of the United Front, accepted by both Kuomintangists and Communists as well as by all participants, is the Three People's Principles of Sun Yat-sen, founder of the Chinese Republic. In a speech at Yennan on May 1, 1939, Mao Tze-tung explained the meaning of these principles:

"The principle of People's Nationalism is nothing other than the overthrow of Japanese imperialism. The principle of People's Democracy means nothing other than the granting of freedom to the entire people. The principle of People's Livelihood means that the whole people must be given work, food and clothing."*

To those in China who wish to omit the principles of Democracy and Livelihood, Mao points out that these are just as necessary as Nationalism to bring about the regeneration and mobilization of the whole people for the final defeat of Japan.

Important to the success of the National United Front in China is the fact that the Three Principles are advocated by the Communists together with the other participants in the national front as the political basis not only of the anti-Japa-

* For a complete discussion of these principles, the reader is referred to the article "The Communists and China's Three People's Principles," in *The Communist* for March, 1941.—*The Editor*.

nese war but of national reconstruction after the war. The United Front is conceived as an indispensable instrument for both war and peace. As early as December, 1937, the Communist Party of China made it clear in a special appeal that it considered collaboration of the party with the Kuomintang as lasting, and that collaboration is necessary not only during the period of resistance to the Japanese aggressors but after victory is obtained in order by their joint efforts to construct a democratic, "Three Principles" China.

The political basis of the National United Front in China, resting upon three simple but indispensable principles, offers the foundation upon which this united front can be extended to encompass all the peoples of Asia in a concerted defense against the Axis enslavers and for the democratic reconstruction of Asia after the war. China has demonstrated that unity between formerly antagonistic elements for the achievement of an immediate objective can develop with the least friction and with greater mutual confidence and trust if the perspective of long-range collaboration, extending into the peace, is adopted by both sides. This lesson can also be applied to the development of closer, more intimate and more complete collaboration in the political, military and economic spheres between the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Britain for the defeat of the Axis and the creation of a just peace.

Another key to China's success was the foreign policy of the Na-

tional United Front and the Chinese Government. China made it clear early in the conflict that it was prepared to ally itself with all sympathetic states and all forces opposed to Japanese imperialism in order to check military-fascist aggression. It accepted the friendship and firm cooperation extended by the Soviet Union, which more than all the other great powers has consistently and staunchly supported the just war of the Chinese nation, has fully respected China's sovereignty and rights. The Central Government and the Chinese Communist Party both called for a world-wide united front of all the anti-aggression nations. This policy struck a responsive chord with all the anti-fascist forces of the world. During the days when it was still possible to weld a world front of democratic peoples against the fascist warmakers before the outbreak of the world war, Comrade Earl Browder, with an insight which every day is proving itself more brilliant, pointed out that:

"The fundamental interests of China, the Soviet Union, and the United States are in profound harmony; the cooperative protection and advancement of these common interests furnish the only possible foundation for the stable organization of peace in the Pacific."* (July 5, 1939)

This community of national interests, today operating on a world scale and involving other members of the United Nations, still provides the basis for the organiza-

* Earl Browder on the Soviet Union, Workers Library Publishers, p. 26.

tion of victory over the Axis and of a stable peace. Thanks particularly to the rise of free China, the harmony of common national interests in the Far East has through the dynamics of war extended to involve all the Asiatic peoples.

The successes of China in its war of liberation against the Japanese invader have secured for it a position of leadership in the united front of the Asiatic peoples and entitle it to a corresponding position of influence and partnership among the United Nations as a whole. The great lessons which are furnished by China's national war—the national united front against the Axis aggressors, mobilization and arming of the people, the coordination of tactical maneuver and guerrilla warfare, the extension of democracy and the people's welfare, united action with all the anti-Axis nations—can well be applied throughout the whole colonial world in the struggle against Axis enslavement.

* * *

Today, China is in a position to enter upon the third and final phase of her war of national liberation—the offensive against Japan. Despite the military reverses of the ABD powers in the Southwest Pacific, a favorable situation has developed for a Chinese offensive because of the wide dispersal of Japan's military might. It is true that China also has had to take up positions along new fronts—in North Burma and on the Thai frontier—to prevent a break-through toward Chungking along the Burma Road.

But to offset this, there are the deeper involvement of Japan into far distant theaters of war, the unfolding offensive of the Soviet Union, which is delivering devastating blows against Hitler Germany, the accelerated mobilization of American resources and fighting power, the acquisition of new allies among the Eastern peoples, and the strengthening of the world anti-Hitler front of the United Nations. Supply of modern equipment to the Chinese armies remains a problem, but a problem which can and must be met in relation to concentrating the main blows and supplies against Nazi Germany, the main enemy, whose defeat is the precondition for smashing the entire Axis. The favorable opportunity for a Chinese offensive which now exists should not and must not be lost before the Japanese aggressors have been able to entrench themselves in their newly acquired territories and utilize the war materials and resources which they have seized.

In fact, a Chinese offensive has now become a necessity of the global war, as a major military action supplementary to the opening of the crucial second anti-Hitler front in Europe by America and Britain. This is not only a requirement of China's salvation, but will strengthen the national defense of the United States, Britain and the whole anti-Axis coalition. Such an offensive is not only China's affair, but the concern of all the anti-Axis powers because it is linked in with the situation on all the world fronts, especially the decisive Soviet-German front, where the outcome will

determine the fate of the Axis as a whole.

On the key front of the world war, the Soviet Union by its successful offensive has created the opportunity for the defeat of Hitler this year through concerted military action of herself, Britain and the United States in Europe. In all likelihood, especially if the launching of a new Western front in Europe is delayed, Hitler may have to be met as well by the United Nations in force to block his drive toward Suez and the Middle East. To prevent parallel action by the Japanese military-fascists toward India and the Middle East, toward the Western Hemisphere or toward Siberia, it is necessary to launch a powerful offensive against Japan in China, while supplementing this with other offensive actions in the Southwest Pacific. The decisive and paramount need of opening new fronts in Europe this spring requires the major efforts of Britain and the United States; but important supporting actions of a major character are likewise possible and necessary in the Far East.

When in his Order of the Day on the 24th Anniversary of the Red Army, Stalin remarked that "certain seekers after foreign lands felt the weight of this power [the Red Army] on their own hides," his reference undoubtedly included the defeats suffered by Japan on two occasions when she undertook large-scale provocative actions on the Far Eastern frontiers of the Soviet Union. The possibility that Japan may violate the treaty of neutrality and attack the U.S.S.R., timing this

with the effort of an offensive by Hitler on the Eastern Front, cannot be dismissed offhand. And if this would occur it would necessarily hamper Soviet and Allied action in Europe at a time when the fullest development of the Soviet offensive, supported by joint Anglo-American military action in Western Europe, against Nazi Germany, is the prime necessity of the global war and of supreme importance to the whole anti-Hitler coalition.

All that China has lacked to transform the present stalemate into a successful offensive has been sufficient quantities of modern equipment. Repeatedly, the Chinese Government has requested that such supplies be rushed to her armies to enable her to undertake the offensive. Today, what China does has a more direct bearing upon the national safety of the United States and her Allies than ever before; the practical problems of supply, aid and collaboration can be met if their strategic and political value is fully grasped.

Once the full role of China emerges as the leader of the united front of the Asiatic peoples and as the pivot of a successful offensive against Japan, coordinated with the main offensive of the United Nations in Europe, it remains to apply in full the principle enunciated by Roosevelt in his Washington's Birthday fireside chat:

"The United Nations constitute an association of independent peoples of equal dignity and equal importance. . . . In the partnership of our common enterprise we must share in a unified plan in which all of

us play our several parts, each of us being equally indispensable and dependent one on the other."

A full realization of this well-expressed and basically correct guide to victory requires especially the equal partnership in collective leadership and common military action of the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain—the leading coalition of the United Nations—in a centrally directed offensive against Hitler Germany this spring. It also requires that these powers, especially America and Britain, establish a close alliance with China, unify their strategy and action in the Far East as part of the anti-Axis strategy on all fronts, and help in-

sure the development of a formidable Chinese offensive. The development of a common strategy and perspective of victory by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, together with China, acting in unison, pooling their common resources, concentrating their main blows against the Hitlerites and fully releasing the largely untapped fighting power of Asia, is necessary for ensuring victory of the decisive anti-Axis offensive against Hitler in Europe, while at the same time striking shattering blows at Japan.

Toward this end, labor and the people must exert their power and initiative fully to apply and implement the anti-Axis policy of President Roosevelt.

NATIONAL UNITY AND THE COMING ELECTIONS

BY RALPH V. BARNES

WHAT is happening to our national unity? Is it growing stronger or is it becoming weaker? What is it that has to be done to consolidate further the unity of the American people for the destruction of the Axis enemy? These and related questions have been receiving recently considerable attention in our press, especially in the light of the coming Congressional elections, preparations for which are already on foot. The answers to these questions must be made fully clear, objective and profitable.

It is maintained by some that our national unity is becoming weaker; that following a short "honeymoon" of national unity which began with the attack on Pearl Harbor, old divisions have again come to the forefront, threatening to weaken and undermine the unity of our people. Others insist that there is nothing especially wrong with the national unity of our people but that the trouble lies with certain attitudes of the government, which—so it is asserted—is not sufficiently frank with the nation, does not admit mistakes and fails to give the proper lead. But these explanations,

while containing certain elements of truth, merely skim the surface of the question. The full truth, which we need, lies much deeper.

The outstanding fact in our national life is that the unity of the American people for the victorious prosecution of our national and democratic war against the Axis is steadily growing stronger and is becoming more solid. Ever since Hitler's treacherous attack upon the Soviet Union, the attack which placed our own national security in imminent danger and which created the conditions for a united struggle against the fascist aggressors by all freedom loving peoples, ever since that time the national forces of the American people have been moving towards a common objective, towards a firm national unity for the preservation of our national freedom and democracy from the assault of the fascist aggressors, towards closer collaboration and alliance of all the United Nations.

Not all classes and groups have been moving to national unity with the same rate of speed or with the same determination. Certainly, the working people of our country have demonstrated thus far a much

greater ability and readiness to serve the interests of national unity than have, for example, certain elements and groups among the employers and among some of the big corporations. But also among them, the predominant tendency has been to go along with and support the national war effort and to collaborate in the national unity. To be sure, the process of development is very uneven and the difficulties to be overcome are substantial, but the direction in which we have been going is unmistakable. It is to greater and closer national unity to win the war.

The attack of Japan and the Axis upon the United States has had a most profound effect in consolidating and *energizing* this growing national unity, and in speeding it up. Our full entry into the war has immeasurably accelerated the process, arousing the widest masses of our people to action. And the unanimous vote of Congress declaring a state of war with the Axis has only registered the already existing high degree of national unity in support of the government's war policies.

Have the effects of Pearl Harbor and of our entry into the war begun "to wear off"? No; that is not so. And here are the facts: the majority of the American working class and labor movement *continues* to grow more united, and is becoming more determined in the promotion of national unity and in the prosecution of the war, displaying daily an increasing initiative and influence in the national effort. Vast masses of our farming population, though not so well organized, are

progressively entering into the war effort with increasing determination and effectiveness. The fighting spirit of our youth, of which we have already seen magnificent examples on the battlefields, is steadily rising. Most of the Negro people have placed themselves unreservedly in the service of the war effort, actively seeking opportunities to contribute their all to the common cause. The spirit of national unity and readiness for service is steadily rising among the American women, as well as among our professional groups.

Ever larger numbers of businessmen and business managers and technical personnel are joining hands with labor and with the farmers in the practical job of speeding production and services for the war effort. This is also seen in the development of Civilian Defense which some hidden appeasers and hopeless reactionaries are attacking as "boondoggling." This is seen, finally, in the efforts to develop a relationship of national unity between the Roosevelt tendency in the Democratic Party and the Willkie and related tendencies in the Republican Party—efforts which undoubtedly reflect, even though inadequately, pressure of the masses from below for closer collaboration and an all-out effort in the prosecution of the war.

Does that indicate a weakening of national unity? Just the contrary. It demonstrates the growing width and strength of national unity, which is taking place in spite of and in struggle against the forces of defeatism, division and dis-

unity. But the forces of division and appeasement are still with us. The attack of the Axis on our country has not abolished them; it only compelled them to resort to different means and methods, more subtle and more dangerous. It is these, therefore, that the entire anti-Hitler camp, especially the Administration and organized labor, must now fully expose and more decisively combat in order to further promote and consolidate our national unity for victory against the Axis.

* * *

The forces of defeatism and disunity have "accepted" the war. So they say. They will not admit the justice of our cause. They still maintain that the war could have been avoided, if only we had been willing to come "to terms" with the aggressors. But they are willing to go along and "to support" the war. And from now on, they say, they will criticize, not the war as such, but the "conduct" of the war.

At first glance such a position might seem perfectly loyal, although not fully satisfactory. But that would be taking a superficial and dangerous view of the matter. While there may still be some honest people who have not yet come around to seeing the justice of our cause and are thus going along with our war effort passively, *the political position of "going along"* has become the *new mask* of the defeatists and appeasers. It has become the new weapon of the enemies of our national unity and of our national war effort.

Mr. Wendell Willkie has put his finger on a real menace when he singled out in the Republican Party those "that would simply follow a passive course." Of these he said:

"They go along. They vote the necessary war powers. But they counsel that the Republican Party should not develop an affirmative program at this time. It should await the inevitable reaction from this war. . . . They believe that the Republican Party will then come back into office on an inheritance of discontent." (*New York Times*, Feb. 13).

And he added: "I have no faith in such a theory," which is consistent with his general position of national unity. But what sort of a theory is this? It is a "theory" of defeat—defeat of our nation and victory of Hitlerism. Many of the narrow political partisans in the Republican Party, who share this "theory," may not know it, but the fact is that this has become the deliberate instrument of the pro-fascists and appeasers for undermining our national unity and for sabotaging our common war effort. It has become the instrument of treason for the appeasers in the Republican Party, and also in the Democratic Party, and among the Norman Thomasites. It is necessary, therefore, to help the innocent "go alongers" to become fully conscious of the fact that they are being manipulated by the supporters of the Axis in our own midst.

To meet effectively the new methods and tricks of the appeasers, it will not do any good and

may do much harm to confine the question to the formal right "to criticize the conduct of the war." That is what the appeasers want. Among other things, they seek to undermine our war effort in the guise of criticizing its conduct. The question, therefore, is not the right to criticize but the nature of the criticism: what is being attacked and what is being proposed. And when we examine this, we find little difficulty in discovering the pro-fascist and appeasement nature of certain "criticisms" and in separating these from genuine efforts to improve and strengthen our war effort.

When the appeasers "criticize" the conduct of the war, they invariably direct their attacks against the two most vital spots in the armor of our nation. They attack our allies and they attack our national unity. Why they do so is reasonably simple. If they could succeed in separating the United States from the Soviet Union and Great Britain, as well as from China, and the other United Nations, and if they could also succeed in splitting apart all the various classes and groups that make up the alliance of our national unity, the appeasers know they would thus be preparing the defeat of our country. And for this they are working.

The attacks on our allies take various forms. The most direct and familiar form is to arouse distrust in the intentions of our allies, playing upon fears of the "spread of Bolshevism" with regard to the Soviet Union, and upon fears of imperialist rivalry and "double-cross"

with regard to Great Britain. But these attacks are proving less and less potent. Ever larger sections of the ruling circles of our country, which are expected by the appeasers to be intimidated by these fears, are drawing the opposite conclusion. Realizing that the danger to their position today—externally and internally—arises not from waging the war against Hitlerism but from failure to do so, the decisive sections of our ruling circles are moved powerfully to greater and more active support of our war effort, even through with considerable inconsistency and hesitation. Hence, the appeasers are resorting to additional methods of intimidation, exploiting some of the old prejudices and illusions of "isolationism."

In his speech of February 23, President Roosevelt dealt with this method when he referred to those advices which tell us "to pull our planes and our merchant ships to our own home waters and concentrate solely on last-ditch defense." The President rightly rejected "such foolish advice." And he should have added: this is suicidal advice—advice that has its origin in the camp of the defeatists and pro-fascist appeasers, although it may be repeated by people that are innocent of its true meaning. This theory of concentrating on home "defense" as something separate from fighting the Axis where it can be crushed, and in closest alliance with the United Nations, headed by our own country, the Soviet Union and Great Britain, this is a theory made to Hitler's orders, made for the purpose of isolating us from our allies

and bringing defeat upon us. This has to be said *clearly and plainly*. It is the theory of the same treacherous elements in our midst that go into the making of the "Cliveden Set" in Washington.

From the foregoing the conclusion is: merciless struggle against such defeatist and appeasement "advices" and groups, the establishment of a full economic, political and military alliance with the Soviet Union and Great Britain as the joint leadership of the United Nations, and the development of common fighting action now by America and its allies against the main Axis enemy, Hitler Germany.

Hand in hand with defeatist attack upon our allies for the purpose of isolating the United States, goes the attack upon our national unity. And the form it takes is significant. It is usually directed against our working people, against the labor movement and against the democratic forces of our nation generally. The purpose is to split our *internal* alliance—the anti-Hitler camp of our workers, farmers, professionals, Negroes and businessmen which makes up the national unity of our country.

The force that binds and continually strengthens this coalition of classes and groups is the common goal which they all share today—the national independence and freedom of our country, the defeat of the Axis enemy which seeks to destroy this national freedom. To attack directly this common national goal is to expose a person as a defeatist and appeaser. Therefore, the friends of the Axis in our

midst resort to indirect methods of attack upon our national unity. They try to intimidate businessmen regarding labor's organized strength, its role and activities to help win the war; they try to intimidate those conservative circles which distrust democracy and fear the coming forward of the democratic masses of our people; they exploit the differences between city and farm; they play upon anti-Semitic and anti-Negro and anti-foreign prejudices. And following the same "line" but working from a different end, Norman Thomas and John L. Lewis are seeking to weaken labor's ties with the camp of national unity. Norman Thomas tries to do this by making "Socialism" the immediate objective of the working class; and by promoting labor and national disunity. Lewis attempts this by insisting upon the "paramount" interests of "trade unionism" as against the broad class and national interests of our working people and by trying to divide and disorientate the C.I.O. and the labor and progressive movements. In this way, the camp of defeatists and appeasers is laboring, and with a certain degree of success, to undermine and disrupt our national unity, in order to bring about the defeat of our country.

How this works out in practice can be seen very clearly in recent deliberations and actions in Congress. There we had both: attacks upon our allies abroad and attacks upon our national unity at home—the complete pattern of the defeatist strategy. It was led by such people as the Republican Repre-

sentatives Hoffman and Shaffer of Michigan, Fish of New York, Faddis of Pennsylvania, Ford of California, and the Democrat Martin Dies of Texas; and in the Senate by the Democrats Byrd, McKellar and Tydings.

To isolate our country from its allies, this gentry was brazenly indulging in baiting England and the Soviet Union. To split our national unity, these great "patriots" were having fun at baiting labor, the toiling farmers, the youth, the Communists, the Office of Civilian Defense, and all anti-fascist and consistently democratic forces of our people. Incidentally, they also managed to weaken seriously such important organs of national defense as the Public Works Program, the National Youth Administration, the Farm Security Administration and the Public Housing Program. They are endangering the further development of our Civilian Defense. They laid the basis for continuing the divisive and dangerous work of the Dies Committee. They still continue to sabotage the vitally necessary war measure of price control, under the guise of helping the farmers, holding up the war measure of relief and retraining, while inciting prejudices against labor for its demands for a wage scale essential for most effective war production and sufficient to meet the rising cost of living and for union security. They are playing around with financial measures—sales tax on necessities of life—which are unnecessary for financing the war but which would injure the physical capacity of the masses

of our people to carry the burdens of the war effort.

Moreover: these same hidden appeasers and hopeless reactionaries are deliberately encouraging all tendencies of resistance to the quickest mobilization of our national economy to war needs. They encourage and arouse resistance on the part of the heads of certain large corporations to utilizing labor's initiative and collaboration with management for the realization of the government's war production program. They encourage resistance to integrating the efforts of the Negro people in our national effort. They are seeking to develop a situation of division and disunity among our people, which, among other things, is primarily responsible for the disgraceful and unpardonable failure to release Earl Browder from jail.

The deliberate and open conspirators against our national unity are undoubtedly a minority in the halls of Congress as they are a small minority among our people. But where is the majority of Congress? What is it doing to isolate the splitters and defeatists, to check their treasonable and dangerous manipulations, to express in deeds the unmistakable wish of our nation to close ranks and get on with the war? Mighty little thus far. And the reason for it is that *the spirit of conciliation with appeasement and of toleration with defeatism is still strong in Congress as it is in certain agencies of the government.* This spirit must be rooted out as quickly as possible. An end must be put to the easy-going attitude of

tolerating and conciliating the splitters of our national unity, the inciters of labor baiting and red baiting, the promoters of hostility to the anti-fascist and democratic masses and organizations of our people, the exploiters of anti-Semitic and anti-Negro prejudices, the enemies of the firmest alliance of the United Nations. An iron-clad unity of the nation must be presented against the splitters and appeasers, for the support and strengthening of the government's war effort. This is no time for taking it easy.

And something else has to be said. The classes and groups of our people that go into the making of our national unity must realize more clearly that theirs is a unity, *an alliance* for a common goal, a united national front. This means that every group and class in the national unity, including the workers, farmers and employers, each and all must be ready and willing to *give the common national interest the right of way*, to subordinate all other interests, which may differ or be in conflict, to the national interest: everything to win the war, everything to defeat Hitler and the Axis. This also means a willingness and readiness to make mutual concessions, to follow the rule of give and take, on all questions or issues over which there are differences, and to do it in such a way as will, *first of all*, promote the national interest and common war effort of defeating the Axis.

Clearly, this is no blueprint; none is possible. Problems and difficulties will arise continually and these now will have to be composed—

by labor and the farmers, as well as by businessmen, much more rapidly and determinedly than heretofore—composed on the basis of national unity against the Axis and for a victorious prosecution of the war, and by the method of mutual concessions and of give and take. Let there be a “rivalry” between the various classes and component parts of the national unity, not on the issue of which will sacrifice least for the nation, but which is capable of doing most and is *doing most* for the isolation and defeat of the appeasers and all other enemies of our country, for the victorious prosecution of the war, for the destruction of the Axis and of fascism.

In such a “rivalry” for national unity, differences on secondary and conflicting interests will present no danger, because then they will present no openings to appeasers for driving wedges between the various groups and classes in the camp of national unity. The danger arises only when the defeatists and appeasers are allowed by the national forces to drive wedges between their various classes and groups. Hence, the major duty of each of these groups and classes is to curb and isolate the defeatists and appeasers in their own midst. Labor has already begun to do so. It has rejected the anti-national appeasement and splitting tendencies emanating from John L. Lewis and Norman Thomas and is steadily developing and applying a national standpoint and policy—the policy of the working class as the backbone of the nation and the national

war effort, and its most consistent anti-fascist and progressive class. And it is along these lines that labor should continue, more rapidly, more consciously.

Labor has to continue to free itself more thoroughly of the vicious influences which would make the working class a mere passive supporter of the national war effort and which would subordinate, in the name of "trade unionism," the most fundamental immediate tasks of the working class—the destruction of the Axis and of fascism—to narrow group interests of a temporary and transitory character. Labor has to strive to become the foremost example of political initiative, influence and national service for all other classes and groups in our society, aiming thus to show the American people, more than ever, that the working class is, in fact, the most dependable champion of the nation's independence and freedom, the most consistent opponent of the Axis and fascism.

An equally serious "internal" task of house cleaning confronts the other classes and groups in our national unity, especially the employers of labor, the capitalists. It is among some of them particularly that the defeatists and appeasers have their nests, their sources of sustenance, their social contacts. It is among them, as a class, that "Cliveden Sets" originate and grow, poisoning the atmosphere around them and breeding hesitations, weaknesses and capitulation among the supporters of the national war objective. Certainly, the major duty of our businessmen and employers

of labor is to combat the influences of these appeasers, to reject their labor-baiting and democracy-baiting, to curb and isolate the disrupters and enemies of our national unity, and to overcome speedily all attitudes of "business as usual." Our businessmen and employers of labor must always be conscious of the fact—as must all the rest of us—that our national unity is an alliance or coalition of various classes, of all patriotic Americans regardless of social origin, *for a common goal*, which is the winning of our national war against the Axis. *Everything* must be subordinated to this goal, and all secondary and conflicting interests must be composed and resolved *on the basis of and within* the anti-Hitler camp of national unity, not in conflict with it and not outside of it. Clearly, anti-labor incitements and unwillingness to cooperate with labor in the national war effort are one of the surest ways of undermining our national unity. Therefore, it is essential to curb, isolate and defeat the appeasers, the friends and allies of the Nazi-fascist Axis.

This same spirit of "rivalry" for national unity and victory in the war should dominate the developing political campaign for the coming Congressional elections. And American labor, especially the trade union movement, can play a very important part, not only because of its considerable organized strength and political influence, but also because it is capable of and is rendering the *most consistent* championship of the national interest, of the national war effort. It is capable

of projecting and carrying through in the elections a genuine line of true non-partisanship and national unity to win the war, and of gaining the support for this line of the widest masses of our people.

Narrow partisanship can have no place in such a policy. People should be elected to Congress, not because they are Democrats, Republicans, Laborites, etc., but because they are the most dependable and reliable fighters for *national unity for victory* over Hitler and the Axis. Conversely, all those candidates should be defeated, regardless of party affiliations, who are not reliable and dependable in the struggle for victory for our national and democratic war. And this includes not only the well known appeasers of the Wheeler, Fish and Nye stripe, but also such hidden defeatists and enemies of our national unity as Dies, Smith, Hoffman, Cox, Ford, Shaffer, Faddis, Byrd, McKellar, Tydings, and all others of the same category of hidden appeasers and conciliators with appeasement. Where candidates of all parties in a locality stand committed to the same general platform of national unity for victory, preference should be given by the voters to those candidates whose record and position offers *the most guarantees* that they will fight *wholeheartedly* and most *consistently* to unite the nation for winning the war, for strengthening the alliance and common fighting action of the United Nations, for the complete destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism.

The people cannot and will not

accept a position of narrow partisanship whether of Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, or of Martin, chairman of the Republican National Committee. Flynn's assertion that only a Democratic Congress can help our country win the war would be true only under two conditions. First, if the Democratic Party would eliminate from its lists of candidates and from its councils those defeatists and open or hidden appeasers, as well as the extreme reactionaries, who are still in its ranks and in public office, like many of the Southern Congressmen; not only the Wheelers, but also those such as Dies, Cox, Smith (Virginia), Tydings and Byrd. Secondly, if the other political parties (Republican, Labor, Farmer-Labor, etc.) would present to the voters for election only defeatists and appeasers. This, of course, may be the situation and lineup in many states and electoral districts. But this is not inevitable, it is not the only kind of a choice that is indicated by the situation.

At any rate, the Democratic Party still has to demonstrate that many of its candidates will be the most dependable champions of our national and democratic war. The leaders and followers of that party should proceed to make that demonstration. *Above all, labor—especially the trade union movement, acting unitedly and in the closest collaboration with all other anti-Hitler forces—Democrats and Republicans, Laborites and Communists—should take the initiative to help influence the selection, as well as the election, of the most capable*

and resolute anti-Hitler candidates, regardless of party affiliation. Among these candidates, who should be fully representative of national unity and firmly committed to the national war effort and objectives, labor, as well as the Negro people and the working farmers, should be adequately represented.

As for the presumptions and questionable claims of Mr. Martin. He claims that we must elect Republicans to Congress in order to maintain the two-party system, to provide a "loyal opposition" and to insure "constructive criticism" of the conduct of the war. To which the answer is: first, the American people are not particularly concerned in these elections with party systems for the sake of these systems; they are primarily interested in winning the war for our national freedom and democratic liberties and will use the existing party systems for that end and that end alone—victory in the war.

Second, the people do not need and do not want "opposition" and "criticism" for the sake of opposing and criticizing. They want primarily a united nation and a united Congress as well as the common action of the United Nations, to achieve victory over the fascist aggressors. They need and want Congressmen that will fight for this objective and will oppose and criticize as required by our national war objective.

Third, the Republican Party *has still to demonstrate*, much more than the Democratic Party, that it really stands for national unity and victory in the war. The Republi-

can Party has still to show whether it intends to follow the leadership of Wendell Willkie, which is generally along the lines of national unity for victory, or whether it will follow the defeatist and appeasement course of Lindbergh, Hoover, Vandenberg, Hoffman, Shaffer and Ford. Let Mr. Martin and the Republican leaders first make sure that their party can and will match the other parties in presenting to the voters dependable fighters against the Axis. Then and then only will it be time for them to claim support for their party as against all the others.

Nor can the people accept the proposition that, while there should be national unity for carrying on the war, there should be a free-for-all "in the field of domestic affairs." The *New York Herald Tribune* seems to favor some such position for the Republican Party. But that is absurd. Domestic affairs today are affairs of the war, and the questions of war are domestic affairs. When the bulk of the Republicans in the present Congress join hands with the hidden appeasers of the Democratic Party to sabotage the Administration's price control measure, to kill the special appropriation for emergency relief and retraining of the "priority" unemployed, to continue the unspeakable Dies Committee, to injure the Farm Security Administration, to destroy labor legislation, to arouse and incite prejudices against our working people and the labor movement, etc.—when the Republicans, in alliance with the reactionary Southern Democrats, en-

gage in this sort of "opposition on domestic affairs," are they helping the war effort or are they hurting it? The answer is: they are driving a poisoned dagger into our national unity and into our national war effort. They are sabotaging the war and undermining our national unity. And the American people cannot and will not, on pain of defeat in the war, countenance such "opposition on domestic affairs."

The dominating issue in this election campaign is national unity for victory over Hitler and the Axis. This means unity of all classes and groups of all anti-Hitler forces that make up our national front against the Axis. And this especially requires today that an end shall be put to all incitements and attacks against the working class—the backbone of our nation—and that labor's full partnership in our national unity shall be recognized, and that labor shall be adequately represented in the government and Congress. This requires full collaboration with, and absolutely no incitements and attacks upon, all of the other democratic forces and anti-fascist elements of our nation. It further and especially requires the isolation and defeat of all pro-fascist appeasers and defeatists, and all splitters of our national unity, open or hidden, everywhere, particularly of the large number of pro-appeasement and extreme reactionary Congressmen from the South and the Midwest.

With these fundamentals of policy as the basis of its election platform, labor can render the cause of national unity an inestimable serv-

ice in the coming elections. This requires, of course, *united labor action in the coming elections*, especially united action by the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and Railroad Brotherhoods on a common platform to win the war, and in support of a common list of anti-Axis candidates representative of all sections of the anti-Hitler coalition and movement. It requires still greater political and organizing initiative on the part of labor, particularly for rallying the entire trade union movement, and for cooperating with and mobilizing the farmers, the Negro people and the national groups.

Time is short and action is necessary at once. The organizations of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., Labor's Victory Board, which reflects and is called upon to help develop further the growing unity of our working class, and the various local united labor committees and movements, have an important role to play in providing a *united labor leadership in the election campaign* and in the promotion of labor and national unity for victory. Some of the existing Labor Parties, and other independent political organizations of the masses, following a united labor leadership on a platform of national unity to win the war, are in a position to make significant contributions to the common cause, *to strengthen still further the bonds of alliance between the working class and all other anti-fascist forces in our nation*, to help secure broader and more active mass support for realizing and implementing the government's war policies.

It is obvious that the present situation neither demands nor is it ripe for a general movement or campaign to organize the labor and popular anti-fascist forces of our people into separate political parties. While it might become necessary to set up independent tickets, or even parties, in certain individual localities, this will not be required generally or on a national scale.

In this matter, labor will have to guard seriously against such appeasement and splitting tendencies as come from Norman Thomas and John L. Lewis. The Norman Thomasites are scheming to drive a wedge between labor and the other forces in our national unity, such as are represented by President Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie. This also is the scheme of John L. Lewis, who, undoubtedly, will try to misuse Labor's Non-Partisan League for this purpose. Obviously, this is sabotage of our national unity and of our war effort, whether it is done in the guise of "Socialism Now," "A Democratic Peace Now," or a "National Labor Party Now." All these schemes have to be resolutely rejected and combated.

It is also clear that the forthcoming elections can be made to accelerate greatly the current political realignment for achieving the broadest unity of the national anti-Hitler forces, for isolating and defeating the appeasers and defeatists, and for strengthening the independent role and the political influence of labor—but still within the general framework of existing party relationships, allowing for local exceptions. Towards this end,

labor's and the nation's best interests in the coming elections require that labor develop the greatest political and organizing initiative, unity and mass activity, and consistently carry through a line of genuine non-partisanship and national unity for winning the war, in the closest collaboration with the leaders and organizations of the other national anti-Axis forces of our country, irrespective of party affiliation or social origin.

The Communist Party, as an organic and inseparable part of the American working class, considers its main task in the elections to promote labor and national unity to win the war, to help enlighten, unify and assist the working class and people to adopt and carry through a line of national unity for victory over Hitler and the Axis. The Communist Party will exert every effort to function as the most consistent and far-seeing fighter for this line, as the advanced detachment of united labor in the elections and, on this basis, will also endeavor to extend and develop its mass activities and influence. It will thus make its best and maximum contribution to promoting national unity, to strengthening our war effort, to advancing common action of the peoples and the United Nations, for the destruction of the fascist aggressors and fascism, for the realization of our national and democratic objectives. It will thus also make the best contribution to the historic mission of the working class, which is to liberate the world from all wars, exploitation and oppression.

NEGROES AND THE NATIONAL WAR EFFORT

An Address by Frederick Douglass with Foreword by James W. Ford

FOREWORD

THese are trying days for our nation. They are even more trying than those in the national crisis of 1860, when the threat to the nation's existence demanded just as today the integration and utilization of Negroes to the fullest in the struggle to preserve the Union. Frederick Douglass' leadership in clarifying the issues that resulted in the raising of Negro troops and their integration into the Union armies is graphically illustrated in the following speech made by that great Negro Abolitionist in Philadelphia, at the National Hall, on July 6, 1863.

Again the Negro people dare not fail to appreciate their stake and their role in helping to win the war today against the Axis powers, without which the struggle for the rights of the Negro people will be set back for generations. Frederick Douglass, one of the outstanding figures of the Civil War period, comes forward now to challenge those who declare "this is not the colored man's war" and who would minimize the stake of the Negro people in this titanic global conflict. Douglass has not fully come into his own

even among the most politically advanced white and Negro masses in the United States. Too little has been made known about him by the official historians. Those who have written the history of our country in the decades since the Civil War have either deliberately, or out of an ignorance nurtured by prejudice, omitted Douglass' contribution to our nation. Falsification by silence has to a considerable extent concealed the real issues of that period from the masses.

In the Civil War the nation was faced with dissolution. The Union had to be saved or liberty would have been lost for all. All true patriots rallied against those who aimed to dismember our country and who, if they had been successful in defeating the Union, would have imposed the system of human slavery over the entire nation and spread it throughout Central and South America.

Labor exercised an important role in determining the course of the Civil War. It supported Lincoln and stood solidly for the abolition of slavery. Of strategic importance also was the active participation of Negro troops in helping to determine the successful outcome of the

war. No one understood this more clearly than Frederick Douglass. In his speech Douglass makes devastating arguments against wavering and hesitation in regard to supporting the war, by his brilliant analysis of the two forces that were struggling for mastery in the military drama of the Civil War. Although vacillation and weakness on the slavery question were found in high places in the government, Douglass nevertheless admonished colored men to join the Union Army and fight for freedom and liberty. He declared that the logic of events should convince all Negroes that their basic interests demanded their participation as fighters in the ranks of the Union Army. When Confederate cannon shattered Fort Sumter at Charleston—the Pearl Harbor of the Civil War—Douglass at once “saw the end of slavery” for his people. He threw himself into mobilizing Negro troops for the Union Army. He fought the Copperheads.

In the crisis today the nation is fighting for its existence against new would-be enslavers of the whole of humanity, the Nazi-fascist Axis—the most fiendish imperialists in all history. We have the McClellans, pro-Hitlerites and appeasers of today, black and white. We have our Lindberghs, Hamilton Fishes and Coughlins; we have the Ku Klux Klan and our Cliveden Set, all of whom constitute the most serious obstacle to the war against Hitler and are a Hitlerite camp of reaction at home. We have a group of Southern poll-tax Congressmen, who, under the guise of supporting the government’s foreign policy,

obstruct every measure necessary for the fullest mobilization of our human and material resources to destroy the fascist Axis.

Shameless policies of “Aryan superiority,” such as blood segregation, can only contribute to undermining unity of the nation. There is not a single American patriot who does not glory in the sacrifices that Negro Americans have made in giving the last drop of their blood to sustain this nation since its birth until the present moment. We must fight against the appeasers in the spirit which Douglass indicated, of unity of white and black.

A matter of the gravest concern to all Americans anxious for the destruction of everything that Hitlerism stands for is the widespread discrimination against Negro Americans in the armed forces and in the industries, which militates against their fullest mobilization for the war effort. All Americans—Negroes and whites—can never be satisfied until this blot is erased from American life. In the spirit and tradition of Frederick Douglass, this question is not placed as “condition for support of the war”; rather, it is advanced in the interests of most effectively prosecuting the war. In the course of this war the struggle for democracy and equality must be furthered. Unless all unite *effectively* to defeat Hitler, white and black will become the chattel slaves of fascism.

The work of Douglass in rallying his people in support of the war in the interests of national unity was made easier by labor’s support

of the anti-slavery cause. The leadership of Douglass, as history has proved, was wise and sound.

Labor is immensely stronger today. It is the backbone of the nation. Its task of rallying the Negro people in support of the war against Hitler requires united effort in wiping out discrimination and lynching: This constitutes a basic part of the battle for production. It means helping win the war on the battlefields. It means helping the government rally all the forces of the nation to win the war.

The crisis which faces the nation today requires national unity embracing all classes and peoples to preserve the very national existence

of the United States. In developing further its policies for combating discrimination, the government will help smash the nefarious efforts of the Axis-aiding demagogues and splitters, and will strengthen national unity for dealing the death blow to the fascist Axis.

"Events more mighty than men," said Douglass, "... have placed us in new relations with the government and the government with us."

The republication of this speech of Frederick Douglass in *The Communist* should serve, not alone to honor him, but to make more clear the tasks we face today and to stimulate us fully to meet them.

JAMES W. FORD.

THE SPEECH OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS

MR. PRESIDENT and Fellow Citizens—

I shall not attempt to follow Judge Kelley* and Miss Dickinson** in their eloquent and thrilling appeals to colored men to enlist in the service of the United States. They have left nothing to be desired on that point. I propose

* Judge Kelley: William D. Kelley, a Republican of Philadelphia, who was a Congressman during the Civil War. In the House, he pressed constantly for a more vigorous conduct of the war, the arming of the Negroes and emancipation.—*Editor.*

** Anna Dickinson: Poet, Abolitionist orator. In 1864, at the age of 21, she spoke in the House of Representatives for the benefit of the Freedmen's Relief Association. From the beginning of the war she advocated emancipation, and division of the large plantations among the freed Negroes. She was active in exposing McClellan's treason on the battlefield.—*Editor.*

to look at the subject in a plain and practical common-sense light. There are obviously two views to be taken of such enlistments—a broad view and a narrow view. I am willing to take both, and consider both. The narrow view of this subject is that which respects the matter of dollars and cents. There are those among us who say they are in favor of taking a hand in this tremendous war, but they add they wish to do so on terms of equality with white men. They say if they enter the service, endure all the hardships, perils and suffering—if they make bare their breasts, and with strong arms and courageous hearts

confront rebel cannons, and wring victory from the jaws of death, they should have the same pay, the same rations, the same bounty, and the same favorable conditions every way afforded to other men.

I shall not oppose this view. There is something deep down in the soul of every man present which assents to the justice of the claim thus made, and honors the manhood and self-respect which insists upon it. [*Applause*] I say at once, in peace and in war, I am content with nothing for the black man short of equal and exact justice. The only question I have, and the point at which I differ from those who refuse to enlist, is whether the colored man is more likely to obtain justice and equality while refusing to assist in putting down this tremendous rebellion than he would be if he should promptly, generously and earnestly give his hand and heart to the salvation of the country in this its day of calamity and peril. Nothing can be more plain, nothing more certain than that the speediest and best possible way open to us to manhood, equal rights and elevation, is that we enter this service. For my own part, I hold that if the Government of the United States offered nothing more, as an inducement to colored men to enlist, than bare subsistence and arms, considering the moral effect of compliance upon ourselves, it would be the wisest and best thing for us to enlist. [*Applause*] There is something ennobling in the possession of arms, and we of all other people in the world stand in need of their ennobling influence.

The case presented in the present war, and the light in which every colored man is bound to view it, may be stated thus. There are two governments struggling now for the possession of and endeavoring to bear rule over the United States—one has its capital in Richmond, and is represented by Mr. Jefferson Davis, and the other has its capital at Washington, and is represented by "Honest Old Abe." [*Cheers and long-continued applause*] These two governments are today face to face, confronting each other with vast armies, and grappling each other upon many a bloody field, north and south, on the banks of the Mississippi, and under the shadows of the Alleghenies. Now, the question for every colored man is, or ought to be, what attitude is assumed by these respective governments and armies towards the rights and liberties of the colored race in this country; which is for us, and which against us! [*Cries of That's the question*]

Now, I think there can be no doubt as to the attitude of the Richmond or Confederate Government. Wherever else there has been concealment, here all is frank, open, and diabolically straightforward. Jefferson Davis and his government make no secret as to the cause of this war, and they do not conceal the purpose of the war. That purpose is nothing more nor less than to make the slavery of the African race universal and perpetual on this continent. It is not only evident from the history and logic of events, but the declared purpose of the atrocious war now being waged

against the country. Some, indeed, have denied that slavery has anything to do with the war, but the very same men who do this affirm it in the same breath in which they deny it, for they tell you that the abolitionists are the cause of the war. Now, if the abolitionists are the cause of the war, they are the cause of it only because they have sought the abolition of slavery. View it in any way you please, therefore, the rebels are fighting for the existence of slavery—they are fighting for the privilege, the horrid privilege of sundering the dearest ties of human nature—of trafficking in slaves and the souls of men—for the ghastly privilege of scourging women and selling innocent children. [*Cries of That's true*]

I say this is not the concealed object of the war, but the openly confessed and shamelessly proclaimed object of the war. Vice-President Stephens has stated, with the utmost clearness and precision, the difference between the fundamental ideas of the Confederate Government and those of the Federal Government. One is based upon the idea that colored men are an inferior race, who may be enslaved and plundered forever and to the heart's content of any men of a different complexion, while the Federal Government recognizes the natural and fundamental equality of all men. [*Applause*]

I say, again, we all know that this Jefferson Davis government holds out to us nothing but fetters, chains, auction-blocks, bludgeons, branding irons, and eternal slavery and degradation. If it triumphs in this

contest, woe, woe, ten thousand woes, to the black man! Such of us as are free, in all the likelihoods of the case, would be given over to the most excruciating tortures, while the last hope of the long-crushed bondman would be extinguished forever. [*Sensation*]

Now, what is the attitude of the Washington government towards the colored race? What reasons have we to desire its triumph in the present contest? Mind, I do not ask what was its attitude towards us before this bloody rebellion broke out. I do not ask what was its disposition when it was controlled by the very men who are now fighting to destroy it when they could no longer control it. I do not even ask what it was two years ago, when McClellan* shamelessly gave out that in a war between loyal slaves and disloyal masters, he would take the side of the masters against the slaves—when he openly proclaimed his purpose to put down slave insurrections with an iron hand—

* George B. McClellan: Major-General in the U. S. army in 1861. Bitterly opposed to emancipation of the Negro people. McClellan ordered his soldiers to return to their owners fugitive slaves who had come within the Union lines. He refused to take the offensive in the war, permitting the enemy to escape even after Union victories. When Lincoln had removed him from command, McClellan ran against Lincoln for the presidency in 1864, on the Democratic ticket, calling for "peace." Marx said of McClellan: "... his influence acted as a brake on the general conduct of the war . . . McClellan and most of the officers of the regular army who got their training at West Point are more or less bound to their old comrades in the enemy camp by the ties of *esprit de corps* . . . McClellan covered the traitors in the Union Army with his saving shield . . . McClellan knew how to keep every military traitor from court martial, and in most cases even from dismissal . . . McClellan wages war not in order to defeat the foe, but rather in order not to be defeated by the foe and thus forfeit his own usurped greatness."—Marx-Engels, *The Civil War in the United States*, International Publishers, New York.—Editor.

when glorious Ben. Butler* [*Cheers and applause*], now stunned into a conversion to anti-slavery principles (which I have every reason to believe sincere), proffered his services to the Governor of Maryland, to suppress a slave insurrection, while treason ran riot in that State, and the warm, red blood of Massachusetts soldiers still stained the pavements of Baltimore.

I do not ask what was the attitude of this government when many of the officers and men who had undertaken to defend it, openly threatened to throw down their arms and leave the service if men of color should step forward to defend it, and be invested with the dignity of soldiers. Moreover, I do not ask what was the position of this government when our loyal camps were made slave hunting grounds, and United States officers performed the disgusting duty of slave dogs to hunt down slaves for rebel masters. These were all dark and terrible days for the republic. I do not ask you about the dead past. I bring you to the living present. Events more mighty than men,

eternal Providence, all-wise and all-controlling, have placed us in new relations to the government and the government to us. What that government is to us today, and what it will be tomorrow, is made evident by a very few facts. Look at them, colored men. Slavery in the District of Columbia is abolished forever; slavery in all the territories of the United States is abolished forever; the foreign slave trade, with its ten thousand revolting abominations, is rendered impossible; slavery in ten States of the Union is abolished forever; slavery in the five remaining States is as certain to follow the same fate as the night is to follow the day. The independence of Haiti is recognized; her Minister sits beside our Prime Minister, Mr. Seward, and dines at his table in Washington, while colored men are excluded from the cars in Philadelphia; showing that a black man's complexion in Washington, in the presence of the Federal government, is less offensive than in the city of brotherly love. Citizenship is no longer denied us under this government.

Under the interpretation of our rights by Attorney General Bates, we are American citizens. We can import goods, own and sail ships, and travel in foreign countries with American passports in our pockets; and now, so far from there being any opposition, so far from excluding us from the army as soldiers, the President at Washington, the Cabinet and the Congress, the generals commanding and the whole army of the nation unite in giving us one.

* Benjamin F. Butler: At first a pro-slavery Democrat of Massachusetts, Butler, in the course of the Civil War, became a staunch anti-slavery man. He was a Brigadier-General, later a Major-General, in the Union Army. Placed in charge of Fortress Monroe, in Virginia, he admitted to it, even before the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation, fugitive slaves whom he fed and clothed and put to work for the Union. He refused to return these Negroes to their former masters, answering his critics with the statement that the ex-slaves had been Confederate property and were therefore "contraband of war." In 1862 Butler became military governor of New Orleans after its capture by the Union Army. At New Orleans he raised Negro troops, being one of the first to do so, and setting a precedent which later became national policy. His Reconstruction policy was that of the group of Radical Republicans under the leadership of Thaddeus Stevens.—*Editor*.

thunderous welcome to share with them in the honor and glory of suppressing treason and upholding the star-spangled banner. The revolution is tremendous, and it becomes us as wise men to recognize the change, and to shape our action accordingly. [*Cheers and cries of We will*]

I hold that the Federal government was never, in its essence, anything but an anti-slavery government. Abolish slavery tomorrow, and not a sentence or syllable of the Constitution need be altered. It was purposely so framed as to give no claim, no sanction to the claim of property in man. If in its origin slavery had any relation to the government, it was only as the scaffolding to the magnificent structure, to be removed as soon as the building was completed. There is in the Constitution no East, no West, no North, no South, no black, no white, no slave, no slaveholder; but all are citizens who are of American birth.

Such is the government, fellow citizens, you are now called upon to uphold with your arms. Such is the government that you are called upon to cooperate with in burying rebellion and slavery in a common grave. [*Applause*] Never since the world began was a better chance offered to a long enslaved and oppressed people. The opportunity is given us to be men. With one courageous resolution we may blot out the handwriting of ages against us. Once let the black man get upon his person the brass letters U. S.; let him get an eagle on his button, and a musket on his shoulder, and bullets in his pocket, and there is

no power on the earth or under the earth which can deny that he has earned the right of citizenship in the United States. [*Laughter and applause*] I say again, this is our chance, and woe betide us if we fail to embrace it. The immortal bard hath told us:

“There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
We must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures.”

Do not flatter yourselves, my friends, that you are more important to the government than the government is to you. You stand but as the plank to the ship. This rebellion can be put down without your help. Slavery can be abolished by white men; but liberty so won for the black man, while it may leave him an object of pity, can never make him an object of respect.

Depend upon it, this is no time for hesitation. Do you say you want the same pay that white men get? I believe that the justice and magnanimity of your country will speedily grant it. But will you be over nice about this matter? Do you get as good wages now as white men get by staying out of the service? Don't you work for less every day than white men get? You know you do. Do I hear you say you want black officers? Very well, and I have not the slightest doubt that in the

progress of this war we shall see black officers, black colonels, and generals even.* But is it ridiculous in us in all at once refusing to be commanded by white men in time of war, when we are everywhere commanded by white men in time of peace? Do I hear you say still that you are a son, and want your mother provided for in your absence?—a husband, and want your wife cared for?—a brother, and want your sister secured against want? I honor you for your solicitude. Your mothers, your wives and your sisters ought to be cared for, and an association of gentlemen, composed of responsible white and colored men, is now being organized in this city for this very purpose.

Do I hear you say you offered your services to Pennsylvania and were refused? I know it. But what of that? The State is not more than

the nation. The greater includes the lesser. Because the State refuses, you should all the more readily turn to the United States. [*Applause*] When the children fall out, they should refer their quarrel to the parent. "You came unto your own, and your own received you not." But the broad gates of the United States stand open night and day. Citizenship in the United States will, in the end, secure your citizenship in the State.

Young men of Philadelphia, you are without excuse. The hour has arrived, and your place is in the Union army. Remember that the musket—the United States musket with its bayonet of steel—is better than all mere parchment guarantees of liberty. In your hands that musket means liberty; and should your constitutional right at the close of this war be denied, which, in the nature of things, it cannot be, your brethren are safe while you have a Constitution which proclaims your right to keep and bear arms. [*Immense cheering*]

* Negroes held about seventy-five commissions in the army during the Civil War. One member of the First North Carolina Volunteers, William N. Reed, rose to the position of Lieutenant-Colonel.—*Editor*.

FROM LEIPZIG TO RIOM

BY HANS BERGER

THOSE who do not heed the lessons of the Reichstag fire and of the Leipzig trial in Leipzig end in Riom. This goes for individual statesmen, labor leaders, classes and nations.

A Japanese general not long ago declared that he intended to dictate the terms of peace in Washington. Can anyone doubt that Hitler and his allies, in case of victory, would hold just such a trial in Washington, in which perhaps Dies, Lindbergh, George Sylvester Viereck, and various other members of the American Cliveden Set and Fifth Column would be the accusers and witnesses against Roosevelt and other American patriots?

Recent history is rich in examples that can serve as precious lessons to us. One country purges its scoundrels, others let the scoundrels purge them. The Soviet Union cleared out its traitors, thereby making possible the first great defeat of the Nazi armies. Germany tolerated them, and the result was Hitler. France tolerated them, and the result was Pétain and Riom. The bourgeois democracies tolerated them all too long, and the result was the world conflagration.

* * *

In Leipzig, nine years ago, a man standing the midst of the brown-shirt torturers faced the Nazi tribunal. He was supposed to defend himself against the Goering charge of setting fire to the Reichstag, allegedly to start a "Communist revolution." But this man scorned to be on the defensive. He had no armies, no tanks, no airplanes, but he *attacked*. He did not let himself be confused and intimidated by the Nazi terror as so many peoples, or rather the leaders of so many peoples, and so many equivocal generals have done. He *attacked*.

The accuser in the dock saw, not only the temporarily victorious enemy; he saw not only the enemy's power; he looked past the walls of the Reich court, and felt himself linked with the tremendous popular forces in all the world, with all of progressive humanity, which, united, are able to destroy the arrogant enemy. Like this man nine years ago among the brown-shirt gendarmes in the Reich court, the guerrilla fighters behind the lines of the Nazi armies on the Soviet front and likewise the anti-fascist fighters against Hitler in France, Yugoslavia, Greece, and not least in Germany, feel linked with the glori-

ous Red Army and Soviet peoples, with the fighting forces of the United States, Britain, China, the Netherlands Indies, Australia, and all of the United Nations.

The best "propagandists" of the Nazis could do nothing against the ringing indictments of this veteran leader of the working class, schooled and proven in struggle, who shattered the lies of the brown-shirt accusers and exposed the rotten weaknesses of their regime. Goebels seemed very small, Goering contemptible indeed, when confronted with this man, whose heroism and penetration, drawn from deep Marxist-Leninist understanding of the movement of history, together with long experience in the fight against reaction and unshakable faith in the working class, enabled him to defy the Leipzig "Court" and to expose the Nazi dictatorship to the entire world as the real incendiary. By his example he showed how people must combat the Nazi dictatorship, how the offensive against fascist barbarism must be waged: unitedly, without fear, without vacillation, with iron determination. So mighty was the movement inspired by this man among all peoples that it was able, not only to save him, but to lay the basis for the United Front and People's Front which coalesced the popular forces of democracy and peace into mighty militant movements against fascism and fascist aggression.

The Nazi dictatorship was hardly a month old when it suffered its first signal defeat, at the hands of Georgi Dimitroff, in Leipzig. We

must remember that fact, precisely in these days, nine years after that remarkable trial, now that all the conditions are present to crown the first defeat of the Hitler dictatorship in Leipzig with the final military defeat of the Hitlerite Axis on the battlefields.

* * *

Hitler came to power, not by his daring and that of his gangster bands, but thanks above all to the disunity of his opponents, for which the leaders of bourgeois democracy and Social-Democracy bear the frightful responsibility. Unfortunately there are learned and unlearned fools in many countries who speak of the "Hitler revolution" and believe the stories spread by the Nazi dictatorship about its heroic exploits in "seizing power." Since when were the old reactionaries in Germany, the steel and coal magnates, the Prussian Junkers, the reactionary generals, the Freikorps bands, all of those figures which were at the helm in Germany in the first World War, *revolutionaries?* But it was precisely they who brought Hitler to power. It was they who used the reactionary puppet Hindenburg to put Hitler and the Nazis in power "in legal form," although the Nazis were in the minority in the elections. They were able to do so because of the policy of the Weimar democracy which was aided by the Social-Democratic policy of the "lesser evil"—a policy, for which thousands of Socialists paid with their lives, and which is now rejected by hundreds of thous-

ands of Social-Democratic workers and many Social-Democratic leaders in France and Germany, in Poland and Czechoslovakia, in the Scandinavian and many other countries, who are increasingly taking the path of national unity and common action with the Communists, the Radical Socialists, and all other patriots, the path of united struggle against the Nazi enslavers and their Quislings.

How discouraged the National-Socialists felt a month before "seizing power" can be seen from Goebbels' diary, which he published himself. In December, 1932, he made the following entry:

"Deep depression throughout the organization. One feels so worn out, one longs for nothing but a week's escape from the whole business.

"Phone call from Dr. Ley [Leader of the German Labor Front]: The situation in the party is getting worse from hour to hour.

"The year 1932 has brought us eternal ill-luck. Outside the peace of Christmas reigns in the streets. I am at home, alone, pondering over my life. The past was sad, and the future looks dark and gloomy; all chances and hopes have quite disappeared.

"For hours, the Leader paces up and down the room in the hotel. It is obvious that he is thinking very hard. He is embittered and deeply wounded by this unfaithfulness (of Gregor Strasser). Suddenly he stops and says: 'If the party once falls to pieces, I will shoot myself without more ado.'"

This was the Nazis' situation and the morale of the Nazi "heroes" one month before the big capitalists and

the Junkers and generals, in their fear of the counter-action of the masses, helped the Nazis out of their crisis and put them in power against the will of the German people. No serious person can doubt that had not the majority of the German workers been held back by the divisive policy of the Social-Democratic and reactionary trade union leaders from united struggle with the Communists, the Nazi party would have been knocked to pieces and the establishment of the Nazi dictatorship prevented.

But it was not a spirit such as that of Dimitroff at Leipzig that animated the leaders of the Weimar Republic. They put their hopes in Hindenburg, even in a peace agreement with Hitler, in the "crack-up" of Hitler; in the suspension of parliamentary rules; they hoped that he would content himself with destroying *only* the Communists—they put their hopes in everything except the power of common action against Hitler. They denounced the Communists and all consistent anti-fascists who proposed such common actions as provocateurs.

One wonders whether Goebbels is keeping up his diary today, and whether we shall some day be able to read some such entries as these:

"The situation on the Russian front is terrible. One defeat after another. Frightful losses of men and materiel. Morale among the soldiers and the population deteriorates constantly. Production is dropping. Everywhere there are leaks. If the English and Americans attack us we are lost. Our only hope

is that our opponents will repeat *their old mistake. One month before we came to power the situation seemed as hopeless as now.* Will our opponents help us out of this fix as they did then, by their indecision and disunity? That is all that could save our party and our rule. Otherwise we are threatened with collapse. The *Führer* paces up and down in his headquarters, and I have never seen him in such despair as now, when he receives one bad report after another from the front."

When the Hitler regime was placed in power it felt by no means secure. It feared that its opponents, in spite of all, would unite for a concerted blow. The Nazi leaders knew very well that they had not the majority among the German people, that the mass of the working class hated them, that everything progressive in Germany was the mortal enemy of the Hitler regime. They therefore hit upon the desperate provocation of setting fire to the Reichstag in order to declare the Communists "incendiaries," drive the Communist Party into illegality, throw the Communist representatives out of Parliament, and condemn every collaboration with the Communists as a crime. In short, they did just what the appeasers and fifth columnists would so very much like to do in this country.

But those who hoped that the Brown storm would direct itself only against the Communists, and that they could save themselves at the Communists' expense, were speedily and terribly disillusioned. Their fate followed immediately upon the fate of the Communists.

All who had refused, while there still was time, to fight in the common cause with the Communists, had the common fate of the persecuted, martyred, murdered, in concentration camps and jails. This common fate cut across all lines of class, of party, of philosophy, of religious faith, striking the whole people.

It was Dimitroff at Leipzig, spokesman of the Communists, of the working class, of the democratic masses, who beat back this offensive of the brown barbarians and proceeded to the counter attack.

* * *

Dimitroff's counter-attack at Leipzig called forth a profound response among the workers of Europe and America who faced the threat of fascism. They now had before them, not only the horrible warning of a crucified German people, but a stirring example of working class heroism and successful resistance to the Brown beasts. In the months and years immediately following Leipzig, tremendous popular struggles bore witness to the powerful influence of Dimitroff's counter-attack: the great international protest movement which forced his release; the momentous barricade-struggle of the Austrian workers in February, 1934; the rise of the United Front and People's Front, blocking the path of fascism in France and in the epic struggle of Republican Spain.

But this movement for worldwide anti-fascist unity, for the de-

fense of popular liberty and peace, was prevented from achieving its goal. Through the policy of Munichism, supported or countenanced at that time by the leaders of the Second International, Hitler was able to extend his fascist aggression.

Because of the policy of pro-fascist appeasement, Ethiopia, Austria, Spain, Czechoslovakia and China were sacrificed, and one easy victory after another was presented to Hitler. Those who fought against such a policy were denounced as "Communistic war-mongers," in the style of Hitler. These reactionary forces successfully sabotaged the policy of collective security. They broke the domestic front of struggle against the Hitler regime and its henchmen. Many of those who capitulated to the policy of Hitler's henchmen believed, until their fall, that they would escape catastrophe at the expense of the Communists and of the Soviet Union. Did not Daladier, during the Soviet-Finnish war, actually appeal to Hitler to come to the aid of the Finns? Did not certain Social-Democratic leaders at the same time "coolly" state the proposition that no one need be averse to a Franco-British war against the Soviet Union?

In consequence of all this, the French people are now paying a frightful price. Reaction and fascism do not let themselves be conciliated by concessions, but merely utilize them to reach the goal more easily.

Today Daladier and Blum stand as defendants before the so-called

"court" of Hitler's henchmen in Riom. They are accused of not having betrayed France outright, like Pétain, Laval, Bonnet, Weygand, Schneider-Creuzot, Doriot, and all that gang which was able, quite unmolested, to organize the defeat of France in every sphere. These "rescuers" of France, the saboteurs of the alliance with the U.S.S.R., the organizers of Munich, the incompetent and treacherous generals, the fifth column bands, the French henchmen of the Gestapo, the big-industry saboteurs of armament, the professional red-baiters, the professional crusaders against everything that is socially and politically progressive—in brief, the Pétain regime, are judging at Hitler's orders those men who, great as their political guilt is, did not go over into the camp of the open betrayers of France. The accused at Riom did not purge France of the Pétains, and now the Pétains are purging them at the command of Hitler.

In reporting the proceedings at Riom, the *New York Herald Tribune* of March 12 quotes Leon Blum as paying tribute to the Soviet Union and the Communists, and saying:

"Russia today is still fighting the same enemy we were fighting two years ago, and the Communist Party is furnishing the large part of the hostages shot in the occupied zone."

But how much better it would have been if, in the days of the government that was supported by the Popular Front, Blum had fought resolutely in defense of the Franco-

Soviet pact; if he had not supported the "non-intervention" which surrendered Spain to Franco; if he had opposed the anti-Communist splitting policy of reaction in its torpedoing of French popular unity. How much better it would have been if the anti-Hitler National Front which is now being forged, had been consummated in France when such a front could have averted the disaster of Nazi occupation.

Undoubtedly Blum's position at the trial reflects, however inadequately, some of the profound changes which are taking place among the French Socialists and the courageous anti-Hitler struggle which the majority of them are now waging, hand in hand with the De Gaullists, the Communists, and the Radical Socialists. Regardless of the past and without trying to forecast the future role of Blum, all opponents of Hitler will greet these remarks and the efforts of Blum to indict his accusers, the Nazis and the Men of Vichy.

* * *

They who did not heed Dimitroff and the lessons of Leipzig have landed in Riom, with the French people under the yoke of the Nazi dictatorship.

Is not Riom a horrible warning for all peoples? For Americans who sincerely strive for the preservation of our national existence and the destruction of the piratical Axis? For every one who is not in league with Hitler?

Can anyone deny there are elements in our country who are trying to prepare the same fate for the American Continent as that which the Pétains, Darlans, Laval and Doriot prepared for France?

Are there not appeasers and Quislings who are trying to throttle the voice of the working class and suppress its rights as Hitler's henchmen did in France?

It is these foes of America's security who seek to disrupt our growing national unity and the anti-Hitler front of the United Nations, as Hitler's henchmen succeeded in doing in France; who seek to substitute a fight against everything progressive and nationally unifying for the fight against Hitler; who are continuously sowing distrust of our allies, of England, of the Soviet Union. It is these same elements, too, who try to divert the country from its decisive task by creating internal national and racial conflicts, campaigns against Negroes, Jews, the foreign-born, etc. It is they who sabotage production and would rather lose the war than see their swollen profits restricted.

It is these same forces of appeasement and defeatism which oppose, by every method, the policy of resolute offensive against the fascist enemy.

Against this handful of Clivedenite appeasers—and their Norman Thomas types in the workers' midst—stands the overwhelming majority of the American nation and the solid front of American labor. Strengthening the bonds of our national

unity, forging indissoluble unity with the worldwide forces of the United Nations, we must take the offensive on the military front in Europe, by opening together with Great Britain, a second front; we must strike at the fascist beast in his lair, join forces in a political and military alliance, in common action

with our great ally, the Soviet Union!

In the spirit of Dimitroff at Leipzig, in the spirit of the Red Army, of the Soviet people, of MacArthur, we must understand the grim warning of Riom in time. *We must proceed from defense to a united offensive, to achieve victory!*

LESSONS FROM OUR WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

BY A. B. MAGIL

THE present war is the fourth great national war which the American people have fought. The first, in 1775-1783, created our nation; the second, the War of 1812, preserved it from re-conquest and consolidated the achievements of the Revolution and the gains of Jeffersonian democracy; the third, in 1861-1865, preserved our nation against a threat from within; the present, the most momentous, is being waged to preserve the gains of a hundred and sixty-six years of national independence against a threat from without. All four have been true national wars because in each what has been at stake has been the existence of the United States as an independent nation and the freedom to work out its own destiny. In a very real sense, therefore, Pearl Harbor is our Lexington and Fort Sumter. In contrast, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War, and the first World War were not national wars; far from involving the existence and freedom of our nation, they involved only the plunder and power of a reactionary minority—in the first case, the southern slav-

ocracy, in the second and third, Wall Street financial-capital.

Our four national wars have occurred in different historic epochs; and class alignments, specific problems and issues have not been the same. Yet they have also had much in common. In all four, national political unity had to be created as the fulcrum of military activity, a national unity based on a coalition of classes and embracing every section of the population, from the most radical to the most conservative, that stood for victory over the nation's enemies. In all four the national struggle has been interwoven with the social, but the conflicts among the collaborating classes have been subordinated to the overriding common interest: national survival. However, in the War of Independence, in the War of 1812, and in the Civil War—and there is no reason to assume that this will be different today—the very effort to further the national cause effected important changes and brought to the fore the energies, the courage, the vision of the common man.

All four national wars have also

been part of an international movement for larger freedom and democracy. And our own struggle has in each case been greatly aided from abroad: in the War of Independence, by the French alliance; in the War of 1812 by the general democratic sympathy; in the Civil War, by the protests of the workers and enlightened liberals of England, which prevented that country from entering the conflict on the side of the South, by the sympathetic activity of Russia, and by the response of solidarity from the people of Ireland and many other countries; in the present war, by the united nations and peoples of both hemispheres, headed by the world anti-Hitler coalition of the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain; and in all four, by the countless thousands of brave men of foreign birth who fought for liberty under the American flag. In turn, our struggle has in each case strengthened the liberating forces of other countries. Paralleling this solidarity of the peoples has been the internationalism of reaction: the aid given to our enemies by minorities in our own population—appeasers and traitors.

I. The War of Independence

The American Revolution had its origins in the basic economic conflict between the merchants, planters, artisans, and small farmers, of the colonies and the imperial mercantile system of Britain. The objectives of British policy were bluntly stated by the royalist governor of Massachusetts, Sir Francis Bernard:

“The two great objects of Great Britain in regard to the American trade must be: 1, to oblige her American subjects to take from Great Britain only, all the manufactures and European goods which she can supply them with; 2, to regulate the foreign trade of the Americans so that the profits thereof may finally center in Great Britain, or be applied to the improvement of her empire.”*

But capitalist development in the new world collided with colonial dependence on the old; American trade, nascent American industry American land-hunger, growing American culture and national consciousness strained at the none-too-maternal shackles placed upon them until they broke free. And what began as a limited constitutional struggle of British subjects for economic concessions within the empire grew into a torrential revolutionary war of the American nation for independence. This war could not have been started or won had there not been created a broad unity of the nation that overcame tremendous odds and literally snatched victory out of the jaws of defeat.

It was the Stamp Act of 1765 that evoked the first cohesive effort on a national plane in the struggle against England. The Sugar Act of the previous year had hit at the New England traders; the Proclamation of 1763, by banning westward expansion, had particularly affected Virginia, and blocked westward expansion of all classes. But the Stamp Act, by placing a tax on all legal

* Cited by Ernest L. Bogart, *Economic History of the American People*, p. 164.

documents, newspapers, pamphlets, calendars, playing cards and other items, bore down on almost all classes and all sections of the country. The Stamp Act became the synthesis and symbol of the colonists' grievances and the precipitant of national unity. It also brought upon the scene a new force: the independent action of the common people. Out of the Stamp Act agitation was born the Sons of Liberty, the organization of the democratic masses which became the bellows that fanned high the revolutionary flame. Their outstanding leader in the period prior to the War of Independence was that remarkable professional revolutionist and selfless patriot, Sam Adams of Boston.

The Sons of Liberty, varying in structure in the different colonies and not always operating as a formal organization, consisted mainly of artisans, mechanics and day laborers, who were led largely by militant merchants and lawyers. These masses were in part the beginnings of a working class, in part sections of the petty bourgeoisie. A working class in the modern sense, with its own clearly defined class physiognomy, did not yet exist, and the workers shared the outlook of the petty bourgeoisie. However, not only their immediate interests, but their future as an independent class was bound up with the development of capitalism and the unfolding of bourgeois democracy, both of which required political independence. Today even a liberal historian like A. M. Schlesinger refers disdainfully to the Sons of Liberty as "the mob." But it was the aggressive tac-

tics of these organized patriots that stirred up the colonies and helped prepare the first step toward national unification: the Stamp Act Congress in October, 1765. And throughout the ten years that blazed the path to the armed fight for independence, it was these little people, the unknown carpenters, joiners, smiths, sailors, calkers, ropemakers, small tradesmen, etc., who goaded on the wavering merchants and planters, thrust them aside when necessary, and drove forward the movement that eventually overthrew British rule. Their role has been admirably summed up by Professor Merrill Jensen:

"In Charleston, Philadelphia, New York and Boston the radical parties were the foundation of the revolutionary movement in their towns and colonies. It was they who provided the organization for uniting the dispersed farming population, which had not the means of organizing, but which was more than ready to act and which became the bulwark of the revolution once it had started. Located at the center of things, the town radicals were able to seize upon issues as they arose and to spread propaganda by means of circular letters, committees of correspondence, and provincial congresses. They brought to a focus forces that would otherwise have spent themselves in sporadic outbursts easily suppressed by the established order."*

The Sons of Liberty were to our first Revolution what the Abolitionists and Radical Republicans were

* *The Articles of Confederation*, pp. 10-11.

to the second: the prod in the conscience of America, the fire in the engine of freedom. Creating their own revolutionary law and the instrumentalities for its execution, they became the vanguard of a mighty host, the harbingers and forgers of national unity.

What were some of the problems of national unity in our first great crisis? First, the problem of securing collaboration of the classes that were adversely affected by the oppressive acts of the British Government. Necessarily excluded were those who sided with the Crown: certain of the wealthiest merchants and planters, the landed gentry of the northern seaboard, the clergy of the Anglican Church, and the host of officials and retainers of the British Government. But not everybody who did favor resistance was prepared to go all the way. Most of the large merchants repeatedly shrank back from the boldness of their own non-important agreements, sought to appease the authorities, to check popular outbursts, and to direct all activity into legal and constitutional channels. In Boston, for example, the majority of the merchants repudiated the famous Tea Party. And when Sam Adams in 1774 organized the Solemn League and Covenant, pledged to non-intercourse with Britain, he showed his distrust of the merchants by placing enforcement in the hands of the common people, of those "two venerable orders of Men stiled Mechanicks and Husbandmen, the Strength of every Community."*

As the tide of struggle rose, the cleavage among the merchants widened, the smaller merchants and smugglers siding with those who favored active opposition. When the final break came, a further realignment took place. The dilemma that faced the conservative sections of the bourgeoisie was exemplified in two of their political representatives: Joseph Galloway and John Dickinson, both of Pennsylvania. Galloway, who had been a close lieutenant of Benjamin Franklin in the Pennsylvania Assembly, served as a delegate in the First Continental Congress, but when the second congress met after the Battle of Lexington, he refused to participate and subsequently became an active Loyalist. Dickinson, on the other hand, though he sought to limit the struggle and refused to sign the Declaration of Independence, remained with the patriot side. Thus, from the impecunious agitator, organizer, and "Jacobin," Sam Adams, to the well-to-do conservative lawyer, John Dickinson, the arch of national unity was built. For, neither merchant nor mechanic could advance their disparate class interests so long as both were subject to a foreign power and their country was a mere chattel.

This cooperation of classes was to a greater or less degree achieved first within the individual colonies. The second problem of national unity, therefore, was to bridge sectional differences, to link up the separate colonies for joint action. This was begun through the Stamp Act Congress of 1765, through various appeals, declarations and peti-

* Cited by John C. Miller: *Sam Adams, Pioneer in Propaganda*, p. 302.

tions issued by colonial legislatures and congresses, and through a new and powerful revolutionary organ, the Committees of Correspondence. These, originating in the Sons of Liberty, acquired a new importance in 1772 and 1773 when such committees were set up by towns and legislatures throughout the colonies. Jared Sparks, writing more than a hundred years ago, described the role of the Committees of Correspondence in the following words:

"... the primary movement was to bring the people to understand their interests and act in concert, and the first means used to attain this end was the establishment of committees of correspondence in different parts of the country. These committees were chosen by the people in towns, counties, parishes, districts, or smaller neighborhoods. . . . So necessary was this system in itself, and so well adapted to promote the general welfare that it was acceded to everywhere, and in a short time committees were so universally appointed throughout the colonies that the friends of liberty had speedy and direct channels open with each other in every part of the continent."*

Out of this activity grew finally the First Continental Congress in 1774 and the Second Continental Congress in 1775, which became the central directing body of the War of Independence. And the Committees of Correspondence served as a model, not only for the bourgeois

revolution in Europe, but for the early Communist movement.*

And finally, the most important question of all for effective national unity: the mobilization of the people. Merely with the vanguard organized in the Sons of Liberty and with patriotic merchants, planters and lawyers the fight could not be won. The masses had to be aroused, made conscious of their stake, brought into the main stream of resistance and attack. Through town meetings and demonstrations, through the organization of local militia, through the work of a remarkable group of journalists and pamphleteers, the greatest of whom was Tom Paine, and through the official declarations of colonial and intercolonial congresses, rounded out and culminated by the glowing words of the Declaration of Independence, the common folk were stirred into action. One of the most important instrumentalities for this purpose were the various non-importation and non-consumption agreements directed at British goods.

In order to make these effective, every member of the community was urged to refrain from buying British products and to boycott those merchants who failed to cooperate. The first such mass boycott came out of the Stamp Act Congress of 1765; it is the original ancestor of that embargo policy which Communists and other pro-

* In 1845-46 Marx, Engels and their co-workers established Communist corresponding committees in Brussels, London, Paris and other cities. These laid the basis for the founding of the Communist League in 1847.

* Life of Gouverneur Morris, Vol. I, p. 30.

gressives some one hundred and seventy years later urged against fascist aggressors.

In the first boycotts it was the Sons of Liberty that undertook enforcement, but later this assumed a broader character. When the Continental Congress in 1774 voted a nationwide non-importation agreement and a year later extended this to cover exports to Britain as well, it was decided to enforce the boycott through committees of safety set up by popular election in every community. These bodies, operating under the direction of the Committees of Correspondence, became the police power of the War of Independence, the great right arm that struck hard not only at violators of the boycott, but at traitors and spies. Out of the revolutionary bourgeois dictatorship administered by the Committees of Correspondence and of safety was born U. S. freedom.

The Negro masses made a magnificent contribution to the national war. True, they were not fully accorded their rightful place in the national independence front; slavery imposed its limitations upon them even in the course of the revolution. Of this inconsistency in the revolutionary camp, the British took full advantage, promising the slaves freedom in return for service in the British armies. It is estimated that from 1775 to 1793, "some one hundred thousand slaves (*i.e.*, about one out of every five) succeeded in escaping from slavery, though very often meeting death or serfdom instead of liberty." But while in the

South intensified repression sought to stem this surge toward freedom, in the North the liberating character of the war manifested itself in the enactment of legislation in several states abolishing or limiting slavery. Outstanding leaders of the Revolution, like Jefferson and Franklin, opposed slavery, and Jefferson wrote into the original draft of the Declaration of Independence a condemnation of Negro bondage and the slave trade, a passage which was deleted at the insistence of other delegates.

The first man to give his life for American independence was an escaped slave, Crispus Attucks, shot down in the Boston Massacre in 1770. And black men bled at Valley Forge and served in the American armed forces throughout the war, many distinguishing themselves for bravery.

As the struggle against Britain developed, the popular upsurge produced sharp conflicts between radicals and conservatives in practically every colony. The wealthy merchants and planters were torn between their opposition to the harassing measures of Parliament and their fear of the people. "I see, and I see it with fear and trembling," wrote the aristocratic Gouverneur Morris of New York in a letter on May 20, 1774, to a member of the Penn family, "that if the disputes with Britain continue, we shall be under the worst of all possible dominions. We shall be under the domination of a riotous mob. It is to the interest of all men, therefore, to seek for reunion with the

* Herbert Aptheker, *The Negro in the American Revolution*, p. 20.

parent state."* Nevertheless, when the time came, Gouverneur Morris put his fears on a shelf, conquered his trembling, and cast in his lot with those who broke away from the parent state. After the war, he, like John Dickinson, became one of the pillars of the reactionary Federal Party. Thus social stresses and strains, as in our own day, threatened at times to tear the arch of national unity apart, but despite everything, it held for the duration.

The keystone of the arch that stretched from Sam Adams and Thomas Jefferson to John Dickinson and Gouverneur Morris was George Washington. The greatness of Washington cannot be grasped by dissecting his qualities, for, as in the case of Lincoln, the whole was greater than the sum of its parts. Washington earned the right to be called the father of our country. His achievement in whipping motley bands of raw recruits into a national army, his military skill, his unwavering devotion to the patriot cause, his rocklike determination under adversity that would have broken a lesser man made the final victory more the fruit of his work than that of perhaps any other single individual. Valley Forge, where Washington shared the suffering of his ragged men, has become for all time a watchword of heroism and self-sacrifice and unconquerable fighting spirit. And Washington was more than military leader of the Revolution; he was the symbol of national unity and the national will to victory.

* * *

America's first great national war had more than its share of traitors. The fight for independence from foreign rule also necessitated a struggle against the enemy within, the Loyalist appeasers and traitors, who constituted a formidable minority. No quarter was shown to these supporters of foreign despotism. The Lindberghs of that time, far from being given government jobs, were driven into exile, one hundred thousand of them, their property confiscated, their names hated and scorned. Nor were family connections of any avail. Benjamin Franklin's own son, William Franklin, who was the royal governor of New Jersey, was clapped into jail for Loyalist activity. Besides the Loyalists, open and concealed, the patriots also had to contend with treason in their own ranks. That of Benedict Arnold was the most flagrant, but it was by no means the only example. The relentless struggle waged against these enemy agents strengthened the American cause. Concerning the unmasking of Arnold, Carl Van Doren writes in his definitive work on the operations of the fifth column in our independence fight:

"No event in the course of the whole Revolution did so much to intensify patriotic sentiment. After Arnold few patriots could continue to hold in their minds a lingering image of the war as a conflict between political parties. This was between nations, and Arnold had not merely gone over from Whig to Tory, but had betrayed—or tried to—

* Cited by Jared Sparks, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 25.

betray—his country. . . . Arnold as traitor helped fix a powerful new image of the United States in the minds of its people.”*

The exposure of Arnold and other traitors and the ruthless treatment of the Loyalists are a cue for us today. Our government has shown excessive tolerance toward the contemporary Arnolds and Silas Deanes and Charles Lees. A Laura Ingalls of the America First Committee is sent to jail after it has been shown that she received money and instructions from a secretary of the German embassy. But Laura Ingalls' other bosses, General Robert E. Wood and Charles A. Lindbergh, are welcomed into the government service. A George Hill is sentenced to prison for perjury, but his greater crime, that he was hand in glove with the Nazi agent, George Sylvester Viereck, goes unpunished, while Hill's employer, the appeaser and Red-baiter, Hamilton Fish, is permitted to pose as a patriot. President Roosevelt denounces the American Cliveden Set as disrupters of national and international unity, but when the *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker* expose the identity of these appeasers, most of the press either rushes to their defense or casts over them the protecting cloak of silence. And Father Coughlin continues to spout treason unmo-lestled. The patriots of 1776 were not nearly so tender with the Rev. Jonathan Boucher.

Appeasement today has its source in the most reactionary, pro-fascist

and anti-Soviet circles among the monopolists. These elements, under the guise of a “negotiated peace,” plot for America a fascist dictatorship and collaboration with the Nazi gangsters rather than support a just war for national liberation and democracy which is being waged by our country in alliance with the Soviet Union, Britain, and the other United Nations. It is primarily fear of the peoples that drives the Lindberghs and Woods, as it drove the Galloways and Bouchers in 1776, openly or covertly to side with their country's enemies.

* * *

What about the peoples of other countries? They responded warmly to America's fight for freedom. In England itself support was not lacking. And patriots of other lands, men like Lafayette, de Kalb, Rochambeau, Kosciusko, Pulaski came to America to aid the democratic cause. The German, Baron von Steuben, helped organize and drill the Continental Army; the Jew, Haym Solomon, contributed his skill in finance; the Scotchman, John Paul Jones, became the outstanding naval hero of the war. The largest contribution in manpower was made by the Irish. Thomas H. Maginnis in his book, *The Irish Contribution to American Independence*, estimates that fully one-third of the officers and a large proportion of the soldiers were of Irish birth or parentage. When hostilities began, thousands of Irishmen flocked to this country, seeing their own cause

* *Secret History of the American Revolution*, p. 394.

in America's battle. "Probably in no part of Europe," writes Michael Kraus in his essay, *America and the Irish Revolutionary Movement in the Eighteenth Century*, "were the effects of the American Revolution felt more immediately nor more deeply than in Ireland. Horace Walpole, who heard all and discreetly told some, wrote that 'all Ireland is *America mad*.' It was added, 'So is all the continent.'"*

The Americans, on their part, expressed their solidarity with the Irish, the Second Continental Congress issuing on May 10, 1775, an address to the Irish people condemning the wrongs against their country. Thus the founding fathers were themselves what today would be called in certain circles "foreign agitators."

* * *

The America of 1776, even as the America of today, needed allies in its fight for existence and sought them everywhere: in France, Spain, Holland, Germany, Italy. We were then what the Soviet Union is in our own time: a vanguard country, the most politically advanced in the world. Yet this did not deter those clearheaded realists, the founding fathers, from seeking alliances with regimes of a different political system. France was a particularly likely prospect. For, having lost her American colonial empire to Britain in the Seven Years' War, the France of Louis XVI was not at all averse

to having Britain lose hers to the American people. From the standpoint of France that would weaken Britain and help restore the colonial balance of power. There were divisions in the French government about going to war with England, but Benjamin Franklin's skilful diplomacy and the news of Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga, *plus the sympathy of the French people for the American cause*, finally overcame these hesitations and France signed a formal alliance with the United States.

If there were any hesitations among the American leaders when the French alliance was ratified, history has preserved no record of them. If there were any members of the Continental Congress who said: "We are being dragged into an imperialist war between Britain and France in which our own fight for liberty will be submerged," their objections were not committed to paper. The fact is the vote in the Congress for the French alliance was unanimous. Benedict Arnold, in the address *To the Inhabitants of America* which he issued when he sold himself to the enemy, tried to cover up his treason by saying he had opposed this compact with a despotic monarch. This pseudo-Left demogogy has been emulated in a similar situation by a more recent breed of traitors known as Trotskyites.

America was a weak country as compared to France, and the aims of the French king were certainly not those of the American patriots. But the forces of history were moving through the action of democratic

* Included in the volume, *The Era of the American Revolution*, edited by Richard B. Morris, p. 333.

America, and these outweighed everything else and shaped the character of the war. In 1916 Lenin, in distinguishing between a progressive national war and a reactionary imperialist conflict, cited the American experience:

"England and France were engaged in a seven years' war for colonies, i.e., they waged an imperialist war (which is as possible on the basis of slavery, or of primitive capitalism, as on the basis of highly developed modern capitalism). France was defeated and lost part of her colonies. Several years later the North American states started a war for national liberation against England alone. Out of enmity toward England, i.e., in conformity with their own imperialist interests, France and Spain, which still held parts of what are now the United States, concluded friendly treaties with the states that had risen against England. The French forces together with the American defeated the English. Here we have a war for national liberation in which imperialist rivalry is a contributory element of no great importance, which is the opposite of what we have in the war of 1914-16 (in which the national element in the Austro-Serbian war is of no great importance compared with the all-determining imperialist rivalry)."

By "a contributory element of no great importance" Lenin meant that France's imperialist motives were of no great importance in determining the character of the war. However,

* "The Pamphlet by Junius," *The Communist*, October, 1941, p. 885. On another occasion Lenin cited the tactics of the American patriots in arguing for alliances between the Soviet state and capitalist states when necessary. (*A Letter to American Workers*, International Publishers, pp. 14-15.)

French military and financial assistance proved one of the decisive factors in winning America's fight for independence. And in turn the American Revolution provided an impetus to the French: six years after the Treaty of Paris ended our struggle, the people of Paris were storming the Bastille. Thus, despite the calculations of Louis and his class, by helping to free America, France helped free herself.

* * *

The independence won at such sacrifice had to be given bone and muscle in the years that followed. Most liberal historians have seen only the social side of the conflict between Federalists and Anti-Federalists that arose during the constitutional convention and continued for over twenty-five years. But there was at issue, besides basic attitudes toward democracy and the popular welfare, something else. The differences between the party of Hamilton and the party of Jefferson were in fact *a continuation under new conditions of the struggle for national independence.*

The Federalists represented those wealthy merchant capitalist interests that prior to 1776 had repeatedly sought to come to terms with Britain; during the war most of them either secretly sympathized with the British or entered the fight reluctantly under pressure of the democratic masses. With the war over, these wealthy merchants once more began to operate largely with British capital and credit and sought political accommodation

with the former enemy. This course found ready acceptance among the majority of the Federalist leaders. An additional factor driving the Federalists toward alignment with the bulwark of reaction abroad was fear of democracy at home. As a result, they adopted policies in both domestic and foreign affairs that had the effect of maintaining a status of semi-colonial dependence on Britain. Hence the Jay Treaty with England in 1794, which evoked stormy protest demonstrations in this country—"the most humiliating treaty to which an American has ever put his signature."* Hence the reasonable negotiations between Federalist leaders and British agents during Jefferson's administration. And hence the secessionist conspiracies in New England which reached their climax with the Hartford convention in 1814.

In their struggle to defend and buttress their hard-won independence the American people again had as their ally France—this time free, republican France. It was, in fact, the French Revolution and Tom Paine's magnificent defense of it in his reply to Edmund Burke, *The Rights of Man*, that brought to a boil the simmering conflict between the hosts of Hamilton and Jefferson. To an extraordinary degree American political life became divided between the friends of Britain and the friends of France, the former consisting of the wealthy and privileged classes, the latter of the overwhelming majority of the common people. Actually, this con-

flict between two internationalisms was the form under which the national struggle for a strong and free America took place. "I still hope the French revolution will issue happily," wrote Jefferson to Edward Rutledge on August 29, 1791. "I feel that the permanence of our own leans in some degree on that, and that a failure there would be a powerful argument to prove that there must be a failure here."* And earlier, on February 4, 1791, in a letter to George Mason: "I consider the establishment and success of their [the French] government as necessary to stay up our own, and to prevent it from falling back to that kind of half-way house, the English constitution."**

Just so, in a later time, did another great American, Earl Browder, leader of the Communist Party, urge collaboration with the most advanced country of our own epoch, the Soviet Union, as necessary for the defense of America. For this he, like Jefferson, was reviled as a "foreign agent"; but today his proposal is national policy.

Though Washington was strongly influenced by Federalism, in regard to France he was closer to the position of Jefferson. In a letter on January 3, 1793, in which Jefferson chided William Short, chargé d'affaires at Paris, for his hostility to the Jacobin phase of the French Revolution, he wrote that one of Short's dispatches "induced him [Washington] to break silence and to notice the extreme acrimony of

* Claude G. Bowers: *Jefferson and Hamilton*, p. 271.

* *Works* (edited by Paul Leicester Ford), Vol. V, p. 377.

** *Ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 274-75.

your expressions. He added that he had been informed the sentiments you had expressed in *your conversations* were equally offensive to our allies, and that you should consider yourself the representative of your country and that what you say might be imputed to your constituents. He added that he considered *France as the sheet anchor of this country and its friendship as a first object.*** [Emphasis in the original.—A.B.M.]

It is also significant that while Jefferson ardently supported revolutionary France in her war against the European coalition led by Britain, he turned against France when, under Napoleon, this became a war of conquest and national oppression.

(That conflict developed from progressive to reactionary, the reverse of the present war in which our country is engaged.) Jefferson did what certain people would today call "a flipflop" and adopted a plague-on-both-your-houses attitude. He lived too soon to be called by the Martin Dieses of his day an agent of Moscow, but not too late to be branded an agent of Paris. But his work was full of the seed of history and it bore rich fruit: the War of 1812** ended the foreign

threat to America's existence and ended too the party of neo-Loyalism and appeasement, the Federalists.

* * *

In these times that once again try men's souls, the American people are fortunate in having the rich tradition of national and democratic struggle in 1776, 1812 and 1861 to help light up the problems of our own time. Our present epochal battle against the greatest enemy of civilization, the Nazi-fascist Axis, occurs under totally different historic conditions; yet we have much to learn from the experience of the past—much to learn about the struggle for national unity, the mobilization of the people, vigilance against traitors and appeasers, and morale. Not least of all should we learn more deeply that the defense of our national security and liberties against Hitler and Hitlerism requires, as in 1776, the closest collaboration with other friendly nations, regardless of their political and economic systems: it requires an all-round alliance of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, together with China, uniting all anti-Axis nations in common struggle for the victory which none can win alone and all must share together.

[A supplementing article will deal with the Civil War, and will draw the lessons for our own day of 1776 and 1861.—Editor]

* *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 155.

** I am omitting a detailed discussion of the War of 1812 and Jefferson's role in the years preceding it, since this has already been done in the excellent article by Frank Meyer and Robert Strong, "The Treason of Reaction in America's Second War of Independence," in the July, 1941, **COMMUNIST**.

A magnificent guide and background to the epochal events which are reshaping the world today—

THE BROWDER LIBRARY

These books by Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, written between the years 1936 and the early part of 1941, constitute a penetrating analysis of the historical background of the present people's war against the Hitler Axis, and of the forces which led to its outbreak.

What Is Communism?	\$2.00
The People's Front	2.25
Fighting for Peace	1.00
The Second Imperialist War.	2.00
The Way Out	1.00

PAMPHLETS BY EARL BROWDER:

The Communist Party of the U.S.A.:	
Its History, Role and Organization	\$.05
Communism and Culture05
The Road to Victory05
Earl Browder on the Soviet Union05
Religion and Communism02



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

READY IN APRIL—

COLLECTED WORKS OF V. I. LENIN

VOLUME XIX

This volume, covering the period from the beginning of 1916 to March, 1917, deals with the whole problem of just and unjust wars and the national question. In addition to discussing all fundamental aspects of the question of self-determination of nationalities, the volume contains considerable material on the split in the international Socialist movement arising from the imperialist World War, and the attitude of the various political parties within Russia toward the war on the eve of the February Revolution. The volume also includes Lenin's celebrated article, "The Pamphlet by Junius," written in reply to Rosa Luxemburg in clarification of the question of national wars in the epoch of imperialism.

With the publication of this volume, the complete works of Lenin covering the period of the first World War and the two Russian Revolutions (from 1914 to 1918, Volumes XVIII to XXI, in six books) will be available in English.

464 Pages

Price \$3.00

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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