

The Communist

20c

AUGUST

1943

AXIS REVERSES AND CONFLICTS

•

THE SCHNEIDERMAN DECISION

ROBERT MINOR

•

WE CAN WIN IN 1943!

JAMES S. ALLEN

•

FIFTH-COLUMN DIVERSION IN DETROIT

MAX WEISS

•

CANADA NEEDS A PARTY OF COMMUNISTS

TIM BUCK

•

ON THE DISCUSSION OF WAR AIMS AND
POST-WAR PROBLEMS

N. MALININ

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER



CONTENTS

Axis Reverses and Conflicts	675
We Can Win in 1943! <i>James S. Allen</i>	680
The Schneiderman Decision <i>Robert Minor</i>	688
Fifth-Column Diversion in Detroit <i>Max Weiss</i>	698
The 78th Congress <i>A. E. Blumberg</i>	711
On the Discussion of War Aims and Post-War Problems <i>N. Malinin</i>	720
Canada Needs a Party of Communists <i>Tim Buck</i>	725
June 22 in the United States <i>A. Landy</i>	742
Tasks of the British Unions for Victory <i>Communist Party of Great Britain</i>	753
The British Labour Party Conference <i>William Rust</i>	757
The Communists of Cuba and the Cabinet <i>Blas Roca</i>	761

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

NEW AND FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS

- Congress and You** \$1.10
By Frank Ryhlick
- Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity**05
By William Z. Foster
- The Schneiderman Case**05
United States Supreme Court Opinion with an introduction by Carol King
- Anti-Semitism; What It Means to You**05
By William Gallacher and Earl Browder
- Marxism and the Woman Question**10
By A. Landy
- Soviet Russia and the Post-War World**05
By Corliss Lamont
- Behind the Polish-Soviet Break**03
By Alter Brody



SPECIAL

VICTORY—AND AFTER

By Earl Browder

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

Ten copies for a Dollar.

Regular paper edition 50¢; cloth \$2.00.



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

AXIS REVERSES AND CONFLICTS*

THE German-Italian coalition is today experiencing a profound crisis. From its very inception this coalition contained irremediable organic defects. As the unreality of the mad plans of the Hitlerite imperialists to win world domination revealed itself in the course of the war, these defects had to lead and actually did lead to grave consequences which could not but upset the further "normal" functioning of the coalition and make its very existence questionable.

The heroic struggle of the Red Army was of decisive significance in disrupting the plans of the Hitlerites. The foundation of the military might of Hitlerite Germany was undermined as a result of the crushing blows dealt by the Red Army to the German, Italian, Rumanian and Hungarian troops. The struggle waged by the Red Army against Germany and her allies gave England and the United States the opportunity to develop a mighty war industry, to build up an army many million strong, and to win air superiority in the West and South of Europe. Thus there were prepared the necessary conditions for the armed forces of the U.S.S.R., England and the United States to strike

a joint blow at fascist Germany and her satellites. The German-Italian fascist camp found itself on the brink of disaster.

The defects inherent in the German-Italian coalition had developed into a deadly disease. The first defect was that this coalition was formed as robber-alliance which calculated on easy gains in the hope of a speedy victory for Hitlerite Germany in the war. But the moment it became increasingly clear that the war would be neither short nor easy; that aggression, plunder, and crimes would not go unpunished; and that Germany was going to lose the war, rifts and cracks in the fascist camp were unavoidable. And this is precisely what happened.

Another defect of the German-Italian coalition was the fact that from the very outset there was not a semblance of equality among the component states. Hitlerite Germany openly declared herself the "supreme power" in Europe. The Hitlerite coalition thus revived the medieval feudal dependence which had existed at one time in the German [Holy] Roman Empire. And although Hitler's first vassal—Italy—was formally announced to be on a level of equality with fascist Germany, this equality always remained very illusory. It could not be otherwise, for the simple reason that

* An editorial in *War and the Working Class*, fortnightly magazine issued by the newspaper *Trud*, central organ of the Soviet trade unions, in Moscow.

Italy, not possessing its own base of raw materials and cut off from imports from other countries, was economically wholly given over by Mussolini and his fascist clique to the mercy of Hitlerite Germany.

But apart from the fact that from the very beginning there was no equality between the participants in the German-Italian fascist coalition, the reactionary rulers of the states forming the coalition renounced in advance the sovereignty of their countries in favor of Hitlerite Germany. Thus, the Rumanian and Bulgarian rulers went so far as to permit the Hitlerite troops under the guise of "friendship" or "assistance" to enter their countries and actually to occupy them. This partly happened in Italy too. The reactionary rulers of the countries of Hitler's vassals agreed to play the role of lackey assigned to them by the German fascists, primarily because they feared their own people more than the subordination of their countries to robber German imperialism. In their political shortsightedness they reckoned that they would get some of the booty which they thought would be bagged by Hitlerite Germany. Hoping thereby to participate in the division of future spoils, the reactionary rulers of the vassal states, upon the demand of fascist Germany bent on monopolizing Europe, were prepared to reject the economic ties with England and the U.S.A. which had been advantageous to their countries.

The German-Italian coalition arose as a plot of the most reactionary rulers of the European states against their own people as well as

against other nations. The reactionary rulers sacrificed the real national interests of their countries for the sake of the aims of this plot.

It is easy to understand that as soon as the power of Hitlerite Germany was seriously shaken the arch-reactionary coalition was affected in a like manner. This is exactly what is happening.

The third inherent defect in the German-Italian coalition was the fact that Hitler thrust into it just those very states of Europe whose interests were divided by the sharpest and most crying contradictions. It suffices to cite but a few examples to illustrate this. Who, for instance, could deny that had Hitler succeeded in realizing his "New Europe" there would have been no place in it for Italy as a big independent state? It is a fact that in all the European countries captured by them the Hitlerites hastened to remove practically all Italian influence. The Italian fascist press has on more than one occasion bitterly complained that Italy, which, prior to the war, carried on a very lively trade with France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Norway, has now lost all these commercial ties.

Take the instance of Hungaro-Rumanian relations. It was none other than Hitler who, on the eve of war, cut off the northern part of Transylvania from Rumania and handed it over to Hungary, thus turning Rumania and Hungary into two everlastingly hostile and irreconcilable enemies. Only after this did he make the two countries allies of Germany in its robber war. Thus the enemies Rumania and Hungary found them-

selves "allies" against their will. On the other hand, the Hungarian ruling circles dream of getting back all or most of the territory wrested from Hungary under the Trianon Peace Treaty and given to Hungary's allies—Rumania, Germany, and Italy. In particular, the Hungarian rulers have not given up the idea of also getting Southern Transylvania from Rumania and of annexing Slovakia, which is today a colony of Hitlerite Germany.

These examples reveal the fascist coalition to be more like a menagerie in which hostile wild beasts have been gathered than a real alliance of states based on mutual interests. As long as the Hitlerite beast was sufficiently strong to impose its will on the other smaller beasts a semblance of "order" in the menagerie could still be maintained. However, the weakening of fascist Germany and the loss of all hopes of "settling" the contradictions between the members of the fascist coalition at the expense of the expected war booty had to result in a condition in which perpetual hostility inside the coalition is growing increasingly acute.

The process of disintegration of the German-Italian coalition is proceeding along two main lines. On the one hand, it is developing within the individual component countries, finding expression in a crisis in the reactionary upper circles. Most characteristic in this respect is present-day Italy. Starting with February of this year, Mussolini removed from their posts all ministers, the entire leadership of the army and navy, the general secretary of the Fascist

Party, the overwhelming majority of prefects, and a considerable number of ambassadors. Tens of thousands of members of the Fascist Party were expelled or left its ranks of their own accord. The Fascist Party is torn by fierce internal struggle. The authority of the "Marshal of Defeats," Mussolini, has been greatly undermined. While crisis and confusion reign in fascist circles, the people, led to despair by senseless sacrifices, deprivations, hunger, and bombings of Italian cities, are beginning to stir. In March 300,000 workers went on strike, mostly in Turin and Milan. Since then strikes in Italy have not ceased.

These facts go to show that fascist Italy represents the weakest link in the Hitlerite "allied system" today, which may mark the beginning of the collapse of the system as a whole.

* * *

The other main line along which the disintegration of the German-Italian coalition is proceeding is the growing contradiction between its individual members, the growing mistrust of the vassals in their sovereign, Hitler, and vice versa. The members of the Hitlerite coalition are extensively resorting to double-dealing methods in their relations with Germany and among themselves. Despite the fact that Mussolini and his fascist clique linked their fate with that of Hitler and his gang, a desperate struggle is taking place behind the scenes between German and Italian ruling circles. Today it no longer is a dis-

pute as to who will win the laurels of victory, it is no longer a question about dividing the expected spoils; today it is a question as to which of the two partners will hold out the longest.

After the defeat in Tunisia and the loss of Pantelleria Italy found herself in the first line of fire. She does not possess the necessary manpower and equipment to offer resistance on her own territory to the landing of Anglo-American troops. But the Hitlerites, themselves experiencing a shortage of manpower and equipment, are concerned above all with ensuring, not the defense of Italy, but the front they consider, and not without reason, as the most dangerous one for them, namely, the Soviet-German Front. The Italian fascist chiefs fear that in the event of an acute worsening of the situation the Hitlerites may abandon Italy to the mercy of fate and take up the defense at Brenner Pass.

Neither can one say that the relations between Hitlerite Germany and the rest of its vassals are idyllic. These vassals cannot but realize that the rout of Hitlerite Germany is inexorably approaching. Therefore, although still supporting Hitler's war, they are doing so with very moderate enthusiasm. They are trying to retain within their countries a part of the army reserves that have survived destruction. This is true, for example, of the Hungarians, who are waiting for an opportune moment to "settle" the question of Transylvania with Rumania. There is no doubt whatsoever that the rulers of all these countries are pursuing an obvious double-dealing policy in re-

lation to their German master. The Hitlerites have publicly accused their Hungarian allies of "playing foul." In the Hungarian Parliament Hitler's paid agents—former Minister Jaros and Parliamentary Deputy Rainis, a colleague of Goebbels—attacked the government, whose policy in their opinion suffers from "insincerity toward the Axis powers."

Hitler's Finnish servants accused his Rumanian lackeys of the same thing. The Helsinki Radio broadcast information that Antonescu put out feelers regarding the possibility of concluding a separate peace.

The question arises: how shall we explain the fact that the rulers of Hitler's vassal states continue to fight on the side of fascist Germany, although each passing day makes it increasingly clear that the war holds no perspective for Hitler?

At the beginning of the war, when Hitlerite Germany was still gaining military victories, they reckoned on Germany's winning the war and on getting away unpunished. Now they are staking their hopes on securing amnesty. They hope their reactionary friends in the United States and in England—all kinds of isolationists and the concealed fifth column—will not abandon them to their plight. Hitler's Finnish lackeys, for instance, are speculating on the fact that their American friends have succeeded so far in preventing the rupture of diplomatic relations between the United States and Finland and a declaration of war by the United States against Hitler's Finnish ally.

Horthy, Kallay, and their pro-fas-

cist clique in Hungary still hope that reactionary circles in the United States and England will forgive them Hungary's participation in Hitler's war against the U.S.S.R., that these circles will eventually rescue them, that with the help of these circles they will succeed in retaining power against the will of the Hungarian people.

But all these calculations are built on sand. It is hopeless for Hitler's Finnish, Hungarian, and other accomplices to expect amnesty. It is hopeless, first of all, because the reactionary rulers of the Hitlerite vassal states overrate the strength and influence of their patrons in the United States and England and underrate the growing strength and influence in these countries of the progressive forces and trends. They likewise underestimate the seriousness of the rapprochement between the members of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, the alliance between the three biggest states in the world, which forms the basis for solving, not only the current problems of the conduct of the war, but also postwar political problems.

However, the main reason that the staking of all these accomplices of Hitler on amnesty will be shattered is that they will not be granted amnesty by their own peoples. It would be foolish to think that the popular masses in the vassal states have learned nothing since the beginning

of the war and that they will learn nothing. Rather it would be correct to assume that these peoples, taught by bitter experience, will draw lessons from their disastrous toleration of their criminal, worthless bankrupt rulers.

During the First World War the weakness and instability of German imperialism's allies proved to be its Achilles' heel. In the present Second World War the vulnerability of German imperialism in this sphere is much greater than in the war of 1914-1918. At that time the German coalition was not racked by such crying contradictions and inequality among the components of the coalition. But then, too, the collapse of Kaiser Germany started with the collapse of her allies. A similar course of events is all the more probable in the present war.

However, in order that the present serious processes of disintegration may rapidly lead to the utter collapse and dissolution of the Hitlerite coalition, new powerful military blows must be delivered by the Anglo-Soviet-American fighting alliance. The Second Front in Europe must be delayed no longer. And, above all, it is necessary, through the opening of the Second Front in Europe, to close to Hitler's accomplices in the vassal states the emergency exit which they still use in order to escape from defeat and unconditional surrender.

WE CAN WIN IN 1943!

BY JAMES S. ALLEN

IT IS Max Werner's firm conviction that the decisive blows against Hitler can be struck in 1943. This view is buttressed by a mighty array of fact and argument in his new book, *Attack Can Win in '43*.*

To the readers of *The Communist* Werner's book is a specialist's confirmation of the views which have been expounded for some time in these pages. His point of departure is that of a military analyst, but he arrives at much the same conclusions as millions of laymen who call for the opening of a major second front in Europe now.

This is not said to detract from Werner's contribution. On the contrary, it shows that he is able to avoid the kind of political prejudices that have warped the judgment of many military writers.

As Werner sagely notes, the common failing of previous alliances was to overestimate the allies and to underestimate the enemy. In the anti-Hitler coalition this mistake appears in the reverse form. Britain and America have tended to underestimate the Soviet Union while overestimating Hitler Germany.

This mistake has been an important obstacle, although not the

only one, to the evolution of coalition warfare against Germany. Only the plainest and most unmistakable evidence provided by the Red Army on the Eastern Front in over two years of the most intensive warfare known to history is now breaking down these mistaken conceptions.

Werner is one of those in the West who never suffered from that failure of judgment. For that reason he is one of the most reliable military analysts, whose earlier opinions on military matters have stood up well under the test of events. For that reason also it is profitable to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by his new book to assess anew the military factors relating to coalition warfare in Europe.

I say military factors advisedly. For while Werner has the advantage of a clear military vision unhampered by political prejudices of the kind that have demilitarized a specialist of the type of Hanson Baldwin of the *Times*, he possesses the weakness of being almost apolitical in his broader analysis and final judgments. His main contribution is to show that from the viewpoint of military and strategic requirements the coalition second front in Europe is necessary and

* Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1943.

possible beyond any doubt. This is an important enough contribution in itself, which undoubtedly has helped to shape the thinking of many leaders of public opinion. But much more is needed to explain why the previous opportunities to open the second front were not seized and why, despite the overripeness of the present military position, the correct orientation of the British and American governments is not being more rapidly and effectively implemented by two front coalition warfare in Europe.

For, as Werner makes clear, there can be no sensible argument based on military factors alone against the proposition of striking now against Hitler Germany simultaneously from the East and the West.

Reviewing the experiences on the Eastern Front he shows, as already stated by authoritative Soviet spokesmen, that a change in the relation of forces has taken place there in favor of the Red Army, which he terms the greatest land army of the anti-Hitler coalition. The German army can no longer win; it has not yet been smashed but it has been battered and weakened; its strategy has been proved bankrupt. Already by February, 1943, says Werner, the German armies in Russia were on the brink of the abyss. The Red Army, which has established its superiority in strategy, in operational skill on both the defensive and offensive, and in quality of weapons, can win on the Eastern Front.

* * *

This judgment, based on the experiences of the whole German-Soviet war and particularly on the success of the Soviet winter offensive from Stalingrad, is now being confirmed by the events on the Orel-Kursk-Belgorod sector of the Eastern Front. For the first time a German offensive, spearheaded by the greatest concentration of armored power ever gathered at one point, was stopped cold by the Red Army before any strategic gains could be made, and a counter-offensive immediately launched.

The Red Army has registered a tremendous qualitative change in the relation of forces. Unlike the tactic used in meeting the previous German offensives of sacrificing space and position to bleed the enemy and turn on him when exhausted, in the summer of 1943 the Red Army during the first two weeks of the German offensive has sacrificed neither space nor position, inflicted tremendous losses and made important gains. More German tanks were destroyed in the first week of combat than exist throughout Western Europe and probably more planes than could be mustered by the Germans to meet an invasion in the West. About thirty German divisions, half of them panzers (also half of all German mechanized units), were halted on this narrow 165-mile sector before they could break through anywhere. New German giant tanks, the Tigers, and the new tank tactic were countered successfully by Soviet anti-tank tactics and Soviet weapons.

This success registered at the very start of the offensive marks the culmination of a progressive qualitative improvement of the Red Army over the Nazi. That improvement has reached the point where a pre-Stalingrad phase of defense in depth and strategic withdrawal of the main forces is no longer necessary to perform a Stalingrad.

Thus, in mid-July, 1943, the Red Army was ready to launch its "winter" offensive in the summer. Hitler's army had not yet recovered from the heavy blows of the winter. The Red Army, even stronger than last November, held lines much closer to the area of strategic decision. As Werner points out, the German policy of throwing available front-line reserves into desperate offensive action has led to the sacrifice of their best divisions, with the result that the German reserves are of second-rate quality. On the other hand, the Soviet policy of preserving and guarding its fighting cadres and of keeping some of its best divisions in reserve for the counter-attack assures the fighting superiority of the Red Army over the German army, which has deteriorated in quality. This is already counting heavily in the present decisive battles.

* * *

In connection with the immediate perspectives of the war it is well to keep in mind the point emphasized by Werner that the German army will collapse not on German, but on Russian soil. He considers completely false the conception that the Red Army cannot win until it has

recaptured all the areas seized by Hitler and, conversely, that the Germans will remain on the offensive as long as they remain on Soviet soil. As Stalin made clear last November, the German army can be brought to catastrophe well on the Soviet side of Pinsk, Minsk, Zhitomir and Odessa. To defeat the enemy armies on the Eastern Front it is not at all necessary for the Red Army first to regain lost territory. The battle of encirclement and annihilation at Stalingrad showed that.

But it is necessary for the Red Army to gain that edge over the 211 German divisions on the Eastern Front which will assure the success of a strategic offensive without risks of such magnitude as will endanger not only the Soviet Union but the whole anti-Hitler coalition.

Such assurance must be provided by coalition warfare, by bringing into effective play upon Europe's strategic centers the great accumulated power of Anglo-American arms in coordination with Soviet blows in the East. This general proposition need not be argued in these pages. The events in Sicily emphasize again that all the military prerequisites are at hand, and are now being strengthened further, to assure the success of two-front warfare against Hitler Germany.

Werner musters all the necessary data and arguments to prove it. He shows that as a result of the battering received on the Eastern Front Germany is no longer able to wage a protracted war. She has already suffered defeat of her whole stra-

tegic concept of war. The Wehrmacht has nothing to hope for. The army is deteriorating. The Luftwaffe is declining, and stands absolutely no chance of surpassing Anglo-American aviation. The German army can no longer hope to surpass Soviet weapons and fighting skill. Hitler has no secret military weapon. Hitler Germany is in the same position as Imperial Germany was at the beginning of 1918.

On the other hand, the anti-Hitler coalition has overwhelming material superiority over Germany. Werner points out that one of the features of a coalition is that no single member of it alone has full superiority to assure victory. But already, in Werner's opinion, as a result of the last winter campaign, a kind of military equilibrium was established between the German and Red armies. The specific task facing Britain and America is to utilize their vast accumulation of power, the great military reserve of the anti-Hitler coalition, to turn the scales decisively and irretrievably against Germany. To do this, it will not be necessary for the Western Allies to utilize all their strength. Werner estimates that about one-fourth of the effort now being put forth by the Soviet Union is all that is necessary for Britain and the United States to deliver immediate and decisive blows at Germany.

He also points out that the problems of technical quality of arms and of fighting skill have been solved by Anglo-American arms. This was shown in the North African campaign and is being shown

even more conclusively, we may add, in the brilliant performance of the Allied armies in their Sicilian operations, as well as in the superior performance of Allied planes over Europe.

* * *

Another advantage enjoyed by the Anglo-American armies is that they are fresh. Up to the summer of 1943 British losses amounted to about 300,000 men, while American losses were less than 100,000. The U. S. Army has at least seventy fully-trained divisions, and many more in the process of training, while the British have an equivalent number on the British Isles alone.

The preparation of the coalition for the offensive has reached such a stage, according to Werner, that everything the United States now contributes raises the Allied margin of superiority.

Today the Allies can lose only through mistakes of their own, through "crude military blunders," as Werner puts it. For the war has entered the phase when each operation must become a link in the strategy of victory. The basis for bringing victory can be only the more effective fusion of strategy and common fighting action of the Anglo-American forces and the Red Army. The main danger confronting the Allies, says the author, is that strategic isolation on the part of any one of them may prolong the war. By this he means that failure on the part of Britain and the United States to implement rapidly enough a full common strategy with the

Soviet Union may lead to the danger of stalemate and frozen fronts.

This danger has been reduced, although by no means eliminated, by the extension of the Allied offensive in the Mediterranean, taking place simultaneously with the Soviet successes against the German offensive of July.

* * *

There is something of a parallel between the Orel-Sicily events in July and the Stalingrad-North Africa events of last November. The North African landing took place simultaneously with the turn at Stalingrad and the beginning of the tremendous Soviet winter offensive. It was the timing and the scope of the Anglo-American action which led Stalin to speak in his letter to the Associated Press correspondent of the beginning of merged blows and to show that two or three more mighty blows struck in unison with the attacks of the Red Army would be sufficient to smash Hitler.

The Sicilian operation, which obviously is aimed at knocking Italy out of the war, is another such blow. Especially as followed by rapid action against the Italian mainland and if accompanied by other offensive operations in the Balkans or in Southern France, the landing on Sicily would turn out to be the first of a new round of blows leading to the disintegration of the Berlin-Rome Axis and consequently the further weakening of Hitler.

At the time of writing it is still too early to know the exact nature of the broader scheme of which

Sicily is a part. However, it is clear that the Allies, once embarked in such great force in the direction of Italy, must have even more ambitious plans in the Mediterranean area.

But here the parallelism between last November and this July ends. It is probable that the Sicilian operation will fan out to other areas of the Southern European periphery, and provide important military and political victories. But the kind of merged blows which are needed and are possible this summer and autumn go much beyond a Mediterranean offensive. Last November a blow at the periphery, at that time situated in North Africa, had the advantage of bringing large Anglo-American forces into possession of still another important springboard for an attack upon Europe. No less significant was its role in safeguarding Suez, preventing a juncture of the German and Japanese armies, and in ending the phase in British policy of predominant concern for empire defense at the expense of the war in Europe.

Today, however, the problem is not, by any possible accounting, merely one of winning additional bases on the fringe of Europe. Nor can it be limited only to operations aimed at the peninsulas of Italy and the Balkans. These can be important operations, resulting in isolating Hitler Germany still further from its satellites and releasing a new wave of the people's liberation struggles. But the decisive blows for victory over Hitler cannot be struck there. Such offensive opera-

tions can be important supplements to the struggle on the Eastern Front, but they cannot substitute for the two-front war in which the main blows have to be given from Western Europe and the Soviet front.

On this point Werner is especially precise and clear. In his opinion the invasion of Europe must consist of combined operations of many kinds. These are chiefly of three types. The first is the crucial offensive from the British Isles into Western Europe. The second are flanking operations, chiefly in two directions—from the British Isles to Northern Europe and the other from North Africa to Southern Europe. The third type of action consists of many diversions in all directions, accompanying the main strategic blow as well as the flanking operations. All three types are necessary and supplement each other, but they cannot replace one another. Within this general pattern he sees many possible variations, such as merged Soviet-Anglo-American moves in the Balkans and Anglo-Soviet sea and land action in the Baltic region. But the pivot of the coalition victory, if it is to be obtained most rapidly and with least sacrifice for all the Allies, has to be the second front in the West.

* * *

Werner attempts to reduce this problem to the following formula: "Today the invasion of Europe is no longer a problem, it is an operational task." That may be true from the purely military viewpoint, taking into account only the material

factors which enter into the problem. But there is no purely military problem, except in carrying out an operational task. And the second front cannot be viewed merely as an operational task, for if that were the case we would have had it much earlier.

The second front was and is primarily a political problem, a problem which, with the common blows from the Eastern Front, North Africa, and now Sicily, comes nearer to solution. This political problem encompasses within itself all the complexities inherent in the anti-Hitler coalition and in the dynamic of world relationships. It must be solved by avoiding, not only "crude military blunders," but also crude and even more damaging political mistakes. It must be solved, not alone by the actual war developments, such as the impelling argument of a Soviet offensive earlier and in greater force than generally expected in the West; it must and will be solved also as a result of the improvement of relations between Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. Its solution also is accelerated by the strength and the scope of the people's liberation movement within Europe, and the development of more adequate relations between the Allies and this movement. And, finally, to enumerate only the most decisive elements, the problem of the second front is affected in a basic sense by political relations within Britain and especially the United States.

All these things are involved and it would be a mistake to reduce the second front, which is the key to the further strengthening of the

anti-Hitler coalition, to merely its military components. Once it is made clear that the material and military factors are no longer a problem—that is, that they have been solved—then the political obstacles can be seen more clearly.

In fact, the fifth column and the defeatists recognize this very well. In the main, they no longer emphasize in their agitation the various material factors which were supposed to make a second front unfeasible. After Tunisia and even more after Sicily, they can no longer exploit or prolong the old Allied sense of inferiority to German arms and skill. In so far as they continue to couch their agitation in military terms, they are forced to do it on the grounds of broader strategic considerations, such as the Pacific First line or the victory-by-air-power-alone theory. And even these have less and less appeal as crowding events expose their fallibility.

It is precisely because they recognize that the main military problems relating to two-front war in Europe have been solved, that the defeatists and pro-fascists pin their main hopes on the political struggle at home. Of course, they have never neglected it in the past, no more than they now neglect to exploit every military difficulty. But their main chance today to prevent a coalition victory and to advance the cause of fascism abroad and within the country depends upon what they can do on the home front to distort, divert, dilute and eventually overthrow the war policy of the nation. They aim to avert or at least delay indefinitely the unconditional sur-

render of Nazism-fascism by pushing fiercely for the unconditional surrender of Roosevelt or his defeat and a negotiated peace.

* * *

The advanced stage of military preparation and the successes in battle in North Africa, Sicily, the Solomons and in the air, coinciding with the Red Army's body blows to Hitler's Reichswwehr, are cause for new confidence and strength in the victory camp of our country. The danger is that this will lead to overconfidence, general laxness, a sense of leisure with respect to winning the war, and the perilous notion that our tremendous economic and military power, still mainly in reserve, offers the nation the unrestricted opportunity to force its views upon the other members of the coalition. The danger also is that while succumbing to such temptations there should arise simultaneously the feeling that the richness of war power permits the luxury of easing up at home, of tolerance and middle-of-the-road dexterity toward the defeatists and fascists, and a general reversion to pre-war political standards and practices.

In reality, the high level of military readiness and the great power on hand can constitute the greatest asset of the United States, provided it is put to immediate and most effective use. Our need is to calculate, not how long we can delay our great military action against Hitler Germany, but to calculate how quickly we can bring about its defeat.

From every consideration the military requisites for victory are so preponderant that the second front cannot be delayed much longer without serious political consequences for our nation. The solution of the problem rests not only in the hands of the United States. The Soviet Union holds the main, the gigantic front, and the key positions for smashing Hitler's army. The Soviet Union can be counted upon to take full advantage of whatever situation develops for striking heavy military blows, as she is even now doing. Britain, which holds the decisive base of the West, is most immediately and directly affected by the course of war and peace on the European continent and is pulled most persistently by events elsewhere and by her own national interest in the direction of full coalition war. Our problem in the United States is to assure that our great armament and power be used in such a way as to accelerate and increase the force of the main blow from the West, while completing and extending the flanking and diversionary actions which we are now developing against Southern Europe.

The war is developing at such a furious pace that no pattern drawn up in advance can possibly suffice which does not take fully into account the great power of the Red Army, the rising liberation struggle

in Europe and the impetus of our own blows. Big changes in the direction of stepping up the offensive strategy and of reshaping the plans of last January and even of June to permit the speedier emergence of the two-front war are possible and even likely.

Labor, the progressives, the anti-fascists must do everything within their power to facilitate this development. Their means are primarily through production and the political struggle against defeatism and its allies within the labor movement, a struggle which requires the firmest labor and people's support to the Commander in Chief while pushing for more consistent application of his victory policies in the war and on the home front. Also required is a stiffening of the whole victory camp, greater boldness in the political attack and an end to the partial retreats and compromises which in the main can no longer be defended even as expedients.

We are moving more rapidly in the direction of the two-front war. Labor must play its rightful role in holding the home front against the diversions, maneuvers and obstruction of the fascists and the defeatists, while strengthening itself as the backbone of national unity. Labor must devote all it has to the task of making this the year of decision against Hitler Germany.

THE SCHNEIDERMAN DECISION

BY ROBERT MINOR

AT SOME high moments in American history milestones have been marked and the development of our national life has been affected by decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

Now, in the midst of the biggest war crisis of all time, the Supreme Court has made another decision that I think will rank among the epoch-marking decisions, seen in the great sweep of our history. Many will not agree with such an estimate. My purpose is to show that the Schneiderman decision reaffirms a traditional national policy of enormous consequence to the whole nation, and, if carried into life, will have salutary effect on a most critical period of the nation's life.

Those will understand the decision best who see most clearly its *conservative* aspect, in the sense of the conserving of that basic character of our government which caused all of progressive mankind to speak of it from the day of its birth to the close of the 1860's as "the only popular government in the world."*

No one will understand the importance and the nationally unifying

character of the decision who does not study its issues in relation to the great war that we are in, a great *national* war in which our survival is at stake. In this light only is the fact fully apparent that its reassertion of America's historic character strengthens the internal fabric of the nation, increases its capacity to absorb an enormous social strain, its capacity to make war on the necessary huge all-out scale at astronomical economic costs and the hitherto incredible human sacrifices that may be the price of survival as a nation.

* * *

The decision has two main aspects:

1. In reasserting the integrity of citizenship of naturalized Americans.
2. In reaffirming the American right of political thought, speech and association.

I. Integrity of American Citizenship

A nation founded solely by immigrants used to think naturally of all who came to live in it as citizens-to-be. After Jefferson won his fight against the Alien and Se-

* Words of Karl Marx in the *New York Tribune*, Sept. 1, 1862.

dition laws, and after he had with a stroke of the pen in the purchase of the Louisiana Territory pledged "all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States" to "the inhabitants of the ceded territory" of more than a million square miles from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada and the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains—it is not surprising that the nation regarded the conferring of full citizenship upon all its permanent inhabitants as the normal course.

But times change, and there came several waves of attack on non-citizens and foreign-born Americans.

In my opinion, an essential part of the background of the action to nullify Schneiderman's citizenship is the fact that it was begun in 1939, in the midst of a heavy groundswell against foreign-born Americans.

I know of no more striking sidelight on this case than the campaign carried on by the newspaper chain of Roy Howard against "foreigners" in general and Italians in particular, and for depriving naturalized Americans of the right to hold public office or employment, a proposal made in the "column" of Howard's labor-baiting specialist Pegler. The more recent drive stimulated by the pro-Nazi Hearst newspapers against American citizens of Mexican parentage in the Southwest in the form of "zoot-suit" riots, just at the moment to affect critical war-time relations with Latin America, very easily and quickly fused into the huge successes of the Axis agents in riots

against Negroes in war production centers.

Schneiderman is a prominent Californian of many years' standing, active in civic and labor affairs, a former candidate for Governor, and State Secretary of the Communist Party.

A California federal district court decided to cancel the citizenship of Schneiderman on the ground—as now described by the Supreme Court: "that petitioner's certificate of naturalization was illegally procured [seventeen years ago] because the organizations to which petitioner belonged were opposed to the principles of the Constitution and advised, taught and advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and [that] therefore petitioner 'by reason of his membership in such organizations and participation in their activities, was not "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same."'"

The nature of the Attorney General's claim was that anyone has the right to challenge the citizenship of a naturalized citizen and to hail him into court *at any moment of his lifetime* after the original finding of the naturalization court, and that the naturalized citizen must again prove "the evidence underlying that finding."

In the Opinion of the Supreme Court just delivered by Mr. Justice Murphy (p. 1741), this means that ". . . the Government seeks to turn the clock back twelve years after full citizenship was conferred. . . ."

Mr. Justice Douglas, concurring, adds that to support the Attorney General's position would mean the authorities "at any time could obtain a trial *de novo* on the political faith of the applicant." Mr. Justice Rutledge points out what he believes is "at the bottom of the case":

"Actually, though indirectly, the decision affects millions. If, seventeen years after a federal court adjudged him entitled to be a citizen, that judgment can be nullified and he can be stripped of this most precious right, by nothing more than reexamination upon the merits of the very facts the judgment established, no naturalized person's citizenship is or can be secure. If it can be done after that length of time, it can be done after thirty or fifty years. If it can be done for Schneiderman, it can be done for thousands or tens of thousands of others. . . .

"If this is the law and the right the naturalized citizen acquires, his admission creates nothing more than citizenship in attenuated, if not suspended, animation. . . .

"No citizen with such a threat hanging over his head could be free. . . .

"It may be doubted that the framers of the Constitution intended to create two classes of citizens, one free and independent, one haltered with a life-time string tied to its status."

This strong language seems to me to be confirmed as a description of the nature of the case on a reading of the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Stone and Justices Roberts and Frankfurter (p. 1780). Among its rather startling claims is:

"And whenever a person's right to citizenship is drawn in question, it is the judge's duty loyally to see to it that those conditions have not been disregarded."

"Whenever"?!! The dissenting opinion seems to be that the adjudication of the original court that granted naturalization has *no finality* whatever. All rights as an American are suspended for him and must be proven over again on demand.

Finality does not exist for the act of naturalization. But the two courts which, *twelve years later, reopened and rejudged the evidence* in this case and "canceled" the citizen's most sacred rights, are seen by the dissenting opinion (p. 1778) as entitled to "the finality which ordinarily saves them from an appellate court's intermeddling. . . ."?!!

This concept is decisively rejected. Of the deprivation of citizenship, once granted, the opinion of the court read by Mr. Justice Murphy says:

"In its consequences it is more serious than a taking of one's property, or the imposition of a fine or other penalty. For it is safe to assert that nowhere in the world today is the right of citizenship of greater worth to an individual than it is in this country."

Mr. Justice Murphy condemns the view of unstable character of the citizenship of naturalized Americans in this country whose very schools in some cities, he reminds us (p. 1739), contain a majority of children "only one generation, if that far, removed from the

'steerage of the immigrant ship, children who sought refuge in the new world from the cruelty and oppression of the old. . . .'

"Here they have hoped to achieve a political status as citizens in a free world in which men are privileged to think and act and speak according to their convictions, without fear of punishment or further exile so long as they keep the peace and obey the law." (p. 1740.)

". . . In view of our tradition of freedom of thought it is not to be presumed that Congress . . . intended to offer naturalization only to those whose political views coincide with those considered best by the founders in 1787 or by the majority in this country today." (pp. 1753-54.)

All of America gained by this decision.

II. Right of Political Association

But deep down at the root of the matter is the great question of American political freedom in its largest aspect. For, all rights, for foreignborn or native, will in the end be held or lost according to whether Americans as a whole people retain the right of *free political thought and free political association*.

In Justice Murphy's first sentence in reading the Opinion he said the court has brought the case "because of its importance and its possible relation to freedom of thought."

The Attorney General's office had suffered from a peculiar reappearance of an ambition once held by Prince Bismarck: the ambition to enjoy a modern industrial society *without a political labor movement*.

But there is such vast difference that the contrast is disturbing. The German "anti-socialist law" was passed in the peaceful time of 1878; and for twelve years Bismarck conducted a struggle to suppress the German Marxist workers' party—a fight which ended in the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890 and the emergence of a highly developed German Social-Democratic Party of nearly a million supporters and a far more advanced Marxist political outlook.

But we are not in such a time now. What would be the practical result of *suppression of the right of political association for the United States now in the midst of this war?*

"Organized Government" and "Disorganized Liberty"

The case had turned heavily on two points of *political theory* in the District Court that attempted to annul the citizenship. The first question was whether at the time of his naturalization Schneiderman as a Communist must have "disbelieved in organized government" and whether the Communist Party to which he was affiliated was an organization that "taught disbelief in and opposition to organized government." The second question was whether as a Communist he would have believed in the "overthrow of the Government by force and violence."

Let us take the first of these: "Organized government."

The accusation that Communists "disbelieve in organized government" had not been contained in the original complaint, and there-

fore the Supreme Court, in view of the vital interest involved in the case, quite naturally declined to consider this point in general form. But under the structure of the Attorney General's claim this huge falsification of historic fact lay like a cornerstone of crumbling clay. Upon it, as a "finding of fact," the attempted annulment of citizenship had been partly based.

In previous cases we have had to meet generally the crude assumption that achievement of Marxist objectives would bring as an immediate result a general condition of disorder amounting to anarchy. Anything set up by the working class, it was claimed, would be a chaos of weakness and disorganization.

But the course of world history made that crudity untenable. From the beginning of this war it began to be admitted that strength and organization were evident in Communists' achievements. Therefore a new approach was required of the Attorney General's office in preparing this case for the Supreme Court, what we may call some "refinement" of thought on the question of the Communist view on "organized government." And so the case argued before the Supreme Court was that the Marxist doctrine, though it calls for a first setting up of government, holds that in course of time an "organized government" set up by the working class would cease to exist, would be gotten rid of, made to "wither away," and that this would mean that ordered liberty is replaced by *disorganized liberty*. Out of this new and heady book-learning the Attorney Gen-

eral's office deduced that a Communist, since admittedly he speaks of a future "withering away" of the state, is a "disbeliever in organized government." The conclusion is that he who subscribes to the Marxian view of history can not be "attached to the United States Constitution."

The Attorney General in his brief found "the test," among other things, in ". . . whether he believes in an ordered society, a government of laws . . . ; whether, in sum the events which began at least no further back than the Declaration of Independence, followed by the Revolutionary War and the adoption of the Constitution, establish principles with respect to government, the individual, the minority and the majority, by which ordered liberty is replaced by disorganized liberty." (Brief, p. 106.)

After the decision of the Supreme Court had been handed down, the Solicitor General thundered back into court with a petition for rehearing in which the contention that the Communist Party is "an organization disbelieving in organized government" was exalted to new heights. The completely erroneous statement appears in his petition that:

"There is no dispute in the record that the ultimate end of the Party was the 'withering away' and disappearance of the State."

Most certainly we do dispute this vulgarization. The Solicitor General tries to make a deep "theoretical" dive, but in shallow water.

Must we go in deep?

Very well, let's recapture the views of the revolutionary fathers

on the question of "organized government." For both Thomas Jefferson and the "master-builder of the Constitution," James Madison, and several others considered and wrote about all sides of the question of "organized government," of "ordered liberty" and "disorganized liberty."

In the need to persuade the loosely confederated thirteen states of the necessity of a central national government through accepting the Constitution, they were obliged to go deeply into the whole theory of the necessity of organized government.

Madison expressed the view that "the first object of government" was the protection of the "diversity" of the "faculties" of man, and particularly diversity in the "faculty" to acquire property, from which "diversity" he said "the rights of property originate." (*The Federalist*, No. 10.) From this Madison reasoned that class divisions and political parties representing the respective diverse interests of the property-holding and non-property holding classes would result. He concluded that, this condition being historically necessary, there could be among civilized peoples no society without a state. He shared the apprehensions of Washington and Jefferson about the rise of political strife in the new nation, and of two contending political parties. But he reasoned that:

"From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degree and kinds of property immediately results; and from the in-

fluence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties."

"Zeal for different opinions" arising from this source, Madison said, had "divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity," "the most common and durable source of" which "has been the various and unequal distribution of property." He could think of but "two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence" (*i.e.*, by repression of the right of political association); and "the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, the same interests."

But "giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, the same interests" was an impossibility because "different degrees and kinds of property" inescapably created different "sentiments and views." Therefore "the causes of faction" would remain. This being true, there must be a government instituted, but the right of political association must be preserved, because to destroy this right would be "worse than the disease" of contending political parties. For, said Madison, "It could not be less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency."

And here we have the reasoning

of the "Master-Builder of the Constitution," who wrote the conclusions into the fabric of the Constitution: That *organized government* is made necessary by divisions among the people based upon different "degrees and kinds" of property; that the preservation of liberty is of supreme importance and requires the *right of political association* for both propertied and propertyless classes.

Washington wished, "if parties did exist, to reconcile them." Hamilton didn't think we need keep the liberty of political association for the "turbulent and changing" "mass of the people," but had better assure rule by "the rich and well-born."

Jefferson was not as sure as his colleagues were that there could not be a classless society, and said he remained "not clear in mind" whether organized government need be had at all.

"Societies exist under three forms —(1) without government, as among our Indians; (2) under governments wherein the will of everyone has a just influence . . . ; (3) under governments of force. . . . It is a problem not clear in my mind that the first condition is not the best." (*Writings of Jefferson*; Ford. ed. IV. 362-63, 467.)

To the end of his life Jefferson weighed in a utopian way whether "too much law among the civilized Europeans" submitted man to "greater evil" than "no law, as among the savage Americans (the Indians)" and declared that as between the two "conditions of existence" he thought the stateless form

of communal society of the Indians was the better.

But Jefferson himself in his gargantuan use of centralized authority for such achievements as the Louisiana Purchase proved in practice best of all the historic need of "organized government" and the building up of the great national state. His preference for the primitive communism of the Indian tribes whose life he admired was utopian, unscientific, because the primitive form of communism lies irrevocably in the past, in the childhood of mankind.

The makers of the Constitution were not crude men but were among the most cultured minds of a brilliant revolutionary century. Familiar to Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Franklin were the writings of the French Encyclopedists, and currently before them at the time of the American Revolution were the ideas of Rousseau, whose *Social Contract* had been published in 1762, and much of the brilliant work of Diderot. From Rousseau Jefferson paraphrased most of the formulations of general principle in the Declaration of Independence, such as "inalienable rights," "Nature's God," "we hold these truths to be self-evident," etc.

It was a half century later that an end was put to the utopian "disbelief in [the necessity of] organized government." For the first time modern scientific method began to be applied to the problems of society. Those who did it were Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. It is extremely interesting that an American, Lewis Henry Morgan, became another great figure in the de-

velopment of Communist theory by the independent scientific support that he found for the view of Marx in his long years of study of the same Indian life which has so fascinated Jefferson.

Marx and Engels were the great masters who were able in a scientific way to develop the profound dialectical thought of the French Encyclopedists. They found what they called "masterpieces of dialectic" in the same writings of Diderot and Rousseau from whom Jefferson and Madison strengthened their wisdom for the good of this nation. Marx and Engels could do this because they had the enormous advantage of the developments of modern science and social thought far beyond Jefferson: "... German philosophy culminating in Hegel," "the greatest merit of which was the re-adoption of dialectics of the highest form of thinking"; the classic political economy of England; and the developing Socialist movement of France. Therefore it is precisely Marx and Engels and the modern Communist Parties that destroyed in the labor movement and in all advanced minds the anarchist doctrine of "disbelief in organized government."

It was against the anarchists and their contention that the state must be "abolished" that Marx and Engels directed their famous formulation: "the state is not abolished; it *'withers away.'*"

Engels gave his and Marx's reasoning in these words which took hold of and developed further in a scientific way the thoughts of the

French Encyclopedists that were also the interest of Jefferson and Madison:

"As soon as there is no longer any class of society to be held in subjection; as soon as, along with class domination and the struggle for individual existence based on the former anarchy of production, the collisions and excesses arising from these have also been abolished, there is nothing more to be repressed which would make a special repressive force, a state, necessary. . . . The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the processes of production. The state is not 'abolished,' it *withers away.*" (*Anti-Dühring*, pp. 306-7)

The whole concept of attenuation or "atrophy" of the coercive organs of state is not one of "disorganized liberty" but of a highly organized "administration of things" which would differ from the former character of "organized government" (which is properly called "state") only by the absence of crime and disorder and therefore the lack of anything for criminal-catchers to do. Only *when and if, and because, and to the extent* that the need of the "repressive arm" disappeared, would there be any "withering away" of that repressive machinery; life as well as theory can reassure you of that; therefore the whole concept is (from the juridical point of view) hypothetical.

Indeed, if there is serious objection to the "withering away" of the police arm for lack of crime, or of the military art for lack of war, it would be entirely acceptable to Marxists if we retain an annual

"token" crime or disorder to be staged periodically as a public ceremony, with, say, Mr. Biddle's great grandson in uniform with a cotton-stuffed club chasing someone for a "token" disorder, somewhat as in my native town of San Antonio we have every year a street parade with a symbolic Battle of San Jacinto to make sure we haven't forgotten the brave achievements of General Sam Houston.

"Ordered liberty" is, of course, not the antithesis of the Communist aim, but the essence of it. It would be sheer idiocy to contend that a lack of crime to give business to the coercive organs of government—the aim of all reformers and idealists—would be a "lack of organized government." And in this sense how does the Communist view compare to the idealistic preoccupation of Thomas Jefferson as to a society "without government, as among the Indians"?

The elimination of what Madison called "the various and unequal distribution of property," which he correctly saw would be, for the young American society of his time, undesirable, harmful, even impossible, becomes in modern society something vastly different; it becomes the *nationalization* of the gigantic modern *instruments* of production and distribution. But that it would be the elimination of those property relations (or relationships to the means of production) among men which Madison said were "the most common and durable source" of that social antagonism which "divided mankind into parties, in-

flamed them with mutual animosity," is its one point of correspondence to what Jefferson loved in the primitive communism of the Indian tribes he knew. If it is the realization of Jefferson's dream of liberty, it is liberty certainly on a higher stage of development than "as among our Indians" of his time. And with equal certainty it is a liberty made possible only by a degree of order and organization incomparably more complex and higher than the happy freedom of "cops and robbers" which seems to be the Attorney General's dream.

The Supreme Court rejected the straitjacketing of thought on this subject, and banished from the case the primitive, childish reasoning through which an undermining of our national life was being attempted. In doing so the Court served the stability of the nation somewhat as its founding was served by the interplay of free thinking of Jefferson and Madison, the Adamases and Hamilton and Ben Franklin that resulted in the Constitution and the great "organized government" that we have.

Let it be firmly reasserted that the theory that is described as "disbelief in organized government" owes its banishment from the minds of serious men—precisely to Marx and Engels, to the Communists.

And for the sake of history let us add the following:

Stalin's Development of the Theory of the State

The Marxian theory of the state, like all scientific theory, could not remain static. In the tremendous de-

velopment and shocks of history in which an entirely new form of state grew to a colossal strength, it is inevitable that the theory of the state, and particularly of the concept of "withering away" of the organs of repression, have undergone change. The change is *not a refutation* but a *further development* of theory on the scientific foundation laid by Marx and Engels.

Four and a half years ago, after the completion of the clean-up of the Trotskyite conspiracy in the Soviet Union, there was a general appraisal of that experience, including a frank discussion of the "blunder" that was made in not sooner catching the criminals. The conclusion was expressed by Stalin that there had been an "underestimation of the capitalist encirclement" and "also an underestimation of the role and significance of the bourgeois states and their organs, which send spies, assassins and wreckers into our country and are waiting for a favorable opportunity to attack it by armed force"; [as Germany and Japan did], and "an underestimation of the role and significance of our socialist state and of its military, punitive and intelligence organs . . ."

Stalin pointed out "that certain of the general propositions in the Marxian doctrine of the state were incompletely worked out and inadequate."

There had been an "unpardonably heedless attitude to matters pertaining to the theory of the state. . . ." The Marxist theory on this subject "provides only general *guiding* principles, which, *in particular*, are applied in England dif-

ferently from France, in France differently from Germany, and in Germany differently from Russia."

"It would be ridiculous to expect that the classical Marxist writers should have elaborated for our benefit ready-made solutions for each and every theoretical problem that might arise in any particular country fifty or one hundred years afterwards. . . ."

"Will our state remain in the period of Communism also?"

"Yes, it will, unless the capitalist encirclement is liquidated, and unless the danger of foreign military attack has disappeared. Naturally, of course, the forms of our state will again change in conformity with the situation at home and abroad.

"No, it will not remain and will atrophy if the capitalist encirclement is liquidated and a socialist encirclement takes place.

"That is how the question stands with regard to the socialist state." (Stalin: Report to the 18th Congress, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 10, 1939.)

So much for "disbelief in organized government"—the first of the two main contentions in the realm of political theory employed in this case in a struggle against the right of free political thought and free political association of the American people.

With the other of the two main points—the accusation that the Communists "advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence"—I will deal next month.

(To be concluded in the September issue.)

FIFTH-COLUMN DIVERSION IN DETROIT

BY MAX WEISS

WITH the beginning of coalition warfare already realized by the United Nations, Hitler's agents in America place their main reliance on attempting to throw the home front into confusion and chaos, to create diversion in order to block the speedy establishment of the Second Front or to weaken it when it is opened by preventing the full force of a United Nation from being put behind it.

The pattern of this Axis fifth-column plan to disrupt and divert the home front can be seen in its major outlines in the Lewis-Woll-Hutcheson conspiracy to provoke strikes; in the Congressional warfare against the Administration's policies on such issues as price control, subsidies, anti-labor Connally-Smith bill; and finally in the widespread fifth-column instigation of anti-Negro (in the case of Los Angeles anti-Mexican) riots in the chief war production centers of the country.

The nation has been the shocked witness of such Axis-inspired riots in Mobile, Beaumont, Los Angeles, Chester, Newark—and their culmination in the insurrection in Detroit—which brought the full

extent of these Hitler diversionary tactics to the attention of the nation. The insurrectionary character of these Axis-inspired riots can actually be seen in the physical evidence of killed and wounded—thirty-four dead in Detroit, two dead in Beaumont, one dead in Newark, and countless hundreds injured in all of the cities in which these riots were engineered.

The direct results achieved by the fifth-column forces responsible for these outrages can actually be measured in terms of man-hours of war production lost—more than a million in Detroit, and hundreds of thousands in Beaumont, Mobile, and other places!

Equally, and in the long run more, important is the heavy blow dealt at the nation's morale and unity by these Axis-inspired and organized riots. For the disruption of America's national unity is a prize valued above all else by Hitler and his agents in America, who base their hopes on bringing about such a disruption of our national unity that will render it impossible for our country to make the full force of its blows felt on the battle front.

At the same time serious damage was done internationally by these anti-Negro and anti-Mexican riots. The Axis radio has not overlooked a single propaganda possibility of exploiting these outrages against the Negro and Mexican minority population in our country. Goebbels understands full well their assistance to him in his attempt to win away from the cause of the United Nations the millions in Asia and Africa, as well as the masses in the Latin American countries.

The Negro people (and also, in the case of Los Angeles, the Mexican people) have been the principal victims of these riots. At the same time, the blow struck against them had as its main target the war production of our country, the strength and unity of the labor movement, the national war leadership and policies of President Roosevelt and the nation.

The Axis-inspired riots should help to refresh America's understanding of the cause for which we fight. For rampant on the streets of Beaumont, Chester, Los Angeles, and Detroit was the ugly force of fascism which would be raised to positions of government power should Hitler's plan to enslave our country be realized. It is to prevent the pattern of these riots from becoming the established policy of government—a result which is inevitable should the Axis forces prevail—that our country fights.

In order to understand these events correctly, it is necessary to establish one thing above all. The events that took place in Mobile,

Beaumont, Chester, Los Angeles, Newark, and Detroit were not "race riots." They were, in actual truth, exactly what President Roosevelt called the Detroit riots—insurrections. It is impossible to stress this fact too much. For, so long as unthinking people unwittingly echo the propaganda of the defeatists that these were "race riots," they unconsciously and automatically absolve the Axis and its American fifth column from their direct and immediate responsibility. They fall into the trap which the Axis and its fifth column have set to cover up their own responsibility by prevailing on the American people to consider the outrages in "purely American terms," that is, "merely the unfortunate but inevitable outbreak on a larger scale" of what the country saw once before during the Chicago and East St. Louis "race riots," events having no connection with the work of Hitler's agents.

These riots were no more "race riots" between Negro and white than the murder and rapine of the Jewish masses in Germany by the fascist gangs are "race riots" between "Aryan" and "non-Aryan." We have long since learned to estimate these pogroms for what they are—techniques of fascist terror and intimidation against all democratic forces with the Jewish people as the immediate victims. It is high time that we understand the events which have disgraced our country during the past weeks for what they are—techniques of fifth-column insurrection against the nation's war effort with the Negro

people (and in Los Angeles—the Mexican people) as the immediate victims.

The glib, unthinking assertion that what happened in Beaumont, Chester, Newark, and Detroit was a series of "race riots" can be sustained only by flying in the face of the most obvious facts, and can have the effect only of diverting attention from the real criminal, Hitler's fifth column in the United States, which plotted, organized, and instigated these anti-Negro riots.

There has even been an attempt to buttress such false "race riot" versions of the events in these cities by mystic references to an alleged growth of what is called "tension" between Negro and white during the past period. This mystic "tension" is adduced as "proof" that the relations between Negro and white have deteriorated and, in fact, reached the breaking point under pressure of this "tension." The riots are, then, quite simply interpreted as the result, or the violent expression, of such a deterioration of relations between Negro and white due to this mystic quality called "tension," and hence, forthwith, labeled "race riots."

But when we examine this mystic phenomenon called "tension between Negro and white," we find that, insofar as there is anything more tangible to it than the mystification with which spiritualists but not realists concern themselves, this so-called "tension" is nothing but a series of incidents consisting almost exclusively of attacks against individual Negroes by fascist or hood-

lum elements; or else it is another name for the incitement against Negroes whipped up especially by the Hearst gutter press.

That kind of "tension" bears all the earmarks of Berlin. The Nazis showed us exactly what stuff such "tension" is made of by manufacturing it in the Sudetenland. The *Voelkischer Beobachter* as well as *Der Sturmer* specialize in exactly such "tension." What is really true is that there has been a growth of Nazi-inspired, fifth-column-directed incitements to violence, actualized violence, against the Negro people. But why should patriots allow themselves to be duped by such transparent mystification? This so-called growth of "tension" between Negro and white is nothing but a euphemism for the preparatory work of the fifth column for the organization of the anti-Negro riots. The same kind of "tension" is now being manufactured by the fifth column against the Jewish people through the development to unprecedented proportions of an ugly campaign of anti-Semitism.

* * *

What about the relations between Negro and white masses? Have these relations, that is, has the unity of Negro and white deteriorated in the past period?

The actual fact is that the exact opposite is true. The fact is that unprecedented advances have been made especially during the past period in welding the unity of Negro and white, in heightening the feelings of solidarity between the people

of the United States and the peoples of Latin America. This is precisely the period in which such a strengthened Negro-white unity has brought into existence Executive Order 8802, made possible the greater integration of Negro workers in industry, forced a defeatist-manipulated House of Representatives to vote favorably on the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill, laid the basis for the War Labor Board resolution barring pay differentials between Negro and white; and in which the labor movement has come forward more boldly than ever as the champion of Negro-white unity.

The Axis-inspired riots cannot be explained or understood by false references to the "deterioration" of relations between Negro and white. These riots can be understood only if they are seen as desperate attempts by the fifth column to interrupt the growth of Negro-white unity and to break it completely.

Hence, from whatever viewpoint we examine the events of the past weeks, we must emphatically reject any attempt to characterize them as "race riots." They were insurrections against the war effort, consciously and deliberately organized by Hitler's fifth column in America, with the weakest link in the chain of our national unity—the integration of the Negro people into the war effort—selected as the sector of the home front on which to make a break-through.

* * *

There are some individuals, organizations, and newspapers that

will admit—who can deny?—that the riots in Mobile, Beaumont, Chester, Los Angeles, and Detroit aided the Axis. But, they say, it is an exaggeration to say that these riots were organized by Hitler's fifth column. They aided Hitler and the Axis, but only "objectively," so to speak, and "quite by accident."

But it would be very strange indeed if Hitler's fifth column did not prepare for and organize to bring about such "objective" aid. It is high time that the American people refused to allow themselves to be victimized by such transparent fifth-column camouflage that covers up the Lewis strike conspiracy as something which "quite by accident" merely gives "objective" aid to Hitler; or the Dubinsky nefarious Alter-Ehrlich conspiracy, which "quite by accident" gave merely "objective" aid to Hitler; or the burning of the Normandie, which "quite by accident" gave merely "objective" aid to Hitler; or the insurrectionary riots against the people in a whole score of war production centers throughout the country, which "quite by accident" gave "objective" aid to Hitler. When Hitler and the Axis receive such voluminous and consistent "objective" aid it is quite clear that there is more involved than a series of "accidental" events from which the Axis benefits "objectively." It was such "objective" aid which Hitler and his fifth column organized in the Sudetenland, in France, and in Spain.

This is seen quite clearly by so

able a military commentator as George Fielding Eliot, who wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune* of June 23:

"The German high command is faced with decisions which grow more painful and desperate day by day. The terrors of two-front war have come upon Germany not in the full flower of her strength, but in the declining years of her weakness and war weariness.

"But to desperate men, desperate measures. Her leaders have set not only their power but their lives upon success. If Germany goes down to defeat, they will not survive it. Therefore they will not fail to exhaust every expedient in their power to retard the day of that defeat. Their greatest danger comes from America. The source of that danger is beyond their military reach. But is it beyond the reach of every form of attack?

"There are new weapons which are available in such cases,' Adolf Hitler once observed in private conversation, as reported by Hermann Rauschning. 'America is permanently on the brink of revolution. It will be a simple matter for me to produce unrest and revolts in the United States, so that these gentry will have their hands full with their own affairs.'

"Hitler never doubted his ability to enlist the human instruments of such an attack from within.

"We shall find such men,' he boasted. 'We shall find them in every country. We shall not need to bribe them. They will come of their own accord. Ambition and delusion, party squabbles and self-seeking arrogance will drive them.'

"Americans of every walk of life, of every race, of every political

persuasion, will do well to reflect on these words. A wave of strikes is sweeping the country, culminating in the great coal strike which threatens to paralyze our industrial output. Race riots break out in areas as far apart from each other as Detroit and east Texas. Troops which should have no other task than preparation to meet the enemy in battle are compelled to turn their weapons against their fellow citizens.

"Can it be that these events, which serve the cause of the enemy so well, have come, at this crucial moment, by mere coincidence? Is it not likely, is it not indeed almost certain that enemy agents have been at work to bring these things to pass? This is not, of course, to say that all concerned are in the pay of Hitler. That would be sheer nonsense. But remember that Hitler's own words show that he understands how to play upon 'ambition and delusion, party squabbles and self-seeking arrogance.' Why has every effort to settle the coal strike failed at the last moment? Why did the 'rumors' which bred the Detroit riots spread so fast? Why do these things happen now, in the hour of Germany's greatest need and greatest peril?"

It is of decisive importance to see clearly and beyond all shadow of doubt the fact that Hitler's fifth column in the United States is directly responsible for these diversionary riots. This fifth column operates through the Ku Klux Klan, through Gerald K. Smith's America First Party, through the National Workers League, through the Pacific Firsters, through the Hearst Press incitements, as well as through the

pages of innumerable fifth-column sheets published by these organizations—*X-Ray*, *The Cross and the Flag*, etc.

It is necessary at this point to add the fact that these fifth-column elements have been aided and abetted by the unprecedented brutality and Negrophobia of sections of the police force in all of the cities involved. In Detroit, for example, 90 per cent of the Negroes killed were killed by police! Eighty-five per cent of those arrested by the police were Negroes. In Los Angeles the police stood by laughing and joking while Mexicans and Negroes were being beaten up on the public streets of that city. In various cities throughout the country the police are the actual instigators of violence against the Negro people by their continued, unrestrained, and unpunished brutality against the Negro people.

Symbolic of this attitude of sections of the police force is the photograph widely reproduced in newspapers and magazines showing two Detroit policemen holding a Negro by the arms and making no attempt to prevent a white rioter from striking the helpless Negro victim whose arms were pinioned by the police.

All of this is not accidental. It has been clearly established that the fifth column has, through one or another of its many agencies, penetrated quite extensively into the police force in a number of cities. It is a matter of record that numbers of the Detroit and Toledo police were members of the now outlawed

Black Legion. A new investigation would undoubtedly reveal that sections of the police in these and other cities are members of the Klan, of the Christian Front, of Gerald K. Smith's organization.

Very serious, indeed, is the fact that the police officials in New York have whitewashed the activities of the police in participating in the activities of these seditious groups. In New York City, for example, Patrolman Drew—who was proven to be a close personal friend of the fascist Christian Front leader, Joe McWilliams, whose home had been used as a storehouse for vast quantities of anti-Semitic literature—was cleared of charges of un-American activities and reinstated on the police force. This action will undoubtedly be taken as a green light signal by Christian Fronters to continue their nefarious work.

* * *

Unless the responsibility of the Axis fifth column for inciting, organizing, and instigating these riots is understood, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to understand the full meaning of these events, to take action against those responsible and to prevent their recurrence in other cities in the future.

As a matter of fact, the main aim of the defeatists is to steer the wrath of the American people away from the fifth column, to whitewash the Axis and its agents of all responsibility in order to compound their crimes by attempting to pin the responsibility for these events upon

the Negro people themselves, upon the labor movement, upon the Roosevelt Administration and its war policies.

Unfortunately, they have been aided in this attempt to whitewash Hitler's fifth column of its criminal responsibility for these riots by the attitude taken by various government officials, committees, and law enforcement agencies. This is true, for example, of the Governor of Michigan, the Mayor of Detroit, the Michigan Governor's Fact Finding Committee, the Detroit F. B. I. director, the Mayor of Los Angeles, as well as the Police Departments in the cities concerned. These and other government figures have repeatedly declared that there is no connection between the riots which took place in these cities and the work of Axis agents. Strengthened by such obvious whitewashing, the defeatists have turned the full fury of their fascist attack upon the Negro people, upon the labor movement, upon the Roosevelt Administration, upon the whole war effort.

The fascists attempt to place the responsibility for the riots upon the Negro people themselves, no less! According to this degenerate logic, the anti-Negro riots are a result of the "inordinate demands" put forward by the Negro people which "meet with resistance from the whites."

Westbrook Pegler makes the charge even more specific by accusing the editors of the Negro press of being responsible for the riots because they advocate the end of Jim Crow, whereas, according to

Pegler, "race prejudice is as native to America as ham and eggs."

In this same category is to be placed the accusation made by unnamed persons as reported in various "inspired" news stories that the "Communist Negroes" of Detroit are responsible because of their unpromising leadership of the Negro people in the fight for full integration in the war effort.

This is a fascist slander against the justified demands of the Negro people for the granting of their simple American constitutional rights. The cloven hoof of Hitler logic is clearly apparent in it. It was precisely with such logic that Hitler placed the responsibility for the destruction of the independence of Czechoslovakia upon the Czech people, for the invasion of Poland upon the Polish people, etc. The crime committed by these peoples was that they insisted upon recognition of their "inordinate demands" for national independence. Hence, they "provoked" Hitler to attack them!

This fascist slander is at the same time a complete distortion of the facts. The demands of the Negro people for complete integration into the war effort and into the life of the nation are not the demands of the Negro people alone. They are the demands of our nation itself; they are the life-and-death requirements of our nation for victory. They are supported and fought for, not only by the Communists in the ranks of the Negroes, not only by the Negro people alone, but by growing masses of patriotic white

Americans and, in the first place, by the organized labor movement.

These demands do not meet with resistance from "the whites." They meet with resistance from the fifth-column elements, from the poll-taxers, from the forces of reaction, and from backward sections of the white population influenced by their fascist propaganda.

Another variation of this attempt to fasten responsibility for the Axis-inspired riots upon the Negro people—the chief victims of the riots—is to be seen in the allegation that the riots were the result of work among the Negro people by Japanese agents. In a similar fashion, efforts were made to place responsibility for the anti-Mexican riots in Los Angeles upon the Mexican-Americans by insinuating that Japanese and Sinarquist agents were at work among them. This connection between the Mexican population and the Japanese was even dignified by a degenerate race theory advanced by the "foreign relations" expert of the Los Angeles sheriff's office. According to this typically fascist theory, the Mexicans are half-savage Orientals. The implication clearly is that they are therefore susceptible to the work of Japanese agents.

While there can be no doubt that Japanese agents are at work among the Negro people, any attempt to turn the investigation in this direction is nothing but an effort to cover up the criminal responsibility of the Klan, of Gerald K. Smith, and the National Workers League, whose

organization of violence against the Negro people has been irrefutably documented and brought to the attention of the Federal Government.

Interestingly, and significantly enough, a few short weeks after such accusations were made, the F. B. I. released the information that the copy editor of the *New York Daily News* has been in the pay of the Japanese government for the last ten years. The *New York Daily News* is one of the chief purveyors of anti-Negro slander and incitement. An investigation of the Hearst press as well as the Klan, Gerald K. Smith, and the National Workers League would undoubtedly reveal similar connections.

* * *

The fact that these anti-Negro riots have as their aim more than the Negro people alone is made clear in the instantaneous effort of the defeatists to turn the indignation of the American people away from the real instigators and direct it against the Roosevelt Administration and the war effort.

Representative John Rankin of Mississippi has openly used the House of Representatives as a forum to accuse President Roosevelt and his Administration of being responsible for provoking the riots through the policy of integrating the Negroes into the war effort. He has demanded that the policy of our government be scrapped and that it be replaced by the fascist policy of the segregation of the Negro people.

Similarly, Martin Dies has brazen-

ly announced that the factors behind the riots on the West Coast and in Detroit, "were not purely un-American." In this way, Dies insinuates that it is the policy of the Roosevelt Administration in "coddling" the Negro people, that is, in following a policy of support to the Negro people in the fight for their full integration into the war effort, which is responsible for the riots.

The objective of this fascist attack upon President Roosevelt's policies, as exemplified in Executive Order 8802, in the F. E. P. C., in the ruling of the War Labor Board barring pay differentiations between Negro and white, is to smash all of the advances made so far in integrating the Negro people into the life of the nation and the war effort, thus striking a heavy blow against victory itself.

In this same category must be placed the defeatist accusations of the Norman Thomas "Socialist" paper, *The Call*, which stated:

"It is the government's war against Japan that inspired the riots.

"If white Americans are stirred up to kill colored peoples, some will start killing without military orders."

This direct echo of Goebbles' propaganda insinuates that America's war against Japan is a race war. Its logic is quite clear. To stop further rioting, America must stop fighting against Japan! That is, it must negotiate peace with the Japanese fascist marauders. In fact, this was exactly the line followed by the

Norman Thomas "Socialists" and the Trotskyites at the recent Michigan C. I. O. convention. Heading up the resolutions committee of that convention, they brought to the floor a resolution which stated:

"We should not criticize Hitler for his race theories while events like anti-Negro riots occur in America."

Hitler must not be criticized! That is the conclusion which the Norman Thomas "Socialists" and the Trotskyites draw from the anti-Negro riots. And certainly it follows, as night follows day, that if Hitler cannot even be criticized, then most certainly he should not be fought. This is the treasonable content of the conclusions which the Norman Thomas "Socialists" and Trotskyites publicly advance.

The defeatist attempt to white-wash Hitler's fifth column from all responsibility for the anti-Negro and anti-Mexican riots has been given unwitting support even by well-meaning and patriotic liberal leaders who maintain that these riots are the result solely of "objective conditions" with which Axis and fifth-column agents have no connection, such as the housing, transportation, and recreation shortages in the war production centers; or the factor of juvenile delinquency, especially as it relates to the riots in Los Angeles, Newark and Detroit, where large masses of young people were involved. It is to be regretted that Father Haas should lend himself to such an evasion of the fundamental facts.

It is most certainly true that these factors must enter into any full understanding of the causes behind the Axis-inspired diversionary riots, and must be seen as very important contributing causes. It is clear that all patriotic forces are obligated to move swiftly in formulating policies and taking action to solve the scandalous housing, transportation, and recreation shortages in the war centers of the country and to combat a growing war-time juvenile delinquency. It would be absolutely wrong to minimize these problems in the slightest degree, or to fail to see them as contributing factors to the events which have been taking place.

As a matter of fact, the slightest concrete action to make a definite improvement in the inadequacies which now exist in the field of housing, transportation, and recreation will at once disclose the fact that the same fifth-column forces who utilized the inadequacies in these fields as the starting point for their anti-Negro riots, are the very ones who attempt to block any substantial improvements in this direction. The struggle to improve these conditions—especially as they affect the Negro people, among whom the worst conditions are to be found—is part and parcel of the fight against the fifth-column elements who are responsible for provoking these riots. The Klan-inspired anti-Negro riots which took place in connection with the opening of the Sojourner Truth Housing project in Detroit two years ago is the best illustration of this fact. It is only

by seeing clearly that the enemy is the Axis fifth column which enlists in its support even patriotic Americans who are victims of un-American, anti-Negro prejudice, that the slightest progress can be made in improving the housing, transportation and recreation shortages.

The fact that large numbers of young people were involved in the rioting in Los Angeles, in Newark, and in Detroit has been made the occasion for advancing a theory to the effect that these riots were a result of the growth of wartime juvenile delinquency. As in the case of housing, transportation, recreation, the role of juvenile delinquency must be seriously examined as a contributing factor helping to explain the involvement of young people in the rioting; but in no case can it be seriously entertained as a basic cause of the rioting.

The shameful participation of large numbers of young people in the events in Los Angeles, Newark and Detroit is a blot on the record of brilliant and heroic achievement by the youth of our country on the battlefield, in war industry and on the home front. It is not representative of any trends among American youth. Rather, it stands out in sharp contrast to the important role which America's youth is playing in helping to win victory.

The youth who took part in the rioting in these cities were the unsuspecting tools of the fifth-column forces which instigated and organized these riots. To the extent that the growth of war-time juvenile delinquency created a situation among

youth which made it possible for sections of them in the cities in question to be manipulated for fifth-column objectives, the responsibility falls upon the defeatists and fifth-column forces who have fought tooth and nail against any Federal program for organizing the participation of youth in the war effort, who have resisted any attempt by the Federal, state or city governments to provide for adequate war-time educational programs among youth and to expand facilities for satisfaction of the recreational needs of youth.

The crassest expression of this fact was seen in the scuttling of the Youth Division of Civilian Defense by the defeatists in Congress. The program of the Youth Division for the organization on an over-all basis of the war service activities of youth, their education in the objectives for which the war is fought, was precisely what was—and is—needed to channelize the energies and resources of American youth into constructive, patriotic war work. The absence of any such Federal program or local equivalent of such a program is the fundamental cause for the growth of war-time juvenile delinquency.

The participation of young people in the riots in Los Angeles, Newark and Detroit dramatizes the necessity for moving swiftly to combat the fundamental causes of a growing war-time juvenile delinquency, but must under no conditions be accepted as any real explanation for the events in these cities. Any attempt to do so can only have the effect of diverting attention from

the real criminal—the fifth column.

To bring these objective factors forward, as problems which the anti-Negro riots sharply dramatize, and press for immediate solution is imperative. But it would be simple-minded and naive as well as dangerous to explain the pattern of anti-Negro riots by these factors. These are the factors which the Axis agents find ready at hand to manipulate for their own purposes. It is an axiom of the Axis fifth column to turn these so-called "objective factors" to their own end.

It is an axiom of Hitler's plan for world conquest that in almost all countries—especially the United States—there are such "objective factors" which can be turned to fascist account. The Axis reckons with such "objective factors" in organizing its fifth-column work, just as it reckons with the "objective factors" of heat and lack of water in organizing its desert warfare, just as it reckons with the "objective factors" of oceans and islands in organizing its amphibian operations.

Patriotic Americans must intensify every effort to put an end to the scandals of housing, transportation and recreation shortage; but they must do it as part of the fight against the fifth-column plotters.

* * *

It is in the first place the labor movement which must recognize the pattern of Hitler's fifth column in the riots which have broken out in important war production centers throughout the country. It is the la-

bor movement which must take a bold and decisive stand in pinning responsibility on the fifth-column forces responsible for these outrages and in pressing for the swift and immediate punishment of those responsible.

In this respect, the policies of R. J. Thomas, U.A.W. president, have been particularly important. The statements made by Thomas during the anti-Negro Packard strike which was provoked by the Klan elements in the Packard local, his forthright stand in connection with the anti-Negro riots in Detroit, undoubtedly did much to rally labor for the fulfillment of its responsibilities. It is indeed a matter of pride that during the whole period of the anti-Negro insurrection on the streets of Detroit, not a single incident was reported to have taken place within any shop in Detroit. A number of other trade unions as well as trade union leaders spoke out. In Newark, for example, the C.I.O. immediately and decisively spoke up and took the lead in the struggle against the fifth column responsible for the anti-Negro riots there. Similar action was taken by the C.I.O. on the West Coast during the Los Angeles riots.

But the fact remains that as yet the labor movement and its leadership have not fully realized the far-flung nature of the Hitler conspiracy to disrupt our home front by creating diversions such as those which took place in Detroit, Mobile, Beaumont, Chester, Newark, and Los Angeles. It is a matter of record,

for example, that R. J. Thomas spoke up on the riots as an individual, but that the U.A.W. did not officially take action as an organization, except for its later participation in a conference of a number of national organizations.

It is essential that the labor movement be saturated with this understanding and see the full connection of these diversionary outbreaks with the John L. Lewis conspiracy as well as with the conspiracy of the defeatist Congressmen on Capitol Hill in attempting to wreck President Roosevelt's war program. The labor movement must take the lead in arousing the whole working class and all patriotic and civic forces, Negro and white, to bring about the criminal prosecution and punishment of the fifth-column agents who instigated these riots, as the only preventative for threatened outbreaks in other war production centers with large Negro populations.

* * *

The present situation calls for the immediate establishment of Federal grand juries in all cities in which these anti-Negro and anti-Mexican riots have taken place to investigate and immediately suppress the Ku Klux Klan, the National Workers League, Gerald K. Smith's America First Party; to arrest and imprison the leaders of these organizations; to outlaw and shut down the seditious newspapers and other publications issued by these organizations and individuals. Those already un-

der indictment in the Sojourner Truth case must be imprisoned. The thirty-three seditionists already under indictment must be brought to trial without further delay.

All patriotic forces must press energetically for this demand, especially because the Department of Justice and the Attorney-General's office under Biddle show absolutely no inclination to take any needed step. In fact, the F.B.I. Director in Detroit, Mr. Bugas, has been among the most vociferous in denying—without any investigation whatsoever—that the fifth column is in any way involved in the Detroit riots. Attorney General Biddle, who allowed no grass to grow under his feet in instantaneously following up the Supreme Court decision on Schneiderman by an announcement that he intended to work for the reversal of that decision, has not issued a single statement on the riots to date.

It would be criminal solely to wait until the Axis fifth column strikes again in other cities. What is needed is prompt and decisive preventative action in all the chief centers of Negro population and war production by the government officials of those cities as well as the labor and civic forces and organizations, both Negro and white. The attempt of Hitler's agents to instigate such anti-Negro riots in other cities must be nipped in the bud by the arrest and conviction of those responsible for each specific case

of brutality inflicted upon the Negro people, and in each case of incitement to such violence.

President Roosevelt should answer the request advanced by many patriotic and civic forces and agencies to speak to the nation over the radio in order to acquaint the entire American people with the nature of the fifth-column conspiracy revealed in the anti-Negro riots. He should issue an executive decree outlawing all forms of discrimination.

In addition, the whole program for the thorough integration of the Negro people into the war effort must be energetically advanced. The anti-lynching and anti-poll tax bills must be passed by Congress. Discrimination against Negroes in the armed forces must be ended.

Swift and adequate punishment must be meted out to those members of the police force in Detroit who were guilty of acts of brutality and outright murder against the Negro people in Detroit.

Severe penalties must be enforced against all purveyors of anti-Semitism.

It is through such decisive action to crush the fifth-column conspiracy to throw our home front into chaos by large-scale diversions that Negro-white unity will be promoted, national unity advanced, and the path cleared to victory for a United Nations throwing every ounce of its full strength into the offensive in the European continent.

THE 78TH CONGRESS

BY A. E. BLUMBERG

I. After Six Months

WHEN the 78th Congress adjourned on Thursday, July 8, for an extended recess, the majority of its members left behind an unparalleled record of obstruction of the war effort and disruption of the home front. Reactionary and defeatist gains registered in the 1942 elections soon made themselves felt. After a few polite bows to the slogan of a Victory Congress, the defeatist-inspired coalition of Hoover Republicans and poll-tax Democrats went to war against President Roosevelt's win-the-war policies. Raising the battle-cry of "independence" of the legislative arm from the executive, they proceeded to obstruct and undermine the powers of the nation's Chief Executive in the conduct of the war. In the closing days of the session this policy of obstruction reached such extremes that some conservative anti-Administration organs which had welcomed and promoted this "independence" began to view the situation with some alarm.

The developing military situation made this obstructionist drive all the more serious. Just a few days before the recess, the expected Nazi offensive on the Eastern Front broke into full fury. A few days after the

recess came the Anglo-American invasion of Sicily, another important step toward the full operation of coalition warfare and a two-front war against Hitler Germany, the heart of the Axis.

On June 11, Earl Browder, addressing the National Committee of the Communist Party, said:

"Hitler and his associates are fully aware that the hour of decision is approaching. . . . It would be an unforgivable mistake to underestimate Hitler's remaining power, above all Hitler's fifth column in the United States. Axis hopes are now centered upon creating diversions behind the main battlefronts in order to create diversions among the Allies, disrupt our internal unity, sap our strength and prevent it from reaching the battlefields. To hold the home front line is now of equal importance to holding the battle line. The home front must be protected from Hitler's diversions. Events have already demonstrated that this is our most vulnerable point. That is why we must concentrate our attention in this period on the home front, safeguarding national unity, upholding our Commander-in-Chief in the direction of the war, securing maximum and uninterrupted production, mobilizing the masses for most efficient application of all war measures—rationing, war savings, civilian defense, etc.—perfecting the structure

of our war economy and, above all, unmasking the hidden enemy within, the Copperheads, the defeatists, the advocates of a negotiated peace, the profiteers, the black-marketeers, and all their agents and accomplices." (*The Communist*, July, 1943, pp. 579-89.)

Today it is obvious that one of the most urgent tasks facing labor and the win-the-war camp as we enter the stage of decisive military actions in Europe is to smash Hitler's diversion in the halls of Congress. An analysis of the record of the 78th Congress, and an examination of the forces in the present Congress, show that this can and must be done now. The war won't wait for the 1944 elections to discipline Congress. Labor's leadership in the organization of nation-wide legislative and political activity during the summer recess can isolate the small number of conscious defeatists in the present Congress, end Congressional obstruction, and thus vitally strengthen the home front. Labor, especially the C. I. O. at its National Executive Board Meeting of July 7 and 8, has begun more and more to appreciate the importance of labor's united legislative and political action in our national war. The first test of this growing awareness can well be the summer recess campaign to influence the 78th Congress in the direction of full support of the war policies of the Commander-in-Chief and the nation.

The Record

Briefly put, the majority of the 78th Congress has centered its activities on opposing the "domestic"

program of the Administration. But the "domestic" and the "foreign-military" policies are, of course, inseparable. Disruption on the home front endangers the military front.

The reactionary-defeatist majority sought to prevent the stabilization of our war economy. It passed a pay-as-you-go tax bill which permitted the corporations to get away with a billion and a half dollars in profits above last year's record profits. Yet it blocked the President's \$25,000 income limitation proposal. It endangered the entire price-control and rationing program through budgetary and other attacks on O.P.A. It passed the Bankhead Bill to force price increases, and fought desperately to kill the price roll-back subsidy program. It hampered the critical food program by opposing production incentives and cutting the Farm Security Administration program. National unity was the real target in the Lewis-provoked passage of the Smith-Connally anti-labor bill over the President's veto, and in the continuation of the Dies Committee, as well as the creation of the new witch-hunting Kerr, Smith and Cox committees directed against Administration circles.

But the defeatist clique in the 78th Congress was not at all times able to secure a majority. In the first place, on all matters of military appropriations and lend-lease aid, the Administration received overwhelming support, the reciprocal trade-treaty program passed, although with a fight. Of special significance was the passage by the

House in record time of the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill, H.R. 7. The protracted Senate fight against the dismissal of three liberal anti-fascist victims of the Dies and Kerr committees was the first major Congressional resistance to witch-hunting. The President's vetoes of both the Bankhead Bill and the subsidies ban were sustained. And on the final day, July 8, a last desperate attempt to ban subsidies and push up corn prices was defeated by an Administration fighting aggressively and backed by a rapidly growing campaign of support by labor and the people.

The Line-up of Forces

The number of outright defeatists (i.e., those who seek to save Hitler from unconditional surrender because of their hatred of the Soviet Union and Britain and their fear of democracy) in the 78th Congress is probably very small. They include the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg-Nye-Fish group among the Republicans, the Wheeler-Clark-Reynolds-Cox-Dies group among the Democrats. Representing the du Pont clique in the National Association of Manufacturers, their activities are fully supported in the columns of the Hearst-McCormick-Patterson press. They are highly vocal, and some are strategically placed.

Thus, Senator Reynolds of North Carolina, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, uses his position to suggest a negotiated peace. In a recent speech in the Senate (*Congressional Record*, June 25, 1943, p. 6657) he says:

"If we desire we can bring about an unconditional surrender. We have the power with which to do it. As to whether or not our allies are going to insist upon an unconditional surrender, or whether there will be some sort of negotiation before long, I do not know. Many people are commenting upon the fact that there has not been much activity between the Chinese troops and the Japanese troops lately. Others comment upon the fact that there has not recently been much gunpowder wasted on the Russian front between the Germans and the Russians."

The small minority, however, performs its traitorous role primarily by utilizing the many Congressmen who place profits, partisan politics, and sectional interests above the needs of victory. Thus, through confusion and distortion of issues, the defeatist clique is able to manipulate a majority drawn chiefly from the Republicans and tory poll-tax Democrats. Especially does it capitalize on the Republican partisan opposition to the Commander-in-Chief.

Complacency with regard to the outcome of the war has facilitated the defeatists' conspiracy. Following the Stalingrad and North African victories, there were those who adopted an attitude as though full Axis defeat was already "in the bag." This mood, together with the approach of the 1944 elections, brought a great many members of Congress to permit business-as-usual and politics-as-usual considerations to determine their conduct, thus playing into the hands of the defeatists.

Above all, it has been the absence of fighting labor unity that has made possible this situation. The C.I.O. proposals to the A. F. of L. and Railroad unions for joint labor legislative action have been blocked by William Green and the Woll-Hutcheson forces. The Woll-Hutcheson-Frey leadership of the A. F. of L. instead, has centered its legislative work on fighting the N.L.R.B. They are now scheming to bring about acceptance of the application for entrance into the A. F. of L. of John L. Lewis, arch-traitor and defeatist in the labor movement.

On the other hand, where all labor united, as in the House passage of the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill and the fight for roll-back subsidies, the results were immediately evident.

This reactionary-defeatist majority can be shattered. Neither the Republicans nor the poll-tax Democrats are an undifferentiated mass. If, for example, we glance over the roll-call in the House on the two votes to over-ride the Presidential veto on the Smith-Connally and subsidy-ban measures, we get the following picture: Some 100 Congressmen, in round numbers, primarily Democrats from industrial centers, together with American-Laborite Vito Marcantonio and seven courageous Republicans, voted with the President on both occasions (or would have, if they had been present). These Congressmen may be said to constitute the more or less stable win-the-war sector in Congress at this time. However, it must be clearly understood that their full

weight is never exercised because of the widespread absenteeism, especially in the New York delegation. Absenteeism on the home front helps Hitler just as much as would absenteeism on the military front. Labor and the people must make this fact clear to the Congressmen involved.

Another forty-odd Republicans voted with the President against the Smith-Connally Bill, thus indicating the growing weight of labor's legislative activity. Further, more than sixty Southern Congressmen voted to sustain the President's veto on the subsidy ban. Even though Dies and Smith, for demagogic purposes, joined in this vote, it nevertheless indicates that a large number of Southern Congressmen are not committed to all-out opposition to the President's win-the-war policies on the home front.

In the recent Gallup and *Fortune* polls, it was shown that the great bulk of the American people support the President's policies, foreign and domestic. This was especially true in the Gallup Poll of Southern sentiment which showed 80 per cent for President Roosevelt. Thus, the "unholy alliance" of reactionary Republicans and poll-tax Democrats finds no general popular support. When labor unites and rallies the people in support of the President, and the Administration stands firm, as in the subsidy fight, the alliance can be defeated.

Tell It to Congress This Summer

Popular support for the President's policies, if registered this

summer in the form of joint labor, labor-farmer and broad people's conferences and committees in all Congressional districts throughout the country, can change the situation radically in the 78th Congress. As far as the House is concerned, the aim of such Congressional district conferences and committees must be to add several score Republicans to the seven who stood firm, and to add several score Southern and other Democrats to the ninety-odd who championed the President's policies. A well-organized program, led by labor and concentrating among the labor-influenced Republicans and Southern Democrats, can yield a new House majority—a non-partisan win-the-war alliance. Similar results can be secured in the Senate, at least on some issues. This drive necessarily also requires that labor, in expressing its support of President Roosevelt, at the same time establish a non-partisan approach to the election of win-the-war Congressmen and Senators.

The fruitful experience of the successful campaign to pass the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill in the House should be drawn upon. Here a broad unity (including A. F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods, and many religious, Negro, civil rights and other organizations) in the form of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, teamed up with a Congressional non-partisan coalition headed by Congressmen Marcantonio (A.L.P.), Baldwin (R.), Bender (R.) and Magnusson (D.). A determined fight must be

made to secure Senate concurrence in September.

This principle of joint action between a group of win-the-war Congressmen and a broad united front including all labor likewise contributed materially to saving the Administration subsidy-roll-back program. Here a group of forty (now fifty-two) Congressmen, headed by Representative Scanlon of Pittsburgh, formed the Congressional Committee to Protect the Consumer. As a group of Congressmen, they took the unprecedented step of inviting all labor and people's organizations to be represented at a conference in support of the subsidy program in the House caucus room on June 25. Over 300 delegates representing national labor, consumers', Negro, women's and religious organizations heard speeches by Mayor La Guardia, Philip Murray of the C.I.O., and greetings from William Green of the A. F. of L. A feature of the conference was the official participation of the national officers of the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods, as well as the participation of delegates from most of the national and international unions affiliated with these three labor bodies.

Among the non-labor organizations were the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Council of Negro Women, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the League of Women Voters. Congressman McMurray of Wisconsin, for the committee of

Congressmen, announced plans to ask all national organizations represented to set up a continuing committee to plan and coordinate the work in every Congressional district.

Undoubtedly all labor and other patriotic groups will give this Congressional Committee of fifty-two their full backing. All Congressmen are being urged to join the group. Conferences along the lines called for by the Committee are being organized with the help of the Congressmen throughout the country. These conferences will deal with the vital questions of taxation, food, production, price control and other home front issues which Congress will face when it returns from the recess.

In developing the summer legislative campaign, it is important to note the growing aggressiveness displayed by the Administration in fighting for its policies, as is especially evidenced by the last two veto messages and the dismissal of Chester Davis, war food Administrator. However, as Philip Murray had occasion to point out some weeks ago, Administration leadership in both House and Senate is ineffective. Certainly, labor this summer, in discussing the issues with its returning Congressmen, will very sharply demand that they put up a much more effective and consistent fight for the President's policies.

In addition, the drive to isolate the defeatists in the 78th Congress, disperse the unholy alliance, and make Congress a win-the-war body, requires that the labor and other

win-the-war forces clear up the confusion created by the defeatists on such issues as subsidies. For example, the argument that roll-back means a cut in the farmers' income, or that subsidies mean heavy tax bills for workers, has been used in an effort to build up sentiment against these two key points in the price control program.

Another important requirement is that the defeatists be openly fought for what they are, that is, as enemies of the country and not as "gentlemen of the opposition." The National War Labor Board branded John L. Lewis as an enemy of the government; the *New York Herald Tribune* referred to Chandler as one who gives comfort to the enemy. In both instances a signal service was rendered the American people by such plain speaking.

Vital home front problems await Congress when it reconvenes. The Senate must pass the anti-poll tax bill and make it the law of the land. A new tax program comes up. New battles will be fought over price control and production, especially that of food. Congress must be brought fully behind the victory program of the President and the nation. If the people are organized now, their position will be felt when Congress reconvenes.

II. *The C.I.O. National Executive Board Meeting*

On the eve of the Congressional recess the National Executive Board of the C.I.O. held a very important meeting in Washington, D. C., July 7 and 8. To appreciate the full sig-

nificance of the actions taken by the Board, we should bear in mind the situation immediately preceding the meeting. This was the first meeting following the third miners' strike provoked by John L. Lewis—a strike which brought great damage to the war effort, the Smith-Connally Bill to labor, and nothing to the miners that they did not already have before the strike.

The reactionary-defeatist majority in Congress had just defied the President by passing the Smith-Connally Bill over his veto, and had sought to prevent the roll-back in prices promised to labor, by voting down subsidy payments. A combination of Lewis supporters, Norman Thomas Socialists, "Social-Democrats" of the *New Leader* stripe, Trotskyites, K.K.K. elements and other reactionary forces at the Michigan C.I.O. convention had succeeded in confusing a majority of the delegates and winning their support for a resolution which amounted to a repudiation of labor's no-strike pledge. The same combination at the Michigan convention had made some headway in an attempt to set up a Lewis-Dubinsky inspired "labor party," seeking to exploit the workers' desire for independent political action in order to break labor away from support of the war policies of the Commander-in-Chief. Finally, the Board meeting took place two days after the Nazis opened their 1943 offensive on the vital Eastern Front of this global war.

As in the past, the C. I. O. Board, under the leadership of its pres-

ident, Philip Murray, displayed a labor statesmanship which all of labor can greet. Not only C. I. O. members, but all workers will see in the resolutions adopted at this meeting basic measures to strengthen labor's role in the war effort, increase labor unity and labor's independent political action, and promote national unity for victory in the war against the Axis.

The C. I. O. Board meeting struck out against the defeatists and business-as-usual bloc in Congress as well as against the policies of the Lewis-Woll-Dubinsky cliques in the ranks of labor, brought clarity into the picture and a positive program to meet the situation. While the Board did not speak on the question of the developing offensive against Hitler and the Axis, its program of full support to the war policies of the Commander-in-Chief is the key to that strengthening of the home front required by the developing military offensive.

Specific actions included, first, a resolution reaffirming the no-strike pledge and all-out support of the win-the-war policies of the Administration. Placing responsibility for the Smith-Connally Bill directly upon Lewis, the resolution reads in part:

"1. Despite the disappointment which we experienced over the action taken by Congress in overriding the President's veto of the Smith-Connally Act., we affirm the determination of all the affiliated C. I. O. organizations to maintain our no-strike pledge.

"Because of our deep appreciation

of the issues involved in this war we shall not tolerate or permit any interruption or stoppage of work. We express our commendation to President Murray, who immediately following the provocative action of Congress in overriding the President's veto, clearly and emphatically declared for the C. I. O. that its firm no-strike policy shall continue.

"2. We express our deep gratitude to President Roosevelt, our Commander-in-Chief, for his statesmanlike attitude in vetoing the Smith-Connally Act. By this act President Roosevelt demonstrated his understanding of the contribution being made by labor toward winning the war and that any blow against labor is a blow against the war effort.

"We pledge to our Commander-in-Chief that we shall continue, as we have in the past, to give him our complete and unstinted support in our nation's struggle in this patriotic war."

This is generally the attitude of the labor movement to the Smith-Connally Act. Thus it can be seen that the defeatists and reactionaries have failed in their attempt to use this anti-labor legislation to provoke labor and split it away from support of President Roosevelt.

A second resolution praises President Roosevelt's veto of the anti-subsidy vote and calls for a roll-back of prices to September, 1942. It calls for the immediate accomplishment of the roll-back, and resolves: "continued support to the program of our Commander-in-Chief in the vital struggle to prevent inflation and of controlling and stabilizing our wartime domestic economy."

It calls upon the O. P. A. to carry

through "a program of overall rationing and of strict enforcement of price levels by utilizing the assistance of labor organizations and other local groups of consumers and housewives through the imposition of severe penalties upon price violators and operators of black markets."

In this connection, labor must note the slowness and hesitation being shown by O. P. A. Director Brown in carrying out the roll-back program and press for its full application.

Of prime significance, in view of the present military situation and the growing activities of the defeatists, was the C. I. O. proposal to the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods for united labor action. The C. I. O. urged that

"The heads of these organizations should immediately meet for the purpose of establishing a program of joint action on all issues directed toward an intensified prosecution of the war, the protection of organized labor against its enemies, a fuller participation of labor in the war effort, and for a complete mobilization of the people in support of the war program of our Commander-in-Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

And that

"The heads of these organizations should seek to create joint committees on a local and state-wide basis throughout the nation to encourage joint action between labor and all other groups and organizations that desire to give their wholehearted and complete support to the war program."

Further the C.I.O. Board proposed a national conference of labor and other win-the-war forces:

"The Presidents of the C. I. O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods should convene a national conference of representatives of organized labor and other sympathetic groups and organizations in an endeavor to mobilize on a national basis the entire population to assure the successful prosecution of the war and the defeat of any effort of our enemies to undermine, weaken or sabotage the war policies of our nation and of our Commander-in-Chief.

"Such a conference should establish the means and procedure for local mobilization of the people in order that they may on an organizational basis create the means for communicating to the Congressmen as they return home during the coming recess and thereafter when they return to Congress, the determination of all true Americans to preserve our democratic institutions such as labor unions and to support our Commander-in-Chief in his challenge to the nation for a more vigorous and affirmative prosecution of the war."

This urgent appeal for united labor action undoubtedly will meet with widespread support, despite the evident opposition expressed to this proposal by William Green recently at the Ryan-dominated I.L.A. convention. It must be fought for by all A. F. of L. organizations, all patriotic A. F. of L. leaders. Joint labor legislative and political committees already exist in many localities, such as Cleveland, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Erie, and

Schenectady. Labor in every Congressional district can be expected to seek the establishment of similar committees, as well as to promote joint action between such bodies and the farmers and other win-the-war forces.

There can be no doubt that one of the most important and far-reaching actions of the C.I.O. Board was the decision to *establish a political action committee, headed by Sidney Hillman*. The committee chairman's preliminary report, as well as Mr. Murray's statement to the press, already shows that the C.I.O. will oppose with a positive program of united political action in support of the President all such splitting "labor parties" as that projected by the Dubinskys and Norman Thomases in their alliance with Lewis. The creation of the committee makes it clear that the C.I.O. is planning jointly with the rest of the labor movement to create those instruments for political action that will provide the greatest unity of labor and the whole people behind the war policies of our Commander-in-Chief.

The entire labor movement would do well to study the decisions of the C. I. O. Board meeting. They are a significant contribution to victory. To the extent that they are understood and acted upon, they will play a vital role in beating back defeatist disruption on the home front. At this decisive moment of the war, strengthening the home front for a full two-front war against Hitler in Europe is the supreme obligation of all patriotic Americans.

ON THE DISCUSSION OF WAR AIMS AND POST-WAR PROBLEMS

BY N. MALININ

FOR a long time prominent representatives, politicians, publicists and journalists in Great Britain and the United States have been paying much attention to the question of the so-called "aims of the war." To us this term seems not quite apt. Aims are set up by those who plan or initiate a certain action. Therefore, it is for those to speak of the aims of the present war who deliberately planned, caused and started it—the Axis countries and their inspirer Hitler.

As for the aims of the war started by Hitler, they have been proclaimed over and over again by him, long before his advent to power and throughout the duration of his dictatorship.

It is well nigh impossible to speak of war aims for representatives and citizens of those states on whom war was forced, who did everything to avert it and who were either attacked or menaced with inevitable attack. They did not want war and hence did not set themselves "war aims." These states are fighting because they cannot help but fight if they want to preserve the right to independent existence or restore their lost independence and save

their peoples from the lot of Hitler's slaves.

When people in the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition speak of war aims they have in mind also changes that must be introduced in the organization of the world and international relations to render the world safe from aggressions, save it from a repetition of the present disaster and build a firm foundation for world peace.

The confusion of the two conceptions, namely, war aims and the post-war organization of the world, seems to us not accidental, coming from the lips and pens of those circles who before the war opposed rebuff to the aggressors and who to this day put spokes in the wheels of their governments, trying in every way to disrupt the combined efforts of the anti-Hitler coalition in bringing the war to a victorious conclusion.

It is no accident that the question of war aims engages American isolationists, who persist in thinking that the United States could have remained outside the war, that it was drawn into it by the ill will of President Roosevelt and that a separate peace with some, or even

all, of the Axis countries could still be concluded. Substituting the conception of war aims for post-war problems, they hope to prove that the aims of the war cannot be achieved, and thereby prove that the war itself is senseless and needless.

With such a view in mind, they are representing war aims as the desire to achieve a complete solution of all international economic and political contradictions, to put an end to age-old international disputes, to establish in all countries an identical regime to their liking, in a word, heaven on earth. From here it is but a step to proving the unreality of such a Utopia and consequently the impossibility of achieving the aims of the war and the needlessness of continuing it.

It stands to reason that responsibility for the impossibility of realizing Utopia is placed by the isolationists on the policy of some one or other member of the coalition, as, for example, on Churchill's disinclination to liquidate the British Empire, or on the alleged desire of the U.S.S.R. to "bolshevize" Central Europe. The discussion of "war aims" by the isolationists frequently serves as a pretext for attacks on Great Britain and even more frequently on the U.S.S.R.

In particular, the Soviet Government, among other things, is reproached for failure to reveal its aims, that is, to make public a complete program for the post-war organization of the world. Such accusers fail to report, however, that neither the British nor the American Government has done so, that

such a program must be based on common decisions and that premature discussion of disputable questions may have an unfavorable effect on the unity and the intensiveness of action necessary for the achievement of the principal aim facing the coalition of the freedom-loving peoples—the speediest victory over the common enemy.

I by no means want to imply that only isolationists in the United States are concerned with the problem of post-war organization, wrongly called the "aims of the war," or that this is always done with some malicious purpose. The less active a country is in direct fighting against the enemy, the more energy and time it can spare for this purpose. I am inclined to suggest that even the governments themselves in countries of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition do not keep aloof from this question.

Of course, the greater the number of heavy blows dealt to the armies of the Italo-German coalition, as was the case in the battle of Stalingrad and in North Africa, the greater the confidence of the United Nations in complete victory over the common enemy and the nearness of the day of final triumph, and the more urgent the task of public discussion, if not of all, at least of the principal, problems of post-war organization. The scope of these problems is incredibly great, involving every aspect of life in Europe and other continents.

* * *

What are these post-war problems discussed in the press, in books and theses abroad?

Outstanding among them, of course, is the question of the means by which to prevent another world war, in other words, of rendering harmless those forces that brought on the present bloodiest of wars, with all its horrors, and in the first place those mainly responsible—Hitler and his assistants and the entire Nazi Party. A heated debate has developed around the question whether only Nazis are to be considered responsible for the war, or also the leaders of the German army or even the entire German people, inasmuch as it tolerated Hitler's dictatorship, failed to rebel against it, and obediently took part in its wars of plunder and in the perpetration of barbarous atrocities in the occupied countries.

There is a school of thought which considers that the German people, who brought into being the militarist Junkers system and aggressive Hitlerism, have proved their complete depravity and their incapability for peaceful cohabitation with other peoples and must, therefore, be most severely punished and condemned to punishment for ages to come. The representatives of this school forget, however, that the Hitler clique must not be identified with the German people. This school is headed by one of Britain's outstanding diplomats, in latter years not holding any official post, Lord Vansittart.

There are also less severe judges who propose to deprive the German people of their rights for a certain period of time while they are being re-educated, the re-education to be undertaken by the United Nations,

which are to supervise all public education in Germany.

There is also no lack of quite benevolent judges, who would absolve the culprits and their associates of all responsibility for their crimes and everything would be in order. These views are energetically advocated by German emigrés in Britain and the United States, from the ex-Hitlerite Strasser to the Social-Democrats.

Another project favors the dismemberment of Germany, the separation of Prussia, of the Junkers.

The punishment of Germany involves also problems of all sorts of compensations to the countries subjected to Hitlerite attack, occupation and destruction. Once again the well-known question, which occupied the Versailles Conference, as to reparations being paid in cash or in kind, is discussed. There are many who favor the export of industrial enterprises from Germany to the countries ruined by the Hitlerite occupation.

Apart from the theory advocating Germany's dismemberment, there is the question of the frontiers of future Germany, integral or dismembered, namely: whether she is to be confined to strictly ethnographic borders with the incorporation even of the Sudetenland and Austria, or whether her frontiers are to be determined by Versailles, or whether its territory is further to be ceded mainly to neighboring states. Some plans call for the elimination of the inconveniences created by the Danzig corridor by giving East Prussia to Poland.

It is known that Poland claims

also Eastern Silesia and even all territory to the east of the Oder. Czechoslovakia naturally insists on the restoration of her former borders and the removal of the Germans from Sudetenland, that is, according to the method suggested by Hitler's own practice in occupied territories at present.

Comparatively few debates and projects are concerned with the future fate of Italy. There is a marked leniency with regard to the Italian people and an inclination to absolve it from responsibility for the war into which it was forced by Mussolini. If Italian anti-fascist emigrés are to be excluded, there will hardly be many favoring leaving the African colonies to Italy, but this question partly depends on the colonial problem as a whole.

The question of post-war world organization touches, however, not only the fate of Germany, Italy and the other vassals of Hitler. Wishes are expressed for a maximum radical solution also of the territorial problems disputed among the United Nations themselves. Further, there is great concern over the status of small nations. Granting them the right to self-determination and full sovereignty, it is considered that isolated they might too easily become a toy in the hands of the diplomacy of the Great Powers, which would give rise to greater international friction and pretexts for armed conflicts. There is the theory advocating Great Power guardianship over small nations or uniting small nations into federations and confederations adapted to the needs of certain powers.

These theories involuntarily bring to mind the thought that there are treatments worse than the disease. In Britain, along with an energetic discussion of the economic and financial problems connected with the post-war organization of the world (for example, very popular are the so-called Beveridge and Keynes plans), there are proposals for international supervision over national administration in the British colonies (proposed by the Labor Party), the formation of an international armed force, including military air control, to prevent aggression by any state.

Quite popular among Americans is the theory of the necessity for a radical change in the status of the colonies of the British, as well as the French, Belgians, Dutch, and others. Americans recently also placed on the agenda the problem of international airlines and bases, although it has no direct connection with the war.

No little concern is caused to the leadership of the United Nations by the problems of provisional governments—until the peoples express their will—in the countries occupied by the Hitlerites and administered by them directly or through quislings. The existence of governments-in-exile or so-called National Committees in some cases does not make this problem easier but, on the contrary, complicates it. I have in mind governments and committees into which not only arrant reactionaries but also friends of the Becks and Pétains and even pro-fascist elements have wormed their way, as was recently shown by the

attitude of the Sikorski Government. There are also in emigration pretenders to thrones and old, compromised politicians who also hope to return to power and, it is to be regretted, are encouraged by the favorable attitude toward them of representatives of the State Department in Washington and the London Foreign Office.

We have far from enumerated all the problems debated or developed in connection with post-war organization. The Soviet Union, the most powerful state on the continent, which occupies one-sixth of the

globe, and which in the present war has revealed its tremendous might and unlimited resources, will, it is universally admitted, have one of the decisive voices in deciding post-war organization of the world. The Soviet Union has withstood the brunt of the onslaught of the Hitler hordes and has suffered from them correspondingly more than the other United Nations. The Soviet Union will need lasting peace for the restoration of its ruined economy. Therefore it is especially interested in preventing a new violation of the peace.

CANADA NEEDS A PARTY OF COMMUNISTS

By TIM BUCK

Chairman: National Initiative Committee to Convene a Communist
Constituent Convention

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The statement which follows was made by Mr. Tim Buck, the outstanding leader of the Communist and left-wing progressive forces in this country, to a gathering of leading Communists from across the Dominion, held in Toronto on June 13, 1943. It is a major statement on policy, containing as it does proposals for the launching of a new political party of Communists in Canada. In view of its vital importance for the strengthening of our national unity in the titanic battles against the fascist Axis, we are publishing the statement in both English and French in over two hundred thousand copies. We are confident that it will arouse widespread interest and approval on the part of democratic Canadians.

On opening the conference, Mr. Buck explained that he had invited those present on his own initiative and personal responsibility, in order to initiate a discussion of certain proposals. He pointed out that national unity requires that action be taken to solve the problem created by continued use of the false issue of "Communism" as a source of di-

vision and discord. The solemn duty of making the fullest possible contribution to the supreme task of mobilizing our democracy for the coming invasion of Europe renders it imperative, Mr. Buck observed, that Canadian Communists take steps to organize themselves publicly in their own political party.

Lieut. William Kardash, M.L.A., of Winnipeg, was thereupon elected chairman of the conference, and Mr. T. C. Sims of Toronto, secretary. Following Mr. Buck's statement, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved: That this gathering constitute itself a National Initiative Committee to Convene a Communist Constituent Convention."

Members of the Initiative Committee are: Tim Buck, Stanley Ryerson, T. C. Sims, Aldermen J. B. Salsberg and Stewart Smith, Sam Carr, Leslie Morris, Norman Freed, A. E. Smith, Beckie Buhay, John Weir, W. Kashtan, Beatrice Ferneyhough and Fred Collins of Toronto.

Jean Bourget, Evariste Dube and Fred Rose, Quebec; Oscar Kane, Windsor; Helen Anderson, Hamilton; C. McCaure, Sudbury; H. Proctor, Timmins; A. T. Hill, Fort William;

William Kardash, M.L.A., Manitoba;
 Florence Theodore, Saskatchewan;
 James MacPherson, Alberta.

Delegates from British Columbia and Nova Scotia were unable to attend because of the time factor and the desire not to interrupt vital war work in which they are engaged. However, they are in complete agreement with these proposals.

The conference set up the following sub-committees to assist the preparations for the convention:

Program Committee: Tim Buck (chairman), Morris, Ryerson, Dube, Sims.

Constitution Committee: Alderman Salsberg (chairman), Carr, Bourget, Freed, Weir, Ald. Stewart

Smith.

Finance and Arrangement Committee: Carr (chairman), Ferneyhough, Annie Buller, T. Villeneuve, Kashtan.

Publicity Committee: Morris (chairman), R. S. Gordon and Henri Richard.

Mr. Tim Buck was then elected Chairman of the National Initiative Committee, and Mr. Stanley B. Ryerson, Secretary. The Convention date was set for August 21-22, to be held in the city of Toronto.

STANLEY B. RYERSON, Sec'y,
 National Initiative Committee
 to Convene a Communist Con-
 stituent Convention.

COMRADES: The war for world freedom has entered the stage of combined United Nations' offensive. The havoc wrought upon Germany and Italy by the round-the-clock air offensive is but an indication of the crushing blows that will be rained upon the Axis powers this year. The decisive defeats sustained by the Axis military machine at Stalingrad and in Tunisia marked the final destruction of the myth of Nazi superiority. The Red Army before Stalingrad and the British and American armies in Tunisia out-classed the cream of the Nazi armies in their own chosen type of warfare and, in the streets of Stalingrad and before the German defenses in Tunisia, Red Army men and men of the Allied Expeditionary Forces fought the Nazi troops to a standstill, forcing them into unconditional surrender. The United Nations' alliance is now firmly established on solid foundations and

Winston Churchill was completely justified when he declared to the members of the British House of Commons on Tuesday, June 8: "*The mellow light of victory is beginning to shine upon the Allies.*"

We are approaching the climax of the war. We stand on the eve of the invasion of Nazi-held Europe, an operation in which the Canadian Army Overseas will play a proud and responsible part. There must be no doubt concerning the outcome of that invasion. There must be such firm unity of all the democratic people at home, and between them and the troops at the fighting fronts, as to ensure decisive victory for our arms. Every ounce of strength and enthusiasm in Canada must be harnessed to the task of imposing upon the fascist regimes in Europe the terms enunciated by Roosevelt and Churchill at Casablanca: "*Unconditional Surrender.*"

It must be emphasized that the war is not yet won. Unless Europe is invaded very soon, Hitler will be able to concentrate all his forces on the Eastern front for a third desperate attempt to cripple or seriously weaken the offensive power of the Red Army before a second front is established.

Gigantic battles are ahead. When the soldiers of the United Nations invade Europe they will have to destroy one of the most powerful armies ever organized, fighting desperately to maintain the evil power of Fascist tyranny. This destruction will be achieved. The invasion by millions of British, American, Canadian, French, Polish and other Allied troops, in the south and west of Europe, combined with the offensive of the Red Army from the east, will break the Nazi lines, defeat their armies and crush their military power. This, as Eduard Benes, President of the Czechoslovak Government-in-exile, declared in Ottawa on Thursday, June 3rd, "*can be accomplished before the end of the coming winter,*" if an all-out effort is launched this summer. The democratic people of the United Nations are called upon to make their supreme effort to achieve victory now.

Canada in the Coming Invasion

Canada, the fourth largest contributor to the mighty combined military, air, naval and economic strength of the United Nations, is called upon to gather her forces for an all-surpassing effort. When our sons and brothers cross the Channel and the Mediterranean they must

be assured of an unlimited supply of the finest arms, equipment, ammunition, transport and other tools of war that modern machines and human skill can produce. They must be assured of adequate reinforcements and the unequivocal support of a united people here at home.

How Canadians overseas look forward to the coming invasion may be gathered from the following letter received by Comrade Leslie Morris, editor of the *Tribune*, on Friday, June 11:

"Dear Leslie:

"Do you know anyone who is against our invading Europe? You do? I wish he had been with us the other day when all ranks from my unit helped in the rescue work after a vicious Hun sneak raid. Security does not permit me to name the locality, to mention the number of planes involved or to give any details as to the extent of damage and loss of life. But I can say that bombs were dropped in widely scattered areas of a British city and that it was working people, small shopkeepers, women and children who were the victims. Five little shops in a row had disappeared, along with the flats above them, at the spot where I was. A butcher's shop was demolished and we dug out the butcher, stone dead. His poor wife died the same day in hospital from shock. Many workingclass homes in the vicinity were completely or partly wrecked. We don't know just how many people died there because we dug out some in odd bits. Grim and horrible? Yes, Fascism is a grim and horrible beast that must be destroyed by the invasion of Europe! I would much rather die here in Europe, if necessary, in the ranks of the victors, than slink home and

have my wife and children visited by the craven Luftwaffe. McNaughton's men are ready! We want 100 per cent support from you folks at home.

"Yours,
"JACK."

To ensure that hundred per cent support, to make our full contribution to victory, we Canadians must mobilize every ounce of our united strength. We must do all in our power to strengthen national unity. The forces of labor and of the whole people must assist the Government in clearing the decks for decisive action.

*Strengthen the War Effort
By Lifting the Ban on Communism*

Canadian Communists want to make the fullest possible contribution to prepare our country's strength for the coming invasion. We have worked consistently to support the Government's war effort and we shall continue to do so. We have worked consistently to strengthen national unity and to help overcome all elements of discord which tend to weaken the unity and singleness of purpose of the nation and we shall continue to do so.

It is with the object of eliminating one of the most serious seeds of discord that we have emphasized the need of lifting the ban from the Communist Party.

The demand for lifting the ban from the Communist Party of Canada has become nation-wide. It has been endorsed by all the major democratic organizations. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, in provincial and national conventions,

has repeatedly urged that the ban be lifted. C.C.F. members in the House of Commons have pressed the government to implement the recommendations of the Special Parliamentary committee. The Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, the Canadian Congress of Labor, the United Automobile Workers Union, dozens of central trade union bodies, and hundreds of local unions, the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, the leading body of the United Church of Canada and other Church bodies, have urged the lifting of the ban. City Councils, thousands of public men and other prominent citizens, two provincial premiers and the special inter-party Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons, set up to study the Canadian Defense Regulations in 1942, have urged that it be lifted. The demand for the lifting of the ban from the Communist Party has become a national demand, expressing the widespread conviction that the maintenance of that ban is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter and violates the freedoms for which we are fighting in this war.

Who are the interests and the individuals who have opposed the lifting of the ban? They are distinguished in every case by the fact that their attitude is one of either outright opposition to or extremely lukewarm support of the struggle for national unity and a total effort to win the war.

They are typified by the *Toronto Evening Telegram*, the most glaring example of demoralizing quislingism in Canadian journalism; the

Financial Post with its bourbon-like opposition to social progress and its slogan: "We must continue to stamp out Communism here"; the mis-named "League for the Defense of Canada" and its defeatist organ, *Le Devoir*; the sinister secret organization of "The Knights of Jacques Cartier," which has been exposed in the public press as a subversive fascist organization; and Professor Watson Kirkconnell, whose anti-Communist animus finds expression not only in falsification of statements of Premier Stalin on questions of world affairs, but in outright aid to pro-Nazi organizations operating in Canada.

Such is the character of the interests which oppose lifting the ban. It is clear, however, that they alone would not have been able to thwart the expressed will of the great majority of Canadians, had they not had a champion of their undemocratic policy right in the Cabinet, in the person of the Minister of Justice the Honorable Louis St. Laurent.

Mr. St. Laurent's policy of depriving Communists of their democratic rights is a matter of concern to all Canadians. It can no longer be excused today by casuistic arguments anent the Comintern; and it weakens the nation's war effort by encouraging the most vicious opponents of total war. His policy inflicts a stigma upon Canada in the eyes of democrats the world over. The British Government has lifted the ban from the Communist Party of India. The Australian Government has lifted the ban from the Communist Party of Australia. The British Government has lifted the ban

from the official organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the *Daily Worker*. Indeed, one must look to Axis countries or countries dominated by the Axis to find the sort of governmental attitude towards men and women who hold Communist convictions, that is expressed by Mr. St. Laurent and enforced against them even now after dissolution of the Communist International has eliminated the last excuse for maintaining the ban.

Mr. St. Laurent's policy is one of attempting to suppress Communist philosophy. It is essentially akin to the Japanese law against "dangerous thoughts." In seeking to outlaw the Communist viewpoint and philosophy the Minister of Justice violates not only the rights of those who hold Communist convictions, but equally those of people whose experience may lead them to such a viewpoint—and who are forbidden by Mr. St. Laurent to adopt it! This fantastic ukase of the Minister of Justice is utterly repugnant to the overwhelming majority of democratic Canadians.

It is clear that Mr. St. Laurent's policy is by no means calculated to further the achievement of the broadest unity and the highest morale for the winning of the war. His attitude and policy are, in a large measure, a negation of the democratic aims of the present war. They emphasize the fact that ours is one of the very few countries of the United Nations in which Hitler's "secret weapon," *the false issue of Communism*, is still being used effectively to confuse and divide the people. Enemies of national unity

and of an all-out war effort are still being aided in Canada by the demagogic raising of the false issue of Communism. Continuation of the ban on Communism now when it cannot even be pretended that it is a ban against an organization, is open surrender to reactionary obscurantism. The King Government must repudiate the attitude of the Honorable Louis St. Laurent. The ban must be removed.

Hitler's Lie Is Exposed

Humanity has paid a terrible price in blood and treasure, shattered hopes and human misery, because Hitler was temporarily successful in winning the sympathy of powerful interests in the democratic countries and in duping governments with his fable of the "Spectre of Communism."

By utilizing the narrow prejudices and selfish ambitions of undemocratic interests and individuals in Europe, Hitler prepared the ground for his assaults against Austria, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, France and the Balkans, to such effect that he defeated these countries very easily. It cannot be denied that he received valuable support from similar elements in Britain, support which aided him in his conquests in Europe and which, but for the unflinching national will and the dogged stamina of the British people, might have enabled him to conquer Britain also. His so-called "anti-Comintern" pact which united Germany, Italy and Japan and their fascist allies and satellites in the evil alliance which he hoped would

impose fascist slavery upon the world, came within an inch of securing sufficient supporters throughout the world to place victory within his grasp.

The first real defeat for Hitler's "secret weapon" was when the Churchill Government rejected the proposal which Hess brought to England. Winston Churchill and his Government knew that Chamberlain had been fatally wrong at Munich when he gave Hitler a free hand to master the European continent. They knew that should Hitler succeed in defeating the Soviet Union, Britain would be next. The Churchill Government rejected Hitler's proposal and entered into a fighting alliance with the Soviet Union for war to the end against Hitlerite Germany and her vassals.

The character of the war changed. British policy swung a full circle away from the shame and tragedy of Munich to the twenty-years' treaty with the Soviet Union.

Today Hitler's "secret weapon" is being destroyed. When the Executive Committee of the Comintern made its historic proposal to dissolve the International it struck from Hitler's hands one of his most potent weapons for confusing the peoples of the lands he has conquered and for fomenting discord within the United Nations. It dealt a death blow to Hitler's Anti-Comintern Pact. The dissolution of the Comintern is already having a profound influence upon all political relationships. Although the Communist Party of Canada had discontinued its affiliation with the Communist International as far back as

1940, we Communists welcomed the proposal of the International Executive.

As Premier Stalin pointed out in his recent letter to a British journalist, the dissolution of the Communist International "exposes the lie of the Hitlerites to the effect that 'Moscow' allegedly intends to intervene in the life of other nations and to 'Bolshevize' them. An end is now being put to this lie." The masses of the people are learning by their own experience that the Communists are among the most devoted defenders of democracy; and the Soviet Union stands forward in the very front ranks of the United Nations in the war to destroy Hitlerism and all its works.

As Stalin pointed out: "It facilitates the work of patriots in freedom-loving countries for uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries, regardless of party or religious faith, into a single camp of national liberation—for the unfolding struggle against fascism."

This decision helps to guarantee that, in the post-war world, there will be a continuation of Allied unity in establishing a just and democratic peace. The determination to remove everything that might be used as an obstacle to complete United Nations' unity helps to open the way for the development of more effective forms of international unity of the labor movement. It will facilitate the development of co-operation and united action between the Communists and other progressive forces now, and continuance of such united action after the war. It facilitates development of active co-

operation between the trade union movements of Canada, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. Such friendly cooperation will be no less necessary if labor is to play its full role in rebuilding the world after the war has been won.

The dissolution of the Communist International strengthens the prospect for election of anti-fascist governments, representing all sections of the democratic people in the liberated countries. It clears the way for international co-operation in the spirit of the new and fruitful epoch of democratic progress that victory will make possible.

The leaders of the United Nations have expressed their agreement with the dissolution of the Comintern because it strengthens the fight against Hitler by striking from his hands the weapon of "anti-Communism."

I declare that it is the plain duty of the Canadian government to do likewise, and to march in complete step with our Allies on this vital question of the war. That is one of the main reasons why I thought it necessary to call this meeting, because the need to destroy the false issue of "Communism" faces us Communists as it does the government and all freedom-loving Canadians.

Communists and the Changed Character of the War

The assault of the Japanese at Pearl Harbour, no less than the attack against the Soviet Union, showed in terribly vivid fashion that the unity for concerted action which had been fought for so zealously by the supporters of the principle of

collective security before the war, and lost because of imperialist "appeasement," had to be welded now in the flames of war by the United Nations as the price of their survival.

Today no honest man will defend the imperialist "appeasement" policies of Chamberlain, which helped to make Hitler master of Europe. All democratic Canadians applauded Premier King's repudiation of Munich, as Britishers applauded the similar repudiation by the Churchill Government. President Benes of Czechoslovakia again last week in Ottawa, in a courageous speech which is now on the record of our Houses of Parliament, repeated that it was his opinion at the time of Munich that Hitler's demands should have been rejected and his aggression stopped by collective action. That was the policy we Communists advocated also. But in 1938 and 1939, when not only Communists but great masses of people in the threatened nations fought for concerted action by Britain, France, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union to smash Hitler in his tracks, Chamberlain called us "*victims of midsummer madness.*"

It was our opposition to the continuing "appeasement" policies in the first stage of the war which led to the Communist Party being banned. You will remember the storm of abuse that descended upon our heads when we demanded an end to the suicidal policies which threatened to send Canadian, British and French troops into action on the side of the fascist butcher Mannerheim, the German puppet in Finland! We know now that not

only the Communists, but many, many other influential figures vigorously opposed those anti-Soviet policies.

Today Canadians are beginning to understand that the Soviet Government concluded the Non-Aggression Treaty with Germany to gain time in a situation wherein the "appeasing" forces in Britain, France, Canada and the United States were still strong enough to prevent unity of the democracies with the Soviet Union; and where these "appeasing" forces banked upon getting Germany to drive with all her forces eastward against the Soviet Union with the tacit support of the anti-Soviet forces in the West.

Canadians are beginning to understand, also, the historical and political correctness of the measures that the Soviet Government took against the fascist clique in Finland, to remove menacing invasion fortifications and bases, and of the steps it took to save the peoples of Western Ukraine, Western White Russia and the Baltic States from Hitler enslavement.

History has proven that we Canadian Communists were much closer to reality on these questions than were the editors of the *Toronto Telegram* and *Financial Post*; and that we were far more correct in our fight for the real interests of the Canadian people than were many high-placed personages whose names I forbear to mention here in the interests of national unity.

We Communists, in greater degree than any other body of Canadian citizens, warned Canada from the time of the signing of the anti-Com-

intern Pact that it was a diabolical smokescreen to mask the German-Italian-Japanese fascist plans to conquer, stage by stage—Austria, Spain, Ethiopia, Poland, France, Britain, the U.S.S.R., the United States and the whole world. We fought, through our press and public influence, to unite the labor movement and achieve a Canadian People's Front against the fascist world menace, in unity with the democracies of the world. More than a thousand of our bravest comrades overcame all obstacles in the years 1936-7-8 and made their way to Spain to fight the German, Italian and Franco fascists, to help defend the democratic republic which had been established by the people of Spain. The graves of our beloved Canadian fighters, now desecrated by Franco's fiends, are immortal testimony to our consistent fight against Fascism.

We Communists were not the only people in this country who saw the error of the "appeasement" stage of the war. There is testimony of this in numerous recorded statements of public men. Premier King himself implied very clearly that in the first stage of the war great sections of our people were not wholeheartedly for the war when he said, on April 7, 1942:

"Before and after commencement of the war, the people of Canada, like the peoples of most other countries, continued to think of the present war in terms of the last war. . . . They thought of it as just another European War."

The Prime Minister returned to this when he addressed the House

of Commons on the proposal to amend the National Resources Mobilization Act on June 10, 1942, when he said.

"I do not propose to go, at this time, into the reasons which have since occasioned a change of attitude on the part of some. I readily admit that it may have been due in part to the changed character and world-wide scope of the war. Indeed, one of the purposes of the plebiscite, as I have so frequently said, was to make the way clear for a consideration on its merits, of the question of conscription in the light of the changed conditions."

Even Mr. St. Laurent, in an address to the Men's Canadian Club at Bowmanville on May 4, has admitted a change in this respect:

"We thought of it as one of those European clashes which, of course, would affect our way of life for a time to a certain extent, but that it was someone else's war. It was only after the fall of France, the heroic retreat from Dunkirk and the ferocious bombardment of Britain that we fully realized what we were up against. We realized that for Germany to win this war would mean the destruction of the free spirit of men."

From the instant that Premier King signaled the historic change in world relationships, by announcing to the nation on June 22 that his government stood solid with the Churchill Government and the Soviet Government for war to the end against Hitlerism, we Communists have subordinated everything, including full exercise of our own democratic rights, to the task of

helping to achieve total national unity for all-out war against the fascist Axis.

Hundreds and hundreds of our young, aye, and many of our older comrades have taken their places in the armed services of our country, proud and privileged to fight under the leadership of our government, and our commanders McNaughton, Nelles and Edwards, in our just war to save Canada from fascist slavery.

The Key to Victory

The world has moved a long way from the dark days when reactionary interests could confuse and divide the democratic people by propaganda to the effect that the Soviet Union sought to "impose its rule" upon the world through the Communist International. It has equally gone a long way from the conditions in which the isolationists in the United States could denounce participation in world affairs on the ground that such participation was calculated only to help Britain, while British reactionaries were accusing the United States of attempting to take over the entire British Empire. It is realized today by all democratic people that the vital need is for united action and joint responsibility of all democratic countries in the world battle against the danger of fascist domination.

Unity is established—and is developing on firm foundations. There is a twenty-year pact of friendship and cooperation between Britain and the Soviet Union, with which Canada is proud to be associated,

and a mutual aid agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States. The exchange of greetings between Britain and the Soviet Union on the anniversary of the signing of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty emphasized the fact that both British and Soviet governments look forward to sustained collaboration in the establishment of a just peace. The British government has formally repudiated the Munich agreement and Premier King has associated Canada with that repudiation. The recent announcement of the national character of the great "tribute to the U.S.S.R." celebrations to be held in Canada on June 22, and the organization of a nation-wide movement for Canadian-Soviet friendship, are conclusive evidence of the fact that Canada is moving closer toward firmly established friendship and cooperation with the U.S.S.R. Despite all difficulties there is growing unity in the ranks of the United Nations.

Firm unity of the United Nations, based upon the united support of all democratic people, a unity embracing all classes and creeds in each country, is the guarantee of victory in the war. Continuing United Nations' unity in the post-war period, particularly unity of the nations of the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, the United States and China, in carrying through the program indicated in the Atlantic Charter, will make it possible for the peoples of all countries to achieve far-reaching democratic progress by orderly means.

Thus, unity of democratic forces in the struggle to defeat and destroy

Hitlerite fascism, the worst enemy of mankind, is also the condition which will insure that victory will open the road toward progressive democratic rebuilding of the world.

Communists throughout the United Nations are doing everything in their power to strengthen understanding of the need for such unity. The dissolution of the Communist International signaled the fact that such unity is now firmly based and it opens the way for still further extension and development.

We Fight for Canadian Democracy

We Canadian Communists want to make the most useful contribution that we can to the steady strengthening of unity at home and abroad for the defeat of Hitler and establishment of a just and lasting peace.

Our first loyalty has been, is, and will always be, to the true national interests of our country—Canada. We are a product of Canadian democracy. The national interests of Canada, which include her fraternal collaboration with all other democratic peoples, are the decisive factors in all our considerations and all our proposals. Clear and conclusive proof of this is to be seen in the record of our struggles on behalf of and together with the working people and farmers of Canada, during the past twenty-two years.

Ever since the Communist Party grew out of the Socialist Party of Canada and other left-wing groups in 1920 and 1921, our programs and policies have grown out of and have expressed the problems, needs

and aspirations of the Canadian people.

We Communists were in the forefront of the struggle to prevent nation-wide wage cuts after the last world war. We worked hard and consistently in the rebuilding of the trade unions after the shattering experiences of the early post-war years and the crisis of 1921. In our fight against secession in the trade union movement we built up a widespread understanding of the need for establishing industrial unionism by constructive methods, and of the responsibility of progressive workers in the building of the trade union movement. We worked devotedly in the effort to develop independent labor political action through the Canadian Labor Party. We warned Canadians of the coming economic crash in 1929, and we initiated, organized and led the mass movements in 1930 and 1931 which eventually compelled the Dominion Government to accept a share of responsibility for the relief of unemployment. The workers of Canada have not forgotten that it was in an effort to stop our activities at that time that the Tory governments at Toronto and Ottawa cooperated to imprison our leadership and outlaw our party.

During that period Communists were participating energetically in the struggles of the farmers against foreclosures and evictions, for adequate supplies of seed and feed, for fair prices, for security of tenure and a base line of cash income below which they could not be subjected to legal measures for forced payments.

It was we Communists who initiated the national demand for development of great public works by the governments to employ hundreds of thousands of workers during the great depression. In the brief that we submitted to the Rowell-Sirois Commission we put forward a comprehensive plan for organized full employment and social security for Canada, the validity of which has never been challenged. The brief that we submitted to the national inquiry into wages and labor relations makes a complete case for the claim of the labor movement that there is need today for a new deal in this respect. How necessary our brief was for the labor movement is illustrated by the fact that ours was the only brief submitted which provided complete refutation of the argument in favor of lower wages in the post-war period put forward on behalf of employer interests.

We Communists have fought consistently for democratic unity of French and English-speaking Canada. We have upheld the right of the French-Canadian people to full national equality in all spheres of economic, social and political life, and first and foremost in labor's struggle on behalf of wage-equality for Quebec. We were able to make a notable contribution to the defense of Canadian democracy by our systematic exposure of the treasonable activities of the Nazi-fascist network operating in Quebec, by our struggle against the Duplessis Padlock Law, and our consistent support of the growing democratic trends in French Canadian life.

Throughout that period we were advocating an international policy by which Canada could have become a vital force for the prevention of war. We fought for a world policy of collective security because, as we pointed out at that time, the real interests of Canadians demanded a struggle to maintain peace by stopping aggression. We pointed to the menace of fascism and urged democratic action to defeat it. The more than a thousand Communists who fought in Spain were fighting for that ideal. Our fight for national unity today is a fight to make Canada strong for the defense of our national survival.

Our Aim Is Socialism

We are convinced by our study of history, political economy, the height of development of industrial technique and economic concentration in Canada, and the brilliant success of socialist economy in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that the way to happiness for Canadians, with plenty for all, a rising level of life and culture and opportunities for the fruitful use of leisure, lies in the social ownership of the nation's productive wealth—in socialism. But in the interests of national unity to win the war, we do not put forward our proposals for socialism at this time.

We deny and repudiate the falsehood which is sedulously spread by organs such as the *Toronto Telegram*, the *Financial Post*, etc., and individuals such as the Minister of Justice that we are a party of violence. Communists do not advocate

violence. We are not a conspiracy, we are an integral and constructive part of Canadian democracy. We subordinate ourselves entirely to the democratic will of the majority. We Communists strive to win support for the policies we advocate by exactly the same means as, and by no other means than, the other political parties in Canada. Everything we do and everything we advocate is strictly in accord with the laws of Canada. We strive to convince the people that our policies are those that will bring the greatest advantage to Canada, but we have not aimed and will not at any time try to impose our policies upon the people. We are confident that eventually, the majority of our fellow Canadians will understand and support the policies we advocate; and we work in every sphere of democratic activity, upon that assumption.

New Tasks for Canadian Communists

What are the tasks confronting us today? They may be described as follows:

First and above all we must continue to give consistent support to the government in its efforts to organize the country for total war and the invasion of Europe. We must utilize the opportunity now open to us of broadening and strengthening our contribution to the war effort. We must work more efficiently than ever to influence the direction of national policies in Canada. The proud part that Canada is playing in waging the war must be reflected in a more definite accep-

tance of the full responsibilities of a member of the United Nations' Alliance. As Mackenzie King has pointed out, Canada emerged as a nation through the First World War and through this war she has emerged as a power. To improve and increase our contribution to the national war effort means to help increase enlistments, help eliminate persisting weaknesses, help solve the manpower muddle, help solve the problems of production, which are now complicated by the lay-offs from war industries and, above all, to work harder than ever for national unity, to overcome the corroding divisions in our national life, particularly the deep and persisting divisions growing out of the systematic discrimination against French Canada.

We are called upon to work harder than ever to build the trade unions and to help bring about a big change in the war labor policy of the Dominion Government.

As a part of the labor movement it is our great responsibility to throw our full weight into the national struggle to solve the present, menacing crisis of labor-employer relations. We hope that the recommendations of the National War Labor Board, arising out of its public inquiry, will help to solve this serious situation. To achieve the last ounce out of our great industrial potentials it is vitally necessary that action be taken to guarantee legally the workers' right of collective bargaining and trade union organization. The sub-standard wages of great sections of our workers must be lifted. The cost of living bonus

payments must be made upon an equitable basis. Canada needs a unified, democratic Labor Code and government policies which treat labor as a partner in this war for Canadian survival and world freedom.

While fighting to achieve these overdue changes in the government's labor and production policies, it is now, more than ever, our responsibility to fight for a policy of no strikes.

This is labor's war! Now is the time for Canadian labor to show its mettle and unity and consciousness. By united action labor can and must contribute decisively in solving the present grave industrial situation. Strikes in the present situation hurt labor. To strike today is to strike against all the things that labor is fighting for. Those who suggest that a policy of small strikes is what is needed in order to compel the government to adopt a total war policy are wrong. Those who talk about the need for action leading to general strikes are even more wrong. A policy of strike action in the present situation facilitates the schemes of reactionaries who want to provoke strikes in order to smash the labor movement, divide the nation and weaken the government.

On the above, and all questions of national policy, such as agricultural policy, trade policy, fiscal policy, Dominion-Provincial relationships, measures for social security and the post-war organization of Canada's economic life, we are called upon to put forward the Communist point of view and to work systematically and tirelessly to win support for

that point of view at the polling booth in elections, in every province and in every sphere of our national life.

To fulfill those tasks fully, we must place ever greater emphasis upon the need for labor unity, particularly united action between Communists and the C.C.F. In all spheres of labor political action we shall seek out possibilities for cooperation with the C.C.F. Communists in the trade union movement should work devotedly for the unification of the trade union movement into one all-inclusive national center.

Secondly: we must measure up to the task of strengthening our contribution to United Nations' unity. This involves more than pledges of support to the United Nations, it means more than pledges to support the Atlantic Charter. It means systematic work to help spread the understanding of Canada's place in the history-making struggle that the United Nations are waging. It means patient but tireless work to spread understanding of the fact that victory over the Axis and the prospects of the peace depend entirely upon the wartime collaboration and peaceful post-war co-existence of the great capitalist democracies and the world's first socialist state, the U.S.S.R.

Canada's position as next door neighbor to both the United States and the Soviet Union presents us with opportunities and responsibilities which are unique. Canada should negotiate a twenty-year treaty of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet similar to the

Anglo-Soviet treaty. The safety of Canada, her increasingly important role in world affairs, and her interest in post-war world trade, all demand such a relationship. Canada's foreign policy now and in the post-war period must correspond to the new and higher place that Canada has earned in the comity of nations.

Thirdly: our domestic policies now, to win the war, and in the post-war period, should be brought unequivocally into accord with the letter and spirit of the Four Freedoms enunciated by Premier Churchill and President Roosevelt in one of the historic programmatic declarations of this war.

We have fought for social security measures for twenty-two years. We welcome the Marsh Report as a sign of progress. We will support legislation to implement the proposals in the report regardless of which government introduces it.

It must be emphasized, however, that social security and health insurance measures, necessary as they are, will not and cannot by themselves meet Canada's post-war needs. What Canada will need to maintain national well-being through the post-war transition period, will be measures to maintain the purchasing power of her people. This need will be a national one. Almost every section of the population will depend upon it—workers, farmers, business and professional people. The decisive difference between prosperity and depression will be expressed in public purchasing power.

Government policy must insure that every fit man demobilized from

the armed forces shall have an opportunity to work, at wages at least equal to those now being paid. To hearten the armed forces, the government should announce at this time a policy of adequate pensions for those who are handicapped or unable to work, adequate allowances for the dependents of those who have fallen, and discharge gratuities.

Such, in general, are the tasks which confront us. We must grapple with them as an integral part of our over-riding task—to help win the war.

For a New Party of Communists

To make our full contribution to the war effort, to make our influence felt in furthering the national policies indicated above, the supporters of Communist policies in Canada must be united in their own political party. The number of Communists in Canada and the contribution that we can make to our national life, alike demand our unification in a public Dominion-wide organization. Dissolution of the Comintern has removed the last obstacle to the establishment of such a party. It has removed every vestige of excuse for anybody to render judgment upon Canadian Communists on any basis other than that of their declared aims and purposes and actions. The Minister of Justice, the Hon. Louis St. Laurent, acknowledged that fact in the House of Commons on May 24, 1943, when, in answer to a question from a C.C.F. member as to whether, in view of the dissolution of the Com-

intern, he would recommend that the ban be removed from the Communist Party, he said:

"It struck me when I read the declaration that it perhaps made it unnecessary now to give any further consideration to section 39 (c) of the defense of Canada regulations, which was passed at a time when the Communist Party of Canada formed part of the Communist International. If that organization has now been dissolved and the group in Canada which formed part of it follows the recommendations which the newspapers have reported as having been made by the Comintern, there would no longer be any useful purpose in referring to the matter. It would be an organization that had disappeared, and it would be of no interest to anyone whether or not it remained banned. If any other party or group should be made up of men who formerly belonged to this organization, it would depend upon the attitude they adopted as to whether or not any further action should be taken with respect to them."

I have no desire to enter into controversy concerning the real effect of the dissolution of the Comintern upon the Canadian Defense Regulations. The fact is that the Communist International has been dissolved. The Communists in Canada, as in other countries, now stand without any international affiliations whatsoever, and our aims and proposals are those which have grown out of the needs and aspirations of the Canadian people. We are flesh, bone and sinew of the people of Canada. It is for our common interests that we fight. It is to the na-

tional interest that the Communists should play their full role in the democratic shaping of our country's life.

We are not called upon, either by history, the laws of Canada, or the interests of our fellow Canadians, to renounce our Communist convictions or the proud historic name to which those convictions give us the right. Canadian Communists have fought for those convictions. On the public platform, in city councils, in the trade unions and the factories, in the movements of the unemployed, on the field of battle in defense of democracy in Spain, in the plebiscite campaign, the battle for production, Communists have defended the convictions they hold dear.

We are Communists. We have a part to play in the winning of the war and the building of Canada. We can play that part fully only if we are free to put forth and fight publicly for our proposals and policies on every question of national concern. If we permit continuance of the illegality enforced by the government's ban on Communism, this would only strengthen the "sinister spectre of Communism," which stands in the way of victory. We can exorcize that spectre most effectively by uniting ourselves in a new party of our own, and fighting under our own political banner in the open light of day, in systematic parliamentary, educational and organizational activity in every corner of Canada. The program and constitution of such a new party must be determined by delegates assembled in regular constituent

convention. My direct proposal, today, is that this conference should constitute itself a provisional national committee to initiate the work of drawing together the supporters of Communist policies, to prepare a draft program and constitution for their consideration, and to organize a constituent convention to establish such a party of Communists.

I call upon all supporters of Communist policies in Canada to rally their forces.

Accept the opportunity presented by this new situation.

Organize yourselves into public groups. Raise the banner of democratic action to new and ever higher levels. Step forth in the arena of public affairs in Canada as a public political force and meet the new responsibilities with which the war and history are confronting progressive people.

Unite your forces in one powerful Dominion-wide party through which Canadian Communists shall play their full and rightful democratic role in shaping the destiny of this, our rich and lovely land.

JUNE 22 IN THE UNITED STATES

BY A. LANDY

THE second anniversary of Hitler's treacherous invasion of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, was observed in the United States and the entire anti-Hitler coalition, as well as by the peoples of the occupied countries. After two years, during which the Red Army carried the brunt of the war against Hitler and, fighting practically alone, held back the tide of fascist conquest, the whole world has come to understand the epochal significance of June 22 and to regard that day, not only as an anniversary of our great Soviet ally, but as the turning point in the fate of the civilized world which future generations will observe as a common red letter day of independence of all peoples and nations. This day, which fascist infamy intended as the beginning of its greatest triumph, will forever represent the difference between slavery and freedom, between victory and defeat. And if today final victory is definitely in sight and the fight can be waged with full confidence as to its outcome, it is because the Red Army created the basis for it in the fires of battle, irrevocably changing the military relation of forces in favor of the anti-Hitler coalition.

After two years of war, deep-going and significant changes have taken place in the attitude and sentiments of the American people toward the Soviet Union. The natural sympathy for the U.S.S.R. which had always existed in the hearts of the masses had found it difficult to become articulate and to ripen into full understanding in the atmosphere of prejudice, ignorance and unreasoning fear of Communism with which the truth about the Soviet Union was being obscured especially since the autumn of 1938. Two years of war, however, have cleared away much of the fog. Out of its terrible fires the real Soviet Union, in the heroic stature of living flesh and blood, has emerged to take the place of the dark and distorted and tragically unreal picture of that great country which had been built up in the American mind, a picture which in the past decade had been deliberately cultivated by Hitlerite Germany as its chief instrument of foreign policy and preparation for world conquest.

Once the picture of the real Soviet Union emerged, the American people not only got a more accurate view of our great ally, but quickly grasped the far-reaching signifi-

cance of such an ally for the welfare and future of the United States itself. And all the efforts of the foes of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition to exploit possible differences in policy arising in connection with the Polish, Finnish, and Baltic questions, for example, or to utilize fascist-inspired plots, or the execution of the traitors Ehrlich and Alter in order to smear the Soviet Union and upset the government's program for victory, have been unable to shake this attitude toward our Soviet ally. The American people have come to understand more clearly the central significance of American-Soviet relations for all questions of domestic and foreign policy for the whole next epoch.

A Sober Estimate

That this estimate is not mere wishful thinking but an indication of the actual development, the magnitude of which was capable of quantitative measurement, was shown very graphically in the *Fortune* poll published on May 31, 1943, in which 80 per cent of the American people indicated their desire for an American-Soviet alliance during and after the war. The point is that this poll, which registered a sweeping change in the course of a single year, was not just a vote for cooperation with the Soviet Union under pressure of war. It was a vote expressing deliberate and conscious conviction of the need of full collaboration with the Soviet Union after the war as well. For the poll was taken separately on two ques-

tions: first, "Do you think we should or should not try to work with Russia as an equal partner in fighting the war," and secondly, "as an equal partner in the peace." The American people, of course, know that Great Britain is not only partners with the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler, but also has a twenty-year pact of alliance with the U.S.S.R. They know that there has been steady progress in official American-Soviet relations, but that our official cooperation with the Soviet Union so far has been confined only to Lend-Lease agreements. Their vote, therefore, shows that they want and are ready to support a more enduring and far-reaching alliance with the Soviet Union for the war and the peace which will bring our two countries together as equal partners in the historic and difficult tasks of victory in battle and of peaceful reconstruction to follow.

That this is more than an expression of emotional enthusiasm and admiration for the heroic struggle of the Soviet people, but actually reflects a growing understanding of the driving forces behind this struggle, the institutions, leadership and policies of the Soviet Union, the foundations of its military and industrial might and especially the great moral, political and patriotic unity of the Soviet people, is shown by the many statements of representative Americans from the ranks of labor, Congress, religion and art on the occasion of the anniversary of June 22. Senator James E. Murray,

for example, answered the question, "Why has the Red Army been fighting so well?" by saying that "the Red Army knows what it is fighting for. . . . The Red Army has something to fight for—the better life which the Soviet Government had managed to usher in between the years of 1929 and 1941, when the invaders came. . . . It is fighting with marked heroism and success because the leaders of the Russian people had the foresight and the courage to prepare for what seemed inevitable to all but the blind—the second world war. While the democracies were permitting themselves to be lulled to sleep by Nazi and fascist propaganda and wishful thinking, the Russian government kept pleading for collective security and at the same time preparing to meet with modern weapons the would-be enslavers of the world. They are fighting for a just cause; they are fighting as an enlightened and progressive people with modern technique; they know that they have the wholehearted backing and support of our great democracy. They know that there can be one and only one outcome—complete victory for the United Nations and lasting peace for all mankind. That is why they are fighting with unprecedented heroism, and that is why they have already earned the everlasting gratitude of all civilized peoples." (*New Masses*, June 22, 1943.)

The statement of Senator Elbert Thomas on Soviet leadership is equally indicative of the real processes of thought of democratic

America which recognizes the common ties between the two countries, based as they are on different social systems, the revolutionary origin of both, the democratic character of both, and their common historical and cultural interests.

Tributes to the U.S.S.R.

This underlying attitude toward the Soviet Union found concrete expression on the occasion of the second anniversary of Hitler's invasion of that country. Thus, the governors of most of the forty-eight states proclaimed June 22 a day of tribute to the Soviet Union; mass meetings under the auspices of Russian War Relief, which had raised \$9,369,085 by the end of 1942, were organized in forty major cities; public officials from the Administration, Cabinet members, to the mayors of several hundred cities, joined in the national tribute, while at least several million Americans expressed their sentiments of admiration and respect in personal letters sent during the "Write to Russia Week" which climaxed the anniversary observance here. Mass rallies, organized by the American Slav Congress, were also held and are still being held in the key industrial centers of the country, such as Pittsburgh, Chicago, Gary, Detroit and others.

In all of these manifestations of popular sentiment, labor has played the central role, a role which has been marked by changes in the attitude of such unions as the I.L.G.W.U., whose members are beginning to manifest definite opposi-

tion to the anti-Soviet conspiracies of David Dubinsky and the Social-Democrats, and by the growing demand of the trade unions for international labor unity with the Soviet trade unions, which was emphasized especially on this anniversary.

The extent of the progress in American-Soviet relations is indicated further by the fact that for the first time in the history of our country a cultural institute has been organized for the study of the Soviet Union at Cornell University. At the same time a major effort has been made to bring the truth about the Soviet Union to literally millions of people through the historic film "Mission to Moscow."

Here we have an expression of the real trend of American opinion regarding American-Soviet friendship and collaboration. It would be wrong to say that this is the whole picture, that there are no other elements in it, and that these forces and the line they represent prevail unchallenged in the country and without the need of a bitter struggle, especially in relation to the 1944 Presidential elections. The conspiracy to wreck the home front which has unfolded across the country during the past few months and which is aimed precisely at the President's line of cooperation with the Soviet Union for victory over the Axis and for the peaceful reconstruction of the world afterwards, is dramatic evidence to the contrary. This defeatist conspiracy to take over the government in 1944, while dislocating the war ef-

fort now, derives its political inspiration, in the last analysis, from Hitler's "Communist bogey" and to that extent even exerts indirect influence on some sincere supporters of the war and the anti-Hitler coalition who have still not completely freed themselves from their fears of the Communist bogey.

Three Points of Emphasis

It is the reflection of this overall picture that was registered generally in the observance of the June 22 anniversary in the United States. The emphasis, in the main, was on three points: (1) the great military power and valor of the Soviet Union which proved to be the salvation of humanity; (2) the fact that Hitler made an irrevocable mistake in underestimating this power and attacking the Soviet Union; and (3) the global character of the war, the fact that Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union was only part of his strategy of world conquest.

Thus, the *New York Herald Tribune*, for example, called June 22 "the second anniversary of one of the most fateful miscalculations in the history of warfare," and declared that during these two years Hitler and his generals, "defeated and stalled by one of the greatest, most heroic defenses ever made by a determined people," lost the war. The *New York Times*, remarking on the great change wrought in two short years, declared that "today, Hitler's hopes for victory lie buried under the Russian steppes." Even papers like the *New York Sun* and the *New York World-Telegram*,

which confined themselves to what they undoubtedly regarded as the minimum that could be said on this occasion without appearing to be hostile, declared that the world had miscalculated the might of the Soviet Union and when Hitler committed the same mistake and attacked the Soviet Union, the world was saved.

All this is clearly testimony that June 22 will forever be associated in history with the salvation of the freedom and independence of the world. There can be little doubt of this when the recognition of the power of the Soviet Union and its role in saving civilization has become a universally accepted truism, the *minimum* which could be said in tribute to the Soviet Union and still be acceptable to public opinion. But what is important in the present eulogy of the Red Army and the Soviet Union, as distinct from two years ago, is that *this eulogy is based on new elements of recognition* which provide the foundation for historically far-reaching and fruitful conclusions of policy. Two years ago, the world was also grateful to the Soviet Union for its resistance to Hitler's seemingly invincible armies; but it had grave doubts about the Soviet Union's ability to contribute more than a brief, though welcome, breathing spell, a few more precious weeks for England and the United States to gather their forces before the Soviet Union would itself succumb to Hitler's military might. Today, that resistance which, in the course of two years, has changed the whole world

picture, is recognized as the basis for the realization of our chief objective in the war, the complete and final defeat of Hitler and the Axis.

Hitler's Mistake

That we are dealing here with an advance in our understanding of the Soviet Union, its power and role in the war and its place in the post-war world, is shown by the emphasis and prominence given in our June 22 tributes to the discussion of Hitler's mistake in attacking the Soviet Union. When we recall that the United States and Britain both shared in Hitler's underestimation, thanks to the Nazis' ability to get these countries to adopt Hitler's views regarding the strength of the Soviet Union as their own which at the same time served the Nazis as a means of preventing us from developing a foreign policy in our own national interest, this emphasis on Hitler's mistake carries promising implications for our own future state of mind and policy. After all, stressing Hitler's mistake is only another way of castigating our own.

There can be no doubt of the importance of understanding the **essence** of this miscalculation which has a vital bearing on the outcome of the war and from which it is necessary to draw conclusions for the conduct of the war and the peace to follow. According to the *New York Times*, "the miscalculation Hitler made was not the attack on Russia itself, which was part of his original plan, but his belief that he could beat Russia quickly before

Britain and America could either aid Russia or rise as a menace in the West." In making this distinction, the *Times* correctly emphasizes the global character of Hitler's strategy and the fact that his attack on the Soviet Union was only part of his larger plans of world conquest. Aside from this, the distinction is purely artificial. For the point in characterizing Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union as a fatal mistake is that he met a power which is of such great strength and character that its involvement in the war altered all relation of forces in favor of the anti-Hitler nations. *The mistake Hitler made was that he failed to identify the Soviet Union with great power, military, economic and political.*

What was it that Hitler and his generals calculated? They calculated on the weakness of the Red Army and the instability of the Soviet home front, on exhausting the Soviet Union and on a blitz defeat of its armies, following which they would be free to turn on England and the United States. They calculated all this as a part of their strategy of world conquest, and their calculations proved to be wrong. Hitler failed to recognize the power of the Soviet Union and because of this his *world strategy* was doomed to failure. Here we have the main point: the decisive role of the Soviet Union in all these calculations, not in general, but as the bearer of unconquerable power at the decisive moment and over a decisive period of time. The popular opinion which considers Hitler's at-

tack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, his most fatal mistake is therefore perfectly sound. It is a recognition of the fact that the Soviet Union *turned the tide* against Hitler *on a world scale*; in short, it is an acknowledgment of the decisive weight and role of the Soviet Union in the anti-Hitler coalition.

Some Conclusions

It must be said, however, that not all those who praised the Soviet Union on the occasion of the second anniversary and agreed that Hitler had made a fatal mistake in underestimating its strength have thought out all the implications of this position. Their tribute, with all its generous accolades to Soviet heroism, is still marred by reluctance to draw all the conclusions, by fear to give too much credit to the Soviet Union; in short, by hesitation to add up the facts boldly and courageously and translate them into principles of policy. The whole discussion about Hitler's mistake in underestimating the strength of the Soviet Union is meaningless unless we draw radical and sweeping conclusions from this for the guidance of our own conduct in relation to the Soviet Union.

If Hitler's whole policy of world conquest was knocked out by his underestimation of the power of the Soviet Union, it stands to reason that our policy of victory in this global war must rest upon recognition of the strength, role and importance of the Soviet Union. If we are to recognize, not only the

strength of the Soviet Union and its undying contribution to our common cause, but the fact that in relation to Hitler's strategy and to our own struggle we and the Soviet Union are fighting one global war, then it stands to reason that for us and the Soviet Union there can be only one road to victory, one strategy, and finally one peace; in short, that our present and our future depend upon full and unrestricted collaboration and friendship with the Soviet Union. If we are to recognize the Soviet Union as a decisive world power—and our observance of the second anniversary of June 22 shows that the consciousness of this has become such a basic part of our knowledge and experience as a nation, so much a premise of American national life, that it will figure henceforth irrevocably in all our national calculations—then we must treat the Soviet Union as an equal, an equal as a friend and an ally in the war and the peace. This requires:

1. *The elimination of all remnants of the accident theory from our relations with the Soviet Union.* This theory regards the presence of the Soviet Union in the anti-Hitler coalition as a pure accident. As one of the *New York Times'* London correspondents phrased it on the very day of the invasion of Sicily. "The marriage of Bolshevism with democracy is at best a shot-gun wedding." This theory rests upon the myth that before June 22, 1941, the Soviet Union was Hitler's ally. Unquestionably, this is what some circles have in mind when they say

Hitler made a fatal mistake in attacking the Soviet Union, meaning that Hitler thereby lost a powerful ally. But, as Earl Browder pointed out on the occasion of the June 22 anniversary, "that malicious slander is used to hide the great historic fact that it was the very existence of the Soviet Union, as a neutral, which saved the British Isles from Nazi invasion, a hundred times more than the moral and material support being given by the United States. This lie is used to obscure the truth, so vital to the United States, that it was the Soviet Union, by its very existence, which held back the Japanese militarists from striking at the United States until December 7, 1941, after Hitler invaded that country. It hides the fact, which we must understand for our own future safety, that the Soviet Union was always a power on our side, when neutral as well as when at war, and that invasion of the Soviet Union was the signal of inevitable invasion of the United States as well."

The *New York Times*, in evaluating Hitler's mistake in attacking the Soviet Union, declares that "a greatly different story would have been written if the grand alliance of the United Nations had confronted Hitler before the war." That is belated hindsight, but it is true nevertheless. The point is, however, that if that grand alliance failed to materialize before June 22, 1941, it was not because of lack of effort on the part of the Soviet Union.

The *Times* itself provided a clue to this when it followed its ex-

pression of regret at the absence of the grand alliance before June 22 with the remark that the division of the now United Nations, "carefully nurtured by Nazi propaganda, presented Hitler with his opportunity." That division, it will be recalled, was officially legalized by the Western democracies in 1938 at Munich, where Hitler succeeded in getting his appeasers to adopt the Munich policy which isolated the Soviet Union and gave him a free hand to attack it. Clearly it was not the Soviet Union that was a party to such policies so favorable to Hitler and so disastrous to the democracies.

In this connection, it is useful to cite the recent testimony of a prominent British journalist, which is at the same time a summary of the well known facts. Speaking on "Russia and the West," this journalist, Mr. A. J. Cummings, declared: "At that time [September, 1938] one may be pretty sure Stalin fully understood the situation. He knew that we had sold the pass at Munich. He knew that French and British statesmen shrank from crossing the great divide and entering into a war alliance with Bolshevik Russia. He was anxious to do business with us; he certainly did not want to see an all-powerful Germany in Europe. He certainly did not want to see Germany overlooking the Black Sea and in complete domination of the Border States. He hated the fascist ideology. *I know that overtures made early in 1939 by Germany on two separate occasions had been curtly rejected by Moscow.* But Stalin acted promptly in the

interest of his own country and people when he was finally convinced that Britain and France were playing a double game, by the pretense of lining up with Russia in order to induce Germany to come to terms." (*The Central European Observer*, London, April 30, 1943, p. 132, Italics mine, A.L.)

Neither Hitler's attack upon the Soviet Union nor the latter's presence, following that attack, in the anti-Hitler coalition is an accident. It is worth noting that the same people who persist in the Communazi slander and insist that the Soviet Union is only an accidental ally of ours, also insist that our war with Nazi Germany is likewise an accident. Carried to its logical conclusion, the accident theory not only regards our collaboration with the Soviet Union as an accident of war, but regards the whole war against Hitler as an accident which they hope to shake off as a bad dream so that we may return to the status quo ante, with our old habits and old prejudices, resuming the relationship and perspectives of Munich but without its "surprise" consequences. There is only one little trouble with this theory, and that is that the war is no dream.

2. *The determination to win the war in the shortest possible time.* After two years, the problem of victory is still the key question. Failure to draw the decisive lessons for this from the past two years of war is the chief shortcoming of America's observance of the second anniversary of June 22. For, after all, the main lesson of this anniversary lies

in the answer to the question: what can we do to assure the speedy achievement of victory? And for victory, it is not enough to recognize and eulogize the great contributions of our Soviet ally; we also have to recognize what we ourselves still need to do. Our Soviet friends drew up a highly important summary of the past two years, on the occasion of the anniversary, and the changes have been so great that they could make the following historic report to the world:

"The former military might of Hitlerite Germany has been undermined in the course of the war, and the military and political perspectives of the German fascist army have sharply worsened. At the same time there has been a further strengthening of the military and political positions of the Soviet Union and the friendly Allied states, a further growth and strengthening of the armies of the freedom-loving peoples and a consolidation of their fighting solidarity." (*Soviet Information Bulletin*, June 22, 1943.)

This is clearly news of a most joyous and heartening character. It provides the basis for increased confidence and even greater effort. But it must be said that, on the whole, this was not made the main text for our observance of the second anniversary. The Soviet Union soberly estimated these results of two years of fighting, but refused to underestimate the strength of the enemy and the enormity of the task and the trials still ahead before victory over Hitler Germany is achieved. They therefore understood that the change in the relation of

forces in our favor is not enough for victory. With genuine modesty and a profound recognition of the global character of the war and the great role of England and the United States, which should meet the most rigorous conceptions, they acknowledged that "everything now depends on how our Allies take advantage of the favorable situation for the opening of a second front on the European continent, for without the second front victory over Hitler Germany is impossible."

The question on which everything depends is obviously the key question, for the Soviet Union as well as for us and the rest of the anti-Hitler coalition. Our eulogy of the Soviet contribution, on the occasion of its second anniversary, shows that we realize full well that the answer to this key question is in our hands, the hands of the Anglo-American members of the coalition. The development of the new series of events that began with the invasion of Sicily following the opening of Hitler's third and most frantic summer offensive against the Red Army just two weeks after the second anniversary of June 22 will show how far our answer will go. That the invasion of Sicily is not itself yet the second front which is the key to victory over Hitler is generally acknowledged, and this in itself is a good indication that we may have at last grasped the meaning and requirements of coalition warfare. Equally encouraging is the promise that the landing on Sicily will be followed swiftly by invasion at many other points, not only from

North Africa and the Near East but from England as well. When this happens, the beginning of the end of Hitler, which President Roosevelt proclaimed on releasing the news of the land invasion of Sicily, will really have come.

The speed of the Anglo-American response to Hitler's third and most desperate summer offensive against the Red Army has electrifying possibilities for the realization of coalition warfare, for cementing unbreakable ties among the members of the anti-Hitler coalition, and for achieving an early and complete victory over Hitler Germany. It has such possibilities only if this speed is not restricted to the invasion of the island stepping stones to Europe but is extended to the invasion of Europe itself.

For this it is necessary to put an end to the school of "victory without risks," first cousin to the theory of "victory without fighting," which has given Hitler twice now a new lease on life and which is so beloved by the defeatists and friends of Hitler in this country. This conception has depended upon the Soviet Union to take all the risks while the Anglo-American members of the anti-Hitler coalition were left free to strike when they felt there was no longer any danger of losing. This is obviously not a military conception but a political conception par excellence. It is not a technique for winning wars but for losing them. Military policy can only have the single aim of victory at the earliest moment and consequently at the least cost.

This conception of victory without

risks is not a theory of victory because it exalts caution and thoroughness of preparation above military opportunities, because instead of turning the repeated crises of the enemy into our opportunities, it insists on giving the enemy the opportunities and our camp the crises. It is a theory of protracted war and defeat, because it gives Hitler time to maneuver, to concentrate new forces, to sow division in the anti-Hitler camp while working for the replacement of our win-the-war leadership by advocates of "negotiated peace" and in this way ultimately to snatch victory from our hands.

It is politics in military guise, related in temper and origin to the accident theory, and consequently the worst kind of politics for the welfare of the anti-Hitler coalition. For it can only have the effect of perpetuating differences and weakening the relations between the members of the coalition because this sort of arrangement does not provide for each member to pull his full strength and for all the members to operate simultaneously with their joint strength. This summer will tell whether we are to have victory jointly with our allies or risks without victory; that, after all, is the only real alternative implicit in the conception of victory without risks.

The key responsibility in the achievement of all these requirements clearly rests upon the working class and trade union movement of the United States. By rallying even more firmly and strengthening national unity around the Com-

mander-in-Chief it will provide the best guarantee that the policy of American-Soviet friendship will be victorious. Labor can play a historic role in the realization of these perspectives, and in this connection its first task is to extend and win the fight for international labor unity with the Soviet working class. That would be the greatest tribute we could pay to the epic heroism of our Soviet brothers.

3. *The elimination, as outworn and unrealistic, of the entire pattern and temper of our relations with the Soviet Union which have been generally characteristic of the past twenty-five years.* The war is forging entirely new foundations for world relations, and these include the unconditional acceptance of the Socialist Soviet Union as a great power and an equal in full recognition of its immortal contribution to the common victory. This means a complete reversal of the foreign policy of the past quarter century, eliminating, together with the fascist menace to the independence and freedom of nations, that unwholesome relationship to the Soviet Union which has distorted all other public relationships and made possible the growth and spread of the Nazi cancer.

For twenty-five years the foreign policies of the Western democratic countries were based on the premise that the Soviet Union was an alien element in the world which ultimately had to be eliminated. The reversal of this traditional attitude and approach and its replacement by a new premise of friendship and cooperation

on the basis of equality will open up an epoch of world development based on the peaceful co-existence of socialist, capitalist and intermediate types of democratic powers.

The importance of such an epochal reversal based on a correct estimate of the Soviet Union and our relations to it should be evident from the devastating fact that the incorrect estimate which has dominated policy until June 22, 1941, has already proved calamitous to the world. The most compelling reason, however, is the need of speedy victory in the war above everything else. Although there are a hundred ways to lose the war, there is only one way to win it, and that way rests upon full collaboration and alliance with the Soviet Union.

A Final Word

These, it seems, are some of the considerations that merit attention in a review of America's observance of the second anniversary of June 22. There can be little doubt that the two years that have passed have brought about a far-reaching change in our sentiments and opinions regarding the Soviet Union, and with this, in the actual relations with our great ally. The opening of the Second Front in Europe now when the whole outcome of the war is being decided will prove that we have surmounted the last barriers to full and unreserved friendship with the country whose fate has been so gloriously linked with the independence, freedom and progress of the whole world.

TASKS OF THE BRITISH UNIONS FOR VICTORY

(Draft resolution to the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, held on July 3-4, 1943.)

THIS Congress endorses the memorandum on "Trade Union Policy in the War Against Fascism" as the general basis for our trade union work.

It notes the following wartime changes which present the trade unions with new problems and opportunities:

1. The bringing of the greater part of industry under some form of state control.

2. Increase of mass production methods and payment by results.

3. Recognition of right of unions to have a voice in the state control apparatus.

4. Growth of unions and extension of the area of collective bargaining. Unionization of radio, motor and light engineering industries. Increased organization of women.

5. Growth of organization among clerical, supervisory and technical workers. Drive of technical workers for representation on production committees.

6. Development of wartime legislation which, while placing restraints on workers, has certain positive features, including the guaranteed week, enforcement of union rates, right of the workers to appeal against dismissal, etc.

7. Growth of anti-fascist militancy among workers who are determined to defeat Fascism, to defend many of their wartime gains and to secure an improved position in postwar industry.

Communists and the Unions

Congress declares that this situation affords a unique opportunity for building the power of trade unionism so that no factory or section of industry remains without a collective agreement, or without a representative trade union workshop organization covering all grades of workers. It pledges all Communists to act as model trade union builders, striving to recruit their fellow-workers to the unions and to develop the widest trade union unity.

Congress pledges all Communists to work for:

(a) the creation of a new sense of responsibility among all workers and to drive for the maximum productive efficiency in all phases of industry;

(b) to recruit millions of new members to the trade unions;

(c) to assist the trade unions in their aim of adapting themselves to the new tasks confronting them by promoting amalgamation on the basis of the widest trade union democracy. By developing the Trades Councils as authoritative local co-ordinating centers;

(d) to raise the political consciousness of trade unionists and secure the 100 per cent payment of the political levy;

(e) to support the development of international trade union unity by strengthening the Anglo-Soviet

Trade Union Committee, and by establishing the closest possible contacts with the unions in the Dominions and Colonies and with the workers on the continent.

Trade Union Wage Policy

Congress believes that in framing their wage policy, the unions must take into consideration the specific problems of a war economy.

Because of the shortage of consumers' goods it is necessary to prevent rises in prices and ensure proper distribution by the extension of rationing and price control to all goods, and support all measures to increase the production of food and utility goods, subject to the overriding needs of war.

Within the framework of wartime rationing and control, wages policy should be mainly concerned with:

- (a) consolidating war advances into the basic rates of wages;
- (b) raising wages in the lower-paid sections of work and industries;
- (c) extending payment by results as an incentive to increased production, together with securing special consideration for skilled time workers who work to pieceworkers;
- (d) securing the "rate for the job" for women;
- (e) wage for age scales for youth as a minimum. The "rate for the job" for youths doing more responsible work.

To effectively carry through this policy it is essential for the unions to explain to their members the problems of wage policy in war economy, and to seek to secure the necessary improvements by making the utmost use of the recognized negotiating machinery.

The Unions and Production

The trade union machinery for influencing production is still largely in an embryonic stage. To immediately improve its efficiency the following measures are necessary:

Factory Production Committees: It is essential to improve the work of factory production committees (and pit, yard and efficiency, and site committees in other industries) by securing:

(a) day-to-day co-operation on production questions at all levels—sectional and departmental—within the enterprises. Workers' representatives to have right to raise questions for solution in section or department before putting them on agenda of committee;

(b) workers' representatives to have power to take up urgent questions with general management without waiting for production meeting;

(c) Management to disclose to workers all relevant facts about the factory program;

(d) enlistment of scientists, technicians and clerical workers in work of committees at every level of production. Technical representation on joint production committees;

(e) continuous reporting back to the workers by circulation of committee minutes, notice boards, factory bulletins, canteen meetings. Continuous effort to extract suggestions from workers.

District Production (and similar) Committees: The effective co-ordination of production (or other committees) in the various enterprises demands the creation of an authoritative trade union committee or sub-committee on a district basis such as the district trade union pro-

duction committee in the engineering industry.

In order to secure the effective functioning of such bodies the following measures seem dictated by experience:

(a) the release of their personnel from other trade union work to enable them to concentrate on production problems;

(b) the frequent calling of conferences where experiences can be pooled;

(c) the issue of a district production bulletin where the successes of the most efficient committees can be reported.

It is also essential to organize periodical conferences between production committees and factories which are co-operating together to produce a common product, or are part of the same firm, so that potential bottle-necks can be overcome.

Union Workshop Organization

Without powerful workshop organization capable of day to day negotiations trade unionism cannot function effectively in mass production industries, nor deal effectively with questions affecting production, safety, welfare and discipline, hitherto regarded as falling exclusively within the province of management.

Trade union progress demands that those important workshop organizations (which in some industries link up workers of diverse crafts and unions) should be given a recognized status within the trade union movement.

Exchange of experiences is essential to the full development of these organizations. Just as the development of factory production

committees necessitated the creation of joint district trade union committees in order to co-ordinate their activities, so this or a similar type of organization is necessary to co-ordinate shop stewards' committees on a district basis.

A more definite status should be established for shop stewards within the individual trade unions.

Trade Unions and Legislation

Experience of wartime legislation shows the need to extend the Essential Work order to all vital industries (with the necessary safeguards) and to amend it in order to ensure the complete reinstatement—work as well as wages—of workers whose re-employment is ordered by the Tribunal, and to strengthen the rights of the workers.

Congress emphasizes the urgent need for legislation repealing the Trade Disputes Act, and compelling all employers to recognize the appropriate trade unions in an industry (on the lines of the Labor Relations Board in the U.S.A.).

Trade unions are now actively discussing what progressive features of wartime industrial legislation should be carried over into the post-war period.

Congress suggests that consideration should be given to the adaptation to post-war conditions of the following wartime regulations:

(a) enforcement of trade union agreements as a *minimum* on all employers in an industry;

(b) the retention of the guaranteed week;

(c) the right of the workers to appeal to an impartial tribunal against dismissal from his employment.

Trade Union Unity

It is necessary to explain to the workers the need for taking all possible steps in wartime to prepare the way for the establishment of international trade union unity.

The strengthening of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, the establishment of closer relations with the unions of the Dominions and Colonies, especially India, and the renewal at the earliest moment of relations with the workers on the continent are necessary steps towards this aim.

In furtherance of the war effort the unions have co-operated with the employers in various industries and have sometimes made joint representations to the Government.

While welcoming co-operation in order to secure maximum war production, Congress declares that it is the settled policy of the employers in some industries to secure the unions' support in pressing policies of monopoly and output restriction on the Government.

Such a policy, if accepted by the Unions, would only lead to the impoverishment of the country and the frustration of the purpose for which the trade union movement was formed.

Congress asks all Communists to carry on a powerful political campaign to convince the workers that a co-ordinated trade union policy—industrial and political—which unites the workers in all industries in a drive for improvement in conditions is vital to working class advance and that all measures which unite the workers in one industry with their employers, while

separating them from their fellow workers in other industries, are to the workers' lasting detriment.

It is particularly necessary that there should be a co-ordinated trade union policy in relation to the many problems arising out of the transition to a peace economy, and agreements between all the unions on this general policy must take precedence over any particular policy relating to a given industry.

It is necessary for the unions to declare that, while they welcome increased recognition and wide powers of negotiation, they do not regard this negotiating machinery as constituting "self-government in industry" and that they will not be deflected from their final aim of achieving a planned socialist economy.

Trade Unions and the Labour Party

The rapid growth of trade union membership in recent years has not been accompanied by a corresponding growth in the payment of the political levy.

Communists will campaign for (a) the 100 per cent payment of the political levy; (b) the promotion of young active trade unionists as parliamentary candidates; (c) trade union schemes for the political training of members; (d) the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party will full rights for all affiliated trade unionists within that body.

Congress places this policy before all trade unionists, whether leaders or rank and file, believing that its operation will strengthen the trade union movement for advance in war and in peace.

THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

By WILLIAM RUST

DESPITE the adverse vote the question of working class unity was put so strongly and squarely at the Labour Party Conference that it remains the vital issue before the movement. The great mass campaign for affiliation waged by the Communist Party has brought new hope and inspiration to large sections of the movement, and a firm basis has been created for the further development of the unity fight.

The vote of one-quarter of the Conference is a reflection of the deep conviction held by many of the most active men and women in the local Labour Parties and trade unions. And although the campaign for unity cannot go on in the same form after the Conference vote, the urge remains as strong as ever and it is quite certain that the divisions, bans and black circulars will be increasingly broken down as all sections of the movement get closer together in the common fight.

The chief weakness of the Conference was that it did not directly face the meaning of the present stage of the war and the tasks of the working class in this relation. In fact, the war itself was excluded from the agenda, apparently on the grounds either that the war can be left to run itself, or that it is a

matter for the Ministers and military experts. Meeting at a moment when there is a great feeling of expectancy in the country, the Conference could have called forth a rousing response if it had given a vigorous lead to the workers on the urgency of the invasion of Europe and the necessity for striking in the West with the utmost possible speed.

Although the Conference has failed to bring about the unity of the working class and to give a fighting lead at this historical turning point of the war, it did, however, achieve a number of positive results indicative of the strivings of the mass movement to achieve clarity on those questions which have been of vital concern to the labor and trade union movement during recent months.

By its decisive vote on the electoral truce, to which support was extended by a majority of the Divisional Parties as well as by the large trade unions, the Conference succeeded in making a firm declaration on the necessity for the strengthening of national unity, and wrote "paid" to the account of those "left" intriguers who have been playing up discontent with the Government in order to further their own narrow ambitions and

to bring about labor's withdrawal from the wartime coalition.

The *Tribune* group and their veiled allies of Common Wealth suffered an eclipse at this Conference, mainly because the war has now taken a positive turn. Common Wealth was condemned by the Conference without the necessity of a vote.

The official declaration against a "coupon election" and the pledge that a special conference would be called at the conclusion of hostilities in order to decide labor's electoral policy was welcomed by the Conference. The discussion revealed the fear that certain leaders—said to include a group of influential right-wing trade union officials—are disposed towards the policy of a long-term post-war coalition. The Conference decision is a rebuff to this element.

The debate on Beveridge also expressed a strong sense of reality. The movement is pledged to this massive scheme of social reform and will fight for it, but it understands that the winning of the battle for Europe is a necessary preliminary for the winning of the battle for Beveridge. And that differences regarding the tactics in the fight for Beveridge and, indeed, the lukewarm attitude of a number of leaders towards it, must not be made the cause of division and frustration within the movement.

Thus, the decisions on these three questions (electoral truce, post-war coalition and Beveridge) have done a lot to clear the political air and to strengthen the unity of purpose of the labor movement.

Also the handling of the question of the Trades Disputes Act, although marked by extreme caution, nevertheless showed wisdom and a desire to prevent a conflict between the industrial and political wings of the movement. The determination of the trade unions to continue their fight against the Trades Disputes Act is well understood and appreciated as is the wish of the Civil Servants to end the barriers which separate them from the movement as a whole. But it is obvious that a solution of this conflict must be sought in a way that does not permit such domestic matters to transcend the most vital political question of the day, namely, the unity of the nation in the fight for the defeat of fascism.

Although the Executive Committee had put a great deal of thought and energy into the preparation of conference materials, notably those dealing with post-war reconstruction, which it had worked out in considerable detail, it had altogether failed to give any lead to the conference on India or on the attitude that labor should adopt to the post-war treatment of enemy peoples. The resolutions on India were relegated to the last day, allocated a mere twenty minutes, and then referred back to the Executive. Such cynical political dodgery must have caused a most painful impression in India. It certainly did not raise the prestige of the conference.

On the question of Germany and the Germans the platform, which usually keeps its strong hand on all discussions, simply abdicated leadership and permitted the conference

to turn itself into a squabble between the semi-pacifists and the Vansittartites. Naturally the latter, who have set up a cell or fraction entitled the "Fight for Freedom Group," succeeded in winning the day because they were able to play on the healthy anti-Hitler sentiment of the majority of the delegates.

But this question is of too great importance to be left where it is. The Labour Party will have to draw up a clear declaration which, while urging the utmost prosecution of the war and not absolving the German people of their responsibility for Nazi crimes, will avoid the pitfalls of racialism and rescue the movement from the danger of being identified with those extreme reactionary forces who, under the guise of strong measures against Germany after the war, will seek to crush the revival of democracy and a popular people's movement on the continent.

The sensational conflict over

leadership which resulted in the proposing of Herbert Morrison reveals something deeper than a struggle for power between personalities. It is difficult for new young leaders to rise to the top in the Labour Party; the machine, the bans and the expulsions operate to maintain the power of the established few.

This is one of the fruits of Morrisonism and explains why the challenge to him came from an individual who does not represent a serious alternative policy. The anti-Morrison vote is, however, indicative of certain positive trends within the movement.

This conference was one of the most outstanding of recent years, its decisions will be widely discussed and also remain the subject of keen controversy. It does not as yet mark a real turn in the methods and policies of the labor movement in face of the awakening of the millions taking place around it, but indicative of important changes and vital stirrings.

STATEMENT BY MR. HARRY POLLITT ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, AFTER THE RESULT OF THE DISCUSSION ON COMMUNIST AFFILIATION HAD BEEN MADE KNOWN:

AT THE moment when the supreme battles of the war are opening out, and labor unity is so vital for the people's future, we regret that the Labour Party has rejected the Communist Party's application for affiliation.

The vote for Communist affiliation, supported by some of the most

important trade unions, shows how strong the desire for unity is. In fact, the vote does not fully reflect the support; in many cases votes have been cast against affiliation because of decisions taken long ago and in quite different circumstances.

It is this growing support for unity, already expressed in many

joint local campaigns, that will overcome all obstacles and ensure joint action for the defeat of fascism and the defense of the people's interests. We are ready to cooperate with the Labour Party and its affiliated organizations in any local or national campaigns, and to meet the Labour Party Executive to discuss it, which would be in the interests of the whole movement.

The Communist Party will continue to work for national and in-

ternational unity, and particularly for unity in the working-class movement. It will ask its Congress on July 3 to endorse the organization of a nation-wide campaign for unity and victory, for social progress and advance toward socialism and, in order to realize these aims, the strengthening of all labor organizations and a recruitment to the Communist Party that will bring its membership to 100,000 by the end of 1943.

ERRATUM

We wish to draw the reader's attention to an erratum on page 607 of the July *Communist*.

Due to a technical mishap a line was left out of the article "Victory and the 1944 Elections," by Eugene Dennis, the omission of which distorts the meaning of the passage in question. The clause in this sentence should read:

"rather the objective is to influ-

ence *Willkie and the Willkie Republicans to wage a public and resolute fight against the defeatists within the Republican Party and Congress, to take a correct position, one that will bring them closer politically and into cooperative relations with the Roosevelt-labor alliance.*"

The words in italics are those that were accidentally left out. Readers are asked to correct their copies accordingly.

THE COMMUNISTS OF CUBA AND THE CABINET

BY BLAS ROCA

General Secretary of the Revolutionary Communist Union Party

I.

ON MARCH 5 the entire press authoritatively reported that the long Cabinet crisis had been solved with the nomination of seven new ministers belonging to the Democratic, Liberal, ABC and Union Revolutionary Communist Parties.

This Cabinet reorganization—dismissed by the *Diario de la Marina* in its editorial of March 9 as “a mere substitution of some ministers by others”—in reality ends the crisis described in the manifesto addressed to the people of Cuba on July 23, 1942, by President Batista.

In that historical document General Batista concretely expressed the significance and scope of the crisis which was then just beginning:

“In this hour, facing a future full of foreboding, confronted by the limitless hardships forced on us by Nazi barbarism and its accomplices mad for expansion and blood, we must join hands cordially; for only the united strength of all of us can save us. . . . This is the moment of sacred unity in Cuba. In the name of justice and liberty I aspire to

bring the whole nation close to me, that together we may win the war which concerns each of us equally.”

These public words announced a ministerial crisis of historical scope. They did not deal simply with a question of parliamentary confidence, nor of a party combination of simple political significance. The President of the Republic was appealing to the people, to the entire nation, to all political parties and all institutions to effect the patriotic unity demanded by the war against the Axis.

Following the Presidential call, all Ministers resigned, and the chiefs of the *Coalicion Socialista Democratica*, under the leadership of General Batista, began to take active steps to find together the formula that would bring about the needed understanding.

The President's fundamental proposal—to secure the aid of all parties in a Cabinet above partisan considerations and electoral ambitions—met from the first strong opposition and great obstacles.

Within the *Coalicion Socialista Democratica* the reactionary ele-

ments sabotaged a Cabinet of National Unity under the pretext that Communists should not be admitted. Supported and encouraged by the false and fascist propaganda of the papers *Diario de la Marina* and *Alerta*, they stated that the President's project was a "Popular Front." The noisy discussion within the Democratic Party against participation of the Union Revolucionaria Comunista in the Ministry was finally solved by a compromise agreement.

Outside of the *Coalicion Socialista Democratica*, the *Partido Revolucionario Cubano* took an attitude of extreme opposition and refused, from the very beginning, to participate in the united effort, while its most demagogic leaders echoed the Falangists and the reactionaries in their cries against participation of the Communists in national unity through the Cabinet.

The ministerial crisis, provoking the most acute political discussion and public agitation and arousing national and international interest, became so prolonged that the President decided to solve it partially, while postponing the solution of its most vital points.

The new Cabinet under the presidency of Dr. Zaydin was formed on August 16, but the crisis continued, as Juan Marinello pointed out clearly in words that should be remembered now for a clearer understanding of the meaning of the latest ministerial changes:

"A very interesting chapter of the national crisis has just come to an end. The designation of the new Cabinet represents, as Union Revolu-

cionaria Comunista has stated, an episode in the course of an unresolved crisis. . . . Cuba's great need of the hour has not as yet found, in the principal organizations, in the national government, the adequate answer. *That is why the crisis still exists.*"

That crisis has been developing until now through various forms, along various roads.

After the Cabinet was formed in August, the opposition fought more covertly. The chief conflict within the Democratic Party took new paths. The *Partido Revolucionario Cubano* emphasized even more its demagogic opposition, which carried it to an open stand against unity, against military mobilization of the Cubans, against economic aid to England, China, the United States and the Soviet Union, thus separating it from national unity. The ABC, on the contrary, came out for unity from the very beginning. The perspective of victory of the United Nations and the outlines of the post-war period were drawn more clearly on the horizon of the battlefronts. All this, in its complicated and dynamic entirety, helped to define the aspects of the crisis that remained under discussion. With the participation of the Union Revolucionaria Comunista and ABC in the Council of Ministers, all this has now permitted an organic solution of the crisis that arose in July.

The ministerial changes of today are, therefore, the culmination of a profound and far-reaching crisis. "The Cabinet is a result," the President said at its first session, "of the call issued some months ago to ob-

tain an integral national unity." On the men now in the Cabinet, and on the conscience of all Cubans, depends the future of the great task that history has laid on this Council of Ministers.

II.

The Union Revolucionaria Comunista is represented in the Cabinet by a Minister without Portfolio, not precisely an executive post. A Minister without Portfolio gives his opinions, within the Council, on issues arising for discussion or study, and gives his vote on the issues. But the *execution* of the various agreements, their practical realization and the solution of the many problems posed by the application of policy, are the responsibility solely of the various ministries under the supreme authority of the President of the Republic.

The inclusion of this member of the Union Revolucionaria Comunista in the Cabinet was one of the most fought-over questions throughout the entire crisis.

From the beginning of the far-reaching crisis now coming to an end, all those who were for national unity, all who in one way or another saw our fatherland's responsibility in the global war waged by humanity against Hitler and his accomplices of Rome and Tokyo—all those favored the participation of the Union Revolucionaria Comunista in the Cabinet.

Those who for one reason or another, for this or that consideration, were against national unity, took their stand against Communist participation in the Cabinet.

Those who wanted national unity, those who in greater or smaller measure wanted and still want our country to *aid* in winning a war which is theirs because it is a war of humanity, defended the need for the presence of the Union Revolucionaria Comunista in the Council of Ministers. They clearly perceived that our party represents a strong current of thought in our country, that its opinions correspond to the sentiment of thousands of workers, peasants, professionals, youths, etc.

Above all, they knew that our party has been the most enthusiastic champion of national unity, the most effective propagandist of the war spirit, the force most able to mobilize popular collaboration in the war effort of the United Nations. It is clear. If we want to form a win-the-war cabinet with the participation of all Cubans, why not give representation to those who through many years have carried on a strong propaganda against our enemies, to those who have constituted, with other forces, a national anti-fascist movement, to those who organized formidable collections, *firmly helping the hoped-for victory* with their self-sacrifice?

Those who did not want unity, those who for one reason or another do not believe that our country must contribute *with sacrifices* to win victory over the hated Nazi-Nippo-fascist enemy, opposed Communist participation in the Cabinet, because they realized that this was the best way to defeat the purpose of the President, because this was the pretext most "justifiable" before

themselves and strangers, for their anti-patriotic torpedoing of unity.

The fascists of the *Diario de la Marina* coincided on this point with the demagogic Chibás, even in words. In its editorial of August 11 *La Marina*, opposing inclusion of Communists in the Cabinet, declared: "This conception of national unity should not be confused with that of 'popular front,' after the sad experience we have had of these Cabinet amalgamations." At the same time, Chibás stated: "What they are attempting is a Popular Front Cabinet to which the Communist Party may be admitted." Thus the fascists, demagogues and reactionaries reduced the scope of a crisis whose patriotic solution demanded the understanding and collaboration of all Cubans, regardless of political or ideological differences.

Despite the demagogic and false campaign of the enemies of unity, despite all maneuvers of all hidden opponents of good national understanding, at last judgment has triumphed and the Cabinet has been formed with the representation of all the parties (and all tendencies where some are divided due to the coming presidential campaign) with the exception of the Partido Revolucionario Cubano, which is opposed to all that signifies war effort.

* * *

The inclusion of a member of Union Revolucionaria Comunista in the new Council, even in the post of Minister without Portfolio, has been a severe blow to the Falangist

and reactionary elements; it has been a decisive triumph for the policy of national unity, with important consequences which will be seen in the immediate future.

Last February 13 the National Executive Committee of Union Revolucionaria Comunista considered the invitation made by the President of the Republic to form part of the Council of Ministers, and placing itself in a position to decide what would be most beneficial to national unity, "adopted unanimously the decision to accept the invitation to take part in the Cabinet through a Minister without Portfolio, indicating Juan Marinello for this high and responsible post."

This decision of the National Executive Committee of Union Revolucionaria Comunista was thoroughly examined and discussed before it was adopted.

This was not the first occasion that Union Revolucionaria Comunista had received an invitation to form part of the Cabinet.

In August, 1942, our party was confronted with the same situation and, preferring to remain outside, gave a negative answer in the face of a semi-solution of the crisis.

Long before August, on two occasions, our party was also invited to form part of two different cabinets, declining on both occasions, even though it maintained a frank and decided position of support of the Government.

In any ordinary situation the normal thing would have been for Union Revolucionaria Comunista to decline to participate in a Coalition Government with parties

representing the bourgeoisie and large landlords.

Even when favoring its formation and supporting everything democratic and progressive in its policy, even when giving the support of our parliamentary fraction to its principal legislation, the Union Revolucionaria Comunista would, under normal conditions, refuse to form part of such a government.

Why?

Because, in the first place, it is clear that it is one thing to support a government, give political and popular aid to its measures for raising the standard of living of the masses, for the defense and development of national economy and consolidation of democratic liberties, but that it is a different thing to become a part of such a government.

One can support a government without taking responsibility for all its actions, without having to justify all its measures, preserving at the same time the right and freedom to criticize.

But when forming part of a government within the Cabinet, taking upon oneself some ministry to develop some executive work, it is clear that one takes the responsibility for all the measures and all the actions that may devolve upon this post, and one shares responsibility for the actions of the rest of the ministers.

In the second place, Union Revolucionaria Comunista is a party that represents the aims and ideals of the most oppressed strata of society; a party of struggle for the final goal of the socialist reorganization

of society on the basis of common ownership of the large factories, railroads, mines, banks, etc., of the distribution of land to the peasants and collective farming, of the elimination of all discrimination because of color, race, or sex, of the elimination of crises and unemployment. Such a party must not, speaking in general terms and for normal times, accept the responsibilities of power, except when it is in a position to satisfy fully the demands of the masses or to introduce or defeat measures directly affecting its socialist aim.

A government formed by parties representative of the bourgeoisie and large landlords, no matter how progressive, no matter how well intentioned, cannot satisfy all the demands of the masses, nor can it put an end to such evils as administrative immorality, unemployment, lack of land for the peasants, etc., precisely because it has to respect the interests of certain strata whose privileges do not permit an end to these maladies. Such a government, however, can initiate big reforms to develop industry and agriculture, to protect national interests against foreign monopolies, to better the living conditions of the workers of the city and the farms, to protect the interests of the professionals, to consolidate and extend civil liberties. And all of this benefits the country and the people.

Precisely because of this, even in "normal" times, Union Revolucionaria Comunista should support the formation of such a progressive government of Democratic Socialist Coalition, first giving it its votes and

then supporting the governmental measures through propaganda, through popular mobilization and parliamentary action, defending the government against the attacks of the reactionaries and the demagogic pseudo-revolutionaries, but without neglecting either independent mobilization for specific measures, or criticism of errors and vacillations.

Now, however, Union Revolucionaria Comunista has seen the advantage of forming part of the Cabinet without the perspective or the purpose of advocating measures of a socialist type within it, knowing that the new Council of Ministers will also be unable to satisfy fully the demands of the masses.

For what reason?

For the supreme reason that our country is at war, is cooperating fully in a just war of liberation against the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis defending its own independence, as an ally of the United States, China, England and the Soviet Union.

Cuba has declared a just war and Cuba must win that war against the Hitler bandits and their henchmen.

For Cuba to win this war it is necessary that it give maximum military, economic and political co-operation, making its own sacrifices, wherever necessary. It is necessary that the Cuban people see this co-operation, this self-sacrifice, not as something imposed upon them from outside, nor as a favor or puny utilitarian calculation, but as the willing fulfillment of a supreme duty to preserve the independence conquered by our liberators.

The present Cabinet must carry out such tasks, must lead the nation in its war. To do this it must have the maximum authority possible and the most efficient aid of the citizenry.

This is why we agreed to enter the Cabinet, accept responsibility for its actions as long as it shows itself able to help our nation preserve its liberty menaced by the beasts commanded by Hitler and Hirohito.

If Cuba were *not* at war, if we did not consider that its independence and territorial integrity depended on this war, if we did not consider that the future of our people, and of humanity, depend entirely on the defeat of the Axis, Union Revolucionaria Comunista would not have entered the Council of Ministers, not even as a simple Minister without Portfolio.

On entering the Cabinet we place above all reasons and all questions of convenience, above all ideologic considerations, the supreme aim of defeating the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis and thus saving the independence of our fatherland, the freedom of our people and the future of humanity.

In the supreme service of the cause of our country's liberty, Union Revolucionaria Comunista accepts the responsibilities of participation in the Cabinet.

It enters the Cabinet, then, at a sacrifice, without special or sectarian aims, without partisan inducement.

* * *

One of the questions that must be made clear to the masses is that

the inclusion of our party in the Cabinet does not signify that we enter the Cabinet of National Unity to introduce socialistic measures.

We enter the Cabinet of National Unity to collaborate with other parties and social classes, in a common task which is of importance to all; the salvation of our country's independence, the struggle to help defeat the beasts of the Axis.

Another question that should be made clear is that our participation in the Cabinet has nothing to do with bureaucratism, with the policy of posts and positions.

We do not enter the Cabinet seeking political positions nor to distribute posts; we enter the Cabinet to help strengthen the organization of our country's war effort, to propose and defend better measures, absolutely independent of any administrative struggle for this or that position.

There should, however, be no illusion that the mere presence of a member of our party as Minister without Portfolio will insure, beforehand, the realization of the war program, the adoption of cardinal measures for which we have been fighting. So that the program may be carried out, so that those measures may be adopted, it is necessary for the most energetic mobilization of public opinion, for the national unity of the masses on the street, to support the program of the Cabinet, to impel it to take the most audacious and decisive measures that the present situation demands.

These are some of the most important matters that we must bear

in mind in the field of the immediate practical tasks of the party.

* * *

It is necessary to make clear that our attitudes today demanding national unity and participation in a Cabinet of National Unity differs in every essence from the attitude of the European Social-Democrats when they formed part of the Governments of 1914-18.

During the war of 1914-18 the European Social-Democrats participated in the cabinets of the principle belligerent powers under the banner of "Sacred Unity"; but they did not prevent such "errors" which made possible the rise of Nazi-Fascism, its armament and development, and finally the gigantic explosion of this war that is costing humanity countless sacrifices.

The war of 1914-18 was a war between rival imperialisms whose final aim was a new distribution of the colonies and spheres of influence; the triumph of either bloc would not signify any gain of liberty, any essential advance of the masses of humanity. The present is a war of liberation, a just war, on the part of the Soviet Union, England, the United States, China and the other members of the United Nations, while it is a war of world subjugation, oppression, and enslavement on the part of Germany, Italy and Japan and the other vassals of Hitler. The destiny of humanity for years to come is at stake in this war; the national independence of the occupied countries of Europe, the menaced peoples of the Americas, and the very

fate of socialism in the Soviet land are at stake.

The triumph of the Axis would signify the collapse of the independence that has already been obtained by our countries; it would mean the elimination of the democratic liberties that the peoples have conquered through long centuries of struggle; it would mean the inauguration of feudal-like slavery, sustained by the most modern attainments of technique; it would mean the defeat for all our liberationist and socialist aspirations.

The triumph of the United Nations will signify the maintenance of our national independence and the democratic liberties of the world. It will signify a positive advancement for the masses, with the destruction of their worst and fiercest enemies, of the worst threat to the level of development achieved to date by humanity.

We are, therefore, in a war on whose outcome depends not only the independence of our country, but the very fate of our ideals.

It is precisely this essential difference that determines and validates our participation in the Government of National Unity.

* * *

Comrade Marinello enters the Cabinet as a representative of the Union Revolucionaria Comunista, to give himself fully to the service of the menaced fatherland, to the full service of defeating Nazism and its fascist and Nipponese confederates, to the full service of the cause of victory of the United Nations and a lasting and fruitful peace.

The program of action of Comrade Marinello in the Council of Ministers was clearly expressed in the decision taken by the National Executive Committee of Union Revolucionaria Comunista, when it accepted the invitation for our party to form part, through one of its members, of the Council of Ministers.

The decision states:

“. . . the Executive Committee of Union Revolucionaria Comunista expects, with the solution of the present Cabinet crisis, that emphasis will be put on the government's war effort, through the most urgent and efficient mobilization of all our moral, economic and military resources, to cooperate on any front toward the defeat of the Axis beasts, the worst enemies of humanity and of our country. As the result of this greater emphasis on the effort for the complete application of the war program, we look forward to more efficient measures to curb usury and speculation, to stem the current of peasant evictions, to prevent abuses by intransigent bosses, to improve public administration and cover all budget needs through direct taxes; measures, finally, directed to the principal end of serving the supreme interest of winning the war declared on Italy, Germany and Japan.”

These are the demands that Comrade Juan Marinello will defend, because these are the measures that we consider it indispensable for the government to adopt, in order that this Cabinet may merit the title of the National Unity Cabinet, the War Cabinet, the Victory Cabinet.

Two New "International" Books

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA

By R. PALME DUTT

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

Price \$1.50

LABOR AND THE WAR

Prepared by Labor Research Association

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

Price \$1.25

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

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

SOCIALISM AND ETHICS

By Dr. Howard Selsam

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

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

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

224 Pages. Price \$1.90



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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