

The Communist

20¢

MAY

1944

MAY DAY FOR VICTORY

LOUIS F. BUDENZ

•

TRENDS IN THE TWO MAJOR PARTIES

ADAM LAPIN

•

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

N. SPARKS

•

THE SEATTLE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

HENRY P. HUFF

•

CONCERNING A CHARGE OF BETRAYAL

HANS BERGER

•

ENEMIES OF TEHERAN

BOB THOMPSON

New Books on the Soviet Union

VLADIMIR LENIN

A Political Biography

Prepared by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of the U.S.S.R., this new definitive study of the founder and leader of the Soviet Union constitutes in many essential respects a history of the socialist revolution of 1917 which gave birth to the mighty Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an exposition of Lenin's social, economic and political theories which guided it to power.

Price \$1.90

The Red Army

By Prof. I. Minz

The history and organization of the Red Army and a record of its achievements from its foundation up to the epic victory at Stalingrad.

Price \$1.25

Soviet Economy and the War

By Maurice Dobb

A factual record of economic developments during the last few years with special reference to their bearing on the Soviet war potential.

Paper \$.25; Cloth \$1.00

Soviet Planning and Labor in Peace and War

By Maurice Dobb

Economic planning, the financial system, work, wages, the economic effects of the war, and other special aspects of the Soviet economic system prior to and during the war.

Paper \$.35; Cloth \$1.00

The Secret of Soviet Strength

By Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury

The sources and challenge of Soviet economic, political and military might, described by the author of the best-selling book, *The Soviet Power*.

Paper \$.35; Cloth \$1.50

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

C O N T E N T S

May Day for Victory and the Teheran Goal	<i>Louis F. Budenz</i>	387
Trends in the Two Major Parties	<i>Adam Lapin</i>	397
International Monopolies and the War	<i>K. Hofman</i>	410
The Two-Party System	<i>N. Sparks</i>	415
Enemies of Teheran	<i>Bob Thompson</i>	425
Concerning a Charge of Betrayal	<i>Hans Berger</i>	431
The Maryland-District of Columbia Enlightenment Campaign	<i>Dorey A. Wilkerson</i>	440
The Seattle Municipal Elections	<i>Henry P. Huff</i>	450
Issues and Tasks in the Primary Elections		457
Hungary's Occupation by Hitler	<i>E. Gavrilov</i>	461
Where Is Finland Going—Toward Peace or Catastrophe?		465
Historic Documents		469

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.

PAMPHLETS ON THE WAR

Communists and National Unity, by Earl Browder03
The Negro People and the Communists, by Doxey A. Wilkerson03
Labor Faces '44's Challenge, by Joseph North02
Teheran and America, by Earl Browder05
Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, by Earl Browder05
Farmers in 1944, by Charles J. Coe10
Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity, by William Z. Foster05
A Talk About the Communist Party, by Earl Browder03
Jewish Unity For Victory, by Alexander Bittelman10
The Path Dimitroff Charted, by V. J. Jerome05
We Will Join Hands With Russia on Polish-Soviet Relations	.05
The 16 Soviet Republics: Molotov's Speech to the Supreme Soviet03
The War of National Liberation, by Joseph Stalin, in two parts Each	.15
George Dimitroff, with an introduction by Earl Browder . .	.10



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

MAY DAY FOR VICTORY AND THE TEHERAN GOAL

BY LOUIS F. BUDENZ

IN A WORLD much changed since that which gave birth to the first May Day, the workers' holiday in 1944 stirs labor everywhere anew to visions of anti-Nazi victory.

The responsibilities placed upon the working people in this globe-encircling war of national liberation are different in degree and form from those which faced the workers on that first May Day six decades ago. Underlying both periods, and through the intervening years, there have been nonetheless the same broad and basic objectives in each succeeding May Day. This holiday has been dedicated to that solidarity of the labor movement internationally which would produce the maximum victories over the enemies of the peoples, and it has had ever as its goal the establishment of an enduring peace.

Such objectives—the great goals of May Day—are expressed today amid the thunder of battle and the hopes of mankind, in the new moves for closer cooperation among the American, British and Soviet trade union organizations for the wiping out of Hitlerism. They are likewise brought into life through the struggle in our country and elsewhere for

the triumph of the pledges and the program of Teheran, with its promise of peace for several generations.

It is fifty-five years since the First Congress of the Second International adopted a resolution, as proposed by Paul Lafargue, to celebrate May 1 annually as the workers' holiday. It was a day to review the forces of the international working class.

It grew out of the understanding and initiative of the most advanced section of the workers' movements, which included in the forefront those who marched under the banner of the fight for Socialism.

The resolution which brought this holiday into being, as presented by one of the outstanding disciples of Marx and Engels and adopted by the Congress of the Second International in 1889, called for a great international demonstration on this day. The first theme of the demonstration was to be the eight-hour day, that center of struggle which led to the development of our first permanent American trade union movement.

Three years before the Lafargue resolution, May Day had rocketed across the horizon as a militant day of international labor solidarity in

the big mass movement of the American workers for that eight-hour-day demand. May 4, 1888, will ever be remembered in the annals of human freedom as the time of the Haymarket frame-up and massacre. It will also long be recalled that the then youthful American Federation of Labor, deeply stirred by the battle for the eight-hour day and by the terror represented by Haymarket, made a decision in 1888 that May 1 be a day of militant workers' demonstrations. The French Trade Union Congress followed with a similar resolution, thus opening the way for the decision reached through the act initiated by Lafargue.

It was with an eagerness justified by subsequent history that Frederick Engels waited for the first international celebration of May Day in 1890. "I am looking forward to May 1 with great impatience," he wrote his friend Sorge. And on that day itself he hailed the unity which it signaled, in so many communities and so many lands.

Although widespread provocations and military precautions were taken by the reactionaries in country after country, the first international celebration of May Day brought out thousands of working people in many different nations. In Britain and Germany, Belgium and France, Sweden and Norway, Italy and Spain, Austria and Russia, the workers downed their tools and marched in the big demonstrations.

Called in the name of labor and for the furtherance of labor's aims, these mighty mass parades and meetings have contributed in the long run of history to the progress

of all human freedom. For they have furnished one large occasion for strengthening the sinews of the labor movements everywhere and in giving those movements better political perception. These developments in turn have made these movements strong enough and alert enough, in humanity's present gigantic crisis, to turn out the production and help carry on the war which has seared and will destroy Hitler.

* * *

In the United States, for instance, the existence of a strong labor movement has been a major factor in the record-breaking aircraft production that has distinguished the American war effort. On April 2 Charles E. Wilson, chairman of the Aircraft Production Board, could announce with some pride that America had reached an all-time monthly record of 9,118 planes in March. It is the American trade union personnel of 12,000,000 members that has done so much to bring about the condition that Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, could refer to on Jan. 24. Then he said that "the nation has definitely solved the major problems involved in mass production of munitions," and has been able to arm its own millions of men and devote considerable lend-lease to the armies of its Allies.

The intelligent, cooperative, vigorous trade unions were strong enough to stimulate their members to achievements of this character; they have sprung up, let us remember, out of the struggles of the past, to which May Day gave fire and energy. More than production had,

of course, been involved. The trade unions have been the dynamic centers in all communities for spurring the offensive spirit, pushing the sale of war bonds, arousing the people to the menace of the fifth column and welding the solidarity of the community back of price control and the whole war effort.

One of the mighty towers of strength to the Soviet Union has been its powerful, democratic trade unions. Twenty-six million members are in their ranks and they have been a tremendous source of that moving of mountains that has distinguished the Soviet war effort. The unions have long understood some of the grave responsibilities which were laid upon labor's shoulders in all free nations in this anti-Hitler war. Theirs has been the task of raising the cultural and technical level of the millions of workers in the U.S.S.R., by which they blazed the trail for the huge productivity of the war period.

The success of the Soviet trade unions in reorganizing their work along wartime lines is indicated by Marshal Joseph Stalin's Order of the Day of May Day, 1942: "The front and rear of the country are united in a single fighting camp, firing at the same target. . . . The Soviet people in the rear supply our front with constantly growing quantities of rifles and machine guns, trench mortars and guns, tanks and aircraft, food and ammunition."

The sweep of the Red Army from Stalingrad to Jassy and from Moscow to Tatar Pass has been likewise the sweep of the Soviet labor movement, millions of whose members

were and are in those armed forces. Other millions, women and children included, were and are behind the lines—doing better in their miraculous production effort because they had the inspiration of their trade unions as well as their Socialist fatherland. Such is a trade union movement with which all brave and progressive labor men and women might feel proud to cooperate and to call friends and allies. This trade union movement is the highest product of the slogans and struggles centered around the May Days of the past.

The Communists, direct heirs of May Day, are a boon to the fighting free peoples at this hour of fiery ordeal. Out of their long understanding of the nature of the enemy of labor and the people, the Communists have contributed immensely to the effectiveness of the battle against fascist savagery.

Their work, too, is coming to be recognized among the free peoples. In Yugoslavia, it is a Communist Tito who is in charge of that nation's defense forces in the war for liberation. In the French Committee for National Liberation Communists have been given posts of major responsibility, specifically because of the urgings of the fighters of the Underground. In Italy their aid to national unity becomes more manifest every day, under the leadership of Palmiro Togliatti (Ercoli), their noted representative. In our own country, the Communist movement has been of vital value in emphasizing full backing to the Commander-in-Chief, in insisting upon the keeping of the no-strike pledge, in point-

ing, through the report of its leader, Earl Browder, to the urgency of complete national unity against the defeatist forces of chaos and catastrophe.

All anti-fascist forces in the free nations, no matter what class they may belong to, have benefited by the parades and pledges of the successive May Days. For these observances of the workers' holiday have strengthened the labor backbone of the nations fighting this war of liberation against Hitlerism—the powerful labor movements particularly of such mighty members of the United Nations as Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States.

The members of these labor movements look upon a much different scene and to a much different struggle from that which greeted the martyrs of Haymarket or the marchers in many of the ensuing May Day parades. Fifty-five years ago the infant labor movements were viewing the dawn and early development of the imperialist era; they were engaging in those forms of struggle which would build up and extend the workers' organized strength to meet that period.

Now the workers allied with other groups and classes in the free nations are locked in a death grapple with the most monstrous of imperialisms, Nazi-fascism. This hideous regime of open and depraved force aims to enslave the entire world, to put in chains the large and small countries alike, to reduce to one slave mass all the nations of the earth. It is this characteristic which belongs uniquely to Hitlerism and its Axis allies. The very character

of the enemy requires a difference in the character of the struggle for freedom compared to forty or sixty years ago. It lays upon labor on May Day the grave responsibility to produce to the maximum as its means to struggle; to weld stronger the win-the-war alliance with all groups who seek to smash Hitler, as the road to its own salvation.

In the framework of this current battle, May Day has a message of vital value to give the laboring people of the world. International trade union unity, which has been written high on the banners of May Day for many years, becomes of imperative urgency in the present great historical moment. With the great offensive against Hitler so near at hand, with the promise of victory so vividly real, with the possibilities for a long-term peace so much enhanced by Teheran, the closely-welded solidarity of the labor movements of the United Nations could go far to make all these aspirations speedy realities.

If labor will work cooperatively across national boundaries—particularly the trade union movements of Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States—then will the alliance of these mighty anti-Nazi powers be put on ever firmer and more permanent foundations. Then, also, will it become easier to rout the continued connivings of the defeatists against the Second Front and against that international cooperation for peace laid down at Teheran.

The working people of every country in the United Nations have a distinct "vested interest" in pro-

curing a speedy victory. They are not like those speculators in stocks who are stricken with fear when news of a possible big Allied offensive or of the nearer approach of Hitler's fall is indicated. More extensive international cooperation, to hasten victory over Nazism, is therefore a matter of major concern to the trade union movements of the free nations.

The labor movement of every country, and specifically of our United States, is likewise the nerve center of complete, pulsating, triumphant national unity. It is that force in the community which can peer more sharply through any clouds of confusion which the enemy or his agents may seek to create. Labor is that portion of the general population which can proceed with more clear-headedness and determination to the gaining of all-out victory. By its working together with the trade union movements of our mighty Allies, the American labor movement then contributes to a closer welding of the bonds of friendship and permanent cooperation with the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and all the United Nations. Literally by such an act it leads the people of our nation nearer to full-fledged international cooperation.

* * *

All these reasons have combined to attract the eyes of free peoples to the World Labor Congress which will open in London next month. The American Federation of Labor executive council, still under the evil influence of the Republican defeatists Matthew Woll and William

Hutcheson, has decided not to participate in this congress. The council members have rung all the rounds of Red-baiting and bearing of false witness against the Soviet trade unions in their backward attitude in this matter. "Ominous" was the word which the British liberal weekly, *The Manchester Guardian*, used to characterize the refusal by the Boston convention of the A. F. of L. to participate in close cooperation with the Soviet and British trade unions. It was a correct designation. For such an act definitely retarded the war effort of the United Nations. It perpetuated in the labor movement that chosen device out of the arsenal of Hitlerism, the Communist bogey. It has given impetus to other reactionary moves by the executive council, as witness the dog-in-the-manger act against the C.I.O. in the case of the International Labor Office meeting, the endorsement of the witch-hunter Martin Dies and the defeatist Gerald Nye by William Green and the A. F. of L. president's letter against political cooperation with the C.I.O. The Dies endorsement was too much for the local affiliate of the A. F. of L. in Dies' district to stomach, and it was repudiated by that organization.

Appreciation of the dangerous character of the A. F. of L. stand against international labor unity has begun to be expressed by noteworthy figures and sections of that federation. This is an indication that the fight for international cooperation is not at all ended within the A. F. of L., but has rather just begun. The strong Ohio Federation of Labor, represented by 450 delegates

at a meeting in Columbus in early March, called upon the executive council to reconsider its refusal to send delegates to the London conference. President Daniel Tobin of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, who is a member of the council, had declared a few days before this Ohio action was taken, that there should be a re-examination of the A. F. of L.'s position toward the Soviet trade unions. Leaders of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers International Alliance and the Brotherhood of Painters, Paperhangers and Decorators have made similar declarations of late.

One of the pledges and resolves among the workers on this May Day can well be the determination to continue waging the battle for international labor unity within the A. F. of L., as one of the big guarantees of America's full participation in international cooperation among the free nations. That will be a contribution on a large scale toward anti-Nazi victory.

Despite the executive council's persistent attempts to prevent this unity and all the accompanying machinations with Sir Walter Citrine, Secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, the world labor assembly will be convened in the British capital in June. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress, as a result of the strong sentiment for such action expressed at the Southport T.U.C. congress, has sent out invitations to the labor movements of thirty-seven countries. The invitation has included unions of neutral lands as well as those of the United Nations. The

Soviet trade unions, which have taken the initiative in urging an expansion of the successful Anglo-Soviet trade union committee, will be present. For the United States, the Congress of Industrial Organizations will be represented by twelve of its leading officers.

The mere act of meeting does not, of course, solve all the problems which arise in connection with international labor cooperation. There has been an apparent disposition on the part of a certain section of the British T.U.C. leadership, for instance, to avoid bringing into the preparations for the June Congress the representatives of American and Soviet labor. Such incidents merely say again that international unity is urgently on the order of the day and that every participating national labor movement, for the United States the C.I.O., will have to look keenly and stand strongly for those measures which will fully assure it.

* * *

The history of the struggle for international labor unity in the pre-war world furnishes further realization of what a golden moment is represented in this congress in London. The desire and effort to bring about international cooperation among the labor movements of various countries are as old as labor organization itself. With the rise of Hitler to power, this desire became accelerated by the danger confronting labor and the world. It was voiced in particular by the Soviet trade unions, which keenly understood the blood-bath that was in store for the world unless labor acted.

How different indeed would have been the course of history had international solidarity been attained at the conference of the International Federation of Trade Unions, which took place in 1936 in that very London where now the world congress is to meet. Madrid was about to make its historic defense and thereby signal to labor everywhere the urgency of a united stand against the Axis aggressors. The machinations of the Hitlerites in the Sudetenland were already throwing the shadows of the destruction of Czechoslovakia over the world scene.

So pressing had world events become that one week after the conclusion of this Seventh Triennial Congress of the I.F.T.U., Franco's fascist insurrection was to rear its bloody head in Spain. The congress which met from July 6 to 11 took place with trade union unity already on the march. In France and Spain the trade unions had united, after their previous division.

But the anti-Soviet Social-Democrats of the Friedrich Stampfer-David Dubinsky type, particularly represented by Sir Walter Citrine, resorted to every trick at their command to block unity. This was not new for them; it was tragic for the labor movement of the world. Scarcely had the meeting opened when the Norwegian unions proposed a motion to open negotiations with the Soviet trade unions, looking to their entry at that time into the I.F.T.U. The vote on that was 32 to 32, but Sir Walter Citrine, in the chair, declared the motion to refer the whole matter to a commission "not carried."

Then it was, after debate and pressure from many quarters, that the Congress finally decided "in view of the serious nature of the international situation" to ask all labor movements throughout the world to join hands. While this was what all labor wanted, in this case it was obviously a diversion by the Social-Democratic leaders of a number of national labor movements to block the fusion with the Soviet trade unions by putting forward a bigger agenda and one much more difficult to attain quickly at that time. It was a crude attempt at creating an alibi for no unity by seeming to want inclusion also of the American labor movement. It was thus a bald maneuver on the part of certain Social-Democratic connivers to bring forward the A. F. of L. officialdom's opposition to cooperation with the Soviet trade unions. For Matthew Woll was as busily at work then on behalf of blocking international labor unity as he is today.

How well it can be seen today that unity at London in 1936 would have helped to hem Hitler in, would have given a firm foundation to the People's Front movements developing against the fascist war danger! It would have saved Spain and have prevented the ravages of war which the fascist gangsters brought down upon the world.

The Hitler-Mussolini aggressors went on to sharpen their Damocles sword which they held with a thinning thread over the heads of European labor. Through the farce of "non-intervention," Spain was being slowly choked to death. The urgency

for unity became so clear that the committee set up by the I.F.T.U. to treat with the Soviet trade unions came to what was said to be an agreement. That was in Nov., 1937. But the anti-Soviet Social-Democrats (the little brothers of the Munich-ers) swung again into action against unity. At the I.F.T.U. General Council meeting at Oslo in 1938, it was decided by a vote of 16 to 4 to break off negotiations with the Soviet trade unions. Within two years thereafter Hitler's troops were tramping through the streets of the city in which the I.F.T.U. leaders had rejected unity.

How much could unity still have achieved the following year, fateful 1939, at the Eighth Congress of the I.F.T.U. at Zurich! By then the British trade unions had been alarmed to the extent of standing solidly for unity. Along with the Norwegians, they were the proponents of the resolution favoring speedy negotiations with the Soviet trade unions. Through the machinations of such shady characters as Mertens of Belgium, who had connived against unity from the start, the motion was defeated by 46 to 37. Within two months, guns and bombs were shaking European earth again, Warsaw was under attack, Britain and Germany were at war and the first phase of the new world conflict had opened up.

It was in the fiery test of the peoples' war for liberation that unity began to be first achieved through the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. So well did it function and so great was its acknowledged value in stepping up production and

morale in Britain, that its expansion into a wider united agency was proposed. Certainly, this committee has made a deep impress on the relations between the British and Soviet peoples and has effected indirectly a better relationship among these people and the American workers. In preparing the way for the achievements of Cairo, Moscow and Teheran, the unity of the British and Soviet trade unions has had its due share.

* * *

On this May Day we can recall the united front appeal from Spain to "the working class of the world" of that last May Day in Madrid six years ago. Said the Spanish trade unions then: "This First of May is marked by the desire to preserve, at no matter what price, elementary liberties conquered at the cost of blood and which we are forced to repurchase in the currency of blood. Formerly the First of May was expressed in rights to be demanded—now, while the war lasts, it is converted into the indication of duties which demand fulfillment. For the soldiers of the people we have one watchword: to fight. For the workers in the rear its equivalent: to work. . . ." (Manifesto of Socialist and Communist Parties in Spain and the Spanish Trade Union Federation, 1938.)

The fulfillment of our duty consists in nothing more urgent than the forwarding of solidarity and cooperation among the trade union movements of the United Nations. That entails the pushing forward in other A. F. of L. affiliates of the

patriotic insistence of the Ohio State Federation of Labor for cooperation with the World Labor Congress. It involves the forwarding in every local union, whatever its affiliation, of an understanding of the necessity for making international labor relationships a complete and unqualified success.

American labor's duty and that of the people as a whole is bound up, too, in the mammoth national contest centered around the Presidential election. The fate of the war, as well as the pattern of the peace, is involved in its outcome. It is the triumph of the Teheran agreement that is at issue with the promise of enduring peace, over against the disaster which Earl Browder has said "is the only alternative to Teheran."

Events of the last few weeks have brought out in bold relief that the drafting of President Roosevelt for the fourth term is not a matter of bargaining or quibbling on the part of labor and the people's organizations. It is a solemn obligation that labor and the people appeal to the President in the most emphatic terms to run again for the Presidency. The Republican Party has demonstrated that it is hopelessly dominated at present by the Hoover-Spangler coterie of Rightist reaction and defeatism. These are the leaders of the America First-imperialist clique who are set upon a reactionary course for the United States both in the war and the post-war world.

On May Day it is encouraging to record that the C.I.O. Political Action Committee has begun to rise to

the challenge represented by this shadow over America's political future. Its activity is being speeded up everywhere. The victory for the Committee for a United Labor Party in New York goes in the same direction, and the announcement by such an outstanding leader in the American Federation of Labor as Daniel J. Tobin of the Brotherhood of Teamsters of his all-out backing for the fourth term is a barometer of the sweep within labor ranks to the President's banner.

The real campaign which Tobin has promised to wage for the fourth term, as indicated by the dedication of the entire April issue of his union's official journal to that subject, is also a throwing down of the gauntlet to the defeatists Matthew Woll and William Hutcheson. In coming out four-square for Roosevelt, President Tobin has also felt impelled to stress more strongly his friendship for the Soviet trade unions and our powerful Soviet ally and to emphasize the need for international trade union unity.

These issues all are intertwined. They are all parts of the grand strategy centered around the President, which stands for a vigorous offensive in the war and the firm building of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition as the foundation for the peace.

In dedicating our 1944 work on this May Day to these aims, we can be guided by the pertinent words of Earl Browder in his report of Jan. 7, 1944. "Our course is not easy and it will require political struggles," said he at that time, "but these must be struggles for unity in the nation, not struggles which will break that

unity; struggles against the enemies for which we will have to find ever new means and forms; of unity and for uniting everyone who recognizes, even indistinctly but enough to take the first steps, the need for going along the road of the Teheran Conference.”*

To make itself the dynamo for the doing of these things within the nation and on the world scene, American labor has to pool its own strength. Working-class solidarity on a national and international scale

has become imperative in the new and higher phase of the war for the destruction of Hitlerism and for the building of a stable post-war world. By expanding city and state cooperation, American labor will go forward to national and international solidarity, and it will be the better able to weld the overwhelming patriotic majority of the population who are working for the winning of full victory. From out of the serried ranks of the millions of May Day marchers through the past years of struggle comes the full-throated cry to us now: “*Onward in Unity to Victory!*”

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 47.

NOTE

The concluding installment of the article “The Communist Vanguard,” by V. J. Jerome, the first part of which was published in the April issue, will appear in the June issue.

TRENDS IN THE TWO MAJOR PARTIES

BY ADAM LAPIN

THE historic 1944 election campaign has not yet formally been launched. But in actual fact it has been under way for some time. Important preliminary battles have already been fought. Wendell Willkie, the one Republican Presidential aspirant who did not stand for Hooverism, has withdrawn from the race after his crushing defeat in Wisconsin. The Administration victory in the important Oklahoma by-election has shattered the myth of an invincible Republican tide.

Organized labor has begun to play an increasingly important role in the election struggle. The C.I.O. Political Action Committee led by Sidney Hillman has emerged as a decisive factor in developing the unity of the Roosevelt forces. Daniel J. Tobin of the teamsters union has come forward as the leading supporter of President Roosevelt in the A. F. of L. And the Woll-Hutcheson group in the A. F. of L., frightened at the prospect of unity behind the President and win-the-war candidates for Congress, has intensified its efforts to thwart united labor action in the political campaign.

Earl Browder has pointed out that the Democratic and Republican Parties, the principal organized expressions of the contending forces in the

1944 elections, are in fact "coalitions of many groups which in most countries would be separate parties." But under the impact of the Teheran conference, of the sharp legislative struggles in Congress and of the approaching Presidential election, the leading circles of both these amorphous political groupings have tended in recent weeks to solidify.

The Republican Party has become increasingly the vehicle of the forces which oppose the perspectives of peace and international cooperation held out by Teheran, the forces of downright defeatism. Defeatists like Senator Robert Taft of Ohio and Herbert Hoover, who has had such long experience in leading the nation into economic disaster and anti-Soviet adventures, have strengthened their grip on the machinery of the Republican Party. They have been able to stop Willkie. They have been able to make Hoover's protégé, Governor Thomas Dewey of New York, the leading Republican candidate.

This has created a measure of unity in the official leadership of the Republican Party. But it has also created new possibilities for winning millions of Republican voters for a different kind of unity, for unity behind the President in the November

election. These possibilities are enhanced by the actual unity which has begun to develop in the Democratic Party under the leadership of President Roosevelt.

The April 2 meeting of the Democratic National Committee was unanimous in urging the President to seek re-election and in endorsing his record. The votes in Congress on subsidies and the soldier vote issue showed more cohesion in the Democratic Party, more support for the President than had been evident for some time. Senator Barkley's revolt on the tax issue emphasized the diffuseness and the loosely knit character of the Democratic Party. But it did not reverse the fundamental trend. It was Barkley who made an ardent plea for support of the President's policies in the Oklahoma by-election.

* * *

The frankest statement of underlying Republican policy came after the Moscow conference from Senator Taft, who is now in name as well as in fact his party's leader in the Senate. Taft conceded that there might have been some excuse for going to war against Japan; he had apparently heard of Pearl Harbor. But he insisted that "the question of whether our entrance into the war with Germany was justified seems to me to be a debatable one." As a matter of fact, Taft flatly took the position that it was not justified.

On the basis of his premise that the United States would not have been attacked and could have defended itself if it were attacked, Taft said that "then the only reason

for our going to war when we did was to avoid a war in the future. Certainly there may be some justification for joining a league of nations and for engaging in a small war to prevent a larger war; but there can be no logical justification for engaging in an all-out war such as the present war in order to avoid another all-out war. . . . We were told that if we did not do so we would have to set up an Army and a Navy which would drain the resources of the United States. Mr. President, we could have set up an Army and a Navy and could have paid for them for fifty years without involving the expense that one all-out war is costing in two years the people of the United States."

Taft sharply attacked the notion that the Moscow Declaration closed the door on a negotiated peace. He insisted that this is not "binding on the United States of America because after all we have the right to declare war. Only the Congress can make a peace. Certainly only Congress can say that we will not under any circumstances make peace except with the consent of other nations."

Most Republican Lincoln Day orators were not quite so frank. They did not explicitly renounce the war or call for a negotiated peace. They simply failed to discuss the problems of winning the war and of achieving lasting peace by cooperation between the United Nations. They simply substituted for the great war in which the nation is engaged a war of their own, a war against the President and his policies. Governor Tom Dewey of New York, described

so aptly by Senator Claude Pepper of Florida as the "coy candidate" who "came out against isolationism only when it was ridiculous any longer to embrace it," drew a distorted parallel with the war in Lincoln's day. It was not the war against Hitlerism and fascism which is the twentieth-century equivalent of the Civil War. Not at all. The great crisis today in Dewey's opinion is the centralization of authority in the Federal government and the "abdication" of power by the states.

Perhaps the closest equivalent to Taft's statement of policy, and all the more significant because it comes from a routine Republican politician who is in no sense a policy-maker and who reflects what so many of his colleagues in Congress are thinking, was made by Senator Raymond Willis of Indiana.

Contrasting, unfavorably, of course, Roosevelt's record with that of Lincoln, Willis said: "All the strange schemes which the crackpots and theorists could cook up were foisted upon the people. . . . Now we find ourselves not only confused and confounded with the problems here at home, but with a war on every sea and on fifty fronts. So far have we drifted from the pattern of the government which our fathers laid down for us, and which Abraham Lincoln saved for us, that there is a well-founded doubt we can ever take it up again." For Senator Willis the war is apparently just another "crackpot" New Deal fancy.

It would be an oversimplification to say that every Republican Congressman is a Ham Fish, that every Republican Senator is a Bob Taft,

and that every local Republican politician is a miniature Herbert Hoover. There are, of course, millions of patriotic Americans who vote Republican. There are many Republicans in Congress, even though they have not been sufficiently articulate and aggressive, who sincerely want to win the war. But it would be accurate to say that the Hoover-Taft group has been able to manipulate the narrow partisanship which is all too prevalent in the Republican Party. It would be accurate to say that Republican policy is made by the Bob Tafts and the Ham Fishes and, of course, by Hoover, and that the complexion of the Republican Party leadership is predominantly anti-Teheran, anti-United Nations, and defeatist.

It is this group which has completely taken over the nine-man Republican steering committee in the Senate. Taft is now the chairman of the steering committee which will make policy on all major issues for the Republicans in the Senate. Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan, a faithful follower of Hoover policies, is chairman of the Republican caucus and a member of the steering committee. Curley Brooks of Illinois, the *Chicago Tribune's* mouthpiece, is a member of the steering committee. And so is Senator Harlan Bushfield of South Dakota, who was elected with substantial contributions of du Pont money in 1942. Senator Wallace White of Maine, the Republican floor leader, is not a defeatist, but he has been all too pliable in the hands of Taft and Vandenberg. Carefully kept off the steering commit-

tee were men like Senators Warren Austin of Vermont, Chan Gurney of South Dakota and Harold Burton of Ohio, who have generally supported Administration foreign policy.

The Republicans point to Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire as evidence that the steering committee is not exclusively "isolationist." And it is true that Bridges was in favor of American intervention in the war long before Pearl Harbor. But Bridges has become increasingly anti-Soviet in recent months; this is now his chief concern with foreign policy. There is in fact a disturbing anti-Soviet trend among some Republicans in Congress who are not defeatists. It was the anti-Soviet angle that was most apparent in the complaint of the twenty-four Republican freshman Congressmen that the United States lacks a foreign policy.

* * *

The Hoover-Taft group has maintained remarkable control over most of the Republicans in Congress. The three most important issues to come before Congress this year are subsidies, taxes and soldier voting, which involve the broad problems of price control and economic stabilization and the democratic rights of the nation's 11,000,000 servicemen. On all three issues the Republicans voted against the interests of the war effort with a partisan solidarity which is unique under a political set-up where party labels are frequently discarded.

House Republicans maintained almost unbroken lines. Only nineteen Republicans voted for subsidies.

Only eighteen supported a Federal ballot for servicemen. The most obvious example was the 199-to-3 lineup of the House Republicans to override the President's tax veto. In the Senate, where party lines are traditionally even looser than in the House, only three Republican Senators voted for subsidies. Only one Republican Senator sided with the President on taxes. On the soldier vote issue, ten Republican Senators did make a break with narrow partisanship and showed themselves more aware of the political dynamite in this issue than their House colleagues.

The only major foreign policy issue to reach Congress this year was approval of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. While there were only fifty-four votes, practically all Republican, against final passage of the U.N.R.R.A. measure, this was not, however, the real test. The actual opposition to U.N.R.R.A. came on various amendments. There were 175 votes for the Vorys amendment to slap the President by taking control of U.N.R.R.A. away from him and there were 131 votes for the Rogers amendment to slash U.N.R.R.A. funds in half. In both cases only about half a dozen Democrats sided with a solid mass of Republicans. About three-quarters of the Republicans on the floor, some seventy or eighty in each case, voted for a whole series of amendments such as the Busbey amendment to eliminate U.N.R.R.A. completely as a United Nations agency and turn over its functions to the Red Cross. The votes for these amendments rep-

resented opposition to even the most elementary form of United Nations cooperation.

Unfortunately, there failed to emerge during these crucial Congressional battles any cohesive or substantial group of Republicans who consistently supported the President's policies. There were, however, from fifteen to twenty out of the 211 Republicans in the House who on some occasions voted for Administration measures. Representatives Burdick of North Dakota, Welch of California and Wolverton of New Jersey were perhaps outstanding among House Republicans. Representatives Ellison of Maryland, La Follette of Indiana and Bolton of Ohio have also shown signs of independence. Some Willkie Republicans like Judd of Minnesota and Baldwin of New York have been distinctly disappointing in their performance, and have tended to vote along partisan lines.

The controlling Hoover group in the Republican Party, backed by those sections of American capitalism such as the du Ponts and the Pews which are opposed to the perspectives of Teheran, is determined to stop any candidate, whether for the Presidency or for Congress, who is out of step with their policies. An interesting example of this is seen in South Dakota, where du Pont money is being freely used to defeat Senator Chan Gurney in the Republican primary. Gurney is no maverick; he is a very conservative Republican. But, like Senator Austin of Vermont and Representative Wadsworth of New York, he does support the war after his own lights.

He has voted for renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and for measures to aid the farmer, like Farm Security and Federal Crop Insurance. So the Hoover-Taft-du Pont boys are after Gurney.

But the most significant evidence of the control of the Hoover-Taft clique is seen in the race for the Republican Presidential nomination. Governor Dewey of New York, Herbert Hoover's young protégé, has forged far ahead of his contenders. Dewey has maintained a consistent silence on most national and international issues, in keeping with his pose of not being a candidate at all. But he has occasionally broken out with anti-Soviet comments. He has favored an exclusive Anglo-American alliance. He did take an active part in opposing the Federal ballot for servicemen. It is Dewey who has almost everywhere the support of the dominant Republican machine. He also has the backing of the *New York Daily News* and of defeatists like Senators Nye and Bushfield.

A number of other candidates have been important primarily as part of the stop-Willkie movement. Governor Bricker of Ohio is not taken too seriously. He will undoubtedly throw his support to Dewey, although, if Senator Taft himself shows any real chance of getting the nomination, Bricker's votes at the convention will go to Taft. The candidacies of General MacArthur and Lieut. Commander Stassen also seem to be part of the stop-Willkie drive. But MacArthur has the backing of Senator Vandenberg and other experienced Republican politicians, as well as of America Firsters like Gen.

Wood and Col. R. R. McCormick, and his candidacy may become a serious threat if it develops into a rallying ground for all those who oppose the Administration's basic war strategy of crushing Hitler Germany before completing the war in the Pacific.

Willkie has made serious concessions to the superior forces of the defeatists in his party. He has been guilty of unprincipled partisanship. After failing to lift a finger to help pass an adequate tax bill, he criticized the President for not asking for \$16,000,000,000 in new revenue. And when the President fought with all he had for a more substantial tax bill, Willkie criticized him for fighting. Willkie has criticized the State Department for dealing with the Darlans in North Africa—but he has also hinted his criticism of the State Department for not being more friendly to the Polish Darlans.

All this appeasement of defeatism and reaction did not help Willkie in the Wisconsin primary. He was up against the powerful Republican machine. And the very contradictions in his speeches made it difficult for him to rally the support of the majority of the patriotic Republican voters. Willkie has now drawn the obvious conclusion that he cannot get the Republican nomination. Whether he will draw the equally obvious conclusion of throwing his support to Roosevelt remains to be seen. He did intensify his criticism of Col. McCormick and the defeatists in the Republican Party. He did direct much of his fire against Dewey and the men behind him. But he devoted most of the Omaha

speech in which he announced his withdrawal to an attack on Administration foreign policy.

If Willkie should take the bold step of supporting the President, he would find millions of Republican voters ready to follow him. For, notwithstanding the cry of the McCormick camp, the majority of the Republican voters, like the rest of America, are not isolationist; they want to win the war and smash the Axis. The Hoover-Taft group now has a stranglehold on the official machinery of the Republican Party. It will pick the candidate at the Chicago convention in June. But this very development means that the Republicans run the risk of forfeiting the support of many millions of voters who are more concerned with the welfare of their country than with party regularity. It won't be easy to win their support. But the possibilities have begun to emerge.

* * *

President Roosevelt's policies stand out in distinction to those of the Hoover-Taft group. His is a policy of winning the war in full coalition with our allies. His foreign policy is embodied in the Moscow and Teheran agreements—and it is clear enough, even if Republican politicians profess to be mystified by it. The President's domestic policy is closely linked with his foreign policy. The President himself pointed to the need for developing a program on all domestic issues attuned to the needs of winning the war, at his celebrated press conference in which he told how Dr. Win-the-War has now taken over in place of old

Dr. New Deal. This created dismay among some panicky liberals who are only too eager to believe the worst of the President.

But the President's fight for an effective soldier vote bill, for subsidies and for an adequate tax program shows that he is uncompromising in battle against Rightist reaction when the interests of the war effort are at stake. As a result of his courageous messages to Congress on these three major issues, the President has enormously strengthened his position with labor, servicemen, and the people generally.

On all three issues the President has exposed the reactionary position of the Republicans. They stand for a tax bill which the President exposed as a "tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy." They stand for an anti-subsidy bill which the President twice described as "an inflation measure, a high-cost-of-living measure, a food-shortage measure." And they lined up solidly with John Rankin and the most reactionary Southern Congressmen for a soldier vote bill which the President properly branded a "fraud" designed to keep the nation's servicemen from voting in the November elections.

The Republican alliance with the Rankin poll-taxers has created deep resentment among servicemen and their families. But this alliance also has enormous significance in the battle for the Negro vote, which in many states may be decisive. Add the Republican record on soldier voting to their support for the attack against F.E.P.C., as shown in their activity on the Smith Commit-

tee of the House and the Senate Appropriations Committee, and you have a real basis for exposing the Republican demagoguery among the Negro people and for winning overwhelming Negro support for the Administration.

The President has also succeeded in exposing the hollow demagoguery of the Republicans in attempting to make "free enterprise" the issue in the November elections. The Baruch report has sketched a post-war perspective of full employment and full production on the basis of the Teheran agreement. And it has emphasized that post-war America will be safely capitalist, with government-owned plants and equipment sold to private industry. The Republicans have been robbed of their pet issue.

The Baruch report should be an important factor in winning for the President even more substantial support among the most influential capitalist circles. Charles E. Wilson and Donald Nelson of the War Production Board have already spoken for the most far-sighted sections of American capitalism in warning of the dangers of "Rightist reaction"—and this attitude will undoubtedly be reflected in the elections.

A major problem still facing the Democratic Party is winning more support among the farmers. There is no doubt that the Republicans have made great headway among farmers, exploiting dissatisfaction and confusion on the subsidy issue as well as shortcomings of the Administration program in mobilizing agriculture for the war. Resentment against labor has been deliberately stirred up by leaders of the Grange

and the Farm Bureau Federation, and has become an important factor in political line-ups among the farmers. The labor movement has been all too slow in reaching the farmers, in developing plans for unity and joint activity behind the war effort on a local and state scale.

Despite the many still unsolved problems, the conditions necessary for the re-election of the President are present. The issues are there. The record is there. The President has developed a rounded-out program which should win him and the Administration support and unity unparalleled in our history. The real problem is how to take advantage of the potentialities, how to utilize them to the utmost.

* * *

The Democratic Party cannot do the job unaided. It needs the energetic and united support of the entire labor movement, of the independent voters, and of the patriotic Republicans. The Democratic Party should, however, learn from past mistakes. The issues of the war were not sufficiently stressed in the 1942 elections and in the subsequent by-elections. But the fact is that Administration candidates can win when the issues are actually made clear. The Republicans wanted to make the Oklahoma Congressional race a test of Administration strength. They succeeded in making it just that—and in losing the election.

The enormous strength of the President and his policies with the people has resulted in a definite if uneven trend toward unification within the Democratic Party. An im-

portant indication of this is seen in the fourth term resolution passed at the recent meeting of the Democratic National Committee which said: "We, assembled, realizing his world leadership and knowing that our allies are praying with us for the continuation of his services both in war and peace, do now earnestly solicit him to continue as the great world leader."

The Democrats know that they cannot win without Roosevelt. This was unquestionably a factor in the unanimity of the Democratic National Committee. There are still several interlocking movements with the professed aim of blocking the President's nomination at the Chicago convention in July. There is the Byrd-for-President movement in the South. There is the stop-Roosevelt movement led by former Governor Ely in Massachusetts. And there is the Woodring organization composed mostly of outright fascist elements in the midwest—from which former Secretary of War Woodring has himself resigned in an open admission of defeat. It is clear that these groups are doomed to failure in terms of actually preventing the nomination of the President, if he should agree to run. They are primarily designed to lay the groundwork for a committee of "Democrats" to support whatever nominee is selected at the Republican convention.

All these anti-Roosevelt movements, particularly the Woodring Committee, counted on receiving the support of James A. Farley, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, who had opposed

a third term for the President. The New York State Democratic Committee's recent unanimous declaration in favor of a fourth term for Roosevelt, stimulated by the January resolution of the National Democratic Committee, and by the rising pro-fourth-term tide, had the concurring voice of Farley—a development whose significance is not lessened by whatever motives prompted the adoption of his pro-Roosevelt position.

Robert Hannegan, the new Democratic National Committee chairman, has set himself the job of unifying the party and of eliminating the dry rot and disorganization which were marked both in national headquarters and throughout the country. Hannegan is for the President for a fourth term. Beyond that he is just an organization man, hardly noted for political ideas or policies. But an effective organizer can certainly be used by the Democratic Party.

One problem Hannegan has in cementing Democratic Party unity is the drive by some diehard poll taxers in the South and Rightist Democrats in other parts of the country for the elimination of Henry Wallace as Vice-Presidential candidate and the substitution of a conservative Southerner. A recent Gallup poll has shown that Wallace has substantial popular backing and is running far ahead of all other Vice-Presidential possibilities in the South as everywhere else. Whether the anti-Wallace movement succeeds depends in part on Wallace himself, who has weakened his position with indiscriminate attacks on all big business.

There are, of course, in Congress nominal Democrats like Senators Wheeler of Montana, Johnson of Colorado and Reynolds of North Carolina, who are outright defeatists. But to a degree the same trend toward unity which was expressed at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee is also found in Congress.

On the soldier vote and subsidy issues, the President was able to win substantial support within his own party. He got 130 Democratic votes on the subsidy issue in the House, and 147 on the soldier vote issue. With only a few scattered exceptions, he succeeded in obtaining all the votes of Democratic Congressmen north of the Mason-Dixon line. And, very significantly, he got the support of about half the Southern Democrats in the House.

The Republicans and the most reactionary Southern Democrats were defeated by the President on the subsidy issue and outmaneuvered on the soldier vote issue. They realized that the President was taking the issues to the people. They therefore launched their counter-offensive on the President's tax veto—and got the support of Senate Majority leader Barkley. The anti-Roosevelt coalition successfully used the slogans of Congressional solidarity and independence from executive dictation. The President had to contend with weak Administration leadership in Congress and a whole array of special interest groups and lobbies. Nor did he receive sufficient support from the labor movement which had asked him to veto the bill. Despite the wishful thinking of some reac-

tionary commentators, the line-up against the President was temporary and can be prevented from reappearing to the same degree.

One of the most important features of the recent Congressional battles was the development of a real split between the Southern Democrats in Congress. This is a product of the growth of the labor movement in the South and of the political awakening of progressive and forward-looking forces. It is a reflection of the same factors which have made possible the historic Supreme Court decision outlawing the white primary in Texas, which in turn makes possible great new democratic developments in the South. It is now possible to draw a clear line between men like Martin Dies and John Rankin who represent the most oppressive poll-tax reaction of the South and men like Lyndon Johnson of Texas and John Folger of North Carolina.

Differences can now be discerned between Southern states where the labor movement has begun to grow and make itself felt and states where the workers are still unorganized and democracy is still ruthlessly suppressed. The Tennessee delegation in the House, for example, has an excellent voting record. Out of the eight Tennessee Democrats, six supported the President on subsidies, seven on the soldier vote, and the same number even on taxes. The North Carolina and Florida delegations backed the President overwhelmingly on the soldier vote and subsidies, although they switched on taxes. There are now important splits within state delegations. The

Texas delegation lined up fifteen to five for the President on the soldier vote. It was split eleven to six against the President on subsidies, and was almost unanimous against the President on taxes.

In the Senate the split between pro- and anti-Roosevelt Southern Democrats did not take such a sharp form. This was partly because Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, the Democratic whip and the obvious leader of a movement to support the President, thought he could mend his political fences by lining up with the reactionary poll-tax Senators. Hill failed the President on subsidies and the soldier vote. He did, however, support the President on the tax issue.

The Democratic Party in the South still confronts the President and the whole labor movement with enormous problems. Both Senator Hill and Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, a consistent Administration supporter, face stiff primary opposition. It would certainly be a mistake to underestimate the diehard Bailey-Byrd-Cotton Ed Smith group. But it would be an even greater mistake to assume that the Southern delegation in Congress is one solid reactionary mass; to forget that more than a half of the Southern Democrats in the House abandoned John Rankin on the soldier vote issue; or to take it for granted that the poll tax, although admittedly a serious obstacle to democracy, bars all democratic political expression in the South.

There is substantial support for the President and his policies in the South. The growth of the labor

movement and the Supreme Court decision on the white primaries have opened new opportunities, especially to labor and the progressives, for ridding Congress of men like Martin Dies, Howard Smith, and Frank Boykin. This is a fact of the greatest political importance. It is the real reason that Senators Josiah Bailey and Cotton Ed Smith were unable to carry through their threat to form a Southern Democratic Party and that Senator Harry Byrd is not winning popular support in the South.

* * *

The labor movement has tremendous responsibilities, and tremendous opportunities to take a real position of leadership, in the election campaign. The official Democratic Party machine cannot single-handedly unite the people behind the President. Many of its leaders lack the vision and the grasp of the issues. The labor movement can give direction to the campaign, bringing the issues to the people. It is surely not an accident that in Cleveland, where the broadest support has been rallied for the win-the-war city administration and where the so-called Republican trend has been reversed, the labor movement is a united and powerful factor.

Labor, which is primarily interested in issues and in candidates rather than in party labels, can help win for the President the support of many independent and Republican voters. In some instances, the labor movement will back those Republican candidates that stand for winning the war. For example, the

labor movement will hardly be neutral in a contest within the Republican Party in Oregon between a defeatist like Senator Rufus Holman and a man like Dean Wayne Morse who has consistently supported the war effort. By explaining the issues to the patriotic Republican voters, the labor movement has a chance to enlist their support for the President.

Organized labor can play a major role in winning for the Administration support of Negro voters, hundreds of thousands of whom are now enrolled in unions. It can combat the Republican demagoguery among the Negroes, and it can actively support the F.E.P.C. and the anti-poll-tax bill. Labor can bring the issues to women, the millions of women in industry and to the wives of organized workers. It has the job of exposing the "Equal Rights" amendment which the Republicans are trying to use as a vote-catching device among women. The labor movement can also help win the support of servicemen and veterans and break down the artificial barriers between workers and men in the armed forces.

The most positive political force in the trade union movement is the C.I.O. Political Action Committee, which has done important work in registering war workers in key industrial centers. The Hillman Committee has already paved the way toward building a powerful American Labor Party in New York State, which will be a major factor in the November election, by its recent decisive victory at the primary elections over the Red-baiting Social-

Democratic Dubinsky group. The Hillman Committee is an enormously important development toward independent political action by labor. And the ferocity of the attacks against it by men like Reps. Martin Dies and Howard Smith is a tribute to its effectiveness and to its great potentialities.

In working for the unity of the labor movement behind the Administration, the Hillman Committee has powerful allies in the A. F. of L. and in the Railroad Brotherhoods. Daniel Tobin has become a major factor in the A. F. of L. for the reelection of the President. Tobin has officially endorsed the President for a fourth term. And the editor of Tobin's *International Teamster* has forcefully put the issue as follows: "Well, boys, what will it be in November—another term of Roosevelt or another Hoover? That is exactly what the election boils down to. There shouldn't be much debate in any working man's mind over the answer. We know what we got under Roosevelt and we know what we got under Hoover." Teamsters union bodies have been cooperating with the C.I.O. on legislative and political issues in Ohio, Washington and other states. A. F. Whitney of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is another labor leader who has patriotically backed the war effort and has recently reiterated his wholehearted support for the war effort.

While labor's political activity has not yet developed quickly enough and while some prominent union leaders still hesitate to endorse Roosevelt, the main trend toward unity behind the President is al-

ready clear. It is this trend which men like John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers and Matthew Woll and William Hutcheson in the A. F. of L. are working desperately to reverse. The Republicans are counting heavily on these men. They hope to exploit the dissatisfaction of workers in the railroad unions, in the A. F. of L. and in the C.I.O., with some aspects of economic stabilization, and particularly with the rulings of Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson and War Mobilization Director James Byrnes. They hope that the workers will forget the consistently anti-labor record of the Republicans in Congress in voting for the Smith and Hobbs bills and in fighting price control.

A. F. of L. President William Green has yielded to the pressure of the Woll-Hutcheson group with his stiff directive to A. F. of L. state and local bodies to "cease and desist" from political cooperation with the C.I.O. Most A. F. of L. bodies that have acted on the issue have responded by filing Green's order in the nearest waste paper basket. In Rhode Island, in Ohio, and in many other states the A. F. of L. has made it plain that it will go right on cooperating with the C.I.O.

Green has again carried out the policies of the Woll-Hutcheson group in endorsing defeatist candidates like Senator Nye in North Dakota, Rep. Martin Dies in Texas, and Reps. Fred Busbey and Stephen Day in Illinois. But A. F. of L. unions are enthusiastically ignoring most endorsements of this type. They are supporting instead the position of Daniel Tobin who has repeatedly at-

tacked defeatist members of Congress and has specifically thrown his weight against Nye in North Dakota. The Woll-Hutcheson group has been unable to make endorsements of this kind stick or to stop the developing movement toward cooperation between the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. on a local scale.

There is, of course, still much to be done. But labor has begun to move in preparation for the 1944 elections. It has begun to move with a growing realization of the stakes involved for the labor movement, for the nation and for the entire world—which will anxiously watch the elections in the United States, knowing that the re-election of President Roosevelt and the election of a win-the-war Congress will lead to the hastening of victory and to the realization of the Teheran decisions.

* * *

In this crucial election struggle, the Communists, as an organic part of the win-the-war coalition, taking their stand consistently for a firmly welded national unity in the interests of speedy victory and the Teheran objectives, solidly throw their strength, in conjunction with all consistent win-the-war forces, for the continuation in leadership of President Roosevelt, in support of his policies for advancing in ever-stronger coalition with our British and Soviet Allies to shattering victory over Hitlerism. The position of

the Communist Party was eloquently stated by Earl Browder in June, 1943:

"The preparations for the 1944 election campaign are not formal and traditional preparations. They bear all signs of the development of a major battle for power between two fundamentally irreconcilable trends of policy. The question of the President's succession involves the determination of whether the United States goes forward in the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition to the unconditional surrender of the Axis and all its works, with the reconstitution of the world order on that basis, or whether the U.S. shall dissolve the coalition and embark upon a course of salvaging the Axis powers and combining with them against our present Allies, Britain and the Soviet Union. That is the issue of the 1944 elections. . . .

"And in this whole struggle, whether it be electoral alignments for 1944 or the daily questions of life today in the development of the war, our friends and our allies are not determined by any ideological considerations, or any formal political alignments. We are partners and allies with every American who is ready to fight the defeatists at home and prosecute the war to victory at all costs. That is our political platform today and next year; along that line we must carry on without deviation. That is the line of struggle for the next period of the war, and the line for the 1944 elections." *

* *The Communist*, July, 1943.

INTERNATIONAL MONOPOLIES AND THE WAR *

BY K. HOFMAN

THE question of the role of international monopolies and cartels, and their influence on economy and politics and the future war efforts of the Anglo-Saxon countries, acquires a special significance at the decisive stages of the war. The clearer the prospects of a final defeat of Germany loom ahead, the greater the interest in post-war reconstruction problems manifested by the circles of Wall Street and London City, the centers of international finance, industry, and trading relations.

A number of projects for post-war reconstruction recently published by British and American economists reflect the desire of one or another monopoly group to extend the realm of their activities and their sphere of influence in the post-war world.

Moreover, considerable attention is paid to the question of the fate of German monopolies and the role of international cartels in Germany's post-war economy. The discussion of all these problems proceeds against a background of sharpening competition between the biggest monopolies of the old and new worlds. With all their general interest in victory

over Hitler Germany and her bloc, the monopoly groups are each striving for control over world markets and sources of raw material, and a dominating influence over international trade.

To them the war and its victorious conclusion mean primarily the strengthening of the might and power of their cartels. The present war has shown the tremendous importance which communications between the continents acquire for the destinies of the world.

* * *

With the present development of aviation, domination of the seas is no longer adequate. It is no accident that the biggest British shipping concerns recently created a consortium for stimulating the development of British civil aviation. They arrived at the conclusion that Britain's continued lag behind the United States in the establishment of new air routes may create a danger to British power on the sea.

Vast projects for intercontinental air routes, and the problems arising from the necessary new bases for these, and above all the problem of

* Reprinted from the Soviet journal, *The War and the Working Class*.

oil, have evoked a lively discussion in the British and American press.

Aviation and oil, all that relates to the development of aircraft and the oil industries, including the production of strategic fuel, also occupy an important place in the plans and practical measures of the respective monopoly groups.

Recently the British government sent a commission of experts to the U.S. for preliminary negotiations with the object of settling the disputable question relating to the Near East oil.

It all goes back to 1934, when the American oil companies obtained a concession in Saudi Arabia; and now they have decided to accelerate the output of Arabian oil and build a gigantic pipeline from the Saudi Arabian oil fields to the southeast Mediterranean port.

This decision affects the interests of the British oil concerns, hitherto dominating the Near East. At present the American oil companies are controlled by Standard Oil, which is coming out in the Near East not only as partners and shareholders of the British oil companies, but also as an independent, and, moreover, a very important factor.

Thanks to the activity of the American oil concerns, the role and influence of the U.S. in Near Eastern affairs are becoming increasingly greater. British circles fully realize the big changes in the correlation of forces in the Near East that may result from the further extension of the sphere of activity of American monopolies.

According to the *New York Times*, the British oil companies are con-

sidering the question of building two new oil pipelines in addition to the already existing Iraq pipelines. This plan is a reply to the American initiative.

One of the new pipelines planned by the British is to link the British oilfields in Iran with Haifa via Abadan, while the second one is to run parallel to the existing Kirkuk-Haifa pipeline. It has been proposed to discuss these projects in detail in the course of the negotiations of the British experts in the U.S.

In the opinion of numerous organs of the British press, the solution of the oil problem by means of an agreement between the respective British and American oil companies is the principal prerequisite for the effective development of an international trading policy in the post-war period.

The oil discussion has shown that, as regards the question of cartels and their post-war rule, the viewpoints of the British and American economists differ. With small exception, the British favor the preservation of pre-war forms of cartels and the immediate restoration of the international contacts of the cartels after the war.

In America this viewpoint is being defended only by those economists who reflect the interests of the American monopolies which are connected by cartel agreements with British and other European monopolies.

As regards the rest, although many of them favor the development of international collaboration, they presume that it must not be based on the old cartels, but on

“free competition.” This competition must involve also those American groupings which have considerably expanded and consolidated their positions on the home market as a result of big government war orders.

The fact that these tendencies with regard to the question of cartels are growing in the U.S. causes uneasiness and concern among the British monopolists. The latter are trying to use their extensive business contacts in the U.S. to secure for themselves a corresponding place and influence in the new associations which may arise on American initiative.

The polemics in the press between the champions of pre-war cartels and their international connections, and the supporters of “free competition” on the world markets continue unabated.

The *Wall Street Journal of Commerce*, whose publisher, Ritter, an American of German origin, occupied a pro-German position before the war, took up the cudgels in defense of the international cartels in their pre-war form. In the opinion of this paper, no restriction of cartel rights is permissible, since this would be tantamount to strengthening government control over foreign trade.

Inclined to the same view is the *Christian Science Monitor*, which manages to combine the propaganda of Christian ethics with the defense of the interests of the leviathans of the international financial and industrial monopolies.

The progressive American press points out that such a defense of the international cartels pursued in the present conditions only one aim—

that of concealing from public control the secret of the roundabout paths through which raw materials and Caribbean and South American oil, sent to Spain, are finding their way to Germany; and how the newest patents employed in Allied war production so soon become known to the enemy.

The American Senate Commission for the investigation of war industry, headed by the Democratic Senator Truman, recently published a report on the cartels in the U.S. and their pre-war contacts. The report stresses that many of the cartel agreements remain in force during the war with slight changes. Before December, 1941, some American companies connected through cartels with the Axis monopolies helped them evade the British blockade, especially through the channels of Latin-American and neutral European countries.

The agreements concluded by some of the American companies, for example the du Pont de Nemours chemical concern, provide for the immediate restoration after the war of cartel relations interrupted with the German companies. It is known that this concern concluded an agreement on the division of world markets with the British Imperial chemical industries and the German I. G. Farben industry.

The report also stresses the fact that after the entry of the U.S. into the war one of the American aircraft companies, to evade the action of the U. S. Department of Justice, sought the American government's permission to send a representative to Germany, Italy, France and Japan

to propose changes in the cartel agreement.

Even Standard Oil, a monopoly especially patronized by the American government, broke its cartel connections with Farben-Industrie only after the Department of Justice started proceedings against it.

Nevertheless, the Standard Oil Company refused to pledge to refrain from contact with the German cartels in the future. The American conception on the question of cartels has not wholly crystallized as yet.

* * *

This fact renders easier the game of the supporters of the British conception. Even the Atlantic Charter is utilized by them for proclaiming "the inviolability" of the rights of the cartels. Matters have gone so far that the whole campaign for the restriction of the rights of the cartels conducted by the American Department of Justice was declared a campaign directed against Britain. Grist to the mill was poured by a *London Times* editorial stating that before the war decisive branches of Germany's industry were closely interlocked with the industries of neighboring countries, that today this process of interlocking must be pushed still further, and Germany's economy must be closely welded with the general European system.

American monopolists, preparing for extensive "reconstruction" in Europe after the war and defending the "freedom of competition," have started a campaign against this conception. One of the American radio observers referred, in this connection, to the positions of those British

circles which may be characterized as "economic appeasers," of whom there is regrettably no small number in our country."

The "economic appeasers" operate behind the stage. They imagine no one can see them and the world knows nothing about their activities. What a dangerous delusion! Their aims and intentions are absolutely clear. They place above all else personal selfish interests, and the small handful of international monopolists who are receiving tremendous super-profits from war orders are concerned only lest the gold cease to pour in as a result of a "premature" conclusion of the war.

They are already seeking ways and means for boosting post-war business under the banner of the "reconstruction" of Europe's economy through the efforts of the old, international cartels and with the participation of German monopolies. The international cartels are concerned with the preservation of everything that inevitably breeds new world conflicts and wars.

That is why, now that the extensive offensive operation of the Red Army, supported by mass Allied blows from the air at the German rear, is steadily undermining the might of the Hitlerite war-machine, built up by the German monopolies, world public opinion is watching with great interest the discussion of the problems relating to Germany.

It is common knowledge that, like Kaiser Germany, Hitlerite Germany made extensive use of the international cartels for war preparations. So it was, but it must not happen again.

Meantime, there is a secret headquarters functioning in Switzerland concerned with the preservation of the contacts of the British and American with the German monopolies.

Writing in *Harpers Magazine*, an employee of the New York Guaranty Trust Company, who spent the first years of the war in Switzerland, describes as follows the impressions gained during his stay in the international cartel center:

"For many years Switzerland has been a most convenient place for the meetings between the various British, American, German and French citizens, members of a small international consortium of business men engaged in the organization of cartel agreements.

"Switzerland has become a country where money loses its national color and is transformed into an international medium of exchange between people who understand each other, even at a time when their countries are at war with one another. According to a local official of the D.T.A., in 1939 little Switzerland had 2,278 registered international finance corporations (of which, 260 were registered only in 1939), and 214 banks as well as more than 2,000 control associations and investment companies, private corporations and other legal institutions for conceal-

ing the manipulations of international capital."

The leaders of the cartels, the author stresses, "invariably organize the cartels so that in case of a war between the component parts, each of them could continue their activities within a national framework, and organize them so as to render easier their reunion after the war."

At a time when millions of people on the globe are concerned only with speeding the defeat of Germany along with her monopolies, which succeeded in the pre-war period in capturing the dominating positions in the economy of the democratic countries, a handful of monopolists is planning the preservation of the German cartels and their restoration to full volume after the war.

The American lawyer John Dickinson unquestionably was right when he wrote in *Foreign Affairs* in October, 1943, that if the plans of these monopolists materialize, the danger of German penetration in American industry will not be eliminated after this war.

Lasting peace among the peoples, and economic business relations among countries can be achieved only on a basis of the principles of post-war collaboration formulated in the decisions of the Moscow and Teheran Conferences.

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

BY N. SPARKS

RECENTLY Winston Churchill, discussing the rebuilding of the House of Commons, which was destroyed by bombs during the German blitz, expressed his hopes that the House will be rebuilt in the same oblong shape as before. Expanding on the political significance of the architecture of legislative halls, he expressed his distaste for the semi-circular type of legislative hall characteristic of European countries, which he felt stimulated the growth of all kinds of gradations of political principle—Right, Center and Left, with all the shades of transition in between—and, as a result, general political instability and lack of responsibility. The House of Commons, on the other hand, Mr. Churchill felt, where His Majesty's Government on one side of the House was faced by His Majesty's Opposition on the other side—and the only change any member could make in his politics was to cross over to the other side of the House—conduced to a system that maintained stability and responsibility in British politics.

Despite Mr. Churchill's theories of political architecture and the semi-circular shape of our own American legislative halls, the two-party system is even more firmly installed in

the United States than in Great Britain. The average American concept of a political party is indeed in sharp contrast with the European concept. In Europe a party represents a certain fairly well defined set of economic and political principles, as well as a fairly definite section of the population, and secures a representation in the national legislature that has some relationship to the strength of its support among the people. Usually in the European countries, under the multi-party system, no single party secures a majority of the seats in the chamber. Negotiations are then carried on among parties that are politically "neighbors" until a coalition is formed which comprises a majority of the votes in the chamber, and this majority elects the Premier.

In the United States, on the other hand, each of the two major parties is itself a coalition. As Comrade Browder states in his report:

"... The choice [for President] will be between two candidates selected by two nominating conventions known by the names of Democratic Party and Republican Party. These are parties only in a formal and legal sense; they are not parties in the sense of representing well-defined alternative policies. They are

coalitions of local and regional interests, diverse tendencies of political thought, and institutionalized politics, from which national policy and national interest come forth in a distorted way, with much confusion, and with a maximum dependence upon the personality which emerges as leader. It is a peculiarly American system, without a counterpart anywhere else in the world."*

This two-party system is not grounded in the Constitution, but, on the contrary, arose out of the realities of American political development, in an obvious break with the perspective of many of the Founding Fathers that there would be no parties, but only a united people led by a single party of patriots, among whom the voters would select the best men. The 12th Amendment to the Constitution had to be adopted during Jefferson's administration, once the two-party system had developed, to change the method of electing the President and Vice-President, so as to insure cooperation and continuity between them, and to avert the kind of crisis that faced the country in 1801, when the Federalists sought to rob Jefferson of the election and replace him by Aaron Burr.

Having once become established, however, the two-party system became a dominating factor in American political life. All attempts of the historians to find some definite "principle" that distinguishes one party from the other led only to the misinterpretation and falsification of history. The theory that the Demo-

cratic Party was for "states' rights" while the Republican Party was for "centralization" serves only to conceal the essence of the struggle for democracy against reaction carried on alike by the Democrat Jefferson against the Federalist Hamilton, and by the Republican Lincoln against the slaveholders of the Democratic Party. Despite the fact that this so-called "principle" issue is refuted by all the facts of history, these facts are still treated by the orthodox commentators merely as "paradoxes" (such as the "paradox" that the Republicans today are loud-mouthed champions of "states' rights" and voted for a "states' rights" bill to prevent the soldiers' vote). To the generation preceding World War I the "principle" distinguishing the two parties was supposed to be low tariff (Democratic), or high tariff (Republican), although actually these demands represented chiefly territorial sectional interests.

Despite this absence of any general difference of "principle" between the two parties, the two-party system has been maintained throughout American history, surviving the most severe crises, and undergoing modification in one way or another under the people's demands for a solution of these crises in the direction of progress and democracy. But during the periods when reaction was in the saddle and the people had not yet succeeded in bringing their forces into effective organized expression and political influence for the solution of the decisive problems of the period, the two-party system acted as a most serious barrier to their efforts.

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, 1944, p. 29.

It was at such a time (1891) that Engels gave his well-known description of the two-party system in America as "two great gangs of political speculators, who alternately take possession of the state power and exploit it by the most corrupt means and for the most corrupt ends." And a similar description was given for the same period by an American politician who struggled (and in his own state succeeded) to find a means of popular expression through the two-party system—Bob La Follette, Sr.—who said:

"Until my fight was finally successful, Wisconsin was a corrupted state, governed not by the people but by a group of private and corporate interests. They secured control of the old Republican party organization—the party with the splendid history—and while its orators outwardly dwelt upon the glories of the past and inspired the people with the fervor of patriotic loyalty, these corporation interests were bribing, bossing and thieving within. The machine organization of the Democratic party was as subservient to the railroads and other corporations as the Republican machine, and mastery of legislation was thus rendered complete through all these years."*

Nevertheless, at the critical turning points in our history, the new political alignments arising from the development of new class relationships did succeed in crystallizing themselves and reaching decisive expression in government. In the days of Jefferson and in the days of

Lincoln, this was accomplished through the creation of a new party which came forward almost at once as a *majority* party and almost immediately swept into power. In each case a former major party, the Federalists and the Whigs soon disappeared from the scene, leaving after the Jeffersonian period the Democrats and the Whigs, and after the Lincoln period, the Republicans and the Democrats.

But in the last fifty years another process has been going on: the continual modification of the practices, procedures, and even structure of the two major parties themselves by law, as a result of the pressure of the people, bringing them substantially closer to control by the people and considerably modifying the statement of Engels made before this process had set in, that "the nation is powerless against these two great cartels of politicians."

Wisconsin, under the leadership of Bob La Follette, Sr., was one of the classical battlefields of that struggle and one of the first to win substantial victories. Thus, La Follette wrote:

"At that time [1896], I had never heard of the direct primary. Indeed, there was no direct primary statute in any state. . . . After portraying the evils of caucuses and conventions, and showing how readily they lend themselves to manipulation, defeating the will of the majority, I outlined a complete system of direct nominations for all county, legislative, and state offices, by both parties upon the same day, under the Australian ballot. So far as I am aware, this was the first presenta-

* Robert M. La Follette, *A Personal Narrative of Political Experiences*, p. 22.

tion of a complete direct nominating system. . . . I said that the bosses were not the party. . . . Abolish the caucus and the convention. Go back to the first principles of democracy; go back to the people. Substitute for both the caucus and the convention a primary election—held under the sanctions of law which prevail at the general elections—where the citizen may cast his vote directly to nominate the candidate of the party with which he affiliates.”*

And in 1911 when La Follette, then a United States Senator, organized the National Progressive Republican League within the Republican Party, its statement of principles advocated:

“1. The election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

“2. Direct primaries for the nomination of elective officials.

“3. The direct election of delegates to national conventions with opportunity for the voter to express his choice for President and Vice-President.

“4. Amendment to state constitutions providing for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall.

“5. A thoroughgoing corrupt practices act.”**

The direct election of Senators by the people instead of by the State Legislatures, which freed Senatorial candidates from extreme dependence on the party state machine, was established by the 17th Amendment to the Constitution in 1913. Direct primaries are almost universal throughout the country since many years. Direct election of delegates to na-

tional Presidential conventions is likewise widespread. The fourth and fifth points, while they, of course, failed to bring about the wholesale defeat of corrupt party machines and influences that their sponsors had hoped for, nevertheless had a certain deterring influence at least in many states. The struggle led by the progressives in the early part of the century, therefore, did considerably democratize the two-party system and bring it within the reach of the people, despite the fact that the people have not yet fully taken advantage of its possibilities.

Another development of profound importance at a more recent date was the breaking of the rigid sectional control of the Democratic Party by the South, leaving it more open to the free play of nationwide forces, through the action of the 1936 Convention in abrogating the two-thirds rule that had always given the Southern states an actual veto over all prospective Democratic Presidential candidates.

But, at the same time that these changes considerably democratized the two-party system, they also rooted it more firmly into the law of the land and made the parties an official part of the election process, instead of private organizations which the leaders could manipulate as they wished. Thus, in Wisconsin, minute details are laid down in law regarding every point of the nomination process, popular election of party committeemen, accounting for funds spent in primaries or elections, etc. The length to which the law goes in the attempt to prevent the domination of candidates by a

* *Ibid.*, pp. 195-197.

** *Ibid.*, p. 496.

party machine is shown by the regulations for the platform conventions of the party, which can be composed only of the *actual candidates* for state offices and state legislature *nominated at the primary*. These platform conventions must meet on a specified date in the state capitol, formulate the official party platform, and elect the party state central committee. Many other states have similar regulations. *

Quite recently the official status of political parties (as well as the progressive possibilities involved) has received added confirmation in the eight-to-one decision by the United States Supreme Court against the "white primary" practice in the South. The value of the direct primary law in bringing the political party within the zone of democracy has been shown by the recent smashing victory of the popular forces of the American Labor Party in New York over an entrenched bureaucratic machine.

A natural accompaniment of these developments establishing the political parties into law has been the tendency also embodied in law to make it increasingly difficult for any new party to come forward, especially on a national scale. The demands for placing a new party upon the ballot have been raised higher and higher by one state after another, until only a few years ago in the state of Florida when the Republican Party's vote fell below the recently increased minimum figure,

the state found itself deprived of the Republican Party and had to modify the law in order to preserve the two-party system in Florida—at least in appearance.

An outstanding feature of the political scene since the 'eighties has been the attempt, on at least three occasions, of a third party to break into the national political picture: the Populists in the 'eighties and 'nineties, Theodore Roosevelt with his Progressive Party in 1912, and Bob La Follette Sr. with the Farmer-Labor Party in 1924. In each case (although the Populists succeeded in winning a number of Congressional seats and a large measure of actual control in several states), the failure of the third-party movement to win power nationally and replace one of the two major parties brought about the collapse of the third party. In no case was the third party able to continue as a permanent feature on a national scale with a proportionate share in the national legislature and in national affairs. The third-party movements were unable to break the two-party system (especially as their opponents reinforced it against them), and retired into the role of groupings within one or the other (or both) of the major parties. In each case the third-party movements represented new class alignments that were unable to achieve their political expression through the two major parties during the periods when the two parties carried on substantially the same class policy.

The Farmer-Labor movement of 1924, however, differed substantially from the previous third-party move-

* Of course, in actual practice the parties "get around" these rigid regulations by organizing "voluntary" committees, publishing "unofficial" platforms, etc. Nevertheless, the democratization brought about by such provisions cannot be denied.

ments, in that labor had now begun to attain the necessary strength that would enable it to step forward in alliance with the farmers as leader of all the democratic forces of the people against the unbridled reaction typified at that time by Harding, and later by Hoover. The Farmer-Labor movement of 1924 did not succeed; but it was a milestone in labor's advance to an ever more decisive role in the political life of the nation.

With the advent of Roosevelt and the New Deal, and the beginning of a vastly increased growth of the organized labor movement, it appeared for a time that the new relationship of class forces would express itself through a farmer-labor party that could quickly become a majority party. However, history did not take that course. In the 1936 elections, in the words of Comrade Browder, "class groupings came forward as the decisive factor sweeping over and submerging the old regional traditions and interests." * The nationwide sweep of the Roosevelt victories in 1932 and 1936 brought the Democratic Party into power in many states where it had been out of power for so long that entirely new elements and forces were able to come to the fore in the party organization. In cases where politically organized people's movements already existed, the New Deal formed a natural alliance with them. This resulted in Wisconsin, at first not in rejuvenating the Democratic Party, but in pulling the established

and well-organized progressive wing out of the Republican Party into an independent Progressive Party in 1934.

The positive contributions of Roosevelt through the measures embodied in the New Deal, through the opportunities for the growth of the labor movement, and, most important of all, through the foreign policy of uniting the peace-loving nations against fascist aggression, have created a situation in which today, in the midst of this war for our national existence, despite the distortions in our country's political life inseparable from the two-party system, the national unity finds through Roosevelt's leadership its path toward victory and progress.

In this decisive year of 1944 the supreme need of the nation is the broadest unity of all win-the-war forces around the leadership of President Roosevelt to defeat the desperate efforts of the Hoover-Taft-Dewey forces to disrupt the Teheran Agreement and bring about a negotiated peace with Hitler. In this situation, third-party movements that are either unable or unwilling to work in coalition with the win-the-war forces of the major parties can serve only as a hindrance to national unity and an aid to the defeatist forces. This paramount need for win-the-war unity is responsible for the decision of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party to merge with the Democratic Party, as well as for the resounding victory of the unity forces in the New York American Labor Party, which serves as an invaluable force in cementing the win-the-war coalition in New York State.

* Earl Browder, *The Democratic Front*, New York, 1938, p. 15.

In Wisconsin the Progressive Party has been so far prevented by the defeatist leadership of the La Follette machine from finding its natural place in a well-organized coalition movement with the win-the-war forces of the other parties, in support of Roosevelt. However, in the 1942 state and Congressional elections the win-the-war forces, through the leadership of a united labor political movement, succeeded in effecting a practical political alliance among the win-the-war voters of the Democratic and Progressive Parties (including in some cases Republicans), that resulted in defeating every defeatist candidate that they opposed. And in the Milwaukee municipal elections this spring, the strengthened political unity of labor was able to lead toward eliminating the defeatist candidates for Mayor in the primaries, and electing as Mayor a candidate who, with united labor support, made unity to win the war and full support of the Commander-in-Chief the first plank in his platform.

But a particularly dangerous and inexcusable development is the appearance of the so-called "Michigan Commonwealth Federation" under the influence of Norman Thomas defeatist and Trotskyite elements, in a move which can only help the chances of the anti-Roosevelt defeatist forces. That this "Michigan Commonwealth Federation," in contrast to the well-established Washington Commonwealth Federation, is intended to serve as a splitting instead of a unifying force, is shown by its decision to take steps to get on the ballot, coupled with a decla-

ration that it will "never endorse the candidates of any other party."

This Michigan third party is not the first experience in the country with third parties initiated for reactionary purposes under a demagogic mask of "radicalism." It is not so long ago (1936) since the outstanding fascist in America, Father Coughlin, initiated the so-called "Union Party" with Congressman Lemke as his stooge in the role of Presidential candidate, in the hope of throwing the election to Landon. Nor have the people forgotten Phil La Follette's reactionary adventure with the "National Progressives" in 1938—a move designed to break the people away from Roosevelt, but which only resulted in La Follette's own defeat for Governor, and the re-installation of the Republican Party in power in Wisconsin. Similar splitting moves have been under way on the part of the openly reactionary wing of the Democratic Party, first among the Southern anti-Roosevelt forces, and later under the leadership of former Secretary of War Woodring, to split the Democratic vote and thus prevent Roosevelt's election.

These splitting moves can be defeated only by a more conscious and determined effort on the part of all win-the-war forces to realize national unity behind our Commander-in-Chief on a broader scale than ever before. To this cause the Communists have been devoting their best efforts. And out of the close cooperation of the Communists in this anti-fascist national unity front, and in particular since the Teheran conference makes possible a long-term per-

spective of such collaboration, grows the proposal that the Communists shall no longer operate as a "party" with their own independent candidates, but as a "political association."

This proposal involves a change of status from a so-called "minority party," which in the American political set-up implies a party of protest which takes no responsibility for major political decisions. A political "association," on the other hand (and there are ample precedents for such organizations in the past and in the present), implies an organization which will function in collaboration with other anti-fascist forces through the major parties, as part of the majority of the people, and which accepts full responsibility for trying to present practical solutions to the problems of the nation's political life. That such a change means to bring the official electoral status and name of the Communist organization into line with its practice is obvious to all who stop to consider the high degree of responsibility that the Communists have shown during the past years under the leadership of Comrade Browder, in presenting practical proposals for the solution of the nation's most critical problems. And in many states, as, for example, Wisconsin, it is well known that, despite the fact that the Communists ran certain candidates for public office in the elections, their main election efforts were directed toward fostering unity of all forces in support of win-the-war candidates—whether Democrats, Progressives or Republicans—in order to defeat the defeatists.

The question might be asked: if

this change is in accord with Marxism and of service to the nation, then why was it not made many years ago? The answer is that such a change would not have been correct at that time. It has become possible and necessary because of the supreme necessity of national unity to win the war and achieve a peaceful solution of the post-war problems—a necessity which is felt and recognized by patriotic elements from all classes of the population who see that the only alternative would be an ultimate relapse into barbarism; because of the Teheran Agreement, which at last guarantees that our foreign policy will continue to be founded upon the firm rock of friendship with the Soviet Union and Great Britain, and which thus makes possible and necessary the continuation of national unity after the war; because of the great growth in strength and political maturity of the labor movement which guarantees that the working class will play an ever greater role in guiding the policies of the nation. The proposed change in the name and electoral status of the Communist organization is in line with these great developments and is based firmly upon them.

The two-party system has become a subject of widespread discussion throughout the country this year, because all thinking people are alarmed at the danger of a typical American Presidential election campaign with all its habitual extremes of partisanship, in such a critical moment in world history. As Comrade Browder wrote in the March issue of *The Communist*:

"Narrow partisanship . . . makes the highest aspirations of our nation and the world into political footballs to be kicked around the arena of a domestic struggle for power to which no restraints have been established. Partisanship in 1944 threatens the future of our nation and of the world.

"That is the supreme question of the 1944 elections."

Similarly Dorothy Thompson writes:

"The United States allows itself expensive luxuries, and one of them is political parties, unwilling to subject their partisanship to the realities of the American situation. An election at a crisis in a war is a unique political luxury. No other country with representative government has a constitution which compels it to throw its national and international policies into the arena of public debate every four years no matter what the circumstances." *

During the Civil War, when the administration of Abraham Lincoln was faced with a similar situation in the decisive year of 1864, win-the-war Democrats found it possible to rise above narrow partisanship and give their support to Lincoln on a National Union ticket which united the Republicans and the win-the-war Democrats against the Copperhead candidate McClellan. Thus, the two-party system need not inevitably mean unmitigated narrow partisanship—a mistake made even by the *Milwaukee Journal*, a win-the-war Republican newspaper that for the most part is giving a patriotic example of rising above class and partisan prejudices. In a rather bitter

comment on the defeat of Willkie in the Wisconsin Republican primary, the *Journal* concedes:

"Mr. Willkie, we have been told by many persons, is 'too much like Roosevelt.' In the nature of things the Republican Party is the refuge of those who oppose Mr. Roosevelt. That is the function of the party out of power. Otherwise there would be no recourse except revolution. . . . Those who are 'against' anything have to turn to the opposition party." *

Certainly, the needs of national unity should make it possible in each community to rally together patriotic elements from both major parties that are able to rise above narrow partisanship and preserve our national unity against its assaults. In reducing to a minimum the dangerous effects of narrow partisanship, labor can play an important role. Labor's political action brought into the communities can have a tremendous effect in bringing to wide sections of the people the patriotic purpose, progressive outlook, and freedom from narrow partisanship that today characterize the war activity and political thinking of the progressive labor movement. Among the newer members of the unions which have grown so considerably in the past period are tens of thousands of new industrial workers from middle-class and white-collar groups whose voting habits have been conservative and along strictly partisan lines. Labor, imbuing these new members with its own outlook, can not only win the great majority

* *Madison Capital Times*, March 24.

* *Milwaukee Journal*, April 5.

of these elements to support of Roosevelt, but in doing so can help to create among the conservative circles of their contacts the atmosphere of national unity as against partisanship.

The two-party system in this period does not preclude the independent political action of labor, as is claimed by the supporters of third-party movements. The plans and activity of the labor Political Action Committees constitute, where adequately carried out, the most effective form of independent political action in this decisive period. And it must be said that labor and the people have barely begun to take advantage of the democratic possibilities existing within the two-party system at this time. It is true that

the divisions between the mass voters for the two major parties are not in line with the basic issue of the day—for or against the Teheran Conference; but the policy of labor, centering around support of President Roosevelt, the leader of our war effort—whose leadership is embodied in the Teheran Agreement—is sufficiently flexible to pick out a path among the contending parties and unite the people to elect those candidates to Congress and to state office that will truly express the nation's will to victory in the war effort and support of the Teheran Agreement. In this great united effort of the majority of the American people, the Communists, as part of the labor movement, will play their part.

ENEMIES OF TEHERAN

BY BOB THOMPSON

A CONSIDERABLE effort is under way to sharpen up the attack on the basic propositions of the Teheran Conference and to undermine public confidence in Government war policy. Directing this effort are powerful pro-fascist forces whose resources include the active support or befuddled neutrality of the bulk of the press. Unfortunately, under the heading of "temporary recourse" (one hopes it is temporary) must be included also certain of the old school liberals who under the cover of Leftist spoutings are pursuing a course of action in essence paralleling that of the pro-fascists.

An important part in the stepped-up activities of the pro-fascists is being played by openly treasonous movements such as "Peace Now." Movements such as "Peace Now" are serving a twofold purpose. First, by publicly advocating "immediate negotiated peace" they serve as rallying points for the fascist elements who are the products of the activities over a number of years of such movements as America First, Ku Klux Klan, Coughlin, etc., and, at the same time, they prepare the ground for other, more "respectable," forces to take up the cry "Immediate Negotiated Peace" at an

early future date. Secondly, the activities of openly treasonous movements such as "Peace Now" help to mask the true character of those basic forces in the country that are doing their damndest to set in motion a chain of events leading to a Hitler peace. One could almost say that "Peace Now" is the lightning rod of the Hoover, Taft, Dies, Dewey, Norman Thomas Junta.

Negotiated Peace with a Nazi-controlled Germany is the logical, the inevitable, the inescapable end objective of every force opposed to, and fighting against, the Teheran accord as the foundation of our government's policies. This is so, irrespective of whether the particular forces fighting Teheran are pro-fascists consciously striving to save Nazi Germany from destruction, or are essentially patriotic forces, such as liberals with near-sighted eyes and pious intentions, or others momentarily entrapped in the mesh of partisan entanglements. There are not three or four or five possible lines of development along which the war and the world can proceed. There are only two. The war and the world can proceed along the path charted at Teheran to the complete destruction of fas-

cism and a basic, long term, profitable collaboration between the socialist and capitalist sectors of the world. Not to accept this perspective, leads to the course of turning our country from the Teheran path to the course charted by Hitler. The end objective of this course is a post-war world in which a maximum of prerequisites exist for the organization under American leadership of a third world war for world domination. A prime prerequisite of such a post-war world is a Germany capable of again playing an anti-Soviet role—a Germany in which fascism has not been destroyed. This is the iron logic of the world situation and there isn't any escape from it. There is no more dangerous illusion in our country than that which holds that only those yelling "negotiated peace" are striving for a negotiated peace. One and all, those forces fighting to undermine confidence in our Government's war policy and faith in the value and workability of the Teheran accord must bear the stigma of objectively working for negotiated peace.

In a little more detail, what kind of activities are being engineered by the pro-fascists and what kind of views are being broadcast under their inspiration?

On the desk beside me are a number of clippings from newspapers and magazines. They fall roughly into two groupings.

The first consists of columns by military commentators and statements on military matters by public figures. Among these are the following: Several columns which

speak of the current rout of the German armies on the Eastern Front as "withdrawals necessitated by the transfer of [German] divisions to the Western Front" in order to strengthen further the forces allotted by the German Staff to meet the Anglo-American invasion from England; others, including an entire series by Hanson Baldwin of the *New York Times*, itemize at great length supposed deficiencies in the tactics, equipment and morale of the U.S. armed forces, calling into question the preparedness of our forces for a major military undertaking; a speech by Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, predicting on March 1 that the invasion of Europe will turn out to be "quite a prolonged, a protracted matter"; a resolution introduced into the House by Jessie Summers calling on our national Legislature to go on record against the opening of the second front.

The second group consists of items of the following type: A statement by Herbert Hoover demanding in essence that the U.S. government align itself with Hitler's Finnish satellite against the Soviet Union; a "statement of 58" demanding that the U.S. government intervene on the side of the "Polish Government in Exile" against the Soviet Union and Great Britain; a measure introduced into the House by Hamilton Fish demanding that the United States ship food to fascist-controlled Europe; a "pacifist" demand that the Allies cease bombing Nazi Germany.

These items by no means give a

full picture of the current stepped-up anti-Teheran, pro-fascist campaign. They do give an indication of its nature. They do indicate some of the issues being pushed forward by it.

A clear understanding of certain general features of this campaign is of primary importance. The first such general feature is the over-all situation within which this campaign is taking place.

The most important fact of this situation, the most important fact of our times, is that the joint decisions and the unified outlook of the Teheran Conference are determining the course of the war. In short, the current heightened activity of a pro-fascist, defeatist nature is taking place under circumstances in which the forces basing themselves on Teheran occupy the driver's seat.

The second general feature is the changed relationship between these defeatist-inspired views and activities and the established, officially proclaimed policies of our government.

During 1943 and earlier the defeatists operated under conditions in which a struggle to shape many of the fundamentals of government war policy was taking place. Those conditions no longer exist. The fundamentals of our Government's war policy have been shaped. The always existing sharp divergence between the views of the forces directing the fight against policies based on Teheran, and the policies of our government which are based on Teheran, has vastly widened—has become an unbridgeable chasm. The views and activities of these

forces under today's conditions constitute direct opposition to the essentials of our Government's war policies and openly involve the obstructing and undermining of our country's war effort. In short, they come under the head of treasonous activities in even the limited legal sense of the word.

The third general feature is that 1944 is a presidential election year and that in all likelihood our country's future is bound up with the success or failure of the people's efforts to secure the re-election of President Roosevelt and the election of a victory Congress. That this is a presidential election year is an element favorable to the pro-fascist, defeatist forces. It throws into the arena of struggle innumerable partisan factors and considerations that have nothing to do with the issue of our era. The enemies of Teheran and our Government's war policies are calculating on making maximum use of a policy of partisan diversion.

The Second Front

In his historic January Plenum report, Comrade Browder made the following evaluation of the military aspects of the Teheran accord:

"Complete agreement as to the scope and timing of military operations from east, west and south, reached between the High Command of the three great Allies, has long been understood by all serious persons as the sole guarantee of victory. The Nazis have long known this to be the sure doom of the Third Reich. The only thing that was not certain was whether that

complete agreement could be reached. The Nazis based all their hopes upon that complete agreement being blocked by differences among their enemies, whipped up and played upon by their friends within Britain and America. All anti-fascists based their word and deed upon contributing everything to bring that complete agreement into being. That was accomplished in Teheran.

"In the nature of things the details of that agreement will be known only as they unfold in action. For the world outside the active military command, the only important thing is the existence of the agreement. Given this agreement, the rest of us have no reservations to the motto, 'Leave it to the experts,' which we opposed only when it was used to block the agreement rather than to find and execute it."*

Events since our plenum demonstrate the correctness of this evaluation. Clear indications of the preparations for, and imminence of, the Anglo-American blow from the west are abundant and show that the military policy of our country is based on the agreement of Teheran. Comrade Browder's evaluation of this question has made and is making a profound contribution to the correct orientation of the labor movement and the entire win-the-war camp.

Comrade Browder in his Plenum report did not say, did not mean, and did not imply that we should "leave our military experts to the mercy of the defeatists." Yet I feel

that we and the win-the-war forces generally have to a certain extent done just that.

It is a fatal error to think that because the most advanced patriotic forces in our country have a clear understanding of the crucial need for, and sound basis of, the strategy of the Second Front, that this understanding is shared by all or even the overwhelming majority of the American people. It just isn't so.

The military aspects of the agreement at Teheran finalized a most fundamental transformation of the strategic premises upon which America's conduct of the war has been based.

Hitherto America's conduct of the war has been largely dominated by the concept of a prolonged war of attrition against Germany, aimed at the eventual reduction of the effective war potential of the German military machine to a point below that of the combined Anglo-American forces. The principal elements of such a concept were: An exhausting but largely stalemated struggle on the Eastern Front; large-scale actions of the Mediterranean German industry; relatively small-scale actions of the Mediterranean pattern on the perimeter of Germany's "Fortress Europe"; economic blockade.

Teheran represented the culminating point in the process of abandonment of the concept of a prolonged war of attrition and the adoption of a new outlook corresponding to real relationships of forces and actual strategic possibilities. The principal elements of this concept are: Full coalition war-

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 7.

fare; a correct evaluation of the offensive powers of the Red Army and its ability to smash all German efforts to stabilize the Eastern Front; the launching of an all-out, crushing Anglo-American invasion of Europe from the West timed to merge with the present mounting Red Army offensive; the destruction of Germany's armed might on the field of battle through the combined use of all arms.

This represents no small change in our country's military policy and strategic outlook. Bringing a full understanding of it to the American people and arousing their enthusiastic support for it is no simple over-night proposition. It is an especially difficult and important job, because a large section of the press is systematically attempting to obscure for the American people the actual military situation by such means as: belittling the already decisive accomplishments of the Red Army; exaggerating the ability of Germany to cope with an invasion of strategic proportions from the West; over-emphasizing of the difficulties of amphibious operations; undermining of confidence in the sterling qualities of our armed forces.

By their continued activities around the question of the Second front, the defeatists aim for three things:

First: they continue in their hopes to pressure our leaders into a delay, even if for only a matter of days, in launching the assault.

Second: They hope to pressure our leaders into curtailing the "scope" of the assault. They hope

through pressure to transform what must be a crushing all-out blow aimed at decisive objectives into a western edition of the Italian campaign.

Third: They hope to convince large sections of the American people that the opening of the Second Front is unsound strategy and that "Soviet demands have pressured Roosevelt" into it. The traitorous ghouls look forward with fiendish glee to the day when the casualty lists, which are the inevitable accompaniment of any large-scale operation, begin to arrive in America and hope that this will result in mass resentment and disaffection among the people.

The military policy of our government and General Staff is firmly founded on the rock of the Teheran accord. Support of that policy means explaining to the people again and again and again all the factors which make an immediate launching of the Second Front the one and only sound, the one and only winning military policy for our country.

*The Drive to Destroy Conviction in
the Justness of the United
Nations Cause*

The wave of "viewing with distrust" pieces in the press regarding motives and actions of the Soviet Union; the blatant pro-fascist lies and slanders about Soviet, British and American policy in relation to Poland, Finland and Italy, the bleatings of the pacifists about the cruelties of Allied war measures; the wailings of the liberals about the

"lack" and/or badness of American war policy; all this must be approached with an eye to the fact that we are on the eve of the first really substantial American military undertaking in the war.

Now, as at no other moment, America needs the highest and firmest morale. The foundation of our national morale is the conviction that the cause of the United Nations is a just one; that our nation and the nations with whom we are aligned are in fact fighting a war of national liberation and of democracy.

An important objective of the current heightened activity of the pro-fascists, and those liberals who are being unwittingly led around by the nose by them, is to undermine the foundation of our national war morale by destroying the people's conviction in the justness of the United Nations cause. This constitutes a serious threat to our nation's war effort and to a win-the-war victory in the November elections. The lesson of France's fall should keep ever fresh in our mind the fate of nations—of nations with guns and armies and assembly lines—whose national morale has been

undermined at its foundation by fascist termites.

* * *

The national situation imperatively demands that labor, including the Communists, assume enormous responsibilities.

From them first of all must come: The necessary vigorous reaction to the stepped-up pro-fascist defeatist activities; the firm defense of our government's war policy, and initiative in enlisting the people behind it; the steadiness of orientation that serves to hold firm the whole of the win-the-war camp on the Teheran course.

Every organization professing to serve the needs of our working class and country must today be measured by the sole yardstick of their contribution to the forward movement of mankind along the course charted at Teheran. We Communists are not afraid of such a yardstick. We welcome measurement by it. We welcome it because we are an organization of Marxist-Leninist militants, not petty-bourgeois "radicals." We welcome it because at our head stands a towering figure of creative Marxism, one of those rare men whose thinking has to do with the actualities of history and influences the course of history, Comrade Browder.

CONCERNING A CHARGE OF BETRAYAL

BY HANS BERGER

MR. MAX LERNER, in an article entitled "The Unpopular Front," in *PM* of March 28, criticized the Communist policies as Earl Browder developed them at the January meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party. Since that criticism brought into focus all liberal criticism of an apparently "Left" character currently directed at the Communists, it merits discussion. Lerner's main arguments against the policy presented by Browder are the following:

"There are two premises in the new Communist Party line, as expounded authoritatively by Earl Browder in his interview given to *PM's* Harold Lavine, upon which everything turns. One is that *the world's fate hinges on Russia's future and Russia's alone. The second is that American progressives must give up their home-front struggle to fulfill the promise of American life, lest Wall St. fall out of the Teheran alliance.* I consider the first a misconception, the second a betrayal." (My emphasis—H.B.)

The misconception lies in Lerner's interpretation of Browder's position. Browder took as the starting point in his basic report, as well as in his interview, not the Soviet Union, but Teheran—that is, the agreement entered into by the leaders of our own country, Britain, and the Soviet Union for strengthening the leading coalition in the United Nations, for hastening victory through establishing the timing and the scope of the Western Front, and for laying the basis for post-war reconstruction through the continued Anglo-Soviet-American collaboration "in the war and in the peace that will follow." Browder's starting point was not the question: What kind of policy must we pursue in order to help the Soviet Union? His starting point was the question: How best can the national interests of the United States—the winning of the war, the maintenance of future peace, and the furtherance of economic and social well-being—be promoted?

If Lerner would attempt a serious analysis instead of indulging in gen-

eral phrases, he could not deny that this is the central problem on which the future of our nation and of the world depends. Browder explained in great detail that the significance of Teheran lies not only in the fact that it paves the way for effective military cooperation (the second front) but in that it offers also the perspective of post-war collaboration between the democratic capitalist powers and the Soviet Union. The peaceful co-existence and cooperation of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain following the defeat of Hitler-Germany and her satellites is the prerequisite for obviating another world war. If, after the common victory over Hitler, certain imperialistic circles were to succeed in their aim of unleashing unbridled inter-imperialist rivalry, or of setting the course of the United States or England toward war against the Soviet Union, the world would head for a still more terrible war catastrophe, in the course of which ultra-reaction would proceed to black out the democratic life of our nation. Such a war would be prepared, as was the case in Germany, by systematic reaction, by a systematic campaign for stupefying and brutalizing the masses, by systematic suppression of the working class movement and of all liberal opinion. The American fascistic reactionaries, just as Hitler did, would support the most anti-democratic adventurist elements in other countries, would intervene directly and indirectly to crush all working class and generally progressive forces in other

countries in order to obtain allies, gendarmes, and quislings. American reaction, American fascists would attempt to achieve with far more open means what English policy achieved between 1917 and 1939, not without help on our part, and what was so "brilliantly successful" in Germany.

This is the basis on which Browder focuses the attention of America on "Teheran," as the core of every present and future policy affecting our nation and the world. Browder does this as a Marxist, warning with Marxist farsightedness against the horrible possibility of a new world war, with the most terrible consequences for the life of the entire nation and especially for the conditions of the American working class and all liberals, including the Max Lerner. Browder the Marxist has never declared that Teheran automatically guarantees against the possibility of such a development. Just because "Teheran" must be fought for, and maintained and developed in struggle against its opponents, just because reactionary pro-fascist forces are attempting and will increasingly attempt to destroy the basis it has given us, Browder warned so explicitly against the anti-Teheran perspectives and urged upon the nation full understanding and whole-hearted implementation of the wartime and peacetime policies of collaboration agreed upon at Teheran.

* * *

Where is the misconception of which Lerner speaks? Without question, the Teheran Agreement is.

also in the interest of the Soviet Union. It is of utmost importance to the Soviet Union, and equally so to the United States and Britain, to end this war as swiftly as possible in coalition warfare through the second front. It is of the utmost importance to the Soviet Union, and equally so to the American and British nations, not to be drawn into a new world war and to prevent such a war.

Nor is Teheran less in the interest of France and of the other peoples of Europe, whose liberation depends on the cooperation of the great powers, and whose post-war development would be in the greatest danger if American and English reactionaries attempted to make them gendarmes against the Soviet Union and other peoples.

Browder's premise, therefore, does not, as Lerner falsely interprets, make "Russia's future and Russia's alone" the pivot of all policy. That premise is the premise recognized by the President of the United States in conjunction with the leaders of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, who voiced the deep-going sentiment of the American, British, and Soviet peoples, as the only basis for policy for the three great Coalition Powers on the road to victory and an enduring peace. When the German Communists declared that friendly relations to the Soviet Union were a life-and-death matter for the German nation, they were charged by the German Max Lerner with considering the Soviet Union "primarily" and "in opposition to" the interests of the German nation

Lerner declares he is for Teheran.

But when Browder presents the full meaning of Teheran as the basis of every serious progressive policy, then Lerner talks about "misconception." It behooves one in Lerner's position to accustom himself to thinking questions through to the end. Were he to discard the arrogance of superficiality, it might be possible for him to learn from the Communists to be a consistent progressive.

* * *

Lerner accuses Browder and the American Communists of "betrayal." He asserts that the Communists demand that the "American progressives give up their homefront struggle to fulfill the promise of American life, lest Wall St. fall out of the Teheran alliance." Lerner writes:

"What is Browder's basic fallacy is the belief that the American isolationists and the reactionary primitives can be appeased rather than they must be mastered; it is his belief that they can be lured into good behavior on foreign policy if only we surrender to them on domestic policy. This is to substitute the politics of blandishment and manipulation for the politics of majority strength. To abandon the home-front struggle thus is a betrayal of the best American progressive tradition. It is a betrayal of the Marxian tradition as well in its crucial principle—that men can, acting together, transform themselves by transforming their living conditions and their power structure. I know of very few thinking Amer-

ican progressives who will not be surprised at the extent to which the Communists now depart from their basic principle." (*My emphasis—H. B.*)

Lerner has often expressed his spiritual concern about our existence, and has let it be known that in his opinion it would be best if we disappeared. Lerner belongs to that group of liberals who have a troubled conscience concerning the Communists. They fear to be branded as fellow-travelers, since that would create difficulties for their whole material and social existence. They must therefore continuously still their conscience and better judgment with new arguments against the Communists. They must continuously prove to the world and to themselves why they are not consistent.

Wherein does this "betrayal" consist? Lerner does not make clear when this betrayal occurred. Does the betrayal consist perhaps in the fact that we support the Roosevelt Administration? That we are opposed to strikes in the war? That we oppose the raising of divisive issues that would weaken our nation's fighting power and civilian morale? Does the betrayal perhaps consist in the fact that we are inflexibly determined to carry this policy through to victory? What other policy have Lerner and *PM* to propose?

Where do Browder and the American Communists "appease" the American "isolationists" and the "reactionary primitives"? Don't the Communists carry on a consistent

struggle against the defeatists and pro-fascists who would hinder the prosecution of the war, who put all possible obstacles in the path of the Administration, who systematically attempt to disunite and demoralize the nation? Don't the Communists carry on a consistent struggle against the reactionary, pro-fascist forces who want to undermine our relations with our allies and smash the strength of the United Nations? We ask Lerner and *PM*: In what does the betrayal consist?

What other policy is a progressive one? Is John L. Lewis, perhaps, Lerner's ideal? Is Lerner's ideal the Trotskyite camp, which defames this great war of national liberation as "imperialist"? Is Lerner's progressive ideal Norman Thomas, that "Socialist" helpmate of Hitlerism who finds a dozen "progressive questions" a day, all of which have but one aim, to prove that the consistent prosecution of the war is not in the interest of the American nation?

Browder condemned the First World War as an imperialist war. He went to jail for his just belief. Browder and the American Communists, in common with all enlightened American patriots, know this war to be a war for national liberation. They, therefore, draw all the conclusions that will help prosecute this war victoriously. The American Communists would be traitors to the interests of the American working class and of the nation if they did not make speedy and decisive victory in the war the guide to all their policies, to which all other questions must be subordinated.

Hence, the Lerner's must be asked publicly: Wherein lies the betrayal by the American Communists in this war of liberation? And what, gentlemen, is your policy?

Does Lerner accuse us of betrayal because we do not consider socialism the issue on the order of the day? We do not know to what degree Lerner and *PM* and the liberals of whom he speaks consider the socialist revolution to be an issue on the order of the day. That is not stated very clearly either in the articles of Lerner, or in *PM*. And if they really do consider it an actual issue for our day, they have been singularly skillful in concealing from the nation the task which they propose it undertake.

Or is the charge of betrayal perhaps made on the assumption that we do not regard the working class any longer as the most progressive class in society, the class which, by its development, strength, and political maturation, qualifies itself for functioning as a leading force in the nation? But there are no Communists, there have been none, and there will be none who ever doubted this basic thesis of Marxism. On the contrary, our liberals, including Lerner, don't understand to this very day this unalterable principle of Marxism—despite their extensive libraries.

Or is the accusation of betrayal leveled on the assumption that we have given up the fight for the development of our democracy, for full equality for the Negro people, for wiping out the poll-tax shame, for safeguarding the democratic liberties so dearly won by the Amer-

ican people? Can the Lerner's cite one instance from our practice or one sentence from our declarations that could substantiate such a charge?

Or is the accusation of betrayal made on the assumption that we have proposed that the workers, the toiling farmers, the great masses of the nation say "amen" to whatever the reactionary forces in the nation decree in the way of taxes, wages, prices, etc.? Lerner cannot deny that we carry on an energetic struggle against all depredations on the living standards of the men and women on the production front and support all campaigns that undertake such action. In conducting this policy of struggle, we make clear that under war conditions we are opposed to all such actions that would disturb war production and interfere with the prosecution of the war. That is why we have vigorously opposed Lewis and all advocates of strikes during the war.

The President in his Annual Message to Congress, in January, proposed an economic Bill of Rights, much clearer and more meaningful for victory and a progressive post-war development than anything proposed to date by liberals of the Max Lerner type. It is a program of far-reaching reforms which can be carried out in the framework of American capitalism. We welcomed this program, as did millions of trade unionists and millions of Americans of the most varied strata and occupations. As Communists together with all labor and progressives, together with the American

fathers, husbands, sons and brothers in uniform, we support such a program which declares:

"In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race or creed.

"Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

"The right to a good education;

"All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

If, instead of resorting to general phrases, Lerner would present a bill of particulars, he would discover that he has not the slightest grounds for accusing us of betrayal. If he endeavored to formulate concretely the needs of the American people, now and in the post-war world, he would find himself on the same platform with the great trade unions of our country, and also, whether it be to his liking or not, with us Communists. Only so long as he stays in the hazy "higher regions," can he hurl lightning bolts at us—bolts that are cold, devoid of the fire of truth.

Lerner reproaches Browder for "his acceptance of monopoly control of the American economy on the ground of inevitability and handing the world over to the despoilment by the cartels."

What does Browder accept and what does he see as inevitable?

Browder realizes that in its dominant sections American monopoly capital supports the war. The American capitalists have helped, by and large, to produce everything necessary for the war. In this historic hour for the American nation, the decisive sections of American capitalism are aligned with all the patriotic forces of all classes in the great national war of our country. This very significant fact, in contradistinction to the situation in those European countries where the decisive strata of the bourgeoisie have brought national catastrophe upon their peoples, taken together with the non-socialist ideology of the

overwhelming mass of the American people, must be taken into consideration by every Marxist who wants to pursue a practical progressive policy. What, therefore, is the issue, the inevitable issue, as it presents itself to every serious Marxist?

Should one ascend to the "higher regions" á la Lerner, in splendid isolation from the actual present situation, howl meaningless phrases about the power of the monopolies? Or should one set himself to work with labor, with the people, toward the effective solution of the most urgent wartime and post-war problems of the nation? These are not little problems unworthy of a liberal custodian of Marxism. They are the problems of winning the war and of preventing a terrible post-war crisis with possibly 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 unemployed, and the most dangerous social and political consequences, nationally and internationally. What have the Max Lerner to offer toward the solution of these problems?

Browder well put it:

"... Today, to speak seriously of drastic curbs on monopoly capital, leading toward the breaking of its power, and imposed upon monopoly capital against its will, is merely another form of proposing the immediate transition to socialism—or else it is the Utopian trust-busting program of return to an earlier, pre-monopoly stage of capitalism.

"National unity around a program to break the power of monopoly capital is possible only if and when the

majority of the people can be united for the institution of socialism in the United States.

"That time is not now, and certainly not in the 1944 elections."*

For the Max Lerner, who refuse to face this reality (not created by the Communists), the only perspective is darkness, hopelessness, and desperate charges of "betrayal."

Earl Browder and the Communists do not see any reason for desperation. The American Communists consider it possible, even within the framework of American capitalism, to avoid the Lernerian darkness.** The precondition for objective post-war reconstruction is an appreciation of the extent of the problems to be solved after victory and the cooperation of all strata of the population who are determined in their mutual interest to avoid a colossal crisis.

Max Lerner appears outraged when Browder speaks of cooperation also with the patriotic sections of monopoly capital; Max Lerner does not understand what cooperation means. Consequently, he accuses the Communists of appeasing reaction. One can cooperate in various ways. Chamberlain cooperated with Hitler. The result was war and fascist triumphs. The German Social-Democrats cooperated with Bruening in the great economic crisis. This cooperation consisted in permitting the

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 23.

** We would earnestly recommend to Mr. Lerner that he study the highly enlightening article by Gilbert Green in *The Communist* for April.

Bruening government to throw the full burden of the crisis onto the backs of the toilers. As a result, the fascist offensive was the more successful. In these cases the word "cooperation" was a synonym for capitulation, sacrifice of the interests of the working class and of the nation to reaction and fascism, with the well-known consequences. But Browder has not proposed cooperation in order that the burden of a terrible crisis might be placed on the people. On the contrary, he proposed cooperation through anti-fascist national unity, precisely for guaranteeing the adoption of such measures that will avoid the crisis.

Browder states to the class in control of American economy: The great masses of the American people are convinced that our rich and resourceful country can, by internal measures and through economic cooperation with other countries for achieving the Teheran objectives, avoid a post-war crisis and mass unemployment. To solve the post-war problems will not be a simple task. But they can be solved. If you wish to avoid crisis and disintegrating social conflicts, it is necessary that in conjunction with labor, farmers, and middle classes, you work for the adoption of such common policies, supplemented by governmental measures, that will solve the problems of the post-war world.

It is a proposal to cooperate against unemployment, against crisis, against the danger of fascism and new imperialist adventures. It is the proposal to solve all the diffi-

cult social and economic problems of the post-war world in a way which will guarantee the maximum of peaceful development. It is cooperation in the interests of an economic Bill of Rights, not cooperation à la Chamberlain, or à la Social-Democracy.

But Max Lerner has still another argument against cooperation. The Communists are so weak that the "tough capitalists" will not cooperate with them at all. Of course, the American Communists are still too weak today to convince "tough American capitalists" of the need for cooperation. Therefore, if this cooperation depended on the Communists alone it would be condemned to failure. Cooperation among various classes, in their mutual interests, can only be successful, and not be transformed into labor's capitulation, when the working-class movement, on the basis of maximum unity and an understanding of the *whole* situation, uses its strength to cooperate and to solve these urgent problems with the organizations and representatives of the other classes. Therefore, at the very time that they establish the necessity for this cooperation, the Communists, as part of the labor movement, emphasize the necessity for labor unity, the strengthening of trade union organization and joint action.

Where in all these considerations, in these conclusions is there betrayal? Who can seriously assert that the development of such a policy as Browder has outlined makes it easier for reaction, for fascism, in

America or in other countries? On the contrary, it is precisely such a policy—the policy based on Teheran—which shows the working class, the broad masses of the people, the whole nation, the great historic course of achieving a speedy victory and of returning to peace without a post-war crisis, without threat to national security, and of creating the preconditions for further social progress.

THE MARYLAND-DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENLIGHTENMENT CAMPAIGN

BY DOXEY A. WILKERSON

THE "Enlightenment Campaign" following the January meeting of the National Committee has enormously advanced the political understanding and influence of the Maryland-D. C. Communist organization. Centering around the study of Earl Browder's report, *Teheran and America*, there have developed a pronounced improvement in the quality of branch political discussions, an upsurge of theoretical study of the Marxist classics, a definite trend toward greater public understanding and acceptance of the party, and especially a more intimate and effective working relationship between Communists and non-Communists in the trade union movement.

There have also been problems, many of them, both ideological and practical. Moreover, some of these problems, even now, move very slowly toward solution. Yet, in the continuing struggle for theoretical clarity on the new perspective which the Declaration of Teheran has opened up for our nation and the world, there are being developed, first, a solid basis of political understanding among the membership, and secondly, definitely improved

methods of work. As a result, the Maryland-D. C. Communist organization looks forward with complete confidence to the crucial task of this period; namely, the building of real fighting unity of all democratic forces in this area—for the triumph of the win-the-war coalition in the 1944 elections, for a speedy victory over our Axis enemies and the destruction of fascism, for the organization of a just and enduring peace.

Branch Discussions

Beginning with the second week of January and continuing until now, every bi-weekly meeting of every branch in the Maryland-D. C. District has entered into a discussion of some aspect of the perspective and program outlined at the Plenary Meeting of the National Committee. Approximately 60 per cent of the membership has participated directly in these discussions. Others have been reached through bulletins which many branches mail regularly to their members. Moreover, a copy of Browder's *Teheran and America* was mailed to every member in the District; and the sale of the February issue of *The Communist*, carrying reports on the National Commit-

tee meeting, was unprecedented for this area.

The response of comrades to the political conclusions of the Plenum has everywhere been enthusiastic. Although full clarity on all the theoretical and practical implications of the Teheran perspective has still to be achieved, practically the entire membership hailed the National Committee's decisions with warm acclaim.

One significant initial reaction to the Plenum decisions came from a branch of white-collar and professional Negro comrades. They readily saw the historic necessity for the program outlined in Browder's report, but they expressed real concern over an erroneous report they had received that the party was now "giving up" the goal of socialism. Their anxiety grew out of the fact that they had come correctly to associate the achievement of socialism with the complete liberation of the Negro people, the primary basis upon which many of them entered the party. It required a thorough discussion of the application of Marxist political economy to the post-war world envisioned by the agreements of Teheran, and especially to the perspective now opened up for the peaceful transition to socialism, to reassure these comrades that the Plenum decisions are thoroughly consistent with its historic mission to lead the working class and the nation to the ultimate socialist solution of the problems which inhere in the capitalist organization of our society.

An extremely valuable outcome of branch discussions of the Plenum

decisions is a deepened understanding of, and heightened admiration for, the party's dialectical approach to the problems of history. Although the commercial press continues to snicker at alleged "flip-flops" in the party policy, our members are coming increasingly to appreciate the profound change in world relationships which was registered at Teheran. They see the increased strengthening of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition as the fruition of the basic anti-fascist policies which our party has consistently advocated throughout the past decade. They observe how unreal, grotesque and dangerous are the outmoded slogans of certain "liberal" and other groups who take pride in adhering to formulas which arose in a historic era which has now passed. Moreover, they grasp even more fully the earlier changes in Communist strategy and tactics in response to the sharp turns in history during 1935, 1938 and 1941. As a result, they are coming more and more to understand Marxism as the science of social change, as a body of living principles guiding to progressive action rather than a set of dogmas. Consequently, their respect for the Marxist leadership of our party and their confidence in it are immeasurably strengthened.

Most of the branch discussions during January and February were led by state and city party officials and other leading comrades. This procedure was necessary in order to assure a prompt and correct interpretation of Plenum decisions to all branches. Its weakness, however, lay in the tendency of party leaders to

dominate the discussions. Real democratic give-and-take by the entire membership was unwittingly discouraged by the "authoritative" presentations of the recognized leadership. In due time the obvious corrective was applied. Discussion leaders are now selected from the branch itself. Although city and state officials still attend and participate in branch discussions, they consciously avoid giving "the answer" to every problem that arises, leaving it to the membership to think through to correct formulations.

One result of this withdrawal of the "top" leadership to the background is a distinctly broader and more democratic discussion by the branch membership. Problems and issues which members formerly kept to themselves tend increasingly to be brought into the open for discussion. This, of course, is all to the good. The new problem that has emerged is how to keep the branch leaders from assuming the position of dominance voluntarily relinquished by city and state officials. There is still much progress to be made before genuinely democratic give-and-take, involving *all* the rank-and-file members, becomes the prevailing practice in branch discussions.

Another effect of the withdrawal of state and city officials from the leadership of branch discussions has been the emergence of new and more fruitful forms for such discussions. One branch tried the panel-discussion technique reported in the *Daily Worker* from the California District, with notable success. One

branch is becoming adept at the dramatic presentation of political issues—with sound effects and all. Several branches are organizing discussions around the Robert Minor series of questions and answers in the *Daily Worker*. Still another branch delegates some member to make a five-minute introduction of some one issue involved in the Plenum decisions, after which the meeting is opened for general discussion. A state official who observed this latter procedure commented: "I have never participated in a party discussion where so large a proportion of the members took an active part." The further development of such new forms of branch discussion obviously warrants the utmost encouragement.

The initial emphasis in branch discussions of the National Committee decisions was upon *general* understanding of the over-all policies agreed upon in the light of the Teheran perspective. There followed a period of greater emphasis upon more *specialized* aspects of policy—the new perspective and the struggle for Negro democratic rights, the 1944 elections, new forms of struggle by the trade unions, the current problems of political reorganization in Poland and France and Italy. To some extent there also developed a re-examination and application of basic Marxist postulates of political economy, imperialism, the role of the state, and the working class and the nation—all in the light of the perspective of Teheran.

Now, the emphasis in branch discussions has shifted again, this time to the practical *application* of the

Plenum decisions to the functioning of neighborhood branches and the tasks of the trade union movement in the immediate community. This is becoming the dominant emphasis in the pre-Convention discussions now under way. It is being fostered and guided through use of a printed *Pre-Convention Bulletin* distributed to all members of the Maryland-D. C. Communist organization.

New Classes

The ferment of theoretical discussion which the Enlightenment Campaign has stimulated in party branches led naturally to increasing demands by members for even more systematic study of fundamental Marxist theory. At the same time, there was recognized the special need during this period for advancing the political understanding of the party leadership, and also for providing some special "orientation" program for the new members being enrolled during the recruiting drive. The result is an ever growing number of specialized study groups which sorely tax the District's ability to provide an adequate corps of instructors.

Several classes have been organized for new members in different sections of Baltimore and Washington. They center around a series of four weekly discussions: (1) the background and history of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., its overall program and organization; (2) the background and development of World War II, up to the Moscow Conference; (3) the Conferences of Cairo and Teheran, their implications for victory and enduring peace,

and the related decisions of the January meeting of the National Committee; and (4) the organization and functioning of the community branch. These several discussions are rotated in four-week cycles. Each new member is assigned to one of the classes and is expected to participate in a complete cycle of four discussions, beginning at whatever point he enrolls in the party.

The experience with these new members' classes has been that the discussions are extremely profitable for the new comrades who attend, but that the record of attendance is very poor. It is now apparent that main reliance will have to be placed upon branch education programs for the ideological integration of new members.

One of the most vital classes in the District is that for branch organizers in Baltimore. It serves as a clearing-house for questions and issues which are raised in branch discussions and which require further clarification. The general procedure is for branch organizers to formulate the questions they have encountered, and for other branch organizers in the class—not the instructor—to supply the answers. This procedure not only stimulates maximum participation, but it also reveals to the city leadership the nature of the theoretical problems facing the several branches and the ability of branch leaders to cope with them adequately. A somewhat similar class is being conducted with community branch executives in Washington, D. C., with a more formal and systematic program of study.

The District staff, itself, has initi-

ated a long-time program for weekly discussions of basic Marxist theory and its application to the present period. Attention is given to Marxist postulates regarding imperialism, political economy, the role of the state, the working class and the nation, the national question, the farm question, dialectical and historical materialism, the nature and role of the Communist organization, and the history of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. The class promises greatly to raise the theoretical level of the District leadership—if its much-harried and busy members can resist the constant temptation to forego scheduled theoretical study and discussion in order to give more attention to the ever-pressing problems of party organization.

The Negro question is coming in for increased study and discussion as a direct result of the Enlightenment Campaign. The Negro Commission in Washington has undertaken a systematic, long-term program of study of Marxist theory on the national question, with special application to the problem of integrating the Negro people into American society. Several Washington branches have also worked out cooperatively a three-session study program on the theoretical and practical aspects of the current struggle for Negro democratic rights.

A recent branch discussion in Baltimore turned to the question: Why are so few Negro comrades theoretically prepared for responsible party leadership? Here was opened up one of the most serious questions facing the District, where Negro comrades constitute an ever-increasing pro-

portion of the membership, but a very, very small proportion of city and District leadership. The question was subsequently raised in an informal discussion with several leading Negro comrades. All were keenly alert to the problem and eager, themselves, to participate in a special study program geared to the urgent need for more theoretically prepared Negro leadership.

As a result of these discussions, there has been organized a weekly class involving seven or eight leading Negro comrades. The study program includes a Marxist interpretation of Negro history, the theory of the national question, current problems in the struggle for Negro democratic rights, and more general postulates of Marxist theory. Time is given at each meeting of the class for informal discussion of any theoretical or practical problems which have arisen during the week. Effort is being made to involve members of the class in a series of mass activities in the community. The common hope of the District leadership and of the seven or eight students is that within a few months there will emerge from this class at least a few real Marxist leaders of the Baltimore Communist organization.

In addition to these, there is a new and growing class of Communist and non-Communist housewives in Baltimore, which serves the dual purpose of Marxist education and recruitment. Many branches in Washington, Baltimore, and Western Maryland have set aside definite periods, in addition to their regular branch discussions, for the systematic study of Marxism. A class has

recently been organized among Slovak comrades in Baltimore, which it is hoped will soon be paralleled by similar classes with other national groups.

The Baltimore branch educational directors decided to initiate, for themselves, a program of bi-weekly study and discussion on the use of the Marxist classics during this period, with special reference to their application to the perspectives and problems which stem from the agreements of Teheran. They began with a discussion of "The Nature and Role of the Marxist Party," based upon Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* (Chap. VIII), *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (pp. 44-52), Williamson's "New Problems of Communist Organization" (*The Communist*, February, 1944) and Jerome's "The Communist Vanguard" (*The Communist*, April, 1944). Over a period of time, this group plans to review the whole range of basic Marxist postulates in the light of the present period, and thus to achieve a more functional command over the theoretical premises which underlie our party's program. Such an ambitious project by branch educational directors opens up exciting possibilities for a still more general revival of Marxist study in the District. This group is the key to the education of the membership as a whole.

General Public Reactions

Effective measures to interpret the National Committee decisions to the general public have been far from adequate in this area whose political atmosphere is constantly polluted by

the Hearst-Patterson press and the fulminations of Dies and Tydings and Bilbo and their ilk. Some such measures have been taken, however, and they are bringing wholesome results.

Twenty Communist Party radio broadcasts have been made as a part of the Enlightenment Campaign, two in Cumberland, six in Washington, eleven in Baltimore, and one over a statewide hook-up. Among them was a series of eight Sunday afternoon discussions over a Baltimore station. This latter series, which was widely advertised, included talks on "Lincoln and Today's War Against Fascist Slavery," "300 Years of Struggle for Negro Freedom," "Who Are the Communists?" "Capital and Labor—Key to Victory," "American-Soviet Relations in the Post-War World," "Post-War—Prosperity or Chaos?" "Issues in the 1944 Elections," and "The Communists' Message to Trade Unions."

There are a few evidences that these radio broadcasts have brought favorable responses from the public. The Baltimore *Sun* made the unprecedented request for a copy of the Executive Secretary's address on "The Meaning of Teheran for America," and played it up in a full and accurate front-page story which was picked up by other papers in the District. A number of letters and telephone calls of commendation have been received, along with requests for copies of radio addresses. Several persons are known to have joined the party as a direct result of the broadcasts. Formerly strained relations with officials of one large broadcasting station have become

warm and cordial; and even the obstinate attorney for the station, who for months has precipitated a fight over every Communist Party manuscript submitted for his approval, now passes upon proposed speeches with little or no objection.

The big weakness of the radio broadcasting program was failure to arrange for, and to *guarantee*, a large number of listening-in parties by comrades and their non-Communist friends. Effective organization to this end would have enhanced tremendously the value of the broadcasts.

Early in the Enlightenment Campaign, the District of Columbia party held a reception at its newly remodeled offices. It was attended by an unusually broad group of Communist and non-Communist citizens. Several ministers and civic leaders present expressed genuine appreciation for the party's approach to the problems facing the nation and the community during this period.

All branch meetings during the Enlightenment Campaign have been open meetings, with many non-Communists participating in discussions. Such meetings and discussions have proved to be the most effective technique thus far used to enroll new members.

Shortly after the meeting of the National Committee in January there was initiated a series of informal discussions between party officials and leading non-Communist individuals in Baltimore and Washington. In every case, face-to-face interpretations of the Plenum decisions brought forth attitudes of

greater respect and appreciation for the party's program.

Also during the recent period, one party District official has received invitations to speak to meetings of two non-Communist mass organizations. Another official played a leading role in a non-Communist mass demonstration against Negro employment discrimination and spoke at the City Hall Plaza meeting which culminated the campaign. In Washington, not long after the Plenum, two leading Communist trade union officials felt free for the first time to speak openly as Communists, taking part in a public panel discussion organized by one of the community branches. Only one who has experienced directly the political climate of the nation's capital can appreciate the full significance of this latter development.

There is no doubt that, despite continued slanders in the defeatist press, the Communist Party in the Maryland-D. C. District is coming more and more to be understood and accepted as an important force in the struggle for victory and enduring peace. This trend, although still not tremendous, has very definitely been pushed forward during the period of the Enlightenment Campaign.

Relations with Trade Unions

Copies of Comrade Browder's *Teheran and America* were mailed to a large number of non-Communist trade union leaders in the Maryland-D. C. District. Many of these leaders were also engaged in informal discussions about the decisions of the National Committee meeting and the implications of Teheran for the role

of labor in strengthening national unity in the country as a whole. Further, the Executive Secretary's radio address, "The Communists' Message to the Trade Unions," was printed as an eight-page accordion-fold pamphlet for wide distribution throughout the District.

The responses of non-Communist trade unionists to these approaches have generally been warm and appreciative. Many of them are coming for the first time to understand the true relations of the Communist organization to the trade unions. They are also getting rid of distorted notions, engendered by the press, as to the nature and import of the Plenum decisions.

As an important feature of the Enlightenment Campaign, the District leadership held a series of discussions with groups of leading trade union comrades representing the major industries in this area. The purpose of these discussions was to interpret the implications of the Plenum decisions for concrete programs of action by the labor movement in relation to the problems of the several industries.

Among other outcomes of these discussions with leading trade union comrades, there emerged several major problems of theoretical understanding which must be cleared up before the labor movement can effectively assume its responsibilities to the nation during this period.

First, there is far from adequate appreciation, by both Communist and non-Communist trade unionists, of the urgent need to apply the Teheran perspective of growing and continuing national unity to the im-

mediate problems faced by the workers in their industries. "Bethlehem Steel," some are inclined to say, "isn't pulling for Teheran; they're trying to break our union." Implicit is the assumption that the union must fight back in the old way, as the only means of self-protection. There is failure to understand that labor cannot solve today's problems merely through insistent demands upon management, but only as an organized and powerful force in the national unity demanding the right to collaborate with management and government in the interests of the nation as a whole.

Second, there is the related tendency for many trade unionists to become overwhelmed by a multitude of unsolved grievances, and thus to lose confidence in the applicability of the Teheran perspectives to their industry. They fail to see that the effective approach to specific grievances must now be on the basis of labor's over-all role as the major force for strengthening national unity. The big need is for labor to establish a common meeting ground with employers for agreement on general policy—in the interest of war production and national unity. Only when there is agreement on general policy will labor cease to be harried by company obstructions to the settlement of specific grievances.

Third, far too few trade unionists fully understand that the national-unity implications of Teheran will not be realized automatically, but will come only through correct and persistent struggle. The labor movement will command respect and attention from management and gov-

ernment only to the extent of its demonstrated strength and continuous struggles for its necessary place to function with full effectiveness in the coalition of national unity. Let labor organize its power as an independent political force dedicated to the strengthening of national unity. Let labor demonstrate that the nation simply cannot solve its problems except through collaboration between government, management and the trade union movement. Then, and only then, will the decisive sections of the capitalist class be convinced of the necessity for constructive relations with organized labor.

Fourth, the labor movement is unduly laggard in mobilizing its full influence in the struggle for Negro democratic rights, both on the job and in the community. This is especially serious in view of the coming elections and the urgent necessity for unity between labor and the Negro people in order to assure the return of President Roosevelt to the White House and the election of a win-the-war Congress. Not only is it important for labor to establish firm unity with the Negro people; it is also easy of accomplishment. But the only basis upon which it can be done is for the trade unions to enter far more vigorously into the struggle for Negro democratic rights.

Finally, many trade union leaders still fail to appreciate how directly the continued freedom of our nation, indeed, its very existence, depends upon the closest collaboration and the maximum coalition with the Soviet Union within the framework of the Teheran agreements. Otherwise

it would be impossible for the Hearst press of Baltimore repeatedly to slander our great Soviet ally without a word of protest from organized labor. Otherwise the scheduled address of Gerald K. Smith in Baltimore would have evoked overwhelming mass protests from the trade union movement. Labor still must learn that it can no longer defend either its own or the nation's interests until it moves vigorously to smash the anti-Sovieteers who now function with relative immunity.

These are some of the still unsolved problems facing the Communist Party of Maryland-D. C. in its efforts to help the labor movement adjust its outlook and forms of struggle to the crucial task of welding all win-the-war, pro-Teheran forces in this area into a firm and fighting coalition of national unity. And the first step toward this end is redirecting trade union policy to achieve absolute clarity on the part of Communist members of the trade unions.

It is appropriate to end this discussion with accounts of two instances in which the Plenum decisions really were applied to the immediate problems facing the trade unions—and were found to work!

In one major war industry in Baltimore the union has long been beset by artificial divisions of "Right" and "Left," with consequent weakening of the win-the-war leadership, in which there is really little difference as regards the immediate political and other tasks of the trade unions during this period. In the course of the Enlightenment Campaign the

"Lefts" went to the "Rights" with a proposition to bury the hatchet, stating that *for or against the defense of our nation* is now the only valid basis for division between trade unionists or any other patriotic Americans. The proposition was accepted, with consequent enormous strengthening of the progressive forces in the union.

In another industry in Baltimore the union and the company have long been bickering and clashing over grievances. Every little issue led to a fight. Several weeks ago a committee from the union went to company officials and said, in effect: "It is natural that problems arise between us, and the only sensible way to solve them is to sit down and agree upon a general approach to

the handling of grievances. That we do so is necessary to hasten war production and safeguard the morale of the workers." The outcome was a comprehensive agreement which has notably speeded up the satisfactory handling of grievances and has brought qualitative changes in the formerly hostile attitudes of company officials toward the union.

The latter experience was a revelation to one trade union comrade, whose comment reflects a discovery many of his colleagues will make if they really come to understand and apply the Plenum decisions to the problems facing the trade union movement. Upon leaving the successful negotiations with the company, this comrade exclaimed: "Teheran is wonderful!"

THE SEATTLE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

BY HENRY P. HUFF

Secretary of the Northwest District of the Communist Party

THE outcome of the Seattle municipal elections has brought rather sharp, if not shocking, disappointment to the camp of labor and all patriotic win-the-war forces of this key war industrial and political center of the State of Washington. The defeat of the win-the-war candidates constitutes sufficient grounds for most serious concern to labor and all democratic forces as we approach the greater and more decisive political struggles of the 1944 state and national elections.

In this first major political skirmish of 1944 against the reactionary-defeatist Republican Party machine, headed by Governor Langlie, Mayor Devin and Co., a coalition of a considerable section of the labor movement, business and middle-class forces, backing a slate of five candidates for mayor, city council, and school board, respectively, failed to score any decisive victory in the elections and the reactionary forces were able to slide back into office.

However, it should be said that they did not win the fight without bearing considerable scars of battle. True, they are still in power, but confronted with stronger forces united against their reactionary policies than ever before.

It is important to note that out of

a total of 195,755 registered voters only 71,062, or 36 per cent of the eligible voters, cast ballots in the primaries of February 29, and 101,978, or less than 52 per cent of the eligible voters, went to the polls for the final elections on March 14.

Because the win-the-war candidates and their campaign directors, as well as the precinct workers, failed to make the issues in the election sufficiently clear to arouse and mobilize into action the whole eligible voting population and to expose the true connections and defeatist policies of the Langlie-Devin forces, the incumbent Mayor Devin was able to return to office with 58,000 votes, or only 29 per cent of the total registered electorate. James Scavotto, the people's win-the-war and pro-labor candidate, received 40,880 votes, trailing Devin by 17,220 votes.

In the councilmanic race the two incumbent candidates, John E. Carroll and Mrs. F. F. Powell, both of whom have a long standing anti-labor and reactionary record, were also re-elected by a two-to-one majority over their closest opponents. For a third councilmanic vacancy, Alfred R. Rochester, who made no mention of the war in his campaign speeches and received the support

of the reactionary forces, including the Hearst and defeatist Republican newspapers, won over Mrs. Jeanette Testu, National Democratic Committeewoman and a progressive member of the State Legislature, by the small margin of 3,380 votes.

Failure on the part of Mrs. Testu to speak out more forcefully on the war issues and her refusal to speak out against the reactionary, defeatist policies of her opponents were undoubtedly responsible for her defeat.

In the school board race the two incumbents, who were also supported by the most reactionary forces and the defeatist press, were re-elected by a large majority. Mrs. Florence B. James, a runner-up in the school board race and a newcomer in politics, came out on a 100 per cent win-the-war pro-Roosevelt, pro-Teheran program, and furnished one of the bright spots in the elections by rolling up 22,453 votes.

With this general picture of the Seattle elections before us, what are the main reasons for the defeat of the win-the-war candidates? What positive features were registered in the campaign and what lessons can we draw from the election that can contribute toward a people's win-the-war victory in the 1944 state and national elections?

* * *

First, in our opinion, one of the prime reasons for the defeat of the win-the-war slate was the failure of the labor movement to achieve the necessary unity behind the candidates committed to a people's win-the-war program, and particularly the slowness with which the unions

acted to unite and to take any active part in the elections.

Although some thirteen A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions were finally united in a formal manner behind the win-the-war slate of candidates, such powerful unions as the boilermakers took no official position, with part of its leadership supporting the anti-labor Devin camp. The aero-mechanics union, with some 40,000 members, only halfheartedly committed itself to the support of part of the slate backed by labor and took very little action to throw the full strength of the union into an active and organized participation in the campaign. The teamsters union refused to take any position until after the primaries and finally came into the campaign too late to be very effective.

These weaknesses, coupled with the fact that the labor unity which was finally achieved was never developed much beyond the formal or agitational stage, contributed materially to the lack of interest and spirit in the elections and, in the final analysis, to the loss of the elections. Practically none of the unions involved in the labor front coalition ever succeeded in involving any appreciable number of its membership in organized, active campaign work, either in the industrial plants or in the precincts.

All of these weaknesses taken together reflect the results of a serious division that developed some five years ago in the State Federation of Labor, at which time the teamsters, ships scalers, and building service unions disaffiliated from the State A. F. of L. Federation. The disasso-

ciation of these three strong and progressive unions contributed considerably to labor's division in the elections, with part of the trade-union movement aligned with anti-labor, defeatist Langlie-Devin forces, in one of the most crucial elections in Seattle's history. The sum total of such a situation, of course, amounted to a defeat for all of labor and all other forces who place victory in the war and a stable, durable peace above all other considerations.

* * *

The second main reason was the fact that the campaign was permitted to become narrowed down to a purely labor and Left-wing campaign. This kind of campaign certainly did not reflect the true character of the win-the-war candidates, all of whom were truly people's candidates, representing the best interests of all sections and classes of the population. This weakness was reflected in the fact that not a single business man, not a single employer, not a single civic or church leader spoke out during the whole campaign for the election of Scavotto, although he is a small business man himself, a veteran member of the City Council, and certainly not a Left-wing or labor candidate.

Here again we cannot overlook or underestimate the degree to which the division in the labor movement contributed to the failure of business and middle-class forces to come forward more energetically for the election of Scavotto and the win-the-war candidates for City Council and School Board. Certainly, Mayor Devin and the reactionary Hearst and defeatist Republican press capi-

talized on this weakness by making Scavotto out to be a candidate of the teamsters union and of the Washington Commonwealth Federation, excluding any mention of other trade unions which were also a part of the labor coalition.

Had the labor movement presented a solid front behind the candidates pledged to carry out the victory policies of President Roosevelt and Teheran, neither Devin or the reactionary newspapers would have been quite so bold in lashing out against the teamsters union, or against Scavotto, or even against the Washington Commonwealth Federation as part of such a unity coalition.

Without such unity, labor's ability to influence the necessary broader unity of all patriotic forces and bring the whole win-the-war forces from the "Left to the Right" more fully into the elections was greatly weakened, and ineffective. This was precisely why Devin and the local press singled out Scavotto, Dave Beck and the Washington Commonwealth Federation and hurled against them the demagogic cry that "Beckism and W.C.F.-ism" were out to dictate the policies of the city government. The purpose of such an attack was to intimidate business and middle-class forces and some industrialists, and scare them away from support of the win-the-war candidates.

Had business leaders, civic and church leaders been brought more actively into the election struggle, a great deal more interest and support could have been won, not only from business, middle-class and church forces, but from the thousands of

workers in the large war industries who are gaining their first experiences as industrial workers and trade unionists. Many of these workers, from the farms of the Midwest and the South and many from middle-class families, are not fully conscious yet of their responsibilities as trade unionists and are not yet prepared to accept fully the advice even of their own union leaders on all political questions.

Thus, for lack of unity in its ranks, labor failed to fulfill a very important political responsibility to its own best interests and to those of our nation.

* * *

A third factor contributing to the unfavorable outcome of the elections was the lack of serious concern and leadership displayed by the state and local Democratic Party. While it is quite noteworthy that eighteen members of the state legislature issued a joint appeal to the voters of the city of Seattle for support of the democratic, win-the-war candidates, a number of the most influential state and local Democratic Party leaders failed to give serious consideration to the Seattle elections and did little, if anything, to win the elections.

For example, some of the most influential King County leadership was involved in an internal fight which brought before the voters of Seattle the question of dissension and a split in the Democratic Party as the issue in the midst of the Seattle election campaign. Of course, the defeatist press made capital of this situation. Consequently, none of the Democratic Party leaders, except

those identified as Washington Commonwealth Federation leaders or as Left-wing forces, spoke out for the election of the candidates pledged to carry out Roosevelt's policies for winning the war. At the same time, it must be noted that the whole Langlie-Devin Republican machine was on the job in the Seattle elections to re-elect their candidates into office.

Here, too, labor must accept a large share of the responsibility for the lack of initiative and the unstable situation which exists within the Democratic Party. In the midst of this great people's war for freedom and liberation, faced with great political responsibilities to itself and to the nation, labor needs to become more seriously concerned about the status of the Democratic Party, which represents the strength behind Roosevelt and Teheran in this state, and to begin to involve labor's forces more actively to strengthen and unite the Democratic Party, if more disastrous defeats are to be avoided in the 1944 elections.

* * *

A fourth factor that affected the outcome of the elections was certain organizational weaknesses which had been permitted to develop within the Washington Commonwealth Federation during the last two years. Although the W.C.F. has maintained its prestige and influence and now constitutes the strongest and most active force within the Democratic Party, it was unable to overcome the effect of incorrect policies directed toward its own dissolution and which caused a certain organizational deterioration in precinct and

neighborhood organization. While this weakness was partially overcome during the Seattle election campaign, the Federation's campaigning was not brought up to the standards of past elections, and certainly not up to the requirements of the decisive political struggles yet to come in the 1944 elections.

Still one other contributing factor in the loss of the elections was the lack of adequate consideration for the special problems of the Negro people prior to and during the election struggle. As a result, the Negro people were not clear as to the issues involved in the elections and were not adequately involved in the election campaign. This is also true of other national minority groups.

Such, in our opinion, are some of the basic reasons that the most progressive, win-the-war candidates were defeated and the most reactionary defeatist candidates were elected in the Seattle municipal elections.

* * *

The next important question is: was the election struggle a total loss? What were the positive features registered in the Seattle elections and how can the lessons drawn from these elections be utilized to turn this temporary setback into a democratic people's victory in the coming 1944 political struggles?

In answer to these questions, it is important to note the campaign conducted by Terry Pettus, editor of the Washington Commonwealth Federation organ, *The New World*. His projection of the war issues in the early stages of the campaign, although he was eliminated in the

primaries, receiving 10,339 votes, or 392 votes short of nomination, was mainly responsible for giving a win-the-war character to the whole campaign. It was this introduction of the real issues into the Seattle elections that was mainly responsible for the consistent, win-the-war campaign conducted by Scavotto, which was one of the constructive features of the Seattle elections.

It was the program introduced by Terry Pettus in the primaries, and carried forward by Scavotto in the final elections with more than 40,000 votes behind it, that forced Mayor Devin to call for an elimination of the differences of the past and "for a united Seattle to win the war as soon as possible" in his acceptance speech on the night of the elections.

It was the clear-cut, win-the-war, pro-Roosevelt, pro-Teheran program introduced by Terry Pettus, calling for a United Seattle for a quick victory and for a stable, peaceful and prosperous Seattle in the post-war period, that brought about the overwhelming rejection in the primaries of City Councilman Frank McCaffrey, candidate for mayor—the only candidate who dared to talk demagogically about winning the war and at the same time indulge in open Red-baiting. McCaffrey, a public official, received 2,282 votes less than Terry Pettus, who was a new figure in politics in the city of Seattle. The defeat of McCaffrey, which also eliminates him from Seattle city government, was a victory for the people in the Seattle municipal elections.

The fact must not be overlooked that while the results of the Seattle

elections were disappointing to a large section of the labor movement and all win-the-war forces, the results were far from satisfactory to the Langlie-Devin Republican Party or to the defeatist press. They see in these results a growing consciousness among labor and the people of what the real issues are in this war and in American political life and they see an ever-growing unity of labor and the people that threatens to sweep them from positions of power unless they can find some new schemes to confuse and deceive the people.

These facts are best expressed by the fact that the Hearst *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* was forced to point out editorially that the "victorious candidates will have to face the win-the-war issues introduced into the Seattle elections by the losing candidates." The defeatist forces see a further warning of things yet to come in the editorial comments of the *Aero-Mechanic*, official organ of the powerful aero-mechanics union, which stated: "Recent political campaigns in which the aero-mechanics union participated prove one point: there is a sad lack of unity among labor organizations"; and further, "Labor has a strong voice, but only when everyone controlling that voice sings out in harmony. The coming fall elections prove an interesting challenge. By serious and careful planning, labor in this area could help map the future laws of our state. Yet nothing but misguided, ill-fated ventures will result if different organizations advance and sponsor different proposals."

Further, we can point to the edi-

torial analysis of the Seattle elections in the *Washington Teamster* of the teamsters union, which said: "As a test of the voting strength, the elections proved conclusively that unless working people go to the polls, their friends cannot win. Labor made a far better showing in the finals than in the primaries, but it will have to do better in November. As pointed out before the election, Devin's chief backers are also anti-Roosevelt. Devin himself will probably be on the air in behalf of Dewey, or whoever is picked to be the reactionary candidate for President."

These statements expressing the views of the powerful aero-mechanics union and the teamsters union also express the sentiments of an ever-increasing number of trade unions and their hundreds of thousands of members who are not willing to accept the outcome of the Seattle elections as a permanent defeat. Out of these lessons of defeat great new forces are beginning to emerge looking toward a more powerful movement for labor's united political action and a great democratic people's victory in the 1944 primaries and fall elections.

* * *

We are, of course, proud of the fact that our Communist organization, although, in the interests of win-the-war unity, it did not put forward its own ticket, nevertheless waged an intensive political campaign and played a most constructive role. It was most keenly conscious of the need for breaking the control of the reactionary defeatist political forces over Seattle's politi-

cal life, and worked energetically for the election of all win-the-war candidates. It was also the Communists who saw most clearly the weaknesses in the campaign and tried to point them out to all forces interested in the elections of the win-the-war candidates.

The experience of the Seattle election campaign proves more conclusively than ever before the need for building the Communist Party in the trade unions, especially those unions which took little or no active part in the elections. The election activities have also proved the need further to strengthen our party neighborhood clubs both theoretically and organizationally in preparation for the greater tasks immediately ahead.

Our work in the Seattle elections has helped us to see more clearly the need for bringing greater clarity and understanding to the hundreds of thousands of trade unionists on the vital issues confronting labor and the nation in this war, on the meaning of the Teheran declarations, on the fight now going on in Congress and its relation to the Teheran decisions.

This calls for greatly increasing our educational and agitational activities, our literature distribution and the circulation of our press.

Out of all the hard work, the disappointments, and the temporary defeat experienced in the Seattle elections, the Communists must draw the necessary lessons and apply their Marxist understanding to the new conditions and tasks created out of the struggle. It is our Marxist understanding and training which enable us to see that in the heat of

these elections, regardless of the immediate results, the groundwork has been laid for a more united and politically active labor movement, for a more united Seattle behind the war effort.

On the basis of our experiences and new relationships with new and broader mass forces in the elections we can approach the coming struggles with the confidence, symbolic of our great Communist movement, of final great victories for the people. On this eve of the opening up of the greatest and most costly stage of the war for our country, we must still further extend our relationships with all patriotic and democratic forces to hurl back the offensive of the appeasers and obstructionists in Congress and their foul defeatist press, who shout "no foreign policy" in the face of the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow, Cairo and Teheran Declarations—documents and accords which establish policies that open the road to greater freedom for all mankind.

While involving our whole party in the pre-convention discussion, our tasks in the coming weeks are to work more energetically for labor unity and labor's united political action, strengthen our ties with the great war industry unions and with the Negro people.

We must prepare for the coming primary elections, for the re-election of President Roosevelt, the election of all win-the-war candidates in November. And in order to contribute effectively to fulfillment of these major political tasks, we must build and strengthen the Communist organization in the Northwest.

ISSUES AND TASKS IN THE PRIMARY ELECTIONS

DRAFT STATEMENT BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY

THE California primary elections on May 16 place the most urgent tasks on the labor movement and all win-the-war forces in the coming weeks. It is the opening round of the Presidential election struggle of 1944, and will play a decisive part in the selection of candidates for United States Senator, for all members of Congress, and for the State Legislature.

In many cases the primaries may determine whether there will even be a progressive candidate in the final elections. The moving up of the date of the primaries from August to May places handicaps on the labor and progressive forces, with less time to increase the registration and organize the campaign for win-the-war candidates and issues. It is all the more important that there be no underestimation of the importance of the primary elections.

The major all-embracing issue of these elections is national unity for the winning of the war and for a democratic, enduring peace when the fascist Axis is destroyed. Coming as they do at the moment when our armed forces are poised for the invasion of Western Europe, to match the magnificent offensive of

the Red Army on the Eastern Front, the outcome of the elections as well as the election campaign itself will have a decisive bearing on the course of the war, its length, and the character of the peace after victory.

The coming election campaign must see the strengthening of a broad win-the-war coalition behind our Commander-in-Chief, with labor taking the lead and setting an example for all progressive forces in the shaping and influencing of our national policy, in support of the Teheran Declaration of America, Britain, and the Soviet Union. The war and home-front policies of President Roosevelt, and the post-war perspectives for America and the United Nations made possible by the Teheran agreement, must be supported and reinforced by labor and the common people in the course of this election campaign, to the end that the President shall be drafted for a fourth term and re-elected, together with a Congress which will advance the national interest and the war effort.

In order to contribute to the unity of the win-the-war forces in California, the State Committee of the Communist Party, in accordance

with the policies and decisions outlined at the January meeting of our National Committee, will not file or run candidates on a party ticket in the 1944 elections. It will devote its entire efforts to working with all other win-the-war forces in support of President Roosevelt and other candidates who advance the cause of national unity.

The pro-Roosevelt forces in California have a great responsibility to counter the attempts of the reactionary Hoover-Warren clique to capture the state for the Republican column. Earl Warren, who still tries to put up a liberal and progressive pro-war front, has come out in the open as the leader of the defeatist bloc in California, by heading the Republican Presidential ticket against Roosevelt in the May primaries. Anyone who still had illusions about Warren must admit that this is his present role, especially since his alliance with the Dewey-Taft-Bricker group in the Republican Party and the elimination of a number of win-the-war Republicans for the Warren slate.

Warren's refusal to support adequate Federal legislation for the servicemen's vote, his negative attitude toward national post-war planning and cooperation with the Federal Government, as well as his approval of the Republican Party's position on subsidies, price-control, taxation, and foreign affairs, show that any gestures toward liberalism on his part are merely political expediency to deceive the voters as to his reactionary alliances with the lose-the-war bloc.

Next to the Presidential contest

itself, the election of a United States Senator and Representatives who support the President, and the defeat of those California Congressmen who have voted with the obstructionist bloc, are all-important to assure a Victory Congress which will not sabotage the war effort and a democratic peace. This will be the test for all candidates regardless of party labels. Nearly all the Republicans are supporting the defeatist bloc, but there are a few Republican candidates for Congress and the Legislature, the outstanding example of whom is Congressman Welch of San Francisco, whose stand for national unity behind the President entitles them to the support of the voters of all parties. On the other hand, those Democrats who have been voting with the anti-Roosevelt bloc to the detriment of the war effort do not deserve the support of the Democratic voters because they represent as great a danger to national unity as do the reactionary Republican candidates.

The most essential prerequisite for achieving victory in the elections is the establishment of the political unity of labor. The general agreement already reached by the California State A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods on common candidates in most election districts, and their joint activities on the voters' registration campaign, are a great step forward in developing such labor unity. But the parallel activities of A. F. of L. and C.I.O. bodies must develop into completely united labor activities in the election campaign, beginning with the union members in each election district, to

the central labor bodies and state councils of both organizations, if they are to be effective as they must be to win California for Roosevelt and for a win-the-war Congress.

Political unity of labor can also further the unity of the Democratic Party behind the President and Congressional candidates supporting his policies. Democratic party unity has been advanced by the fling of a broadly representative slate of delegates in the primaries pledged to a fourth term for Roosevelt. Although this slate is running unopposed in the Democratic primaries, it is essential that a large vote be registered for the Roosevelt delegation, to establish in unmistakable terms that the majority of the voters demand that the President be drafted for a fourth term. In every community, neighborhood, and election district there should be political clubs or committees of trade unionists, Democrats, and all other pro-Roosevelt voters to conduct campaign activities.

The election campaign gives an opportunity to labor and the Democratic Party to reach all sections of the population in the state with a people's program for national unity. The Negro people, even those who are traditionally Republican, can be rallied to such a program because their interests lie with the labor and progressive forces behind Roosevelt, and because national unity for the war effort demands that all win-the-war forces support the Negro people's fight against the Jim-Crow barriers of race discrimination, for full citizenship and equal democratic rights.

The farmers have been an easy prey to the disruptive influence of defeatist forces. Labor and the Democratic Party must seek to win the majority of the farmers to active support and alliance with the labor-Democratic coalition behind the President, where their interests lie. The honest desire of the farmers to help the war effort must not be diverted to anti-Administration channels, through the neglect of the labor-Democratic camp in countering the propaganda of the forces of disunity.

This election campaign must not be viewed as one of labor versus capital. Nothing would be so harmful to the national interest as to pit class against class. The issues being fought out in this election, as in the war itself, do not concern the fate of any one group alone, but of the whole nation. Middle-class and business elements who understand this can also be rallied to support the pro-Roosevelt camp in the election campaign, on the basis of the need for a program of national unity in wartime, and for the solution of America's post-war problems by a united nation, including all classes, following the policies outlined at Teheran.

The Communist Party will seek to clarify these issues in the election campaign. All party organizations must give major attention to the primary campaign, establish friendly and cooperative relations with trade unions, Democratic Clubs, and all other organizations concerned with these issues. Communists will make every effort toward labor unity, and the unity of all progres-

sive forces in their community. Party members must actively engage in all phases of the election campaign in their communities through the Communist Clubs as well as with all other organizations supporting the war effort.

In preparation for the state and

National Conventions of the party in May, Communist Clubs should discuss these tasks as part of the pre-convention discussions, and take steps to mobilize their entire membership for the election campaign and for the successful completion of the national recruiting drive.

HUNGARY'S OCCUPATION BY HITLER *

BY E. GAVRILOV

THE Red Army's sweeping offensive, victoriously developing along a wide front in the Ukrainian and Moldavian S.S.R., its attainment of the state border with Rumania on the Prut, were like a powerful earthquake rocking to its foundations the Hitlerite system of alliances in Southeast Europe.

In the face of menacing disaster, the German fascist imperialists tried at any price and by all means to retain hold of their front, to secure communications leading to the Balkans, to prevent the downfall of their vassals at all costs. At the same time, the Hitlerites want to drain the remains of their satellites' manpower and material resources to make good at least part of the tremendous losses suffered by the Hitlerite army in the gigantic battle of the Ukraine and in the course of the winter offensive of the Red Army in general.

Of all fascist Germany's vassals fighting the Soviet Union, Hungary is the only state with relatively large manpower reserves and certain food and other resources. Hungary, too, possesses a most extensive network of communications. Its oil fields, with an annual output up to

a million tons, are especially important for Hitler, now that the Red Army is nearing the Rumanian oil fields.

By virtue of its central geographical situation in this part of Europe, in conditions of the Red Army's advance, Hungary has now acquired the importance of a key position for Hitler, trying as he is to build up a new defense line and to keep in submission all his other vassals in this area — Rumania, Bulgaria and Slovakia. In view of his desperate military position, Hitler decided to occupy Hungary and Rumania. Sustaining nothing but defeats on the Soviet-German front, Hitler is consoling himself with his easy victories over his own vassals.

Hitlerite Germany by no means possesses reserves for the occupation of Hungary which are not tied down in other places. Scores of German divisions were smashed this winter on the Soviet-German front. Thousands of German guns, tanks and planes were destroyed and captured by Soviet troops in the last four months alone.

Apart from the divisions thrown by Horthy on the Soviet-German front, the Hungarian army numbers some 300,000 men. Had Hungary's rulers even the slightest will for re-

* Reprinted from the Soviet journal *The War and the Working Class*.

sistance, Hitler would need a minimum of twenty to twenty-five divisions for the occupation of the country. Not a single report about the strength of the Hitlerite troops which occupied Hungary named more than six German and two Rumanian divisions. It is indicated, moreover, that they are poorly equipped and inadequately trained divisions. It would be ridiculous to think that the occupation of Hungary could be possible with such forces, had she offered any resistance.

The German occupation of Hungary became possible solely because the Hungarian rulers, Horthy and his clique, opened wide the gates to the Hitlerite groups. Horthy long ago was preparing to surrender Hungary for Hitler to devour. He pretended that he reluctantly took part in the predatory war of the German fascist imperialists, that he was not giving in and was sabotaging Berlin's demands.

Horthy needed this to conceal his vile treachery from the people and from the world. The facts reveal Horthy's complicity with Hitler. He preferred to sell out the country to the Germans rather than defend it against German attack.

* * *

Horthy's plot with Hitler was preceded by a long chain of vile acts of betrayal and treachery by the Hungarian regent. The spoils which Hungary won during the partition of Czechoslovakia were the first bribe received by Horthy from Hitler for Hungary's subsequent participation in the military gambles of

German imperialism. Northern Transylvania was Hitler's second bribe for future participation of Horthy's Hungary in Hitler's war for world domination.

In 1941, a mere three months after Hungary's conclusion of the agreement of "eternal friendship" with Yugoslavia, the Hungarian army, on Horthy's orders, attacked this unfortunate country as it was plunged in distress.

This time the Hungarian jackals received a third bribe from fascist Germany for participation in the attack on the U.S.S.R. Hitler permitted Horthy to tear pieces of flesh from Yugoslavia's bleeding body—Backa and the so-called Baranja triangle. On seized Yugoslav territory the Hungarian troops engineered a horrible mass slaughter of the civilian Serb and Croat population, which for cruelty and barbarous sadism rivaled the crimes of the Hitlerite executioners.

Before the occupation of Hungary by the Hitlerites, Horthy prudently concentrated Hungarian troops far from the borders where the German troops were to cross to Hungarian territory. He denuded the Austro-Hungarian frontier, thereby encouraging the Hitlerites to enter the country.

Precisely on the eve of the German occupation, the Hungarian rulers staged a comedy, the sudden sharpening of the Hungaro-Rumanian conflict. This comedy was necessary to Horthy and his clique to divert the people's attention from the blow being prepared then on Hungary's western frontiers.

The Hitlerites appointed a new

Hungarian "government" of the Quisling type. This government consists of Horthy's close associates: War Minister Csataj; Finance Minister Remenyi-Schneller; Minister of Justice Antal; Minister of Agriculture and Food Supply Jurcsek; Minister of Industry Szasz, for years member of the Kallay and other earlier governments appointed by Horthy.

Along with them are the fresh-baked ministers in the "government" with a long record of service for the Gestapo and its chief, Himmler, primarily the "Premier," Sztojaj, an old Hitlerite spy.

That is why the attempts of some foreign observers to depict Horthy's role as a different one, to transform him to a certain extent into Hitler's "victim," are clearly bankrupt. Equally bankrupt are the attempts to depict the ex-Hungarian Premier Kallay, an old-time anti-Hitlerite now dumped overboard, as a "national hero."

Until the last moment, that is, before the Germans dumped him into the ashcan, he kept on repeating "anti-Bolshevism," that is, a struggle against the Soviet Union has been and remains the principal line of his foreign policy.

The anti-Hitlerite opposition circles in Hungary also landed in an unenviable position. It is against them that Hitler's S.S. gangs, as well as Horthy and his "government," are directing their blind terror. Prior to the Hitlerite occupation of Hungary these opposition circles—we have in mind primarily the leadership of the Social-Democrats, the independent Small Peasant

Party, the Democratic Party and a number of other groupings—pursued a policy of "waiting."

They long ago entertained no doubt as to the fact that Germany and Hungary had lost the war. They clearly realized that Hungary was following Hitler Germany into an abyss. But they did not draw the necessary conclusions therefrom.

Far from manifesting the necessary activity of courage and persistence to wrest Hungary from fascist Germany, far from appealing to the masses and putting into action all the levers at their disposal in the form of their influential organizations, they tried, on the contrary, to hamper every initiative from below.

In many cases the Hungarian legal opposition circles, instead of ruthlessly fighting Horthy, actually supported him.

* * *

Hitler's occupation of Hungary means the complete enslavement and depletion of the country, the subordination of all its economic resources and manpower to the German occupation authorities in accordance with all the rules of Hitlerite "total mobilization": orgy, terror and brutal, alien yoke, the mass destruction of the Jews and the liquidation of the last remnants of state independence for Hungary.

Characteristic is the fact that following the Hitlerite occupation several Hungarian ambassadors hastened to declare their non-recognition of the legality of the new Hungarian "government" and to abandon the sinking ship.

The recent experience of Hungary

represents a grim warning to all those who are now frightened by the fascist terror, thinking perhaps that by passive conduct they can save themselves from the fascist cut-throats and save their country from doom.

Actually the whole experience of the struggle in the countries seized by Hitler shows that salvation lies only in a resolute struggle against the German invaders and their agents. The Hitlerite occupation of Hungary constitutes an object lesson to Hitler's other vassals and a grim warning of the danger of alliance with fascist Germany.

Such an alliance leads only to a frightful catastrophe, and no other outcome can be expected by a single Hitlerite satellite continuing its alliance with Germany. Salvation for Germany's satellites is possible only on the condition of a resolute and final break with the German ally. But time does not wait and the slightest delay is tantamount to death.

Smashing the Hitlerite troops on the Soviet-German front, the Red Army is marching to the Carpathians. It is bringing liberation to those who prove by their deeds that they are not and do not want to be Hitler's serfs, but represent a people worthy of freedom and who are capable of selflessly fighting for it.

The near future will show whether the masses and their anti-Hitlerite leaders in the now German-occupied Hungary and Rumania are capable of proving this to the freedom-loving nations. Hitler's occupation of Hungary, and subsequently Rumania, fully exposes the weakness and instability of the Hitlerite brigand bloc. It is extremely clear that under the powerful blows of the Red Army the Hitlerite coalition is cracking and disintegrating.

Hitlerite Germany's allies are easily becoming occupied countries. The transformation of the vassal country which formally retained its independence into an occupied province of the German fascist Reich, losing even illusory independence, is rendered easier by the service policy of Hitler's puppets.

The Berlin clique's "victories" over its ill-fated allies, in the final analysis, are not solving but on the contrary are aggravating Germany's difficulties.

The additional transfer of the German troops to the territory of the occupied "allies" will cause the further weakening of the already lean Hitlerite reserves in the west, thereby creating an even more favorable condition for the blows against the common enemy from the west.

WHERE IS FINLAND GOING—TOWARD PEACE OR CATASTROPHE?*

IN FEBRUARY of this year the Finnish government authorized its representative to ascertain the Soviet government's conditions regarding Finland's withdrawal from the war.

The Soviet armistice terms were made known to the representative of the Finnish government on his request, and then published in the press, where they were unanimously characterized by public opinion in the democratic countries as moderate and generous.

Also a majority of the papers of the neutral countries commented favorably on the Soviet terms. The Turkish paper *Tan* draws attention to the fact that the Soviet proposals do not contain a single point which would affect the independence and sovereignty of Finland, that the Soviet Union "offers the Finns the possibility of an honorable withdrawal from the war."

Evidently opinion differs in the political circles of Finland on the question of war and peace. However, it is impossible not to draw attention to the manner in which the unified press of Finland, under the

control of the government, reacted to the Soviet conditions.

The Finnish papers, as if prompted, began to assert, without any grounds and despite the truth, that the Soviet conditions were "heavy" and "brutal," and "unacceptable." Moreover, the Finnish papers distorted the actual contents of the Soviet terms, claiming, for instance, that "The Soviet conditions are in camouflaged form nothing other than unconditional surrender."

But it is most characteristic that such a paper as the *Uusi Suomi*, the main organ of the leading government party, was compelled indirectly to admit the moderateness and justice of the Soviet terms. The newspaper realizes that refusal to accept the Soviet armistice terms would make the ruling circles of Finland responsible in the face of the world for the consequences of such "stupid stubbornness."

Nonetheless, it is precisely this line of action which the paper recommends the government to take.

They see the main stumbling block above all in the first point of the Soviet terms, the point against which other leading papers of Finland also object, The Finnish press

* Reprinted from the Soviet Journal *War and the Working Class*, Issue No. 6.

represents the elementary demand that relations with Germany be severed and the German troops be interned, without which Finland cannot withdraw from the war, as the main obstacle to Finland's withdrawal from the war.

The demand to intern the German troops, declares *Uusi Suomi*, will place Finland in an impossible position.

By this invented impossibility the paper is trying to brush aside the elementary condition for Finland's withdrawal from the war.

Another paper, *Hufvudstadsbladet*, is frightening its readers by assuring them that if Finland were to accept this point, she would "fall out of the frying pan into the fire," that is, would clash with the Germans. The paper, however, hides the fact that Germany does not possess the forces for operations against Finland.

The third of the leading papers in Finland, *Helsingin Sanomat*, declares: "It is clear to all that the fulfillment of this point is detrimental to the honor and dignity of the Finnish people." Accordingly, the arguments of the Finnish papers against the first point of the Soviet terms amount to an obligation to remain loyal to "their fraternity of arms with the Germans."

If such is the case, a question naturally arises, a question addressed to the Finnish ruling circles responsible for the publication of these papers: "Why then did you approach the Soviet government with an inquiry about Soviet armistice terms? Why have you been making assurances that you were

allegedly waging 'our own war' with the sole aim of preserving freedom and the independence of Finland, when you now admit that your decisive object is to preserve not freedom and independence for Finland, but your 'fraternity of arms' with the Germans?"

Either Finland now withdraws from the war and thus saves herself from disaster or she continues to fight together with the Germans and share Hitlerite Germany's inevitable, inglorious fate.

Finland cannot attain peace without breaking off with Germany. The continued alliance with the Germans means a war to the end, until the complete destruction of the Germans and all their "brothers in arms." Here it should be noted that the Finnish version, about alleged "impracticability" of the demand to break with Germany and intern the Hitlerite troops, is meeting with support from certain sections of the press in neutral and even Allied countries. Thus, for instance, Stockholm's *Tidningen* wrote on March 11:

"Acceptance of this Russian demand, the meaning of which on the whole is very vague (!) would place Finland in an impossible position."

The same day the Stockholm correspondent of the *New York Times*, Axelsson, repeating the inventions of the Finnish propaganda, wrote that the "attempt to carry out the conditions proposed by the Soviet Union would lead to civil war in Finland, since in this even the Finnish Nazis, who comprise a consider-

able section of the army, would help the German troops."

Also, the *Daily Mail* carries a similar dispatch from its Stockholm correspondent. Isn't it clear that such acts are a disservice to Finland? The subterfuges of the Finnish papers shed light on the position of the Finnish government.

A month has already passed since Finland has been notified of the Soviet armistice terms, but the Finnish government is delaying its decision. When the representative of this government raised the question through Seiss, the mediator, whether the Soviet government agrees to have dealings with the present Finnish government, he was informed that the Soviet government has no grounds to entertain any particular confidence in the present Finnish government, but that if the Finns have no other possibility, the Soviet government agrees in the interests of peace to negotiate with the present Finnish government to cease hostilities.

Whereas the Finnish government has taken certain steps in the direction of an independent policy for Finland by approaching the U.S.S.R. government on the question of armistice terms, the impermissible procrastination in making a decision on the Soviet armistice terms by no means speaks of the Finnish government's determination to withdraw its country from the war.

This procrastination makes the sincerity of the intentions of the Finnish government very doubtful. If the Finnish government discards the last opportunity offered to Finland to withdraw from the war, it

will thus be proved to the world that it places the interests of fascist Germany, which strives to drag out the war, above the interests of saving Finland from Hitler's death grapple.

In vain do certain Finnish newspapers, such as the *Ilta Sanomat*, console themselves by saying that "the war is not yet over," and who knows how it will finish. It is quite clear to those who are not blind.

Of course, the newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* obviously is resorting to self-deception, when it declares that "the Russian army is by no means as powerful as it was at the beginning of the war." This paper presents the generosity of the Soviet armistice terms as a sign of weakness on the part of the Soviet Union.

Isn't it clear that such self-deception can only lead to the most bitter disappointment and have ruinous consequences? The Hitlerite Field Marshal Mannstein, against whose troops in the south the Red Army has struck a number of crushing blows during the last few weeks, could inform his Finnish colleagues of a number of interesting things about the actual strength of Soviet arms.

The Finns could also have food for thought if they cared to note the fact that Hitler's satellites in southeastern Europe, toward whose borders the Soviet troops are advancing, and above all Rumania and Bulgaria, are most zealously studying the Soviet armistice terms offered to Finland.

Only recently the British *Times* reminded the Finns that "Finland

as a good neighbor to Russia has a future. As a satellite of Germany, she has no future."

This is beyond question. It may be said that precisely today the question is being decided: Are the ruling

circles of Finland capable of availing themselves of the last chance to save their country and its future which is open to them thanks to the Soviet conditions for Finland's withdrawal from the war?

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF STATE CORDELL HULL ON DEVELOPMENTS IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, WASHINGTON, APRIL 9.

I WANT to talk with you this evening about the foreign policy of the United States. This is not, as some writers assume, a mysterious game carried on by diplomats with other diplomats in foreign offices all over the world. It is for us the task of focusing and giving effect in the world outside our borders to the will of 135,000,000 people through the constitutional processes which govern our democracy. For this reason our foreign policy must be simple and direct and founded upon the interests and purposes of the American people. It has continuity of basic objectives because it is rooted in the traditions and aspirations of our people. It must, of course, be applied in the light of experience and the lessons of the past.

In talking about foreign policy it is well to remember, as Justice Holmes said, that a page of history is worth a volume of logic. There are three outstanding lessons in our recent history to which I particularly wish to draw your attention. In the first place, since the outbreak of the present war in Europe, we and those nations who are now

our allies have moved from relative weakness to strength. In the second place, during that same period we in this country have moved from a deep-seated tendency toward separate action to the knowledge and conviction that only through unity of action can there be achieved in this world the results which are essential for the continuance of free peoples. And, thirdly, we have moved from a careless tolerance of evil institutions to the conviction that free governments and Nazi and fascist governments cannot exist together in this world, because the very nature of the latter requires them to be aggressors, and the very nature of free governments too often lays them open to treacherous and well-laid plans of attack.

An understanding of these points will help to clarify the policy which this government has been and is following.

* * *

In 1940, with the fall of France, the peoples of the free world awoke with horror to find themselves on the very brink of defeat. Only Britain in the west and China in the

east stood between them and disaster, and the space on which they stood was narrow and precarious. At that moment the free nations were militarily weak and their enemies and potential enemies were strong and well prepared. Even before that this country had begun its preparations for self-defense. Soon thereafter we started upon the long, hard road of mobilizing our great natural resources, our vast productive potentialities, and our reserves of manpower to defend ourselves and to strengthen those who were resisting the aggressors.

This was a major decision of foreign policy. Since that decision was made we have moved far from the former position. We and our Allies are attaining a strength which can leave no doubt as to the outcome. That outcome is far from achieved. There are desperate periods still before us, but we have built the strength which we sought and we need only to maintain the will to use it.

This decision which we have made and carried out was not a decision to make a mere sporadic effort. An episode is not a policy. The American people are determined to press forward with our Allies to the defeat of our enemies and the destruction of the Nazi and fascist systems which plunged us into the war. And they are also determined to go on, after the victory, with our Allies and all other nations which desire peace and freedom to establish and maintain in full strength the institutions without which peace and freedom cannot be an enduring reality. We

cannot move in and out of international cooperation and in and out of participation in the responsibilities of a member of the family of nations. The political, material, and spiritual strength of the free and democratic nations not only is greatly dependent upon the strength which our full participation brings to the common effort, but, as we now know, is a vital factor in our own strength. As it is with the keystone of an arch, neither the keystone nor the arch can stand alone.

This growth of our strength entails consequences in our foreign policy. Let us look first at our relations with the neutral nations.

* * *

In the two years following Pearl Harbor, while we were mustering our strength and helping to restore that of our Allies, our relations with these neutral nations and their attitude toward our enemies were conditioned by the position in which we found ourselves. We have constantly sought to keep before them what they, of course, know—that upon our victory hang their very existence and freedom as independent nations. We have sought in every way to reduce the aid which their trade with the enemy gives him and to increase the strength which we might draw from them. But our power was limited. They and we have continually been forced to accept compromises which we certainly would not have chosen.

That period, I believe, is rapidly drawing to a close, it is clear to all that our strength and that of

our Allies now makes only one outcome of this war possible. That strength now makes it clear that we are not asking these neutral nations to expose themselves to certain destruction when we ask them not to prolong the war, with its consequences of suffering and death, by sending aid to the enemy.

We can no longer acquiesce in these nations' drawing upon the resources of the Allied world when they at the same time contribute to the death of troops whose sacrifice contributes to their salvation as well as ours. We have scrupulously respected the sovereignty of these nations; and we have not coerced, nor shall we coerce, any nation to join us in the fight. We have said to these countries that it is no longer necessary for them to purchase protection against aggression by furnishing aid to our enemy—whether it be by permitting official German agents to carry on their activities of espionage against the Allies within neutral borders; or by sending to Germany the essential ingredients of the steel which kills our soldiers; or by permitting highly skilled workers and factories to supply products which can no longer issue from the smoking ruins of German factories. We ask them only, but with insistence, to cease aiding our enemy.

The Allied strength has now grown to the point where we are on the verge of great events. Of military events I cannot speak. It is enough that they are in the hands of men who have the complete trust of the American people. We await their development with absolute

confidence. But I can and should discuss with you what may happen close upon the heels of military action.

* * *

As I look at the map of Europe, certain things seem clear to me. As the Nazis go down to defeat, they will inevitably leave behind them in Germany and the satellite states of southeastern Europe a legacy of confusion. It is essential that we and our Allies establish the controls necessary to bring order out of this chaos as rapidly as possible and do everything possible to prevent its spread to the German-occupied countries of eastern and western Europe while they are in the throes of re-establishing government and repairing the most brutal ravages of the war. If confusion should spread throughout Europe, it is difficult to overemphasize the seriousness of the disaster that may follow. Therefore, for us, for the world, and for the countries concerned a stable Europe should be an immediate objective of Allied policy.

Stability and order do not and cannot mean reaction. Order there must be to avoid chaos. But it must be achieved in a manner which will give full scope to men and women who look forward, men and women who will end fascism and all its works and create the institutions of a free and democratic way of life.

We look with hope and with deep faith to a period of great democratic accomplishment in Europe. Liberation from the German yoke will

give the peoples of Europe a new and magnificent opportunity to fulfill their democratic aspirations, both in building democratic political institutions of their own choice, and in achieving the social and economic democracy on which political democracy must rest.

It is important to our national interest to encourage the establishment in Europe of strong and progressive popular governments, dedicated like our own to improving the social welfare of the people as a whole—governments which will join the common effort of nations in creating the conditions of lasting peace, and in promoting the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples.

It is hard to imagine a stable Europe if there is instability in its component parts, of which France is one of the most important. What, then, is our policy toward France? Our first concern is to defeat the enemy, drive him from French territory, and the territory of all the adjacent countries which he has overrun. To do this the supreme military commander must have unfettered authority. But we have no purpose or wish to govern France or to administer any affairs save those which are necessary for military operations against the enemy. It is of the utmost importance that civil authority in France should be exercised by Frenchmen, should be swiftly established and should operate in accordance with advanced planning as fully as military oper-

ations will permit. It is essential that the material foundations of the life of the French people be at once restored or resumed. Only in this way can stability be achieved.

It has always been our thought in planning for this end that we should look to Frenchmen to undertake civil administration and assist them in that task without compromising in any way the right of the French people to choose the ultimate form and personnel of the government which they may wish to establish. That must be left to the free and untrammelled choice of the French people.

The President and I are clear, therefore, as to the need, from the outset, of French civil administration—and democratic French administration—in France. We are disposed to see the French Committee of National Liberation exercise leadership to establish law and order under the supervision of the Allied commander in chief. The committee has given public assurance that it does not propose to perpetuate its authority. On the contrary, it has given assurance that it wishes at the earliest possible date to have the French people exercise their own sovereign will in accordance with French constitutional processes. The committee is, of course, not the government of France and we cannot recognize it as such. In accordance with this understanding of mutual purposes the committee will have every opportunity to undertake civil administration and our cooperation and help in every practicable way in making it successful. It has been

a symbol of the spirit of France and of French resistance. We have fully cooperated with it in all the military phases of the war effort, including the furnishing of arms and equipment to the French armed forces. Our central and abiding purpose is to aid the French people, our oldest friends, in providing a democratic, competent and French administration of liberated French territory.

In Italy our interests are likewise in assisting in the development at the earliest moment of a free and democratic Italian government. As I said some moments ago, we have learned that there cannot be any compromise with fascism—whether in Italy or in any other country. It must always be the enemy and it must be our determined policy to do all in our power to end it. Here again, within these limits, it is not our purpose or policy to impose the ultimate form or personnel of government. Here we wish to give every opportunity for a free expression of a free Italy. We had hoped that before this enough of Italy would have been freed so that we might have had at least a preliminary expression of that will. Events have not progressed according to our hopes.

The present situation, then, is this: In October, 1943, the President, Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin accepted the active cooperation of the Italian government and its armed forces as a co-belligerent in the war against Germany under the supervision of an Allied Control Commission. The declaration regarding Italy made at Moscow by

the British, Soviet and American governments confirmed the policy initiated by the British and American governments that the Italian government shall be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism; that all institutions and organizations created by the fascist regime shall be suppressed; that all fascists or pro-fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions and organizations of a public character; and that democratic organs of local governments shall be created. Finally, it recites that nothing in the declaration should operate against the right of the Italian people "ultimately to choose their own form of government."

This policy has been and is being carried out. Only that part which calls for the introduction into the central government of more democratic elements has not yet been put into effect. This does not signify any change in the clear and announced policy. Thus far it has been thought by those chiefly responsible for the military situation that it would be prejudiced by an imposed reconstruction of the government, and a reconstruction by agreement has not yet been possible.

But there is already promise of success in the activities of the political parties which are currently holding conferences with a view to drawing up a program for the political reconstruction of their country along democratic lines. The permanent executive junta is seeking a solution which will provide

for the cooperation of the liberal political groups within the government. Thus, after twenty-one years, we see a rebirth of political consciousness and activity in Italy, which points the way to the ultimate free expression of the Italian people in the choice of their government.

* * *

What I have said related to some of the most immediate of our problems and the effect of our policy toward them as we and our Allies have moved from a position of weakness to one of strength. There remain the more far-reaching relations between us and our Allies in dealing with our enemies and in providing for future peace, freedom from aggression and opportunity for expanding material well being. Here I would only mislead you if I spoke of definitive solutions. These require the slow, hard process, essential to enduring and accepted solutions among free peoples, of full discussion with our Allies and among our own people. But such discussion is now in progress. After two years of intensive study, the basis upon which our policy must be founded is soundly established; the direction is clear; and the general methods of accomplishment are merging.

This basis of policy and these methods rest upon the second of the lessons which I said at the outset of my remarks was found in the pages of our recent history. It is that action upon these matters cannot be separate but must be agreed and united action. This is fundamental. It must underlie the entire range of our policy. The free na-

tions have been brought to the very brink of destruction by allowing themselves to be separated and divided. If any lesson has ever been hammered home with blood and suffering, that one has been. And the lesson is not yet ended.

However difficult the road may be, there is no hope of turning victory into enduring peace unless the real interests of this country, the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union and China are harmonized and unless they agree and act together. This is the solid framework upon which all future policy and international organization must be built.

It offers the fullest opportunity for the development of institutions in which all free nations may participate democratically, through which a reign of law and morality may arise and through which the material interests of all may be advanced. But without an enduring understanding between these four nations upon their fundamental purposes, interests and obligations to one another, all organizations to preserve peace are creations on paper and the path is wide open again for the rise of a new aggressor.

This essential understanding and unity of action among the four nations is not in substitution or derogation of unity among the United Nations. But it is basic to all organized international action, because upon its reality depends the possibility of enduring peace and free institutions rather than new coalitions and a new pre-war period. Nor do I suggest that any conclusions

of these four nations can or should be without the participation of the other United Nations. I am stating what I believe the common sense of my fellow countrymen and all men will recognize—that for these powers to become divided in their aims and fail to recognize and harmonize their basic interests can produce only disaster, and that no machinery, as such, can produce this essential harmony and unity.

The road to agreement is a difficult one, as any man knows who has ever tried to get two other men, or a city council, or a trade gathering, or a legislative body to agree upon anything. Agreement can be achieved only by trying to understand the other fellow's point of view and by going as far as possible to meet it.

Although the road to unity of purpose and action is long and difficult, we have taken long strides upon our way. The Atlantic Charter was proclaimed by the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in August, 1941. Then by the declaration of the United Nations of Jan. 1, 1942, these nations adopted the principles of the Atlantic Charter, agreed to devote all their resources to the winning of the war, and pledged themselves not to conclude a separate armistice or peace with their common enemies.

After that came the declaration signed at Moscow on Oct. 30, 1943. Here the four nations, who are carrying and must carry the chief burden of defeating their enemies, renewed their determination by joint action to achieve this end.

But they went further than this and pledged cooperation with one another to establish at the earliest practicable date, with other peace-loving states, an effective international organization to maintain peace and security, which in principle met with overwhelming non-partisan approval by the Congress in the Connally and Fulbright resolutions.

Further steps along the road of united Allied action were taken at the conference at Cairo, where the President and Mr. Churchill met with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and at the conference at Teheran where they met with Marshal Stalin. At Teheran the three Allies fighting in Europe reached complete agreement on military plans for winning the war, and made plain their determination to achieve harmonious action in the period of peace. That concert among the Allies rests on broad foundations of common interests and common aspirations, and it will endure. The Teheran declaration made it clear also that in the tasks of peace we shall welcome the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, which wish to enter into the world family of democratic nations.

The Cairo declaration as to the Pacific assured the liquidation of Japan's occupations and thefts of territory to deprive her of the power to attack her neighbors again, to restore Chinese territories to China and freedom to the people of Korea.

No one knows better than we and our Allies who have signed these

documents that they did not and do not settle all questions or provide a formula for the settlement of all questions or lay down a detailed blueprint for the future. Any man of experience knows that an attempt to do this would have been as futile as it would have been foolish.

* * *

There has been discussion recently of the Atlantic Charter and its application to various situations. The charter is an expression of fundamental objectives toward which we and our Allies are directing our policies. It states that the nations accepting it are not fighting for the sake of aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise. It lays down the common principles upon which rest the hope of liberty, economic opportunity, peace and security through international cooperation. It is not a code of law from which detailed answers to every question can be distilled by painstaking analysis of its words and phrases. It points the direction in which solutions are to be sought; it does not give solutions. It charts the course upon which we are embarked and shall continue. That course includes the prevention of aggression and the establishment of world security. The charter certainly does not prevent any steps; including those relating to enemy states, necessary to achieve these objectives. What is fundamental are the objectives of the charter and the determination to achieve them.

It is hardly to be supposed that all the more than thirty boundary questions in Europe can be settled

while the fighting is still in progress. This does not mean that certain questions may not and should not in the meantime be settled by friendly conference and agreement. We are at all times ready to further an understanding and settlement of questions which may raise between our Allies, as is exemplified by our offer to be of such service to Poland and the Soviet Union. Our offer is still open. Our policy upon these matters, as upon all others, is the fundamental necessity for agreed action and the prevention of disunity among us.

So it is with the basic conviction that we must have agreed action and unity of action that we have gone to work upon the form and substance of an international organization to maintain peace and prevent aggression, and upon the economic and other cooperative arrangements which are necessary in order that we maintain our position as a working partner with other free nations. All of these matters are in different stages of development.

It is obvious, of course, that no matter how brilliant and desirable any course may seem it is wholly impracticable and impossible unless it is a course which finds basic acceptance, not only by our Allies, but by the people of this country and by the legislative branch of this government, which, under our Constitution, shares with the executive power and responsibility for final action.

A proposal is worse than useless if it is not acceptable to those nations who must share with us the responsibility for its execution. It

is dangerous for us and misleading to them if in the final outcome it does not have the necessary support in this country. It is, therefore, necessary both abroad and at home not to proceed by presenting elaborate proposals, which only produce divergence of opinion upon details, many of which may be immaterial. The only practical course is to begin by obtaining agreement, first, upon broad principles, setting forth direction and general policy. We must then go on to explore alternative methods and finally settle upon a proposal which embodies the principal elements of agreement and leaves to future experience and discussion those matters of comparative detail which at present remain in the realm of speculation.

It is a difficult procedure and a slow procedure, as the time which has been required to work out the arrangements for such a universal-ly accepted objective as international relief makes evident. It is a procedure in which misunderstanding, the premature hardening of positions and uninformed criticism frequently cause months of delay and endless confusion, sometimes utter frustration. It is a procedure in which the people, who are sovereign, must not only educate their servants but must be willing to be educated by them.

* * *

In this war we are proceeding with the matter of an international organization to maintain peace and prevent aggression. Such an organization must be based upon firm and binding obligations that the member

nations will not use force against each other and against any other nation except in accordance with the arrangements made. It must provide for the maintenance of adequate forces to preserve peace and it must provide the institutions and procedures for calling this force into action to preserve peace. But it must provide more than this. It must provide for an international court for the development and application of law to the settlement of international controversies which fall within the realm of law; for the development of machinery for adjusting controversies to which the field of law has not yet been extended, and for other institutions for the development of new rules to keep abreast of a changing world with new problems and new interests.

We are at a stage where much of the work of formulating plans for the organization to maintain peace has been accomplished. It is right and necessary that we should have the advice and help of an increasing number of members of the Congress. Accordingly, I have requested the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to designate a representative, bipartisan group for this purpose. Following these and similar discussions with members of the House of Representatives, we shall be in a position to go forward again with other nations, and, upon learning their views, be able to submit to the democratic process of discussion a more concrete proposal.

* * *

With the same determination to

achieve agreement and unity we talked with our Allies at Teheran regarding the treatment of Nazi Germany, and with our Allies at Cairo regarding the treatment which should be accorded Japan. In the formulation of our policy toward our enemies we are moved both by the two lessons from our history of which I have spoken and by the third. This is that there can be no compromise with fascism and Nazism. It must go everywhere. Its leaders, its institutions, the power which supports it must go. They can expect no negotiated peace, no compromise, no opportunity to return. Upon that this people and this government are determined and our Allies are equally determined. We have found no difference of opinion among our Allies that the organization and purposes of the Nazi state and its Japanese counterpart, and the military system in all of its ramifications upon which they rest are, and by their very nature must be, directed toward conquest. There was no disagreement that even after the defeat of the enemy there will be no security unless and until our victory is used to destroy those systems to their very foundation. The action which must be taken to achieve these ends must be, as I have said, agreed action. We are working with our Allies now upon these courses.

The conference at Moscow, as you will recall, established the European Advisory Commission, which is now at work in London upon the treatment of Germany. Out of these discussions will come back to the gov-

ernments for their consideration proposals for concrete action.

* * *

Along with the arrangements by which nations may be secure and free must go arrangements by which men and women who compose those nations may live and have the opportunity through their efforts to improve their material condition. As I said earlier, we will fail indeed if we win a victory only to let the free peoples of this world, through any absence of action on our part, sink into weakness and despair.

The heart of the matter lies in action which will stimulate and expand production in industry and agriculture and free international commerce from excessive restrictions. These are the essential prerequisites to maintaining and improving the standard of living in our own and in all countries. Production cannot go forward without arrangements to provide investment capital. Trade cannot be conducted without stable currencies in which payments can be promised and made. Trade cannot develop unless excessive barriers in the form of tariffs, preferences, quotas, exchange controls, monopolies and subsidies, and others, are reduced or eliminated. It needs also agreed arrangements under which communication systems between nations and transport by air and sea can develop. And much of all this will miss its mark of satisfying human needs unless we take agreed action for the improvement of labor standards and standards of health and nutrition.

I shall not on this occasion be able to explain the work which has been done—and it is extensive—in these fields. In many of them proposals are far advanced toward the stage of discussion with members of the Congress prior to formulation for public discussion.

I hope, however, that I have been able in some measure to bring before you the immensity of the task which lies before us all, the nature of the difficulties which are involved, and the conviction and purpose with which we are attacking them. Our foreign policy is comprehensive, is stable, and is known of all men. As the President has said, neither he nor I have made or will make any secret agreement or commitment, political or financial. The officials of the government have not been unmindful of the responsibility resting upon them; nor have they spared either energy or such abilities as they possess in discharging that responsibility.

* * *

May I close with a word as to the responsibility which rests upon us. The United Nations will determine by action or lack of action whether the world will be visited by another war within the next twenty or twenty-five years, or whether policies of organized peace

shall guide the course of the world. We are moving closer and closer to the hour of decision. Only the fullest measure of wisdom, unity and alertness can enable us to meet that unprecedented responsibility.

All of these questions of foreign policy which, as I said earlier, is the matter of focusing and expressing your will in the world outside our borders, are difficult and often involve matters of controversy. Under our constitutional system the will of the American people in this field is not effective unless it is united will. If we are divided, we are ineffective. We are in a year of a national election in which it is easy to arouse controversy on almost any subject, whether or not the subject is an issue in the campaign. You, therefore, as well as we who are in public office, bear a great responsibility. It is the responsibility of avoiding needless controversy in the formulation of your judgments. It is the responsibility for sober and considered thought and expression. It is the responsibility for patience both with our Allies and with those who must speak for you with them. Once before in our lifetime we fell into disunity and became ineffective in world affairs by reason of it. Should this happen again, it will be a tragedy to you and to your children and to the world for generations.

New Books on American History

The Rise of the American Nation

1793 - 1824

By Francis Franklin

A major new study of the formative years of America's rise to nationhood, the development of events and forces leading to the War of Independence, the democratic victory over Federalist reaction under Jefferson's leadership and the national victory over foreign aggression culminating in the War of 1812. Franklin also describes the beginnings of the rise of industrial capitalism and the political realignments of 1824.

Price \$2.00

•

"Builders of the Nation" Series

Edited by Dr. Philip Foner

Abraham Lincoln: Selections From His Writings

Lincoln's writings on democracy, slavery, the Civil War, and labor, arranged and with an introductory essay by Dr. Foner.

Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings

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

George Washington: Selection From His Writings

Washington's speeches and letters on national unity and the revolutionary War of Independence, on education, religious freedom, etc., arranged and with an essay by Dr. Foner. Ready next month.

Paper 25¢ — Cloth 85¢

•

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

A New Book of American History:

The Struggle for American Freedom

The First Two Hundred Years

By HERBERT M. MORAIS

Herbert Morais' new study of the first two hundred years of America's history is a first-rate contribution to the growing arsenal of literature on this subject.

The first part, dealing with a century and half of struggle and growth toward nationhood, provides an insight into the English and American background, starting with the economic revolution of 1350-1600, the rise of the Tudor monarchy and the growth of merchant capital seeking new sources of raw materials and wealth. It describes the era of colonization in the New World, the development of tobacco colonies in the South and the rapid growth of commerce in the New England colonies of the Atlantic seaboard. It shows the influence of the English mercantile system on imperial-colonial relations and the unfolding struggle between the merchants of Old England and New England culminating in the revolution of 1688-89 which gave powerful impetus to immigration and economic expansion and which led to a sharpened struggle for control in America.

The second part of Morais' book covers the vitally important years from 1763 to 1801, the growing conflict of interests between Britain and the colonies, the revolutionary upsurge and broad movement for separation leading up to the revolutionary War of Independence and the founding of the American Republic. The book is enriched with copious reference notes, a bibliography, index and several maps.

Price \$2.25



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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