
America's Youth in the Struggle Against the Imperialist War

BY CARL ROSS

OUT of the confusion and temporary loss of direction in the youth movement following the outbreak of the imperialist war, several distinct trends and lines of action are emerging. But the main trend within the independent youth movement is toward unity of action on concrete issues against U.S. involvement and particularly against the pro-war foreign policy and budget of the Roosevelt Administration. A closer examination of these trends in relation to the various youth organizations will help illuminate the path toward more effective mobilization of the anti-imperialist forces among the American youth.

Last November, Gil Green, in an article in *The Communist* observed that:

"Little difficulty would be encountered today in getting all organizations of young people to come out against America's involvement in the imperialist war. In fact, all the organizations affiliated with the American Youth Congress and the United Student Peace Committee have already agreed to making their

leading slogan correspond with this thought. But the hitch comes in the concretization and application of this slogan."

That remains true today, but with an important difference. Now, with a sharp break taking place between the youth movement and Roosevelt, the masses of youth are moving toward unity on *concrete specific issues* of struggle as well as agreement around a general slogan. This is manifested in a new fighting spirit and readiness to accept a militant program and leadership, dramatized in the recent *Citizenship Institute* of the American Youth Congress. The "hitch" that Comrade Green referred to, while not yet entirely eliminated, is being swept under by a rising movement of opposition to every step toward U.S. involvement in the war.

Both the American Youth Congress and United Student Peace Committee unanimously accept a substantially correct and effective program based upon agreement on specific issues. For instance, in its annual student strike call, the

U.S.P.C. adopts the slogan "The Yanks Are Not Coming" and implements it by "no war loans, no planes, no men to any European belligerents"; opposes increased armament at the expense of social service, militarization of youth, M-Day Plans; and favors civil rights, the American Youth Act and a "just peace" with "no Versailles." This call is endorsed by nine organizations including the "big three" among students, the National Student Federation, Student Christian Movement, American Student Union, and also by the A.Y.C.

Practically all important organizations cooperating with these movements have declared themselves along similar lines. A number express considerable clarity. For instance, the peace commission of the Student Christian Movement (combined student sections of the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A.) states:

"The U.S. Congress has already repealed the embargo to help the Allies defeat Germany in this war. It is the clear duty of the Peace Commission to oppose any further concessions to the pro-Ally forces, to oppose any credits or loans to any belligerents, to oppose the abandonment of any of the safeguards written into the present neutrality act. This, in a nutshell, is what it means to work to keep America out of war in Europe."

Another factor which seriously influences the direction of the organized youth movement, is the

growing collaboration between the labor and youth movements, particularly between the C.I.O. and the Youth Congress. Undoubtedly John L. Lewis's forthright statement at the *Youth Institute*, that he will not influence youth in favor of going to war "to suit the policies and requirements of the imperialistic world governments," and the broader participation of labor and youth in joint peace actions strengthens the anti-war movement among youth and assures it greater independence.

Labor's special contribution has been its slogan "The Yanks Are Not Coming," and the new form of anti-war organization in "*Yanks Are Not Coming Committees*" which are fast appearing among all sections of the youth. Here is an independent mass movement capable of rallying the masses of youth for united action from below and of influencing the unorganized youth, including basic sections of unemployed and working class young people, and around which may crystallize a much-needed national militant peace action center of youth.

Far greater possibilities have been opened up for engaging the youth in practical daily struggle against U.S. involvement in the imperialist war. A program such as outlined above provides a concrete basis for mass action. It definitely removes the question of formulating a program for keeping America out of war from a committee room

atmosphere, into the realm of tangible issues understood by the widest masses on the basis of their own experience.

At the same time, it would be a serious error to obscure its weakness, which lies in the failure of the mass organizations accepting these practical planks to agree with equal unanimity on the broader, more fundamental question of the imperialist character of the war. While this does not prevent agreement on a limited program of specific points, the failure to recognize the basic imperialist character of the war and the aggressive imperialist role of the U.S. can be the Achilles heel of an otherwise powerful movement. Without this clarity, the youth may be unwittingly trapped into supporting pro-war policies because of a failure to unmask their real objectives.

All of this emphasizes that the ability to unmask, to expose, and to explain the real character of the war is of vital necessity for the Young Communist League. Its main task remains, to follow the advice of George Dimitroff: ". . . *explain, explain, and once again explain the real state of affairs to the masses.*"

While comparatively few national organizations such as the American Student Union and the Farmers Union have boldly condemned the war as imperialist; it has been the practically unanimous judgment of the *local* peace conferences that the war between the Allies and Ger-

many is an imperialist war. The unequivocal condemnation of the war by every *mass* gathering of young people indicates the essential soundness of the growing youth anti-war movement.

* * *

AS AGAINST this growing clarity, apologists for American intervention, who disclose a chameleon-like ability to camouflage their aims, are widely peddling their wares. Perhaps most conspicuous and influential among these are a group of prominent Protestant clergymen and laymen numbering at least a round dozen Bishops among them, and the heads of some of our more swanky schools, and Reinhold Niebuhr who is widely acknowledged to be the leading "theorist" of the Christian youth movement. A statement by 33 of these gentlemen (and ladies) on January 21 appeared in that house organ of Wall Street, the *Herald Tribune*, and for good reason. Among other generalities they state:

"A victory for the allied powers or China would not of itself assure the establishment of justice and peace, but the victory of Germany, Russia, or Japan would inevitably preclude the justice, freedom of thought and worship, and international cooperation which are fundamental to a Christian world order. Therefore Christians cannot evade the ethical issues involved

and the consequent claims upon their sympathy and support."

What remarkable reasoning! A victory "of itself" for the Allied powers would *not* mean justice and peace! Just what does all this mean? Perhaps our worthy clergymen have something up their sleeve that they haven't divulged to the public, something besides an allied victory "of itself." But what could it be? Certainly nothing but more well turned phrases! A victory is a victory after all—and an imperialist one at that!

This then is the "ethical issue" (a fine hair-splitting one indeed) that an Allied victory is bad, but a German one would be worse! And on that flimsy basis we are asked to give our "sympathy and support" to one side as against the other. Sympathy and support may sound very fine and even Christian. But in reality it can only mean American youth sacrificing their lives and limbs in the muck of battlefields for the greater glory and profit of Wall Street.

As every poll and test of public opinion has shown, while large sections of the American people may yet mistakenly express their belief that a victory for the Allies would be the lesser of two evils, the overwhelming majority are even more emphatic in their opposition to entering the war for any reason whatever. Yes, the masses understand better than the hair-splitting moralizers that there is a grave

danger of involvement in the imperialist war in every expression of so-called "sympathy" for one side against the other.

That is why the apologists for "aid" to the allies must resort to bare-faced trickery. In one breath they speak of a victory for "the allied powers or China." This is a shallow deception to use the genuine sympathy of the masses for China's glorious struggle for liberation in order to trick them into supporting its very opposite, the war of the allies to enslave the colonial peoples.

On the other hand, they speak of victory for "Germany, Russia, or Japan," assuring us that they all equally and inevitably preclude justice and freedom. This juggling of words and phrases is not only intended to present a false issue of "democracy against dictatorship," by lumping the socialist Soviet Union with imperialist Germany and Japan, but also to obscure the real liberating, peace policy of the Land of Socialism.

We can but point out that Soviet victories (the antithesis of fascist enslavement) saved eleven million Polish people (including two million Jews) from the horrors of life in Hitler Germany; that Soviet victories led to peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and Japan in the far East; that Soviet victories on the diplomatic front established security to the Baltic states; that Soviet victory against the Manner-

heim line and the peace with Finland has enabled the Scandinavian countries to maintain their neutrality, and has at least temporarily foiled the imperialist plans to spread the war by embroiling neutral states with the Soviet Union. That kind of victories no one need fear!

As always imperialism conceals the predatory nature of its wars from the masses by subterfuge, this time by masking it as a struggle between "democracy and dictatorship." They tremble in their boots lest the masses grasp the fact that fascist dictatorship and bourgeois democracy are blood brothers, are but different forms of exercising the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Already the truth is being revealed that only a hairsbreadth separates the two, and that in the course of waging a reactionary war, the bourgeoisie in the "democratic" countries is resorting to a more ruthless, more fascist, dictatorship in order to compel the masses to support its criminal war. Distinctions between fascist dictatorships and bourgeois democracies have become meaningless, not because the masses do not desire greater democratic liberties today, but because imperialism is abandoning all democratic forms that have cloaked its naked dictatorship.

The fact of the matter is that a victory for either rival imperialism in the Allied-German war would mean in essence a redivision of

world markets and colonies favorable to the victor. It would mean enrichment of the robber victors by continuation of the oppression of 500,000,000 colonial slaves who would gain no more than perhaps a change of masters (unless they take matters into their own hands to establish their independence and liberty). And as is already clear from the suppression of democratic liberties in England and France, a victory for either imperialist camp means a continuation of the war upon the rights and living standards of the working peoples of all countries, and violent efforts to suppress their revolutionary movements. That kind of victory is the opposite of "peace and justice" for it could but give rise to new wars, to an unfolding of new imperialist conflicts involving the struggle for supremacy between American imperialism and the dominant imperialist powers in Europe and Asia.

As they grasp the full revolutionary significance of the fact that their enemy is imperialism, monopoly capitalist rule; that this war does not present a choice between a victory for democratic powers or for dictatorships, the masses will be preparing in the course of struggle against their "own" imperialism for the only possible "just victory," a peoples victory over the ruling imperialist governments.

Now let's look at this business of an "allied victory" from another angle. Such eloquent pleaders for

the Allied cause as Dorothy Thompson or even Colonel Lindbergh shed some light on the war aims of British imperialism. They attempt to subordinate the contradictions between the imperialist nations in resolving the cardinal world contradiction between Socialism and capitalism in favor of capitalism. They plead with Germany to "come back, come back" into the Chamberlain axis, to join in an anti-Soviet crusade to protect "Christian civilization" from "Asiatic barbarism."

That's what our Christian friends, as well as President Roosevelt, are asking for in an "allied victory." They ask the involvement of neutral states into war, for a united imperialist front against Socialism, for a bloody world-wide imperialist and counter-revolutionary war against the Socialist one-sixth of the world! Surely not a very Christian objective!

Are not our worthy Churchmen practicing a deception and revealing the real essence of the pacifist ideology they have been teaching to millions of young people in the United Christian Youth Movement? The declared principles, for instance, of the United Methodist Church that "we insist that the agencies of the Church shall not be used in the preparation for war, but in the preparation for peace" and the Church "cannot endorse war nor support or participate in it," are rendered meaningless and harmful.

Fortunately for the majority of those Protestant young people who have accepted the ideology of pacifism these ideals have a different meaning than to Mr. Neibuhr and his fellow travelers. By and large, the Christian youth regard the war and President Roosevelt's policy with suspicion and mistrust, opposed the revision of the Neutrality Act, are against the shipment of arms or loans abroad, and even as expressed by the *Epworth Herald* attribute the causes of the war to "greed which expresses itself in economic imperialism—a ruthless competition for markets and raw materials."

But they must necessarily ask, can a pacifist position stop war? And of what use is it if in the very next breath a "moral" issue is found justifying support to one side in the war? Or can it be of any value unless the Christian young people support a practical program against *every step* toward involvement in war?

If the youth of the Christian and pacifist movement get no better advice than to be "conscientious objectors" after we get into war, and engage in no other struggle than for the right to "object" to military service, then it is utterly senseless and dangerous. Lenin described that policy in saying "one of the forms of deception of the working class is pacifism and the abstract preaching of peace." Only if that honest horror of war results

in practical activity in combatting the Roosevelt drive to war and militarization can it make a positive contribution.

Its fundamental weakness lies in the inability of pacifists to oppose a war *as an imperialist war*, and to support a *just war*. They declare that war cannot be supported even "when employed in a righteous cause." That is completely contrary to the concept of Communists who support just wars, wars of national liberation as in China and in Republican Spain, for liberation of the working class, or for defense of the Soviet Union.

* * *

A MORE direct and open apology for British imperialism, laying the ideological ground-work for American participation in the war, is to be found among certain national leaders of Jewish youth organizations, many of whom play upon the anti-fascist sentiments of the Jewish masses to mislead them along the road which would inevitably plunge them over the precipice onto the battlefields of the imperialist war.

Surely even the editors of *Masada News*, "Official Organ of the Youth Zionist Organization of America" must now blush for shame at this touching testimonial to Chamberlain of last October:

"It is our good fortune that the destiny of Palestine has become

fused with that of the world's greatest empire. For now, the entire imperial strength of Great Britain is engaged in a death struggle for the moral vindication of common humanity. We cannot doubt that the Zionist ideal of a free Jewish state is in support of the British war aims for a free Europe."

We cannot even doubt! Chamberlain's war is for a "free Europe" and for "common humanity"! At least these editors are not timid souls. Or would they be willing to concede that there might be a doubt (just a tiny one even) in the minds of the Jewish masses who have now seen "the world's greatest empire" betray its promises of a Jewish "homeland," forbidding Jews to buy additional land in large sections of Palestine. Against whom is the "imperial strength of Great Britain" directed? To crush the aspirations of the Jewish, the Arab, the Indian, Irish and Negro peoples to attain freedom!

Jewish youth are learning to recognize and repudiate in their *local* organizations such poppycock as the editors of *Masada News* dish out. Perhaps these leaders of Jewish youth organizations can explain how it is that in practically every local youth peace conference the votes are unanimous or overwhelming against the imperialist war and yet Jewish youth are well represented in these conferences! Certainly it can't be because they don't stand up for their convictions. The

fact is, their convictions are the same, by and large, as those of the masses of youth, as is shown wherever they find a means of expression. For example, in Seattle, Washington the exclusive Temple Circle club and the youth forum of the Jewish Educational Center "Resolved that this organization go on record as opposed to America's involvement in the *imperialist war*."

* * *

But the reactionary predatory character of the war in Europe is being concealed in a somewhat more subtle fashion in some circles. Discussion of a "new international society," of a "federal Europe," and of the "kind of peace" to come after the war is becoming quite fashionable. This is particularly true of higher Church circles, and of the section of the Young Women's Christian Association closest to its controlling Boards.

The impossibility of any but an imperialist peace resulting from an imperialist war so long as the ruling bourgeois governments remain in power, was demonstrated long ago. And schemes for a utopian "new world" or a "federal United States of Europe" were exposed in V. I. Lenin's teachings as reactionary proposals, or at best as utter impossibilities. He wrote in 1915 that:

"Of course *temporary* agreements between capitalists and between the

powers are possible. In this sense the United States of Europe is possible as an agreement between European capitalists—but what for? Only for the purpose of suppressing socialism in Europe, of jointly protecting colonial booty *against* Japan and America."

Who can deny that today it is even more true that Socialism alone can make possible in Europe a free union of peoples? Any other "union" of capitalist nations must of necessity be a bloc organized against the Soviet Union, and to carry out the reactionary Chamberlain-Daladier policy of suppressing all popular democratic and revolutionary movements. Who can deny that if we spend our time contemplating an "ideal peace," but do nothing to keep out of war, that America will be involved in this imperialist war with our hopes of peace blotted out by the reality of bloody destruction? There can be no hope of a just peace at the hands of the ruling governments of the capitalist nations. The hope of just peace lies in another alternative, a peoples peace which can be won only by systematically organizing the peoples now against the imperialist policies of their ruling governments.

Yet misconceptions in regard to these questions continue to exist in wide circles. They will bear more careful examination. For instance, in the Y.W.C.A. a partial explanation of this particular trend can be

found in historical fact, in a traditional support over decades to all forms of international agreement, the League of Nations and World Court.

Support to the League of Nations is a many sided question. Just as the Y's support to the League of Nations in the period after the World War when the League was an adjunct of British imperialism's reactionary policy, led the Y' into support of that imperialist policy; so today, reactionaries in the Y.W.C.A. will attempt to use support to the League, which is again serving as an instrument of reaction, to transform the Y.W.C.A. into an agency of support to imperialist war.

Yet, it was this same traditional policy of the Y' which enabled it to readily endorse a policy of Collective security at a time when the League of Nations, with the Soviet Union counted among its members, could serve as a slight hindrance to aggression.

Now, it is clear, the Y.W.C.A. must learn not to place its emphasis upon vague plans of international cooperation which actually give support to President Roosevelt's position of aiding the allies, but must bring forward the features of its program which emphasize resistance to the step by step war preparations of U. S. imperialism. It was absolutely correct to organize collective security and even to try to use the League of Nations in

an effort to prevent the outbreak of this war. But now the imperialist war is an inescapable fact. Now the problem is to stop it, to keep the U. S. out. Obviously new tactics are needed: this is not a problem of "Quarantining an aggressor" by "pressure on nations using war" as the Y' puts it; it is a problem of resisting the feverish preparation of our "own" government to enter a war from which we cannot possibly hope to gain anything but misery and death, a war in which distinctions between "aggressor" and "victim" have no meaning.

The trend of policy in the National Public Affairs Committee (and National Board) of the Y.W.C.A. indicates the consequence of shoving the practical struggle against war into the background. For example: the 1938-40 Public Affairs Program calls for "abolition of compulsory military training in civil educational institutions." But in the proposed draft program for 1940-42 submitted to its National Convention, the Y' meekly asks to "guard against the growth of militarism." The old program opposed "all war-time industrial mobilization plans" and asked for "restriction of our military and naval establishments." Now these points are omitted completely. Nowhere in the draft program is there expressed opposition to war loans and credits. Only opposition to war profiteering is retained in its original form, together with a positive

stand on civil rights and social legislation. But a serious retreat has been made. Can it be said that these vital points were simply overlooked in enthusiasm for writing sophistries of a new "world commonwealth" into the program? Of course not. Their elimination followed from the Y's basic position as logically as a cart follows a horse.

The question is: will the YWCA repeat the tragic mistake of the World War, or will it firmly oppose all war policies of the Roosevelt Administration. This is a very real problem. In its wartime 1915 Convention the YWCA Public Affairs Program commended the "Wilsonian Plan for Peace" and the same Convention in a special telegram pledged its unqualified support to President Wilson's conduct of the foreign policy of the U. S. during the war. But precisely because of its support of Wilson, and his so-called "peace" plans, without calling another Convention to consult the membership, the YWCA gave its support in 1917 to the imperialist war in which our country became involved under the very guise of those "peace aims" of President Wilson. The "war work" of the Y, carried out under the guise of "humanitarianism" from 1914-18, which was nothing but support to an imperialist conflict, must certainly rest as a burden on the consciences of those responsible if they are to regard their respons-

ibility in leadership with full honesty.

It is hardly strange that the rank and file of girls in the YWCA find their honest desires for keeping America out of war clashing with the opinion of a considerable section of the Y Boards, who after all get their outlook from their bourgeois class position. In fact, the Industrial, Business and Professional, and Student Councils are traveling in a different direction, towards acceptance of the policies put forward by the American Youth Congress and local youth peace movements. The National YWCA Convention and the simultaneous meetings of the *assemblies* (which represent the girls directly) in April will more fully indicate the major direction in which the Y will move.

* * *

The experience of the YWCA cannot but focus our attention on the general tendency for the adult, bourgeois dominated boards of the mass youth organizations to exert pressure upon their membership in an effort to restrict their participation in the anti-war movement. Only the "youth led" democratic organizations are free of such pressure, while within the least democratic organizations it amounts to a demand for complete subordination to the war plans of U. S. imperialism. Witness, for instance, the appeal of the Rt. Rev. Fulton J. Sheen of the Catholic University of Ame-

rica for the militarization of youth, "this country would have been better off during the depression if it had put *all* the unemployed youth into the Army and Navy for a time".

Or recall the bureaucratic order of Aubrey Williams, NYA administrator, to turn the names of NYA workers over to the U. S. Army recruiting service. Such complete kow-towing to the Roosevelt war drive must place the masses of youth on guard against every effort to destroy their autonomy and rights and to shackle them to the war machine.

Bitter experience in the last war showed that the bourgeois dominated boards (closely linked by financial ties to monopoly capital) of many youth organizations, Y's, churches, settlements, and schools rapidly transformed them into adjuncts of the military forces. Even now the YMCA has appointed a committee of big businessmen to investigate the possibility of "over-seas" work, while according to a N. Y. Times Story of Sept. 23, 1939 the British YMCA "is prepared to exceed its World War appropriation of 8,000,000 pounds and its previous force of 60,000 volunteer helpers" to aid British imperialism's armed forces.

* * *

SINCE the attitude of groups and movements towards the Soviet Union is a touchstone that reveals their true position, it is of particu-

lar importance to examine the attitude of the youth movement toward the land of Socialism.

How is it to be explained that the youth movement has with overwhelming sentiment rejected tremendous pressure to condemn the Soviet Union, has not supported the Hoover relief campaign for Mannerheim, or the Roosevelt drive for war loans to Scandinavian countries? The young people have taken the lead in repudiating the hysteria whipped up against the Soviet Union despite President Roosevelt's personal plea to the Youth Congress for condemnation of the Soviet Union on the pretext that resolutions against war loans are "twaddle", while aid to Finland is "axiomatic". The American Student Union pointed out the danger of anti-Soviet incitement and condemned unneutral acts against it. Even the conservative National Student Federation condemned loans to all belligerents and made no mention of the Soviet Union. Yes, the very absence of any reference to the Soviet Union in either the U. S. P. C. or A. Y. C. policies can only be regarded as a rebuff to the anti-Soviet policy of the Administration and its supporters among the youth. But far better would it have been and certainly far more in harmony with the facts and with the needs of America's youth, if the youth movement had in a firm positive fashion taken its stand with the consistent peace policies and actions

of the only non-imperialist great power in the world today—the Socialist Soviet Union.

Of course, reactionaries, professional red-baiters, members of the Catholic hierarchy, and even erstwhile New Dealers may jump to the hasty conclusion that here is evidence to confirm “Communist control” among the youth! These gentlemen had better look before they leap, for nothing could be further from the truth. Such an absurd conclusion would only lead them, and us as well if we were to accept it, far astray from the real facts.

The advanced position adopted by the youth movement is primarily due to fear of American involvement in this war over any pretext. It speaks volumes for the suspicion and scepticism with which President Roosevelt’s new orientation is regarded. Without doubt it represents a more conscious conviction that the danger of war comes, not from the Soviet Union, but from the policy followed by American imperialism.

Another element is the recognition of efforts to artificially inject the issue of the Soviet Union as “red-baiting” splitting tactics, harmful to the unity established around other questions. Already the individuals who most insistently attack the Soviet Union find themselves inevitably lumped together with the most unsavory provocateurs, such as the thoroughly discredited Murray Plavner represents.

While these definite advances can

be noted, only extreme shortsightedness could conceal certain still-existing confusion as to the role of the Soviet Union. Even in regard to the efforts to transform the imperialist war into a counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet war, which has become its main feature, there exists far too great unclarity. A real job lies ahead in bringing to the masses of youth even the understanding reflected in the statement of the Peace Commission of the Student Christian Movement (and by the way, that job still exists in this movement) which states:

“the chances of American involvement in war have increased by leaps and bounds since the outbreak of war between the Soviet Union and Finland.—But the essential task—remains to detect and fight the forces driving this country towards the brink of war—to oppose any abandonment of strict neutrality.

“England and France may continue to fight against Germany—on the other hand, there may develop a combined Italian-French-British—and German—with possibly Japan—attack on Russia. With either eventuality the basis is being prepared now for American participation—in a holy war against atheism and communism on behalf of God and our Christian faith.”

The task of clarifying the role of the Soviet Union is made especially imperative because of the presence among the youth of groups and policies definitely hostile to the

Soviet Union and to the unity of the young people. For instance, the Youth Committee Against War, Avukah (Student Zionist group), the Paole Zion Alliance are ready to concede, as Avukah puts it, that a "general war against the Soviet Union may be in the offing." But from all indications they welcome it with unholy glee! While posing as firemen they pour fuel on the fires, pass anti-Soviet resolutions, call for an embargo on the Soviet Union, and join in attacking the Communists.

Only the presence of the virus of Trotskyism can explain this strange conglomeration of lip service to anti-war slogans and incitement to war on the land of Soviets. The first symptom of poisonous Trotskyist-Lovestoneite-Socialist influence is the breaking out of an anti-Soviet rash. Fortunately for the youth movement, this influence has not found a response among the masses. Though a significant group such as the National Council of Methodist Youth is infected by the Socialist dominated Youth Committee Against War and provides it with a base, the YCAW has not struck roots among the young people. In fact, it is being repudiated by the only other large or important group whose support it claimed, the Farmers Union Juniors. But a warning is in place; that as President Roosevelt more openly and boldly leads the howling anti-Soviet pack, precisely these groups will strive to

ride into strategic positions on his coattails.

The conclusions to be drawn are clear. While a full acceptance of the Soviet Union's policies is not a pre-condition for anti-war unity; nevertheless, such unity can not be built on a firm foundation unless it repudiates all anti-Soviet attacks and recognizes that anti-Soviet threats constitute a danger to our own neutrality and peace. For the Communists and those who see the full significance of the firm peace policy of the Socialist state, there remains a responsible duty and task of continuing to discuss, debate and clarify this and other controversial issues among the masses of youth.

* * *

The particular responsibility of the young Communists in this respect is clear; and their tasks in helping to build the anti-imperialist unity of the working, farm and student youth follows logically from this analysis of the trends among America's young people. Whether they like it or not, the spokesmen of the imperialist bourgeoisie must recognize that the Young Communist League represents a trend of thought in the life of the youth and their organizations. President Roosevelt gave official recognition to that fact in his address to the *Youth Institute* by noting the presence of those who "call themselves Communists." As a minority consciously advancing a fundamental Socialist

solution to the problems of the youth, and cooperating in every movement capable of offering the least resistance to the war-makers, the Y. C. L. will continue to participate in and give its support to all those policies of the American Youth Congress which are in the interests of the youth. Precisely because its understanding of world affairs and its analysis of the war is based upon Marxism-Leninism; and because its membership represents the working, farm and student youth who have accepted these policies

and are thereby most able to give concrete leadership and correct guidance; the Young Communist League, working as the closest collaborator of the Communist Party, assumes a responsibility far beyond its size or numbers in rallying the masses of youth, particularly of the working class youth, into the anti-imperialist peoples front for struggle against the imperialist war, against every form of bourgeois reaction, and for the final emancipation of all mankind through the establishment of Socialism.