

Political **A**ffairs

20¢

MAY

1945

ROOSEVELT'S HERITAGE AND THE TASK AHEAD

EARL BROWDER



POSTWAR LABOR-CAPITAL COOPERATION

EUGENE DENNIS



INTERNATIONALISM AND AMERICAN LABOR

A. LANDY



HOOVER PLOTS AGAINST SAN FRANCISCO

N. SPARKS

TWO *New* "INTERNATIONAL" Books

CAPITALISM AND PROGRESS

By ANNA ROCHESTER

A fundamental study of the influence of capitalism, in the process of its development, on the modern world. It shows how capitalism, in developing from earlier productive means and relationships, has brought new progress and achievement to the human race, and why, at the same time, it worked serious maladjustment, poverty and crises in the process. Taking into account the new conditions in world economic and political relationships that have emerged out of the war, the cementing of the American-Anglo-Soviet coalition in joint struggle against the common enemy—fascism—the author indicates the possibilities and potentialities that give reason for hope that further progress can be realized under capitalist economy in the future.

Paper \$.40, Cloth \$1.25

GERMANY: LABOR AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS UNDER FASCISM

By JURGEN KUCZYNSKI

This book by the eminent English economist is a scholarly treatment of two aspects of fascist Germany: its economic and its labor conditions. Drawing upon original reports to state and local governmental and other agencies in Germany from 1933 to the present, the author paints a graphic picture of the war and of the terroristic aspects of fascism, the complete deterioration of the living standards of the German people and their utter loss of the most elementary rights and liberties. This book helps us to understand Germany today and how to meet the problem of Germany tomorrow.

Price \$2.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A Marxist magazine

devoted to the advancement of democratic thought and action

EARL BROWDER, *Editor*; EUGENE DENNIS, *Associate Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME XXIV, NO. 5

Contents

MAY, 1945

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: 1882-1945	<i>Frontispiece by Hugo Gellert</i>	
Roosevelt's Heritage and the Task Ahead	Earl Browder	389
Nearing Conclusive Victory in Europe	Robert Thompson	392
Hoover Republicans Plot Against San Francisco	N. Sparks	397
Internationalism and the American Working Class	A. Landy	407
Postwar Labor-Capital Cooperation	Eugene Dennis	415
The New Situation in Poland—and the Old Delusions		423
The Bretton Woods Hearings	Max Gordon	430
The New Stage in the Far East	James S. Allen	441
France and the San Francisco Conference	M. Nikolayev	448
The Missouri Valley Authority	William Sentner	453

BOOK REVIEWS:

A New Biography of an American Utopian Socialist Louis Budenz 461

VITAL DOCUMENTS:

468

President Truman's Address to Congress—The New Charter for Labor and Management—Declaration of the Soviet Government Voiding Its Neutrality Pact With Japan—The Rebirth of Austria—The Government of Dr. Negrin.

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., 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.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.





FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT
1882-1945

ROOSEVELT'S LAST MESSAGE

“Today as we move against the terrible scourge of war—as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace, I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight-edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

“The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.”

—*From a speech written the night before he died.*

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

EARL BROWDER, President of the Communist Political Association, is the author of a new book, *American Marxists and the War*, which International Publishers will release this month on the occasion of his birthday, May 20. * * * N. SPARKS is the President of the C.P.A. of Wisconsin. * * * A. LANDY is the author of *Marxism and the Woman Question* (New Century Publishers). * * * EUGENE DENNIS is a Vice-President of the C.P.A. * * * WILLIAM SENTNER, a member of the National Committee of the C.P.A., is General Vice-President of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, C.I.O., District Council No. 8. * * * LOUIS F. BUDENZ, a member of the National Committee of the C.P.A., is Managing Editor of the *Daily Worker*. * * * ROBERT THOMPSON, a Vice-President of the C.P.A., is Editor of the *Overseas Supplement* of the *Daily Worker*, and a specialist in veteran's problems. * * * JAMES S. ALLEN is Foreign Editor of *the Worker*. His latest pamphlet, *World Cooperation for Postwar Prosperity* (New Century Publishers), is now being reprinted in a second large edition. * * * M. NIKOLAYEV is a Soviet political analyst. * * * MAX GORDON is a member of the Editorial Board of the *Daily Worker*, specializing in New York State and City politics.

Political Affairs, with this issue, closely approaches the 7,000-mark in subscription circulation, and has passed the 20,000-mark in total circulation. With the active cooperation and support of its present readers, there is no doubt that the goal of 10,000 subscribers and a total circulation of 25,000 can be reached in the course of the next few months. Many valuable suggestions and criticism have been received, and these are being given the most serious study and consideration. The Editors welcome comments from the readers of *Political Affairs*.



ROOSEVELT'S HERITAGE AND THE TASK AHEAD

BY EARL BROWDER

ROOSEVELT IS DEAD. There is an aching void in the hearts of men and women and children. We had grown to depend upon him—too much so, for thereby we heaped burdens upon his shoulders too heavy for his body, though never too heavy for his spirit. His body broke under the strain, and now he is gone. His leadership continues only through those Americans who absorbed his spirit and his wisdom, who will continue his appointed work until it is completed.

The policies of Roosevelt were an essential expression of his greatness which the whole world felt and trusted. Those policies are no rigid blue-print, but they are clear, they are definite, and they are indispensable to America and the world. They may be summarized briefly as:

Firm and continuing cooperation with our Allies, Britain and the Soviet Union, in peace as in war.

The gathering of the family of nations, around this firm nucleus, into an ordered system of international relations, in the direction pointed out by Teheran and Crimea, and by the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks plans.

Full utilization of America's tremendous economy, with jobs for all American workers and a constantly rising standard of life and security, and expanding economic collaboration with the whole world for its healing and reconstruction.

Unity of all Americans of good will in support of this program, regardless of previous or continuing differences of class, creed, national origin, or political alignments or labels.

In these four main guiding thoughts of the Roosevelt policies are concentrated the essence of his wisdom and his genius, tested in the terrible fires of war from which they brought victory, and now to be tested without the master workman's direct guidance in the peace which we must organize.

The fateful responsibilities of the Presidency are now upon the shoulders of Harry S. Truman. His first acts as President steadied the country and the world under the initial shock of Roosevelt's death. In the first hours of his Presidency he announced through the Secretary of State that the San Francisco Confer-

ence of the United Nations would open as scheduled on April 25; he communicated with the Soviet Union and received the response that, revising previous plans, Foreign Minister Molotov will attend the Conference. Thus quickly were put at rest all speculations that the main course of American foreign policy would now be altered by the death of its great architect. America and the world gained confidence from the first contact with President Truman.

This brief article must go to press before President Truman has made his first public address. It is safe to assume that he will declare that his task is the completion of the established Roosevelt program. In this great task he must and will receive the steady support—the most energetic support when necessary—of labor and the people.

President Truman, in undertaking his tremendously difficult duties, is entitled to go about his work without having his supporters constantly jogging his elbows or pulling at his coat-tails. His course is not going to be determined by those who rush to "pressure" him into this, that and the other. He is entitled to choose his counsellors and assistants according to his own best judgment, without carping criticisms and without constant suspicions that he "is abandoning the Roosevelt policies"—an accusation from which even Roosevelt himself was not free.

The vigilance of labor and the people in organizing ever greater masses for Roosevelt's policies must be preserved from its caricature of "nagging" in small questions, to which some of our liberal friends have been addicted in the past. It must also be preserved from those who, professing to be the best champions of the Roosevelt policies, already, before his body was laid to rest, rushed into print with "corrections" of Roosevelt's "weaknesses." President Truman will be judged by the people on the basis of results in carrying on and advancing Roosevelt's policies, not by his detailed means of reaching those results, of which he must be assumed to be the best judge.

The first great test of the Truman Administration comes in the San Francisco Conference, to the planning and preparation of which Roosevelt himself gave such sustained thought and effort. The basic work is done and the main plans drawn. But it will still require a steady hand and sure brain, and much wisdom such as we learned to expect from Roosevelt, to complete, in closest unity with our Allies, the establishment of the new world security organization. President Truman has the supreme responsibility of successfully completing this great task. The majority of the country, especially the labor movement, will support him in full confidence that the results will be such that Roosevelt would have approved.

America and the world have suffered a profound shock in the loss of the great Roosevelt. The nation is plunged in grief at its immeasurable loss. Important readjustments of national life will inevitably follow. We must hold fast to the great legacy bequeathed to the nation by the departed Commander, his policies, his wisdom, his humanity. We must

transform grief into new strength, to replace that which we have lost. We must help President Truman bear his tremendous burden. We must guard our unity against the bickering of factionalists. We must march forward more unitedly than ever to that future whose possibility was revealed to the nation by Roosevelt.

THE CRIMEA DECISION ON THE DESTRUCTION OF GERMAN FASCISM . . .

. . . It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and nazism and to insure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world. We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans; wipe out the Nazi party, Nazi laws, organizations and institutions, remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public office and from the cultural and economic life of the German people; and take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to the future peace and safety of the world. It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when nazism and militarism have been extirpated will there be hope for a decent life for Germans, and a place for them in the comity of nations. . . .

NEARING CONCLUSIVE VICTORY IN EUROPE

BY ROBERT THOMPSON

SINCE DECEMBER 7, 1941, destruction of the German Army has been the central military objective of all the major democratic powers; for upon this barbaric force depended the entire Axis plan of world conquest. Today, thanks in great measure to the wise and decisive direction given America's armed forces during three and a quarter years of war by our late Commander-in-Chief, President Roosevelt, this central objective is on the verge of being attained.

At a time when German armies were battling on the approaches to Moscow, and were poised on the English Channel, it was President Roosevelt's firm hand at the helm which enabled the nation to brush aside the powerful forces that strove to turn our war effort away from the decisive center of world conflict in Europe and into the dead-end morass of a "Pacific First" muddle of confusion.

At a time when full-fledged coalition warfare became the key to military victory, and when this coalition warfare depended upon the formulation of a joint American-Soviet-British world policy, President Roosevelt became America's archi-

tect of this world policy, together with Stalin and Churchill, at Teheran.

At a time when a major two-front war became an inescapable necessity for clinching the military destruction of Hitler-Germany, and for establishing solid foundations for continued Big Three and United Nations unity, President Roosevelt's firm counsel gave America and our Allies the Second Front.

No American Commander-in-Chief has ever been confronted with such momentous decisions affecting the destiny of our country and the world, and none has arrived at decisions more wisely. Because of this, April 1945, which has been saddened by the death of President Roosevelt, is also the eve of the most far-reaching military event of this war: destruction of the German Army as an organized national force.

As this is written the dispersal of the German Army as a national force has yet to be achieved in battle; but the battles that will achieve it are already in progress. As surely as at Stalingrad this German Army lost the ability to determine the course of the war, so at the Rhine it lost the ability seriously to influence the tempo of the war's concluding phase. The German High Command gambled on creating dissension among the Big Three by a policy of concentration in the East, and capitulation in the West. This gamble is now boomeranging against the Hitlerites by speeding Germany's defeat.

President Roosevelt's leadership has seen us through to the point where military victory in Europe is within our grasp. The great and crucial test of strength which lies ahead for our new Commander-in-Chief, President Truman, and for our nation as a whole, is in the problems and tasks of the radically new stage of the war which will be ushered in by the destruction of the German Army as a national force. Only the fullest and widest understanding of what the destruction of the German Army signifies, and of the chief features of this new stage of the war which will follow, will enable us to meet and surmount this test.

MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

Destruction of the German Army as an organized national force will eliminate Germany's ability effectively to block by military action the realization of the war aims held in common by the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and their United Nations allies. It will not wipe the slate clean of military tasks in Europe.

Substantial pockets of resisting Nazi bandits will have to be exterminated, and this will require the prolonged employment of very considerable military forces and materials. Especially in the South, in the region surrounding Hitler's Berchtesgaden citadel, these mop-up campaigns on a mammoth scale may extend into months.

The searching out and apprehension of war criminals will require the services of large numbers of Allied soldiers as well as an extensive force of specially trained personnel.

The indefinite, but certainly prolonged, occupation and control of all phases of German life by the Allies will bear little resemblance to the formal occupation following the last war—this time it will be a serious military operation requiring large armies of occupation, commensurate with the great democratic tasks facing the Coalition.

Formidable as the remaining military tasks in Europe will be, nevertheless, very considerable ground and air forces will be almost immediately available for transfer to the Pacific for use against Japan. The problems of organizing all-out warfare against this deadly enemy of our country and of world security will then arise for the first time in their full magnitude. Japan's military forces have from the very outset functioned strategically as an auxiliary force to the Hitler war machine, and in isolation are in no respect sufficient to cope with the military power of the United Nations coalition opposing her. It is therefore correct to say that the military tasks which will confront our country and its allies following the destruction of the German Army, while being formidable in their magnitude and decisive in their character, will nevertheless not constitute a crucial test of strength for the available military

forces of the major powers of the United Nations coalition. The key problem of the approaching stage of the war against Japan is the full utilization of this available military strength. This in turn hinges upon the further development of a joint British-American-Soviet policy for the Far East and above all upon the speedy breaking down of Kuomintang resistance to the unity proposals of the Yennan Government and the Chinese Communist Party. On the solution of these political problems depends the speed with which victory over Japan will be secured, the price in American lives which will have to be paid for that victory, and in large measure the prospects for a stable and peaceful post-war Asia.

WAR TASKS IN GERMANY

"Wars . . . differ in character according to the nature of the motives and circumstances from which they proceed."—Clausewitz, *On War*, Volume I, page 25.

"If policy is grand and powerful, so also will be the war, and this may be carried to the point at which war attains to its absolute form."—*Ibid.*, Volume III, page 123.

The abiding genius of President Roosevelt's leadership of the nation is that he deeply understood that this war differs from all past wars—that it is a war of survival, with our country's existence and the foundations of civilization at stake. It is that he understood the stake in this war

to be the future of the world, and that this determines the specific character and the conduct of the war.

This is no Spanish-American War fought for stakes which enabled it to end with the occupation of a few islands. Nor is it the first World War fought for stakes which enabled it to end before the enemy's frontiers by confronting his army with a superior force. It is a war fought for policies more grand and powerful than any other war in history, a war "which attains to its ultimate form" absolute destruction of the enemy's resources and forces more fully than at any time in past history. It is a war which can have no final and conclusive ending short of the uprooting and annihilation of fascism everywhere in the world. Until this is achieved nothing is irrevocably decided, nothing irrevocably won.

In past wars destruction of the enemy's army represented the final and most conclusive result. In this war destruction of the German Army is only one aspect of such a conclusive result. It opens the road to the achievement of the other aspects of this conclusive result: apprehension and punishment of all war criminals; destruction of the Nazi Party and State apparatus; destruction of the German General Staff; removal or control of all actual or potential war industry, and the liquidation of German trusts and cartels; the fullest possible reparation, including labor reparations,

in the post-war years by Germany for the destruction wrought by her in the occupied lands. The full attainment of all these objectives is essential to the defeat of Germany's plan for World War III. To this end the peoples' forces supporting President Truman, will have to fight as firmly and as effectively as Roosevelt would have wanted them to fight against all eleventh hour saviours of German fascism who advocate a soft peace for Hitler Germany which would leave intact the economic and military groundwork of the Nazi order and German imperialism.

THE PLAN FOR WORLD WAR III

Hitler Germany's preparations for World War III are already far advanced. They are proceeding along four main lines:

1. Creation of a powerful financial base for the subsidizing of underground work.

2. Preservation of the main cadres of the Nazi Party and German General Staff.

3. Retention of effective control of a substantial portion of Germany's and Europe's economy, as well as the economy of countries in Latin America, as a base for a future war machine.

4. Political preparations for continued efforts to split the unity of the United Nations and prepare the ground for the revival of fascism as a world force.

Within Germany the Nazis are

preparing to conduct underground work along three lines: (a) organization of bands for the conduct of sabotage and terrorism; (b) setting up of underground Nazi Party organization; (c) preparation of extensive and diverse forms of sabotage of future peace terms between Germany and the United Nations, and of provocations designed to disrupt Coalition unity.

Outside of Germany the Nazis are using so-called "neutral countries," especially Franco-Spain and Argentina, as bases from which they hope to prepare for the resurgence of fascism as a world force. It is primarily through the collusion of these countries that they hope to retain effective financial and economic control of European economy in the years following this war. It is through these countries that they hope to secure the preservation of many of their top cadres. It is upon the divisive political and diplomatic activities of these countries that they place great hopes for eventually disrupting the unity of the United Nations.

Just as the last stand of substantial remnants of the German Army will take place on Austrian and Czech soil, and will have to be destroyed on that soil, so the last substantial hope of the Nazis for success in their plans for a third world war will have to be destroyed through the bringing about of the collapse of fascism in countries outside of Germany, and above all in Spain and in South America.

Removal of all diplomatic and economic support to Franco, and the full encouragement of the democratic forces grouped around the Spanish Supreme Junta and Negrin, together with the resumption of a firm opposition to the Argentine fascist regime, are essential tasks of the next stage of the war against Hitler Germany and its plan for a third world war.

FURTHER WAR TASKS IN EUROPE

The abiding genius of President Roosevelt's leadership is that he fully understood that this war to save our country and the world from fascism could be won only if the great constructive goal of establishing the foundations for a prosperous, democratic and peaceful world is achieved.

It remains for our new national leader, President Truman, supported by the entire country, to complete the work of laying these foundations upon the principles already projected at Teheran and Crimea. With the destruction of the German Army many existing problems in this connection will assume sharper and more urgent proportions and new ones will arise. Among these will be:

1. The more speedy realization of the Teheran and Crimean formula for the resurgence of democratic governments in the liberated countries of Europe.

2. A far greater measure of direct economic relief for the peoples of the devastated liberated countries.

3. The speedy undertaking of measures to restore and build up the productive plant of the liberated countries.

To this end the San Francisco Conference must be successfully carried through with the adoption and implementation of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement; the Bretton Woods monetary rehabilitation plan must be speedily ratified; fuller and more unified British-American-Soviet support must be accorded to the broadest democratic unity within each liberated country, such as that which exists around the present Polish Provisional Government; U.N.R.R.A. activities and lend-lease measures directed toward relief of the peoples of the liberated countries will have to be greatly and quickly expanded; long term economic credits will have to be made more readily and speedily available to the governments of the liberated countries.

These war tasks are absolutely essential next steps toward consolidating the approaching conclusive military victory in Europe, and to achieve the great constructive goals of the United Nations of which President Roosevelt was a foremost author and champion.

HOOVER REPUBLICANS PLOT AGAINST SAN FRANCISCO

BY N. SPARKS

SPEAKING at the final session of the Bretton Woods Conference on July 22, 1944, Secretary Morgenthau declared:

There is a curious notion that the protection of national interest and the development of international cooperation are conflicting philosophies—that somehow or other men of different nations cannot work together without sacrificing the interests of their particular nation. There has been talk of this sort—and from people who ought to know better—concerning the international cooperative nature of the undertaking just completed at Bretton Woods.

I am perfectly certain that no delegation to this Conference has lost sight for a moment of the particular national interest it was sent here to represent. . . . Yet none of us has found any incompatibility between devotion to our own country and joint action. Indeed, we have found on the contrary that the only genuine safeguard for our national interests lies in international cooperation.

It is safe to say that the events since the Bretton Woods Conference—the election campaign and the Roosevelt victory, the military victories on the battlefronts, and the Big Three Conference at Crimea—have fixed ever more firmly in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the American people the fact that “the only genuine safeguard for our national interests lies in international cooperation.” There can be no honest doubt as to the clear desire of the American people to stake their hopes of lasting peace on the same international collaboration of the United Nations under the leadership of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, which has already carried them within sight of victory over Nazism in this war of international survival.

This decision of the American people was shown again in the universal gratification which greeted President Roosevelt's report from Yalta, as well as in the feeling of intense interest and welcome anticipation with which the whole country has been awaiting the San Francisco Conference which is to set up the World Security Organization. Dramatic evidence of the mind of the people was given in the vote in the town meetings of New Hampshire which turned out 13,847 for the Dumbarton Oaks plan as against only 751 opposed.

This broad support for Crimea and San Francisco has by no means been confined to the followers of the President's own party. On the contrary, as President Roosevelt himself point-

ed out, "Republicans want peace just as much as the Democrats." And it was in full accord with this fact, and undoubtedly to set the tone for a thoroughly non-partisan approach to the vital national interest of lasting peace, that President Roosevelt, with nation-wide approval, appointed a bipartisan delegation to San Francisco.

The wisdom of the President's approach received its first important confirmation in the speech of Commander Stassen. Placing the San Francisco Conference in its correct perspective as a logical outgrowth of all the previous steps strengthening the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition and the United Nations, Stassen declared:

With the background of the Atlantic Charter and the commitments of Secretary Hull's conference at Moscow, the declarations of Teheran, the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks, the decisions at Yalta, the President's excellent message to Congress last week, and the never-ending wholesome study and discussion throughout America, have brought us to the eve of the San Francisco conference *with the overwhelming support of the people of the country and of the United States Senate* for the steps proposed.

On the question of the technical features of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, Stassen again recognized essentials:

Let us clarify our thinking. If either the United States, or Russia, or Great Britain decide in the next 25 years to make war, then there will be another

world war, and no organization, or league, or union, or treaties will stop it. But I do not believe any of these countries will want to make war. . . .

They will not always see problems alike. They will not always please each other. But in the main, they must and should work out their differences of views and find the way for joint action. *The Yalta Conference was a very important indication that this can and will be done.* Clearly, then, our policies should be based on the development of the world with these three desiring peace.

While Stassen undoubtedly reflects the position of large sections of Republican voters as well as important sections of the leadership, unfortunately his position cannot be said to be that of the Republican Party as a whole. A bitter-end campaign of hatred and reckless political disruption of the nation's interests is being carried on by Senator Wherry of Nebraska, who occupies the important position in the Senate of minority "whip," as well as by Senator Brooks of Illinois and similar notorious agents of the McCormick-Patterson axis.

But while this treasonous program of openly spreading hatred and disunity to hamper victory in the war, to disrupt the San Francisco Conference and the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition on which it is built, has its effect, the chief strategists of the anti-Crimea forces know that this method alone, no longer has any chance of turning the tide of public sentiment.

They have before them, in the fight over joining the League of Nations in 1919-20, the classic example of how to turn majority support among the people into defeat in the U.S. Senate: the campaign of Senator Lodge foreshadowed in his notorious remark, "I do not propose to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations." This is the significance of the statements of Dewey's advisor on foreign relations, John Foster Dulles (Dewey himself, of course remaining silent), of the amendments of Senator Vandenberg, and above all of the articles of the chief ideological leader of the anti-Crimea forces, Herbert Hoover—under the guise of supporting the main purpose and essence of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to execute a flank attack through additions and amendments, so that the plan will be internally transformed from a structure of lasting peace into its opposite—a preparation for World War III; or, failing that, to arouse so much confusion and hostility in the country that it will fail of the two-thirds vote in the Senate.

The Hoover articles recently appearing in the newspapers under such headlines as "*Asks Code of Ideals in Peace Structure*," "*Hoover Wants Moral principles Written In*," "*Security System must not be Strait Jacket*," etc., represent the most complete programmatic statement of the anti-Crimea forces on Dumbarton Oaks, upon which all the special objections, proposals and amendments

of Dulles, Vandenberg, etc., are based. Let us therefore examine the underlying conceptions of the Hoover articles.

HOOVER'S "MORAL" PRINCIPLES

Hoover himself declares quite openly that his proposals are based on the book he wrote together with Hugh Gibson three years ago, *The Problems of Lasting Peace*. It was in this book that Herbert Hoover, the America Firster, carefully avoiding any discussion of the present war as a war for our national existence, sought to confound it with the past world war in order to mobilize against it and against its outcome the mass feeling of disillusionment and resentment flowing from the last war. It was in this book that Herbert Hoover, the inveterate hater of the Soviet Union, referring specifically to "our allies in this war—Britain, Russia, China" said: "*We cannot foresee the kaleidoscopic shifts in the relation of nations which will probably take place during this war.*" It was in this book that Herbert Hoover, the Great Engineer of Starvation, declared: "Communism and Fascism are both founded on sheer materialism. . . . *There is less murder and liquidation under fascism, but the moral base is no higher.*" And it was in this book that Herbert Hoover, the advocate of appeasement, declared: "It is too easy to attribute our present wars to individuals or a group of individuals or

even to perverse nations." And it was out of this type of thinking that Hoover came forward with his chief proposal—a "cooling-off period" between the end of the war and the signing of the peace.

Lenin wrote in 1916 (foreshadowing incidentally the character of the Versailles Treaty):

Just as all war is but the continuation by violent means of politics . . . so the peace that succeeds every war can be nothing else than a summing up and registration of the changes in the relation of forces brought about in the course of, and in consequence of the given war.*

Herbert Hoover, bitterly disappointed in the absence of the "kaleidoscopic changes" he had hoped for, whereby the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition against the Nazis would have become the Anglo-Nazi-American coalition against the Soviet Union, is striving at all costs to bring about a *separation* between the war and the peace, so that "the changes in the relation of forces brought about in the course of, and in consequence of the war" shall *not* be registered in the peace.

What are these changes? They are the crushing of the military power of the fascist axis, the creation and strengthening of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, and all the liberating, progressive and democratic developments throughout the world flowing from the anti-fascist war.

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V. p. 232.

They are the changes from Munich to Teheran and Yalta. These are the changes which Hoover wishes to prevent being registered in the peace. And this is the reason for his proposals providing for delay and revision—to convert the Dumbarton Oaks plan from an instrument to maintain peace under the leadership of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, into an instrument to disrupt the Coalition and again develop a resurgent Germany as a military hireling against the Soviet Union.

For this purpose, Hoover, who, to say the least, has been generally considered rather on the static side as a philosopher, suddenly appears as a convert to "change": "There is nothing rigid or immutable in human affairs. History is a story of growth, decay and change."* For this reason he proposes provisions for revision of treaties in 10 years. To put teeth into this demand, he declares:

If no provision, no allowance is made for change by peaceful means, it will come anyway—and with violence. . . . Any attempt to maintain the status quo indefinitely is a direct cause of war—for, peaceful means being denied, the change can come about only through force. War becomes the only available solvent.

And so, the tottering Nazi forces preparing for a third world war, as well as the "aggrieved" remnant fas-

* The source references in this section are to four articles by Herbert Hoover which appeared in *The New York Times*, consecutively, from March 25 to March 28, 1945.

cist core in other countries, are assured in advance of "sympathetic understanding," with its implied support, on the part of Hoover and his camp. The encouragement is unmistakable: "Oppressed peoples will agitate and even rebel against oppression. They are hardly likely to go on considering themselves bound by a bargain entered into unwillingly by their fathers."

But will they be *capable* of renewed aggression at that future time? Hoover has looked out for that, too. Out of necessity, he accepts the point of "absolute disarmament of the enemy powers," but whereas Commander Stassen follows this by saying "We, ourselves should remain strong," Hoover at once follows it with "Immediate relative disarmament of the United Nations and the establishment of maximum limit of armies, navies and air power among them."

To disperse the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition and to atomize the "One World" perspective, Hoover proposes regional organization—not the existing regional security pacts, etc., which fit in with, and are subordinate to, the world structure, but that "regional organization should be *the foundation of the whole machinery.*" The three regions should be the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. Instead of a plan to keep the three great powers together, this would be a plan to keep them apart! And while Hoover does not specify at this time, enough has

been written on the theme of the "Atlantic Community" and other such geopolitical discoveries, to draw the conclusion that the Soviet Union would be considered as part of Asia in such a set-up, and the *cordon sanitaire* would be a reality again.

Finally, should all these measures fail, Hoover then wants to be able to fall back upon one of the original isolationist pillboxes: that the American delegate should not be empowered to act on sanctions against aggressors, but American participation in action of the Security Council could be only through the President of the U.S. in agreement with the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees, and perhaps Congress as a whole.

But this program for revision of the World Security Plan—for impairing it and rendering it ineffectual—is not to be supposed to emanate from sympathy for fascism or reactionary class hatred against the Soviet Union. On the contrary, Hoover supplies with his plan a complete line of "moral" principles all ready for immediate attachment. Without the inclusion of these principles, Hoover declares: "We are in danger of setting up a purely mechanistic body without spiritual inspiration or soul."

Aside from the fact that the Dumbarton Oaks structure is neither a super-government nor a new social system, nor a new philosophy nor a religion, but a simple *agreement* between nations to consult and take

united action against threats of aggression, one might nevertheless ask: "What harm could it do to include moral principles?" The answer is that these "moral" principles are subterfuges designed to supplant the sound political principles, which are inherently moral, for effecting the complete destruction of fascism and inaugurating an era of enduring peace and international cooperation. Hoover's "moral" principles are further, in some of their specific provisions, deliberately slanted against publicly-known positions of the Soviet Union; for example, Point 10: "prohibitions against compulsory labor or slavery in any disguise" is obviously intended to protect the Germans from having to expend their own labor to rebuild their wanton destruction in the Soviet Union and other countries, and to save them from paying for their own enslavement of millions of foreign civilians. In this way the basic German strategy of coming out of the war, even in defeat, stronger than the victims of their aggression, would again be successful.

Finally, what consideration can be given to the advocacy of moral principles coming from the man who cynically declares that Communism and fascism are on the same moral plane, with "less murder and liquidation under fascism"—i.e., Maida-nek. Such morality is the morality of a ghoulish, and is clearly intended only to provide an additional "moral" basis to dismember the Anglo-Soviet-

American Coalition vital to the achievement of lasting peace as it is to military victory over Hitler.

VANDENBERG'S "JUSTICE"

For this attempt to create a "moral" basis for isolation of the Soviet Union, the Hoover-Dulles-Vandenberg forces have decided to select "Justice" as their war-cry. Thus "*Justice is tocsin cry*" is the head of an article by Edwin L. James in the *New York Times* of March 11 discussing the campaign against Dumbarton Oaks. In a speech before the Foreign Policy Association on March 17, demanding periodic revision of the peace, Dulles declares: "Neither the organization nor the member states should be required to sustain a condition found to be *unjust*. That is what I mean when I talk about giving the organization a soul." And Senator Vandenberg, on March 5, announcing his acceptance as a delegate, stated: "My chief anxiety about the tentative Dumbarton Oaks formula is that . . . it does not once mention "*justice*" as a guiding objective or a rule of conduct." Finally, the Vandenberg amendments, while crystallizing the fundamental Hoover demand for revision of the peace, appeal in every paragraph to "*justice*."

In the name of "*justice*" Vandenberg opens his battle against the results of the war in the first section of his memorandum:

Permanent peace is impossible if the

new League is a straitjacket which attempts to freeze the status quo (*as largely dictated by military expediency in the course of war*) regardless of *justice*.

Here Vandenberg puts in a nutshell the false theory basic to the whole approach of his group: that there is a fundamental contradiction between the status quo (the results of the war—and indeed the war itself) and “justice”; that the steps taken by the U.S. Government in the course of this war were not dictated by our basic national interests, but by “military expediency”; that chief among these, the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, is but a creature of temporary military expediency not in keeping with the basic interests of our country and repugnant to “justice.” Therefore: revision of the peace, disruption of the Coalition and preparation for new war which alone can establish “justice” and therefore, “permanent peace.”

Vandenberg’s amendments, all ringing with “justice,” aim at skirting the original requirement basic to the whole Dumbarton Oaks conception, of unanimity among the great Powers on basic questions—the only actual safeguard of peace. Like Hoover’s “moral” principles, they constitute a virtual invitation to defeated Germany, or to ultra-reactionary blocs in any other country who may claim boundary grievances or may upon other pretexts seek to annul the results of the peace with claims

of “injustice,” to revolt and stir up war! Vandenberg’s amendments would cripple the effectiveness of the Security Council and its members to act against such an eventuality.

Are we perhaps exaggerating the scope of what Vandenberg calls “injustice”? Let us refer back to the programmatic articles of Hoover, the ideological leader of the group:

There will be continuing gigantic wrongs in the world. Americans for all time will sorrow for the fate of Finland, of Estonia, of Latvia, of Lithuania, the partition of Poland, and other states that will be partly or wholly submerged by this war. We cannot even think of another war to secure their freedom, but we do not need to sacrifice our ideals by acquiescing in their plight. We could at least leave a hope open for their long future.

Of course, in the Hoover lexicon, any small nation that has been wrested from the German imperialists and any Soviet-bordering country that decides to become friendly with the U.S.S.R. instead of an outpost of fascism, becomes submerged. Hoover admits (regretfully) that it is impossible to think *now* of another war, but the Hoover-Dulles-Vandenberg plans aim “to leave a hope open for the future.”

This then, is what is meant by Dulles’ “activating principle,” by “giving the organization a soul!” It is the futile and shoddy soul of the old League of Nations, still heavy with its original sin of anti-Sovietism and its acquired sin of appeasement

of fascism, that has not been permitted by the Hoover-Dulles-Vandenberg gods of the past to escape to Nirvana! In place of the fresh and powerful creation of the peoples that is scheduled for San Francisco, the Hoover-Vandenberg clique offer another futile and weary chapter in the transmigration of souls bound to the wheel of ever-recurring war.

Under the cover of this program, the obstructionists set on foot a campaign to scuttle the San Francisco conference altogether. David Lawrence opened up with a vicious direct attack on the Soviet Union bristling with phrases about "one-man government," "totalitarianism," "We must build up our own defenses and cooperate with the *democracies*" (as against the U.S.S.R.), etc. Walter Lippman fell in with a column declaring that the timing of the conference was bad. Issues of Poland, Rumania, and voting formulas, were pounded by Senator Wherry and even certain respectable newspapers, as proof that it was the U.S.S.R. that was "going isolationist" (!) and did not want the conference; and Drew Pearson contributed an arrogant open letter to Stalin advising him that it would be better for him to follow the example of American unselfishness. This campaign was blocked, however, by the firm position of President Roosevelt and Secretary Stettinius on the one hand, while, on the other hand, *Pravda* wrote that the San Francisco conference is well-timed and will succeed, and the *War*

and the *Working Class* pointed out that participation in a world security organization does not mean that the U.S.S.R. must give up its right to conduct its own foreign policy.

Regrettably, many liberals, and even certain Administration circles were all too quick to take on face value Vandenberg's sudden "conversion" from "isolationism" publicized in his first major speech on the subject in Congress some months ago. That speech was soon thereafter adopted at the G.O.P. National Committee meeting held at Indianapolis on January 22 as the official Republican position on foreign policy favoring post-war review of decisions made by the Tri-Power Coalition during the war. Vandenberg's position was hailed by his supporters with the demagogy that it would "strengthen the Presidents' hand" in "bargaining" at Crimea.

Hoover and Vandenberg both admit that their proposals start from the conceptions of the League of Nations, proposing "modernization" and "improvements." The total unacceptability of the Old League and the fundamental differences of the Dumbarton Oaks plan were discussed a few months ago by N. Malinin in the Leningrad *Zvezda* (reprinted in *The Communist* of November, 1944). On this question suffice it to quote from the speech of Marshal Stalin last November 6:

This organization must not be a repetition of the ill-starred League of Na-

tions which had neither the right nor the means to avert aggression. It will be a new, special, fully authorized world organization having at its command everything necessary to uphold the peace and avert new aggression.

THE PEOPLE'S NON-PARTISAN SUPPORT FOR DUMBARTON OAKS

It is this approach, fully in line with the positions of Roosevelt and Churchill, and with the spirit of the Dumbarton Oaks plan itself, that, despite the virulent clamor of the Brooks - Wherry - *Chicago Tribune* crowd, as well as the confusion sown by the Hoover-Dulles-Vandenberg "yes-but" elements, is steadily becoming accepted in wide-spread circles of Republicans, as well as among Democrats and non-partisans. The *Milwaukee Journal*, a win-the-war, conservative and generally Republican newspaper, that made no final choice between Roosevelt and Dewey last November, invokes the early tradition of the Republican Party on behalf of Dumbarton Oaks:

Memory goes back to a meeting of a few neighbors at Ripon in 1854. It was in their minds that something be done in this country that was not being done. . . . The little group at Ripon adopted resolutions and someone suggested the name Republican. Another group met under the oaks at Jackson, Mich. Neither town was large, but the idea was. The movement spread like a prairie fire and a decade later it had been settled that the Union was to be preserved, with slavery forever abolished.

The people no longer were helpless. . . .

Above all else, we want the men from many countries who will meet in San Francisco to understand that they must bring us a plan for world cooperation. We realize that it will not be all as anyone would have it. We hear a great many dire things predicted. But we hear nothing predicted so dire, so disastrous, as another world war would be. . . . We need to send word to men who represent us at Washington that this time we want something done. . . . This time we don't want excuses. Groups meeting from Maine to California, from Alaska to Florida, testify to the earnestness of the American people in this spring of 1945.*

The type of grass-roots campaign initiated by such movements as the *Milwaukee Joint Committee on Dumbarton Oaks Week*, reported and encouraged by the *Milwaukee Journal* in this editorial, the *Chicago Build for Peace Committee*, and numerous others throughout the country, can have a powerful influence, because of their non-partisan character and their involvement of business and middle-class circles not usually active in mass campaigns in alliance with Labor, in influencing the vote in the Senate where the two-thirds vote is not yet assured and a number of Senators, chiefly Republicans, are still listed as "doubtful." A mass movement to bring about a correct reflection of the wishes of the American people in the Senate vote on Dumbarton Oaks

* *Milwaukee Journal*, February 26, 1945.

will, because of the decisiveness of this question, have further influence in strengthening the national unity of the people and a non-partisan approach to the Congressional elections next year, when additional decisive questions of victory over Japan and fundamental postwar policies will come up for debate.

A splendid example of patriotic non-partisan action on the vital questions of Yalta, Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco now facing the American people, was given by the aged Republican Governor Goodland of Wisconsin in a statement denouncing and repudiating a Congressman of his own party—the professional anti-Crimea demagogue O’Konski. Governor Goodland said:

President Roosevelt’s report to the nation on the achievements of the conference should be recognized by all American citizens as a truly great speech. It seems to me that prospects for world peace are better today than they have been for years. We all should

take heart and support the positive kind of international policy the President has so ably outlined.

However, there are those individuals and politicians who seem to think that it is smart to indulge in carping criticism and to sow the seeds of distrust and fear. The President’s explanation of the understandings reached at Yalta and the part of the citizens of the United States in these agreements was so forthright and clear that they must have the complete support of every one of us.

These words, imbued with deep conviction, and calling forth universal applause from the people throughout the state, represent the growing spirit among leading circles, as well as among the masses of people throughout the country, among Republicans as well as among Democrats, whose sons alike are buying this opportunity for lasting peace with their blood, that will permit neither the pro-fascist isolationists nor the “yet-but” obstructionists to defeat their purpose.



INTERNATIONALISM AND THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS

BY A. LANDY

TWO HISTORIC EVENTS during the month of April have registered with dramatic impact the extent to which the destiny of the United States is intertwined with that of the entire world. One was the sudden death of our immortal President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; the other was the opening of the San Francisco Conference for the establishment of a world security organization. The universal grief over the passing of our nation's great democratic leader was a spontaneous demonstration of how much America, under Roosevelt's leadership, has come to mean to the peoples of the world. The San Francisco Conference, which symbolically, at least, brought the world right into our midst, showed how much the world has come to mean to America.

It was a measure of Roosevelt's greatness that he understood clearly the profound interconnection between the fate of America and the fate of the world. He revealed this in those first days when all the dark forces of reaction began to drive the world toward the abyss of fascism and sought to confuse and paralyze

every democratic and progressive inclination by conjuring up the bogey of communism. He revealed this especially when the Axis Powers launched their war of world conquest. Overcoming the opposition and obstruction of reactionaries and pro-fascists, he worked out, with the support of labor and all the nation's democratic forces, a decisive anti-fascist war policy, for our nation. He threw its great power and influence into the scales for United Nations victory over fascism and for the democratic development of the world based upon collaboration and friendship with the mighty Socialist Soviet Union and Britain. He showed this with even greater maturity in his last days when, on his return from the Crimean Conference, he reported to Congress and the nation, declaring that "the conference in the Crimea was a turning point, I hope, in our history, and therefore in the history of the world. It will soon be presented to the Senate and the American people, a great decision which will determine the fate of the United States, and I think therefore

of the world, for generations to come." He grasped and symbolized the essential truth that the conditions for the solution of our most vital questions today are international in character; that no basic question, whether it be the annihilation of fascism, the establishment and maintenance of peace, or economic stability and jobs, can be solved on any but an international basis. "Responsibility for political conditions thousands of miles away," he reminded Congress and the people, "can no longer be avoided, I think, by this great nation. Certainly, I don't want to live to see another war. As I have said, the world is smaller—smaller every year. The United States now exerts a tremendous influence in the cause of peace." It is in the person and policies of President Roosevelt that the new position and responsibilities of the United States in the world have been most completely represented.

THE WORLD TRADE UNION CONFERENCE

Bound up with this new position of our country in the world is the new position of the American working class in relation to world labor. Its most advanced leaders understand fully that no class in the United States today, whether it be capital or labor, can solve a single important question affecting even its most immediate interests without regard for the national interests and conse-

quently for the world position and responsibilities of our country. The participation of American labor in the historic World Trade Union Conference at London was a conscious expression of this.

The far-reaching significance of this action and the great advance it represents in the history of the American working class are shown by the character of this world conference of labor and by the tasks it has set for itself. In contrast to the impotence and world-scale disunity displayed by labor at the time of the rise of German fascism, this Conference undertook to marshal the unity and strength of labor behind the governments united in the common task of completing the destruction of fascism and initiating a new, historic stage of democratic development and lasting peace. It was a recognition that the unity and active leadership of labor on a world scale are indispensable conditions for the realization of those great decisions and military, political and economic perspectives formulated at the Teheran and Crimean Conferences. The decision of the London Conference to organize a new world federation of labor with the leading participation of the trade union movements of England, the Soviet Union, and the United States, and to take part in the San Francisco Conference for the establishment of a world security organization headed by the Anglo-American-Soviet coalition, corresponded to

the new responsibilities and consciousness of labor in the world today.

By participating in the London Conference, American labor, represented by the C.I.O., rose to the level of the world role of the nation as a whole. Acting in accord with the best national interests, on the level of the national tasks, and with the best traditions of the international ties of our nation and working class, it thereby demonstrated that American labor had attained, not only a high degree of organization, but also of maturity and consciousness. This judgment is not less valid because the top leaders of the A. F. of L. refused to participate in the Conference and even attacked it, among other reasons, on the ground that the Soviet trade unions would also be included. In this, they clearly did not speak for, or in the interest of, their membership; although for whom they did speak is plain enough from the nature of the "arguments" they advanced. The great majority of the membership of the A. F. of L., like that of the C.I.O. and the Railroad Brotherhoods, is in full accord with the principles of the London Conference. It is in full accord with the premises of anti-fascist coalition with the peoples and governments of the Soviet Union, Britain, and the other United Nations, the same premises underlying the policies and perspectives of our government and nation.

Despite the claim of the A. F. of L.

leadership that in repudiating the London Conference it "reflects the sober judgment of the vast majority of the American workers," it actually reflects only the interests of that reactionary section of the bourgeoisie which is violently opposed to the realization of the Crimean perspectives. This is evident from the fact that both ground their position in an ill-concealed hatred of the Soviet Union, the essential trade mark and underlying dynamic of the anti-Crimean camp, which regards cooperation with the Soviet Union as a barrier to imperialist aggrandizement. True, the A. F. of L. officials do not directly denounce the Soviet Union; in fact, they even profess to admire it, but at the same time, they refuse to collaborate with the organized workers of the Soviet Union and describe the London Conference as "a 1945 trade union Munich" because of the participation of the Soviet trade unions. They pretend to recognize the greatness of the U.S.S.R., but hasten to warn the British labor leaders against their "new-found friends" who "will knife you in the back." They declare that the Soviet workers "constitute the government" and through it own all the productive machinery in the land, yet advance this very fact as evidence that the workers' unions there cannot be free, the ostensible reason for their refusal to associate with them in the same world labor body. They pretend to welcome the

participation of the working people of the Soviet Union in world trade union activity, but only on condition that they "free" themselves from their own Soviet government, that is, overthrow the Soviet system.

Such cheap and despicable double-talk, contemptuous of logic and every suggestion of honesty, is not "the sober judgment of the vast majority of the American workers" but an attempt at rank and unscrupulous deception of them. The only consequence of this blind prejudice presented as a policy is arbitrarily and irresponsibly to isolate the six million members of the A. F. of L. from the historic resurgence of world labor unity and officially to dissociate them from support of the Roosevelt policies so vital for the welfare of our nation and the world. It is to sacrifice the true interests of labor, as well as of the nation, its security, its prosperity and peace, to their private hatreds and narrow clique interests. It is a "sober judgment" which the vast majority of the American workers have repudiated time and again in the reelection of Roosevelt and only yesterday in the spontaneous grief and profound sense of personal loss with which they learned of the death of their beloved President, the heart of whose world policy they know full well was based on Anglo-American-Soviet collaboration.

In a time of great decisions this repudiation of the London Conference is a vain, pigmy effort to per-

petuate outworn conceptions which have long proved bankrupt for labor and the nation. It is a futile attempt to ignore the vast historic changes that have come over the world and to drag the American labor movement down from the historic level it has achieved, organizationally and politically, precisely during the past decade of struggle to keep fascism from engulfing the globe—a labor movement based upon the most advanced industrial development in the world, of a country whose military and economic power is so great and decisive that it cannot abdicate its democratic and progressive role in world relations without condemning all humanity to a new hell on earth. It is a hopeless endeavor to set, not only American labor but also world labor, upon a path which the democratic forces, determined to destroy every vestige of fascism wherever it may be found, have categorically repudiated at the cost of million of lives. But, despite all the harm such efforts may do, the A. F. of L. officials will learn that they cannot block the historical progress of our country or its labor movement, and consequently that they cannot block that which corresponds to the innermost needs of our time and provides the indispensable foundation for its democratic development—the friendship and practical collaboration of the governments, peoples and labor movements of the United States and the Soviet Union.

AMERICAN LABOR'S TRADITION
OF INTERNATIONALISM

The American working class has a long tradition of international solidarity which began with the rise of the labor movement in the late 1820's and has continued to the present day. The tradition of fraternal solidarity with the working people of other lands is implicit in the nature of the labor movement and is characteristic of the democratic tradition in general with its philosophy of social progress. This was best expressed by Abraham Lincoln, the immortal leader of American democracy, whom Karl Marx described as "the single-minded son of the working class." "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relationship," Lincoln declared in 1864 in accepting honorary membership in the Workingmen's Association of New York, "should be one uniting all working people, of all nations and tongues and kindreds."

This was the principle on which William Sylvis acted as the first great leader of the new labor movement which came into national existence in 1866 immediately after the defeat of the slave power in the Civil War. Sylvis sought to strengthen the new movement of labor by affiliating it with the International Workingmen's Association (the First International) which, like American labor, rallied to the support of the United States Government headed

by Lincoln when its existence was threatened by the Southern slave owners and their reactionary European friends. The leader of labor, like the leader of our nation at that time, entered into friendly relations with the General Council of the International whose correspondence with the United States was conducted by Karl Marx. Like Lincoln and the First International headed by Marx, Sylvis had a clear grasp of the inter-relationship of the three central questions confronting the American working class then: the defense of the nation against every reactionary threat to its existence, the development of democracy and with it of the labor movement, and finally the international solidarity of labor. Sylvis' premature death robbed the American working class of one of its most promising leaders and contributed to the interruption of the fruitful ties that were in the process of being established between American democracy, American labor and the labor movement of Europe. The transfer of the General Council of the First International to the United States during the last few years of the Council's existence may be counted, in a broad sense, as part of this stage in the history of American labor's tradition of internationalism.

The next big stage extended from 1889 to the end of the first World War in 1918, and it was characterized by the predominance of the A. F. of L. in the American labor

movement and the second, Socialist International on a world scale. It was a representative of the A. F. of L. who, at the founding Congress of the Second International at Paris, first suggested the idea of making May 1, which had become a symbol of American labor's struggle for the eight-hour day, a day of international labor solidarity. It was, however, only the most advanced, socialist sector of the American working class which really made May Day its own. Under the leadership of the A. F. of L., the American trade union movement never fully participated in this international observance, never really was taught the full significance of international labor solidarity. In fact, it was not until the emergence of the C.I.O. under a leadership which took the initiative in placing the national interests above partisan interests in the war against fascism, that the main stream of the American labor movement really came to the forefront also of international labor solidarity. The first World War shattered the international fraternity of labor expressed primarily in the Second International. It succeeded in doing this because of the ability of imperialism to undermine the labor movements of the major countries, with the exception of the Bolsheviks in Russia, and to permeate the Second International with a corroding opportunism which left it powerless in face of the great crisis of war. Due to the influence of Gompersism in

the trade unions and of the opportunist leadership in the Socialist movement, American labor was in no position to make any significant contribution toward the prevention of this ignominious collapse.

The great October Revolution in Russia opened a new epoch in the history of the world and in the international relations of its working people. The establishment of a new, Communist International to which the American Communist Party, organized in 1919, became affiliated, provided a channel for bringing American labor into touch with the vital currents of the advancing working class movements in all countries. This was possible because the newly organized Communist Party of America was itself the product of the development of the labor and socialist movements in the United States during the preceding three quarters of a century. Future historians, free from the harassments of reactionary prejudice, will record the great constructive and fructifying contributions to the development of a progressive American labor movement in the best interests of the nation which resulted from this international association.

It was the Communist movement here and throughout the world that took the initiative in rallying the working people and the democratic nations against the new series of aggressions launched by Japanese imperialism against China in 1931 and

followed up in 1936 by Hitler and Mussolini whose hordes invaded democratic Spain and thereby fired the opening shots of the second World War. When the American working class, under the initiative of the Communist Party, sent 3,000 of its best sons to fight side by side with the embattled Spanish people against the common foe of all progressive humanity, they provided a measure of the historic progress registered by American labor in comparison with its own past history and in the light of the great tasks which were arising before all progressive classes and nations of the earth. But this was only the beginning of a new, magnificent development, organizationally and politically, of the American labor movement. It was a development which was profoundly affected by the world events following the rise of Hitler-Germany and which, in turn, exerted a strong influence on all the anti-fascist forces in the country, preparing them to undertake, under Franklin D. Roosevelt's leadership, the great task of our day.

THE MEANING OF MAY DAY, 1945

The internationalism of American labor today is clearly on a different level, by every indication a higher level and of a more mature quality. It is distinguished by two features:

First, it is based on the new relationship between labor and the nation

forged in a period of history when the emergence of German fascism threatened the national existence of every independent people in the world, and the fascist menace to democracy and progress revealed the extent to which the survival of every nation and the preservation of its independence depends upon the strength and initiative of the working class and its labor movement.

Secondly, it is characterized precisely by the cooperation of American, British and Soviet labor backed up by the resurrected labor movements of a new type in the chief countries of the world. The war against fascism waged under the leadership of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition has created a new historical framework and new historical relationships, and has assigned the roles of leadership to the labor movements of those countries which are playing the leading role in the defeat of fascism and will play the decisive role in the maintenance of peace and the reconstruction of the world. The American labor movement, whose progressive section participated in the World Labor Conference at London is becoming increasingly conscious of this historic position and of the new obligations to which it gives rise. It is these new relationships and these new obligations, and not the narrow-minded prejudices of historically irresponsible individuals, which will dictate the course for the entire American labor movement.

Never has American labor had such gigantic responsibilities toward the nation and the peoples of the world. At no time has it had such call for international solidarity as it has today in this period of the salvation of nations and will have in the immediate future. The new democratic Europe that will emerge from the defeat of German fascism will see the rise of new and vigorous labor movements. These movements will be the backbone of democracy in their respective countries and they will look particularly to the working class of America, as well as to the Soviet Union, for moral and material aid. International working class solidarity, symbolized for so many years in the observance of May Day by the working people of all lands, is already assuming new life, and there is every indication that the American working class will play a new historic vanguard role in its further development.

May Day this year presents new perspectives and new democratic vis-

tas before the working people of the world. The hour of the final defeat of Nazi Germany is at hand and the assault upon the citadel of Japanese imperialism is in preparation. World labor has never been so conscious of its tasks, so eager to fulfill them: to smash fascism and world reaction, to secure a lasting peace, and to anchor it in the firm political and economic foundations mapped out at Teheran, Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Yalta. The passing of President Roosevelt, the great leader of the American nation, on the eve of the final victory in Europe and the San Francisco World Conference, will spur American labor to even greater efforts to safeguard national unity, to deliver even more decisive blows against reaction in the United States, to nourish and develop those historic beginnings of international labor unity forged at the London Conference and to raise that unity and fraternity of labor to an ever higher stage for the fulfillment of the historic tasks and aspirations of progressive humanity.



POSTWAR LABOR-CAPITAL COOPERATION

BY EUGENE DENNIS

THE "New Charter for Labor and Management" announced in Washington on March 28 by Eric Johnston, Philip Murray, and William Green, is a national event of major political importance. It heralds a new advance toward strengthening national unity now and after the war.

The joint "code of principles" for post-war cooperation subscribed to by the presidents of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. is based upon a few simple but significant propositions:

First, it notes the need and the possibility of achieving an expanding post-war domestic economy and a growing world market on the basis of consistent international economic cooperation and a domestic program of obtaining "the highest degree" of production *and* employment, as well as a constantly rising standard of living and social security, under existing production relations.

Secondly, it records labor's pledge, under present social conditions, to recognize capital's property rights and to promote increased produc-

tion, as well as the intention of capital to recognize labor's prerogatives to organize, bargain collectively and exercise its democratic rights.

Thirdly, it underscores the fact that the attainment of an expanding and prosperous post-war era is possible only on condition of securing complete victory over Nazism and Japanese militarism. It emphasizes that economic security and progress for the United States is possible of attainment after the war only if there is an enduring peace. Toward this end, it proposes to support the building of an international security organization resting on the unity of all the United Nations and capable of preventing or curbing new aggressions.

Fourthly, it declares that the continued cooperation of American labor and capital, acting in concert with other sectors of our population and with the government, is essential to promote the national interest in the coming post-war period, as it has been during wartime.

Obviously, this accord between labor and a powerful sector of Big Business—which has been warmly greeted by the President and a great many Congressmen, civic, industrial and labor leaders—constitutes only an initial step in the direction of forging a workable national unity after military victory. A host of measures and great efforts are required to help effectuate this declaration of purpose. This is particularly so in view of the fact that a sizeable and

key section of industry and management organized in the N.A.M., has so far refused to adhere to the Charter. Because of the reactionary influence of its dominant clique, headed by the DuPont and General Motors interests, which orientate upon an anti-labor, anti-Roosevelt and anti-United Nations policy, and which plan to launch an open-shop drive and an aggressive imperialist expansion program in the post-war period, the N.A.M. stands aloof from, and opposes, the course of national unity set forth in the Charter. As a counter part of this N.A.M. policy, John L. Lewis and his friends in the labor movement are, on the one hand, trying to exploit the militancy of the workers, and, on the other, certain narrow economist and other backward influences in labor's ranks. They are conspiring to create renewed divisions in labor's ranks and a series of strike struggles designed to disrupt essential war production and the post-war unity of the nation. Notwithstanding these factors, a significant start has been made toward promoting the cooperation of labor and capital for solving some of the nation's most vital post-war problems.

The signing of the Charter arises out of common national needs. It is influenced by the common experiences and collaboration of many sections of labor and management during the war, by the political maturity and strengthened position of the progressive labor movement, by the con-

structive role of the Roosevelt Government in promoting labor-capital cooperation in the national interest, and above all by the growing unity of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. It indicates that key representatives of the two most decisive classes in American society, labor and capital, are being drawn together today in order to cooperate for certain common national interests on the morrow after victory.

For one thing, the formulation of this Charter evidences the changing approach of important sections of the employers, of big capital, towards the organized labor movement and towards existing social and labor legislation which many of these employers heretofore fought. It reflects their new approach towards the future role of America in a democratic and peaceful world based on the continued collaboration of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and Britain, together with all the other United Nations. It also signifies that the most forward-looking sections of Big Business are inclined to steer a course of national unity after the war; that they are preparing to break with and resist the extreme reactionary and "isolationist" position of the DuPont elements which now dominate the N.A.M. This alignment of the main forces of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce with labor in support of the Charter can facilitate a serious differentiation in the N.A.M.; in fact it is already promoting a sharp division within N.A.M. circles. It can help lead to

the isolation and defeat of the most reactionary imperialist circles of American capital which oppose constructive labor-management cooperation and national unity to support the concords of Teheran and Crimea.

The promising post-war unity of the nation symbolized in the Charter also has another significance. The mutual understanding of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. as embodied in the Charter indicates the possibilities which now prevail for achieving a greater unity of action among the several wings of the trade union movement. The agreement of labor reached in behalf of the Charter promotes and will tend to advance concerted labor action on specific issues directly affecting the trade union movement, as well as for general national objectives. It should help influence important sections of the A. F. of L., nationally and locally, to cooperate ever more closely with the C.I.O., as well as to associate the A. F. of L. with the new world trade union movement.

Thus, it is clear that the "Labor-Management Charter" for post-war cooperation serves to reinforce national unity now, during the final phases of the war against Germany and Japan. Likewise, it will encourage coordinated national action during the difficult reconversion period. And it will open the way toward realizing a more effective collaboration of all patriotic forces in the post-war stage for attaining a durable peace, an expanding economy,

maximum employment, security and progress, and the further development of all democratic processes.

In short, the proclamation of this Charter of post-war domestic unity by the national leaders of organized labor and by the foremost spokesmen of one of the chief organizations of capital reflects the profound impact of the Crimean conference upon all forward-looking groups in American political and economic life. In turn, it will help create additional national possibilities and prerequisites to realize the historic perspectives set forth at Teheran and Crimea for destroying fascism and for securing world peace, economic prosperity, orderly progress and democratic advancement.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CHARTER VS. GOMPERSISM

In estimating the "Labor-Management Charter," it is necessary to examine further the character of the class cooperation envisaged. For instance, the Trotskyites and Norman Thomas "socialists" demagogically contend that the Charter signals a return to Gompersism, to a policy of class collaboration along reactionary lines. Even some progressive trade unionists are confused and are tempted to compare the agreements of national unity reached in the Washington Charter with the destructive social-democratic and anti-labor class collaborationist agreements entered into in the past by reformist labor leaders in the notori-

ous National Civic Federation and the infamous B. & O. Plan.

The Charter of March 28 no doubt is an act of collaboration of diverse classes, of labor and capital. But does this resemble, even remotely, the infamous class collaborationism practiced by the reactionary trade union and "socialist" leaders in the past, in the pre-war years? Is it based on the anti-C.I.O. and pro-fascist clerical version of labor and management "cooperation" recently advocated by Howard T. Curtiss, of the United Steel Workers of America?

Clearly, no! The disastrous policy of class collaboration pursued by Woll, Frey & Co., and by the other American adherents of social-democratism, especially during the period between the First and Second World Wars, was (and still is) a betrayal of the interests of the working class and people. It was a collaboration which promoted the interests of the most reactionary sections of capital, including its fascist-minded wing. It was a subordination of the workers' interests to the offensive of capital, to capitalist reaction. It was an alliance of the skilled aristocracy of labor and its reformist leaders, representing some two million workers, with the capitalists as a class, united under their most reactionary wing. It was an alliance of forces cooperating to obstruct the organization of the unorganized, to prevent labor's independent political action, to allow American imperialism a free hand and to steer a course of active hos-

tility toward the Soviet Union—our best and staunchest ally. This policy facilitated, first in Germany and later in Western Europe, the establishment of Nazism, of German fascism. It promoted World War II.

The cooperation of classes that is set forth in the Washington Charter has an entirely different content, aim, and direction. Irrespective of the subjective motives of some members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as well as of certain circles in the A. F. of L., it is a collaboration of classes within our country directed toward welding post-war national unity in support of our government's foreign policy entered upon at Moscow, Cairo, Teheran and Yalta, and its domestic program for 60,000,000 peacetime jobs. It is a policy of collaboration directed toward destroying Hitlerism and Japanese imperialism. It is a program of internal class cooperation designed to advance the long-term unity of all the United Nations, in the first place of its leading coalition, headed by the U.S.A., the Soviet Union and England. It is an integral part of national unity dedicated to bringing about a durable peace and an expanding post-war economy.

It is a collaboration of classes which does not subordinate the interests of the working class to the class interests or objectives of any reactionary or pro-fascist group. It is a collaboration which advances the interests of the working class and the people, in unison with all other pa-

triotis from all walks of life, for the common purpose of destroying the worst enemies of democracy and humanity: the fascists and their fifth column.

The collaboration of classes outlined in the Charter does not subordinate or impede the great and patriotic role of the working class in the nation's life and welfare. Rather, it is collaboration of classes which can enhance the unity and political influence of the working class. It is a policy of class cooperation, of national unity which depends in the first place on the organized strength of 14 million workers organized in the trade unions, especially upon the progressive role and policies of the C.I.O. It is a policy of national coalition which clearly recognizes the need of organizing the unorganized and which requires the special role, responsibility and contributions of the working class as an organized force, acting as the most consistent and able champion of the national interest, and therefore in the best interests of labor itself.

It is a collaboration based on the common national interests of all the American people, including the decisive class forces represented by the partners of the Charter. It is not based on the exclusive, special or vested interests of one or another of these classes. While it is true that in accord with the Charter the working class assumes an obligation to recognize the property and managerial rights of capital, it is also true

that labor demands and has obtained the recognition of its own vital trade union and democratic rights, including those of freedom of organization, collective bargaining, maximum employment and social security, and improved living and working standards.

Obviously there are forces at work within the country, such as certain N.A.M. circles and the Lewis-Dubinsky-Reuther-Woll clique in the labor movement, who are hostile to the declaration of purposes outlined in the Labor-Management Charter and who will strive to prevent the implementation of the Charter. There are also elements within the U. S. Chamber of Commerce who will endeavor to transform the Charter into its opposite, who will try and shackle and undermine labor's position and its alliance with the Government, and who will attempt to use labor as a political pawn to further the selfish aims of vested capitalist interests.

These individuals and groupings, whether within the ranks of business or labor, must be resolutely exposed, combatted and isolated. This is ABC. This is essential to ensure the realization of the great national benefits which can be derived from a constructive application of the Charter.

For our part, we Communists, who have consistently struggled to consolidate and broaden national unity for speeding victory in the war and destroying fascism, and who have been in the forefront of those en-

deavoring to extend the anti-fascist unity of the country and the United Nations into the post-war period as the pre-condition for guaranteeing America's peaceful, prosperous and democratic future, for effectuating the epochal promise of Teheran and Crimea—we are not frightened by the serious difficulties standing in the way of making the Charter work as a vehicle of labor and national unity.

For we are Marxists and therefore realists. We do not share the illusions of those who see in the Charter a panacea which will wipe out class differences and all industrial strife. Nor do we share the fears of those who are panic-stricken and disoriented by the open and hidden enemies of the Charter and by the stubborn struggles which must be waged to convert the Charter from a declaration of purpose into a dynamic instrument uniting and serving the nation.

We realize and frankly acknowledge that the Labor-Management Charter which can and should promote national unity today and tomorrow, involves the collaboration of different classes whose *ultimate* aims and interests are divergent. For the ultimate aims of the working class lie in the establishment of socialism, while those of the employers lie in the maintenance of capitalism. Likewise, we recognize that the Charter which can enhance the unity of the nation in a most crucial period, neither does nor can abolish classes and class contradictions, least

of all in our own country which is emerging from the war as the strongest capitalist nation in the world.

Yet we Communists welcome the Charter and will bend every effort to facilitate the realization of its program, because it does provide a realistic and constructive basis for reducing the "area of disagreement and conflict" between capital and labor, and for creating a broader and more solid national coalition supporting the government policies of United Nations unity, based on the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, to eradicate fascism, establish a stable peace and economic and social progress.

But our position in respect to the Charter and national unity has nothing in common with the class collaboration policy of reactionary social-reformism, which we condemned yesterday, fight today and will combat tomorrow.

The policy of national unity which we support and advance in common with the entire progressive labor movement, of collaboration of all patriotic forces from all classes and groups is a policy of united action against the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital, against all fascists and pro-fascists. It is a policy of collaboration requiring the greatest unity, initiative and strengthening of the organizations and the influence of the working class. It is a policy directed toward reducing and limiting industrial, racial and religious strife and clashes, in the interests of achieving the broadest unity

of action of all patriots for common national interests. It is, in short, a policy of national coalition, for the purpose of destroying fascism, ensuring a durable peace, expanding production and employment, and guaranteeing orderly democratic progress within the framework of the present social system. To the extent that the Labor-Management Charter can advance any of these national objectives—and the possibilities are many—it calls for the most active support of all patriotic Americans, from businessmen to workers, from Republicans and Democrats to Communists.

TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHARTER

What should be done now to help effectuate the Charter of Labor and Management cooperation?

For one thing, it is imperative to launch an extensive educational and public relations campaign to create a deeper understanding everywhere in the country regarding the supreme necessity of continuing and developing national unity based on a broad anti-fascist coalition. In this connection, it is necessary to make clear and to utilize the new opportunities which the Charter provides for reinforcing the unity of the country now and in the post-war period. And this should be combined with widening the supporting base of the Charter from the ranks of industry, agriculture and labor.

Together with this it is essential

to organize labor, business and civic collaboration in the localities, in the communities, in support of the "Code of Principles" of the Charter and in behalf of specific projects based upon these objectives: *i.e.*, common action in support of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement for establishing a world security organization and, where possible, of the Bretton Woods international monetary and banking proposals; the establishment or improvement of existing labor-management production committees in every plant and factory to help solve the continued problems of war production, as well as the mounting and complex questions of reconversion; joint action directed toward increasing mass purchasing power; coordinated efforts to promote the security and welfare of the veterans; common action to end discriminatory policies and practices in employment, education or public life due to race, creed or political beliefs; cooperation in behalf of an equitable tax program, including measures based on the principles of incentive taxation for business and capital engaged in expanding useful production; active backing for measures extending and improving the social security system, particularly for adequate unemployment insurance to cope with the special problems of lay-offs during reconversion; energetic support for the Missouri Valley Authority and the St. Lawrence Waterway Projects; etc., etc.

To further implement the prin-

ciples of the Charter, it is also absolutely necessary that each participating group undertake to curb and defeat the opponents of national unity and United Nations cooperation who are active in, or operate from within, each body; each group should pursue a firm policy of checking, disciplining and isolating the irresponsibles and reactionaries in its own ranks, *i.e.*, the Hearsts and McCormicks and the Sewell Averys and the Crawfords on the one hand, as well as the John L. Lewises, the Reuthers and the Dubinskys, on the other.

Further, it is necessary for labor and all democratic groups to understand that the success of post-war labor-industrial cooperation and of national unity itself will depend to a large extent upon the ability of the labor movement vigilantly to safeguard the interests of the working people and nation at all times, to strengthen its own ranks organizationally, to unify its own actions and endeavors, and to achieve greater and more effective political action and influence.

Finally, and of paramount importance, it is necessary to develop the cooperation of labor and management proposed in the Charter, in firm collaboration with the Government, in support of the general line of Roosevelt's foreign and domestic policies. This is indispensable for realizing the purposes of the Char-

ter and assuring the consolidation of national unity today and in the post-war era. Only if labor and the patriotic sections of capital, together with all democratic forces work in concert with the government will it be possible to maintain and strengthen the nation's democratic coalition and the great American-Soviet-British alliance. These are the guarantees of complete victory, an enduring peace and economic prosperity.

* * *

Note: Since this article was written, the nation has suffered the incomparable loss of its greatest statesman and leader—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In this fateful moment the need of waging a most stubborn struggle to realize the manifold possibilities of the Charter of Labor-Management Cooperation becomes even more compelling.

The cardinal task of strengthening the country's unity now and in the crucial days ahead urgently requires the most effective collaboration of labor and the patriotic sections of capital. It requires that these forces resolutely cooperate with the Truman Administration to implement and carry forward Roosevelt's policy of national unity and United Nations collaboration, based on the joint leadership and firmest unity of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain. This is decisive to advance Roosevelt's program: to complete the destruction of fascism, to promote the national welfare and world security.

THE NEW SITUATION IN POLAND—AND THE OLD DELUSIONS*

AS THE COMMUNIQUE on the results of the Crimea Conference states, the agreement on Poland proceeded from "a new situation" which had been "created in Poland as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army." This proves the realism of the Crimea decision, and in this lies the pledge of its practical validity. For the agreement reached in the Crimea is based, not on nebulous phrases, but on the firm ground of actual reality.

By defeating Hitler's hordes, the Red Army saved the Polish people and their state from what seemed inevitable destruction in the clutches of the German beast of prey. Perhaps in the eyes of certain hypocritical devotees of "justice," the defeat of the Nazi invaders by the Soviet Armies was a manifestation of "power politics"; but the fact remains that these "power politics" saved the Poles.

Perhaps, also, other hypocrites are inclined to interpret the liberation of Poland by the Soviet Armies as a manifestation of the "policy of *fait*

accompli"; but millions of Poles—who for the first time after five years of savage Nazi terror have straightened their backs and are breathing freely on their native soil—are showering blessings on the Soviet Armies, thanks to whose efforts this fact was accomplished.

The new situation in Poland, created as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army, lies in the fact that the regeneration of the Polish state on new democratic lines is now successfully proceeding on Polish soil. While still underground, under the Hitler regime, the democratic forces of the Polish people united for the purpose of devising new ways of restoring the Polish state, so as to rid it of fundamental defects in foreign and domestic policy which led to the catastrophe of 1939.

These democratic forces of the Polish people vigorously condemned the reckless and criminal policy of the ruling circles of pre-war Poland, a policy that was based on pro-Hitler orientation in foreign affairs and on fascist methods of government at home. The democratic forces of the Polish people unanimously denounced the fascist constitution of 1935 and the machinations of the reactionary Polish émigré politicians who try to base themselves upon this moribund constitution.

Polish patriots drew the only correct conclusion from the tragic fate that overtook their country in this war. That conclusion was that Po-

* An editorial in *War and the Working Class*, No. 6, 1945.

land can be regenerated only as a democratic country living in friendship and harmony with her great Eastern neighbor; as a country which is a mother and not a stepmother to her masses—workers, peasants and intellectuals; as a country where the peasants possess land and the entire people liberty; as a strong democratic republic capable of successfully withstanding any new attempt on the part of Germany to strike against the East, and possessing all the necessary requisites for this in the sphere of home and foreign policy.

There is no need to retrace the thorny path traversed by democratic elements of the Polish people who united on Polish soil to fight the brutal Nazi occupation. From this movement sprang the Polish Committee of National Liberation, later re-formed into the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic.

The Provisional Government, which rests upon a broad coalition of the democratic parties, is now effectively exercising its functions throughout the whole territory of liberated Poland. The Polish Provisional Government took the only possible path of creating a strong, independent, free and democratic Poland. This path was the resolute democratization of the internal life of the country, a firm policy of alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union as well as with Great Britain, the United States, France and other democratic countries, and a deter-

mined struggle against the pro-Hitler reactionary elements.

The Provisional Government of Poland has proceeded to give effect to a broad program for the democratization of the entire political and social life of the country. Success is being achieved in carrying out the agrarian reform, which will satisfy the Polish peasant's age-old longing for a plot of land of his own, and which will at the same time cut away the economic base of the feudal landlord reaction.

Administration, judiciary, organization of the armed forces, and education are being reconstructed on the basis of the democratic Constitution of 1921. In this the Provisional Government has the active support of the broadest sections of the Polish people. The liberation of Poland from the German invaders has called forth an outburst of immense enthusiasm and creative fervor among the masses of the people—all through the country which was plundered and denuded under Nazi occupation, thousands of mills and factories are already operating, trains are running, millions of children are attending school, universities are being opened, and towns are beginning to receive supplies, although still with great difficulty; while the Polish Army, shoulder to shoulder with the gallant Red Army, is fighting the German-fascist armies and daily increasing the contribution of the Polish people to the common cause of smashing Hitler Germany.

* * *

Such, in broadest outline, is the new situation in Poland. Such are the facts—and facts, as the British say, are stubborn things. It was from these facts that the Crimea agreement on the Polish question proceeded. This agreement, as we know, states that “the Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland should . . . be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad.”

In the Crimea a committee of three—V. M. Molotov, Mr. A. W. Harrison and Sir A. Clark-Kerr—was authorized to consult in Moscow in the first instance with members of the present Provisional Government and other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad, with a view to the reorganization of the present government along the above lines. At the same time the Crimea Conference settled the differences which had existed between the three Allied powers over the question of Poland's frontiers.

These decisions of the Crimea Conference were hailed with deep satisfaction and approval by the broadest sections of the public, both in liberated Poland and in all Allied countries. They also aroused the quite understandable fury of those elements to whom the strengthening of unity among the Allied great powers and the genuine rehabilita-

tion of the Polish state on democratic lines are equally odious.

It is not surprising that the Hitlerites and their numerically few but exceedingly vociferous mouthpieces in the Allied countries raised a howl over the Crimea agreement on Poland. In the general chorus of Hitler's henchmen, loudest of all were the shrill voices of the Polish bankrupts who have remained alien to their own country, of the Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique in London which, to the amusement of the world, continues to call itself the Polish government.

The Polish people have approved the Crimea decisions because they strengthen the unity of the anti-German coalition, which is the guarantee of the rebirth of a strong, independent and democratic Poland. The gentry of the Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski camp, on the other hand, raised an outcry against the Crimea decisions because their only prospect of political existence lies in the disintegration of the anti-Hitler coalition. These two positions are so antithetical, so mutually exclusive, that any attempt to reconcile them is foredoomed to failure.

It is also clear from this how vain are the attempts to adopt a betwixt-and-between position made by a group of exile leaders who, as a result of events with which we are familiar, find themselves outside the Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski camp, but who are averse to joining the camp of Polish democracy which is fight-

ing the Hitlerites and building a new life. This group has never resolutely dissociated itself from the reactionary camp, and whatever its intentions may be, by its efforts to make it appear that a compromise is still possible, it is only helping to strengthen this camp of political bankrupts.

The tone in the camp of the émigré "government" is set by a handful of land magnates who stand to lose their vast estates as a result of the agrarian reform, and by a clique of reactionary politicians whose last hope of preserving their power, privileges and lucrative posts is being frustrated by the abrogation of the constitution of 1935.

The interests and aspirations of the Polish people are alien to these bankrupts. They are opposed to Poland's eastern frontier following the Curzon line, because they do not want to give up their vast estates to the east of this line, or the savage feudal exploitation of the millions of Byelorussian and Ukrainian peasants. They object to the substantial accessions of territory to Poland in the north and west, provided for in the Crimea decisions; to the restitution to the Polish state of the ancient Slavonic lands which the Germans seized, because they still cherish the dream of reversion to the pro-German and anti-Soviet policy which the Polish reactionaries pursued in the period between the two wars.

At the time when the Red Army is copiously shedding its blood in battles upon whose outcome the lib-

erty and life of the Polish people depend, the reactionary, pro-fascist elements among the Polish exiles grouped around the London "government" continue to incite the Poles to hostile actions against the Red Army.

The democratic public of the Allied countries unanimously endorse the Crimea agreement on the Polish question. They rightly regard it not only as the solution of the urgent problem of the future of much-suffering Poland, but also as a striking proof that the Allied great powers, despite the hopes of their enemies, will succeed in settling their differences even over the most complex questions in a spirit of harmony and unanimity.

Characteristic of the opinion of the Crimea decisions on the Polish question held by the reputable press of the democratic countries was an editorial in the London *Times* of February 27, on the eve of the debate in the House of Commons on the Crimea Conference. Selecting the mildest expressions, the newspaper admits that if it were relevant to examine the legal credentials of the Polish exile government, they would "certainly not be beyond challenge." It opportunely draws attention to the fact that the experience not only in Poland, but in other countries of liberated Europe as well, shows that "new governments and new leaders thrown up after liberation are the necessary bulwark of a stable future administration." It goes on to say:

"given these premises, it is difficult to see what decision is possible other than to recognize the administration now working, however imperfectly," in Poland.

In conclusion, the *Times*, while expressing the hope of a felicitous settlement of the Polish question, warns that: "It would be tragic if any heated or unguarded words pronounced in the House of Commons in the forthcoming debate were to discourage this hope or render its realization more difficult."

As we know, there was no lack of "heated and unguarded words" during the debate in the House of Commons, although there is no need to take this too tragically. As was to be expected, these words came chiefly from the mouths of those British members of Parliament who with enviable constancy never let slip an opportunity to oppose cooperation among the Allied powers. Their animadversions on the subject of Poland added nothing to the clarification of the Polish question nor to the characterization of their political complexion.

It is difficult not to agree with Labor Member Shinwell's estimate of the political complexion of those members of Parliament who came out in opposition to the Crimea Conference and voted for the amendment that was moved to the resolution.

"The names of those sponsoring the amendment," he said, "are reminiscent of the Chamberlain era of Anglo-German fellowship, of the

era of the friends of Franco, and of many other questionable episodes. Having regard to their record, they are much more concerned about hostility to Soviet Russia than they are to promote the best interests of the Poles."

Among these people may be found not only conservatives of the Chamberlain persuasion, but also some of Mr. Shinwell's colleagues in the Labour Party.

What, for example, should be said of the efforts of worthy Labour Member Stokes who, while accusing the British Government of wanting to "destroy Poland," is so solicitous of the interests of the Polish people that he objected to Poland having access to the sea, and tried to console the Poles with the statement that: "Lots of countries in Europe have no such outlet and live economically secure." As if this overgrown child in the British Parliament does not understand that if the southern Baltic Coast is not in Polish hands, it will remain in the hands of the Germans. Perhaps Stokes has some other scheme in mind about which he is silent?

Not all opponents of the Crimea decision are as frank as Stokes. Others prefer to hide behind a screen woven of all sorts of "doubts." Thus, Michael Foot, of the labor newspaper *Daily Herald*, is very much worried about "freedom of speech and freedom of action" in Poland. He might recall that freedom of speech and action is what Polish seamen in British ports

recently wanted to avail themselves of. They expressed their support of the Provisional Government, which is successfully functioning in Warsaw. And what did they find? Repressive measures were immediately showered upon the directing body of the Seamen's Union by "authorities" of the Arciszewski clique. The representatives of the Union were forbidden access to the ships, some of the seamen were discharged, the ship-owners vetoed the collection of union dues, etc.

Michael Foot, who champions freedom of speech and freedom of action, had the opportunity—if he had wished it—to apply his efforts in this cause in a wide arena which, incidentally, lies not in far-off Poland but in his own immediate vicinity.

* * *

The strength of the Crimea agreement is that it proceeds from the new situation created in Poland as a result of her liberation from German-fascist slavery. The weakness of those who are trying to upset or pervert the Crimea decisions is that they proceed from old prejudices. Attempts to place old prejudices above the actual state of affairs have never succeeded and never will.

Naturally, anybody who confuses geography with politics and calls the Warsaw Provisional Government of Poland the Lublin Committee, puts himself in a ridiculous position. For everybody now knows that the func-

tioning Provisional Government to which the Crimea communiqué refers is the sole real authority recognized by the Polish people. In the controversy with the incorrigible advocates of a Munich policy in the House of Commons, it was convincingly argued that to ignore this fact may only be productive of harm.

At the Crimea Conference the leaders of the three Allied powers—the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain—agreed that by broadening the basis of the present Provisional Government of Poland, with which the Soviet Union maintains diplomatic relations at the present time, a new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity should be formed, which will be recognized by all the Allied powers. This means that the Provisional Government now functioning in Warsaw, the Polish capital, must serve as the basis of the future Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.

As for the London émigré "government," no mention at all is made of it in the decisions of the Crimea Conference. This impostor "government" is ignored because it is utterly discredited in the eyes of the Polish people and alien to the country, whereas the Provisional Government has acquired enormous prestige among the broad masses of Poland and has won the confidence and support of her people. It was no accident, therefore, that the Crimea decisions were welcomed with full ap-

proval by the Provisional Polish Government, whereas the London emigre "government" of Raczkiewicz and Arciszewski released a flood of all sorts of "protests," as stupid as they were ludicrous.

The democratic forces rallied around the Polish Provisional Government have always stood for broad national unity. They have striven and are still striving for such unity. They are fully determined to broaden the Provisional Government by the additional inclusion of democratic leaders both from Poland and abroad. But the issue is precisely the inclusion of additional democratic

leaders, and not an attempt to galvanize into life the political corpses of bankrupt "leaders" of the utterly decayed camp of Polish reactionaries.

The Crimea decision on Poland is being so warmly hailed by the broad public of the democratic countries because it conforms to the general interest of the freedom-loving nations, and makes for the most successful conclusion of the war against Hitler-Germany and the insurance of an enduring, stable peace in Europe and in the world generally. This is a guarantee that nobody will succeed in preventing the Crimea agreement on Poland from being put into effect.



THE BRETTON WOODS HEARINGS

BY MAX GORDON



THE HEARINGS on the Bretton Woods credit and currency agreements before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives are not yet over at this writing. Two facts are, however, already apparent:

1. The only economic group that is opposing outright the acceptance of the Bretton Woods agreements is a small but powerful section of the banking fraternity in the leadership of the American Bankers Association. The dominant spokesmen of virtually every other section of the population, including other banking groups, have testified or placed themselves on record in support of them.

2. Despite this overwhelming backing from every section of the American people, many of those in Congress who customarily attempt to block the Administration foreign policy course, whether for ideological or partisan political reasons, are bent upon scuttling the Bretton Woods agreements.

Among those who have appeared before the Committee or have placed their endorsement of Bretton Woods upon its record are the C.I.O., the

A. F. of L., the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, the National League of Women Voters, the American Economic Association, the Independent Bankers Association, leading bankers from Chicago and Philadelphia, and the Committee for Economic Development.

The C.E.D. proposed a single change in the structure of the international bank; namely, that the bank be permitted to extend long-term loans for purposes of currency stabilization. Under the agreements as signed by the 44 nations, loans are to be confined to reconstruction and development projects. Treasury Department officials have indicated they are ready to go along with the C.E.D. on its proposal and have expressed the belief that the existing provisions can be interpreted to include stabilization loans, hence making it unnecessary to consult the other 43 nations on a change in the agreements.

The groups that have opposed immediate ratification are the American Bankers Association, the New York State Bankers Association and the

U. S. Chamber of Commerce. The A.B.A. and the New York bankers, who represent virtually the same group of financiers, expressed outright opposition to the establishment of the Currency Fund feature of the plan. They endorsed the International Bank and proposed that all problems of currency stabilization be handled through the Bank. We shall discuss below the meaning of this proposal. It should be noted here, however, that Edward E. Brown, president of the First National Bank of Chicago and a delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference, testified before the Committee that the A.B.A. leaders had not polled the members and did not speak for the bulk of them.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, while not demanding the elimination of the Currency Fund, expressed doubt whether it should be set up at this time. The position taken by the Chamber was that we have to await "assurance of peace" and establishment of "sound fiscal and economic policies" by the various nations before going into the world currency stabilization venture. On the basis of the Bank experience, it suggested, the method of handling currency stabilization can be determined later.

As Administration spokesmen have noted, however, the Currency Fund is needed precisely to aid the nations of the world, particularly those whose economic life has been so seriously disrupted by the war, to establish

sound fiscal and economic policies. If, in the light of experience, changes have to be made in the Fund set-up, there is nothing in the world to prevent the managers of the Fund from making them.

WIDE PUBLIC APPROVAL

As far as the masses of the American people are concerned, therefore, it is obvious that few issues considered by Congress that have been subjected to controversy have had such wide popular backing as the Bretton Woods agreements. That this backing is wider than that which usually supports Administration policy is indicated by this significant paragraph from the Independent Bankers Association testimony:

The Independent Bankers Association and its members have not always concurred with the views of President Roosevelt. At times we have bitterly opposed them. On this matter, however, there can be no dispute. We think he spoke for the entire nation when he said that "we must see that the institutions of peace rest firmly on the solid foundations of international political and economic cooperation."

Yet, in the face of this almost unanimous approval, there is no doubt that the agreements face tough sledding in Congress. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been filling the Congressional record with vitriolic speeches against them. There is ample evidence that at least some of these

speeches are being circulated through the country.

The line-up in Congress on the issue is not a partisan one. In the House Committee, for instance, opposition leaders have been Representative William B. Barry (New York), a Democrat, and Fred L. Crawford (Michigan) and Jesse Sumner (Illinois), Republicans. Several House Republicans are known to favor the agreements, while other Democrats are known to oppose them. There appears little doubt, however, that the center of the opposition lies in the G.O.P. leadership in Congress.

Reports from Washington indicate that Republican House Leader, Joseph W. Martin, plans to line up the G.O.P. caucus against them. What lends currency to these reports is the fact that not a single authoritative leader of the G.O.P. has thus far raised his voice on behalf of the agreements. While Governor Dewey has given lip-service to Dumbarton Oaks, and Senator Vandenberg and even Herbert Hoover have said for the record that they favor a world security organization, none of them have troubled to go so far on behalf of world economic collaboration in general, or Bretton Woods in particular.

On the other hand, Senator Robert A. Taft, leading Republican Spokesman in the Upper House, wasted no time in attacking the currency and credit arrangements soon after they

were completed at Bretton Woods last summer. He said then:

I do not think Congress will approve any such plan which (1) places American money in a fund to be dispensed by an international board in which we have only a minority voice; or (2) requires our government to regulate, restrict and regiment transactions in foreign exchange in this country and impose complete control of all international transfer of funds.

The bankers' battle against Bretton Woods is spearheaded by Winthrop W. Aldrich, head of the Chase National Bank, who served as treasurer of the national Republican campaign committee in the recent elections and is known to be close to Governor Dewey. The chief danger to the ratification of the agreements thus lies with any solidification or near-solidification of Republican lines against them.

ECONOMIC AGREEMENTS AND WORLD PEACE

Taking their cue from President Roosevelt, Administration spokesmen who testified before the committee laid heavy emphasis upon the relationship between economic agreements on a world scale and the establishment of world peace.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau stated the question as follows:

The Bretton Woods agreements are a firm step toward the solution of two problems which concern the American people more than anything except only

the progress of our fighting men overseas. These problems are the organization of world security and the development of the world's resources for the benefit of all its people. Of course, the two objectives are as interdependent as the blades of a pair of scissors. One will not work very well without the other.

Later, he stated more specifically:

One of the chief contributions to peace that the Bretton Woods program offers is that it will free small and even the middle-sized nations from the danger of economic aggression by more powerful neighbors. The lesser nations will no longer be obliged to look to a single powerful country for monetary support or capital for development, and have to make dangerous political and economic concessions in the process. Political independence in the past has often proved to be a sham when economic independence did not go with it.

Mr. Morgenthau undoubtedly had in mind the European experience of the past decade in which Hitler Germany first penetrated the smaller nations of Europe economically, reducing them virtually to satellites. This made political conquest far easier.

The testimony of the Independent Bankers Association is quite eloquent on this point:

We see no hope for retaining the unity of the United Nations down through the years if the end of the war is the signal for each of us again to resume the attack in economic warfare. Just as you cannot steal your neighbor's bread from his hungry children and expect to retain his friendship, you can-

not steal your allies' markets and expect the ally to be taken in by pious statements of friendship and cooperation.

Two other aspects of the testimony of those who backed the agreements before the House Committee should be noted; namely, the fact that these agreements do not represent American "do-gooding" but are profoundly in our own national interest, and the fact that any major change will mean the probable end of any possibility of world agreement on the subject of world currency and credit.

The fact that the agreements are essential to world peace is of itself sufficient indication that they are in our own national interest. In his testimony before the Congressional Committee, however, Fred M. Vinson, now the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, noted how they directly affect our economy.

He testified that more than 50 per cent of our cotton and 30 per cent of our tobacco crops must be exported. A considerable part of the output of our important industries is sold abroad. Twenty-two per cent of our agricultural machinery, 14 per cent of our industrial machinery and automobile production must be exported.

"Economically, nations live in one world," he said. "If this country reduces its purchases abroad, unemployment occurs in other countries; and they in turn buy less from us. And if all countries use restrictive and discriminatory devices to limit international trade, as they did in the 1930's, the whole world feels the

effect in diminished employment and lowered standards of living."

The figures given above by Vinson, who was a delegate to Bretton Woods, refute the position of those who argue that because America's foreign trade was only a very small proportion of her total commerce in the past it is not very important. The figures show that without this foreign trade some of America's most basic industries would find themselves in a crisis, and that crisis would throw our entire economy completely out of gear.

Secretary Morgenthau noted that the agreements were the result of three years of consultation and discussion among the experts of 44 nations. They represent the democratic decisions arrived at by these nations after all had made compromises to make agreement possible. He also expressed the conviction that it was not likely that the opportunity for such discussion and agreement would come again should Congress reject the Bretton Woods decisions. And he warned, by inference, that such rejection would create serious doubts among the other United Nations regarding American sincerity concerning the principles of international collaboration.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE PLAN

Now let us get to the objections offered by the American Bankers Association. As noted above, the A.B.A. wants to scrap the Currency Stabili-

zation Fund and to allow the International Bank to lend money to nations that need it for purposes of stabilizing their currencies.

To understand the meaning of this it will be necessary to describe somewhat briefly the make-up and the aims of the Bank and the Fund.

The Bank has a total subscription of \$9.1 billion, with each of the 44 participating nations contributing a specified quota, roughly corresponding to its economic position. The U.S. quota is \$3,175 million. Actually, only 10 per cent has to be put up, the rest being subject to call. The Bank has a directorate, with each nation having a vote corresponding to its share of the total quota. The chief function of the Bank is to serve as guarantor of loans made by private bankers. It can make direct loans only up to 20 per cent of its subscribed capital, or less than \$2 billion worth.

Two things should be noted. First, the Bank has nothing whatever to do with loans made by nations whose credit and standing enables them to get them through their own efforts. Thus, the Soviet Union or France or England or any other major nation will not generally have its loans guaranteed by the Bank. It can get them, as in the past, on reasonable terms without the help of the world institution. That institution will be concerned entirely with guaranteeing loans made by more backward nations whose credit and standing are such that they cannot get loans without such a guarantee, except at ex-

orbitant rates of interest. Thus, two purposes are served. For the nation taking the loan, interest rates are cut and other onerous terms eliminated. For the people making the loan, their investment is secured. Since most loans will be made by Americans, the Bank is of greatest benefit to investors in this country.

Secondly, the Bank is a very conservative credit institution. It can neither make nor guarantee loans which in their total add up to more than the amount of its capital. Every loan is carefully investigated and its purpose approved. There is little danger of default, and if default should occur, the amount of loss would be relatively slight. Generally, the Bank would be involved in only a small proportion of the total international borrowings, but this small proportion is extremely important in developing the economies of backward nations.

The Currency Fund is somewhat more complex. Here, too, nations contribute a fixed quota roughly comparable to their quotas in the Bank and making a total of \$8.8 billion. Each nation is required to contribute a small amount of its gold holdings to the Fund. The rest of the quota it keeps in its own central bank in the form of its own currency. When a nation needs the currency of another nation in order to make up an unfavorable trade balance and lacks the gold resources to pay it, it can apply to the Fund for a short-term loan. In that case it has to deposit to the credit of the Fund

an additional amount of its own currency equal to the amount it has borrowed.

What was said of the Bank, is true also of the Fund. The bulk of financial transactions will be made outside of it. In the great majority of cases, nations will have either the gold or the foreign currencies to pay their balances. The Fund will operate only in cases where a nation finds itself temporarily embarrassed by a lack of either. This, however, is exceedingly important, because in the past when that happened, a nation had to cut down its imports and increase its exports by whatever means at hand in order to get the necessary funds. That meant cutting wages and prices drastically and all sorts of currency manipulation so as to gain an advantage over competitors in foreign markets. These actions compelled other nations to retaliate, and the whole economy was thrown into disorder.

Like the Bank, the Fund, too, is a very conservative organization. When a nation asks for a loan, the Fund management must ascertain first that the purpose is in line with the aims of the Fund. Secondly, in order to make sure that the loan is a short-term one, interest rates go up with every year the loan is outstanding. There is also a limit to the amount of loans one nation can make. If a nation applies for too many loans or has difficulty in repaying, the Fund managers decide that its economy is out of gear. It is then their function

to assist that nation with advice and whatever other means they have available to readjust its economy so that it does not continue to have regular unfavorable trade balances. Thus, the Fund is much more than simply a clearing house for trade balances.

It has one other function that must be noted. In case the internal economy of a nation requires a readjustment in the value of its currency, the Fund managers can authorize such a change. If the change is no more than 10 per cent, the nation need do no more than simply notify the Fund management that it is making it. For larger changes, it must get the approval of the Fund if it wants to remain a member.

This mechanism does two things. Instead of compelling a nation to adapt its internal economy to the value of its money in terms of gold, it permits the nation to adjust its money to the requirements of its economy. Secondly, it makes it unnecessary for the nation to resort to an uncontrolled juggling of its currency, the effect of which is to compel other nations to take similar steps.

THE MEANING OF THE A.B.A. PLAN

The proposal of the American Bankers Association to eliminate the Currency Fund and to transfer stabilization loans to the Bank would make these profound changes in the world currency program:

1. All provisions for an orderly and regulated devaluation of currencies where required would be eliminated, as would the plan to assist nations to convert their economies when persistent adverse trade balances indicate they are out of gear.

2. The principle behind the Fund, that of assisting nations temporarily embarrassed by a lack of sufficient foreign exchange through short-term loans, would be seriously impaired since loans by the Bank would be made only if the nation receiving them could put up satisfactory collateral and otherwise demonstrate its credit is sound.

3. Stabilization loans would be made by private bankers instead of by an international agency interested primarily in employing them for purposes of stabilizing world currency.

These changes, and the testimony of the A.B.A. on their behalf, indicate a reluctance to accept the concept of American participation in any world plan based upon assistance in developing backward economies and rehabilitating those disrupted by war. They indicate also, hostility to the idea of taking out of the hands of private American bankers the power to intervene in, and determine the direction of, the economies of foreign nations which will need the assistance of America after the war. To put it bluntly, the A.B.A. wants a return to the old methods of financial operation. It opposes Bretton Woods because it upsets the old way of doing things and attempts to gear

world finance to the new world relationships and attitudes developed as a result of the war.

Refusal of the A.B.A. to accept the concept of aid to weaker economies is perhaps most strikingly illustrated in the testimony of W. L. Hemingway, past president of the A.B.A. and now a member of its executive council. Hemingway compared the Fund to a local bank clearing house, which daily clears the checks of the member banks. The clearing house manager readily determines which banks have more checks issued against them than they have issued against others, issues its own checks to those that have credit balances and receives from the banks with debit balances their checks to make up the difference. Before the Federal Reserve system was set up, he said, clearing houses would issue temporary loans to banks with debit balances, but they would have to put up satisfactory collateral to get these loans. His complaint was that the Currency Fund differed from these clearing houses in that it did not demand satisfactory collateral. He maintained that a nation's own currency notes which it does put in the Fund, is not satisfactory collateral.

The implication is clear. If a bank which is a member of a clearing house cannot put up the necessary collateral, it may go bankrupt and go out of business. The clearing house has no obligation to assist that bank to put its house in order. But a nation cannot go out of business. If its

economy is disrupted and no aid is given it, its people are not going to sit by quietly and starve. It is bound to use whatever methods it can to maintain itself, and these methods are necessarily those which attempt to improve its position competitively, at the expense of other nations. If there is to be any orderly economic set-up, therefore, the nations of the world cannot take the position that they have no obligation to assist weaker economies.

The A.B.A. official position on this problem is put most succinctly in a pamphlet it prepared for the Banking and Currency Committee on its attitude toward Bretton Woods:

"In contrast to the Fund," the pamphlet says, "the proposed Bank would operate more on the basis of established banking and investment principles, with the criteria that the loans must be investigated in advance by a competent committee and must give adequate promise of repayment."

It is not true, incidentally, that there is no supervision over short-term loans by the Fund, as the A.B.A. claims. As noted above, Fund procedure regarding loans is quite conservative. But the Fund managers would be guided more by the needs of the nation applying for a loan and less by the strength of its collateral. The A.B.A. specifically complains about this. It says in its pamphlet:

... the whole emphasis of the Fund,

as expressed in the articles of agreement, is to give countries experiencing difficulties the benefit of every doubt. As opposed to the usual lending practice, which places the responsibility for making out a case for credit upon the borrower, the Fund goes on the theory that the borrower is entitled to credit unless the lender can make out a case to the contrary. And under the Bretton Woods plan the lender is an institution in which the United States would have only a minority vote as compared with actual and potential borrowers.

This complaint that the U.S. will not have "veto power" over loans in the Fund is repeated many times in A.B.A. testimony.

In that connection there is an interesting item in the "Washington Notes" column of the *New Republic* for April 2. It reports on an article in the October 15, 1944 issue, of *War and the Working Class*, written by I. Zlobin, a Soviet delegate to Bretton Woods, in which he told of a conversation with Winthrop Aldrich. Aldrich, according to this report, had told him that he preferred to dispose of his own capital himself, and to decide for himself to whom he should lend money and on what terms. Aldrich went on to say that he and Mr. Morgenthau lived in "different worlds" since Morgenthau was in favor of active intervention of the state in financial policy.

If Aldrich's position represents that of the A.B.A., it is obvious that the Association leaders are not only interested in getting rid of the Fund,

but of using this as a lever to gain rejection of the whole plan.

THE A.B.A. PLAN AND INTERNAL ECONOMY

In the A.B.A. pamphlet, the following remarkable passage appears:

The operations of any international financial institution could be conducted in such a way as either to encourage or to hamper the spread of the benefits of private enterprise. On the board of any such body there will be representatives of some countries which do not have the same appreciation and understanding of private enterprise that we do."

It is obvious that this concept violates the basis for collaboration between the Socialist and capitalist sectors of society. Yet it is not only the Soviet Union that the A.B.A. has in mind here. What it is aiming at is the philosophy of government stimulation of full employment which is embodied in the so-called "Beveridge Plan" generally accepted in Britain as the basis for its post-war domestic policy. The A.B.A. is worried about this generally accepted theory of large-scale government intervention in the various national economies to stimulate and maintain full employment.

The Currency Fund provision for orderly devaluation of currencies when required by internal domestic policy would permit Britain and other capitalist nations to maintain full employment and a high purchas-

ing power and price level after the war even if the United States should refuse to accept this philosophy and should deflate its own economy. Without this provision for currency devaluation, it would be difficult for Britain to maintain a high income, high wage and price structure if America should, as the A.B.A. envisages, go through a period of deflation.

Deflation here would mean a reduction in mass purchasing power and in prices. The value of the dollar in terms of goods would thus rise. If Britain should maintain high purchasing power through large-scale government assistance to the economy, the pound would not rise in value. Britain would thus be at a sharp disadvantage in the export market. Since Britain must import much of its products to live, it must maintain its markets. If there is no mechanism for devaluating its currency so as to bring it into line with the true value of the dollar, it will have no choice but to deflate its economy so as to put it on a par with the U.S. in world trade competition. This would mean cutting of wages, prices, government spending. It would mean, of course, large-scale unemployment.

This is the meaning of the A.B.A. insistence that nations must show "sound economic policies" before they can be eligible for stabilization loans. It objects to the Fund provision that the Fund management concur in proposed changes in the

value of a particular national currency, "if it is satisfied that the change is necessary to correct a fundamental disequilibrium. In particular, provided it is so satisfied, it shall not object to a proposed change because of the domestic social or political policies of the member proposing the change." (Art. IV, sec. 5f of the Fund Agreement.)

This also explains the current discussion concerning the gold standard. All Fund currencies will be based on gold, and gold remains the sole medium of international exchange. But in place of the inflexible insistence that all currencies remain at a stated par irrespective of the needs of their internal economy, the Fund plan proposes the above-stated flexible arrangement of orderly devaluation. This is a compromise between the position of the U.S. financial world and the British, who want to discard the gold standard. The A.B.A. is not willing to accept that compromise. It wants the old pre-war arrangement whereby other capitalist nations will be compelled to gear their economic policies to those of the United States or suffer serious consequences.

THE POPULAR TIDE FOR BRETTON WOODS

There are indications, however, that even the A.B.A. may be compelled to accept the new order of things. Thus, for instance, there appeared to be a break in its opposition

to the Currency Fund when W. Randolph Burgess, its president, indicated before the House Committee that his organization was interested in the amendment offered by the Committee for Economic Development, which does not touch the Currency Fund but extends to the Bank the right to make long-term stabilization loans.

What this new order of things should be in the world of finance and business was clearly put by President Roosevelt in his Congressional message on March 26 asking extension of the Hull reciprocal trade treaties:

The coming total defeat of our enemies, and of the philosophy of conflict and aggression which they have represented, gives us a new chance and a better chance than we have ever had to bring about conditions under which the nations of the world substitute coopera-

tion and sound business principles for warfare in economic relations.

It is essential that we move forward aggressively and make the most of our opportunity.

It is essential that we move forward in the United States who want to scuttle American collaboration with other nations to build a secure post-war world will concentrate their efforts on preventing economic cooperation on the theory that economic "isolationism" is less discredited publicly and less understood than political "isolationism."

It is also clear, however, that the great bulk of the American people are on record through their organizations for world collaboration economically and politically. The problem is to unite these organizations for an aggressive struggle by the Administration for that program.

THE NEW STAGE IN THE FAR EAST

BY JAMES S. ALLEN

A NEW STAGE in the war in the Far East is presaged by the Soviet denunciation of the Neutrality Pact with Japan on April 5. The denunciation of a pact, like making one, denotes first of all a change in a situation; beyond that, and most important, it signifies a new course of action made necessary by the changed situation.

Let us first inquire what changes are registered by the Soviet denunciation of the pact.

The Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact of April, 1941, provided for the neutrality of the Soviet Union and Japan, should either be attacked by other powers. This provision is unique. It made it clear that it was not a question of an alliance, for such an arrangement would provide not for neutrality, but for assistance in case of attack. The Soviet aim was to prevent an attack by Japan from the East when Germany attacked in the West. As events showed, the Soviet policy proved successful. Two-front war against the Soviet Union was averted. This need of the Soviet Union proved to coincide with the needs of her major Allies in the global war. For as long

as the Soviet Union bore the main brunt of the war against the most powerful and dangerous member of the Axis, the diversion of the Soviet war effort to Asia would have been extremely detrimental to Britain, the United States and all the United Nations.

The policy of the Pact thus became an integral part of the global strategy of the United Nations to concentrate their major forces upon defeating Germany first. The defense of the pact became a part of United Nations policy; attacks upon the pact under cover of demanding Soviet participation in the war against Japan were in reality attacks upon the policy and military strategy of the Coalition.

With the approaching total collapse of Germany—the situation has changed. The general military emphasis of the war is about to shift. So close is the end in Germany that the Allied powers engaged in the war against Japan are about to make the complete transition to concentration of whatever military power is needed to defeat the last remaining Axis belligerent. Due to her great economic and military might, and the prime role played by the Soviet Union in the war against Germany, the United States was able to spare enough power for the Pacific, while the war in Europe was still at its height, to throw Japan back upon the defensive. The approaching defeat of Germany coincides with a deep war

crisis in Japan, which had been able to register its earlier victories mainly because of the pre-occupation of the major Coalition powers with the German threat. Thus it is that when Hitler is about to topple, American armed forces are fighting at the very doorstep of Japan's inner empire.

The Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact had not the slightest resemblance to an alliance. It was founded, not upon any supposed amity between the Soviet Union and Japan; it was grounded upon a deep-going antagonism which had existed ever since the early days of the Soviet Republic when Japan was the spearhead of the anti-Soviet intervention in the East. It came only after Soviet superiority over Japanese arms had been sharply demonstrated in the undeclared border wars of 1938 and 1939. Neither the Soviet Union nor Japan misread the Pact. After it was signed, the Soviet Union continued to extend sizable aid to China in her war against Japan. The Soviet Far East was built up industrially and militarily to sustain a self-contained Soviet defense should Japan attack despite the Pact. The Kwangtung Army, Japan's best military unit led by her most powerful group of military-fascists, took up positions along the Manchurian-Siberian border, where most of it has been immobilized during the entire Pacific war.

The defeat of Germany is the beginning of the end for Japan. The Soviet denunciation of the Pact takes place as the climax is reached in Ger-

many and as the Pacific Allies approach military concentration against Japan. In that sense, it coincides with a new stage in the war in the Far East.

When we turn to consider the further implications of the Soviet action, we must necessarily draw a formal line of distinction between the military and the political aspects. Actually, and especially in time of war, no such demarcation can be sharply drawn. In his note to the Japanese Government, Molotov accused Japan of helping Germany in her attack upon the Soviet Union, in violation of the terms of the Neutrality Pact. This is more than sufficient ground for abrogation of the Pact. In the words of the Soviet note, it "has lost its meaning, and the prolongation of this Pact has become impossible." Accordingly, the Soviet Union served notice that it would not renew the Pact in April, 1946, when it expires. For all practical purposes, the Pact is no longer a serious political instrument.

JAPAN'S WAR CRISIS

We shall limit ourselves to a discussion of the political implications of the Soviet action. Its first effect is to deepen Japan's war crisis. Symptomatic of this was the change of government in Japan, precipitated by the Soviet denunciation of the Pact. In the replacement of the Koiso by the Suzuki cabinet, only a reshuffling has taken place among the main component elements which

constitute the leadership of Japanese military-fascism. They are all in the new Cabinet: the militarists, the Zaibatsu (finance-capitalists), the entrenched bureaucrats, and the Emperor's circle. The bringing in as Premier of Admiral Suzuki, one of the top elder statesmen closely associated with the Emperor, has significance. It is a cabinet with a dual function: to stiffen and increase the total war effort, and at the same time to explore peace possibilities. Hence, the replacement of Koiso by Suzuki, a Kwangtung warlord by the Emperor's spokesman. The deepening of the crisis is indicated by the fact that it is necessary to draw the Emperor, hitherto more or less in the background, into the very center of the picture. This serves both purposes, to restore morale for the defense of Japan while at the same time shoving a so-called "moderate" leader to the fore in the peace offensive.

The nature of Japanese propaganda since the beginning of the German collapse and since the loss of the Philippines and Iwo Jima bears out this supposition. Increasingly, Japanese propaganda stressed the danger to the homeland and the extremely precarious position of the country—in much more alarming terms than the actual military situation seemed to justify. This also serves a dual purpose: to stiffen the defense effort, while at the same time preparing the population, which has been more or less effectively instilled with belief in the supremacy

of Japanese arms, for the peace offensive. With the denunciation of the Pact by the Soviet Union, it is to be expected that efforts at a peace, in which essentially the same relations within Japan will be preserved, will become more pronounced.

It is at this point that the Soviet denunciation of the Pact transcends the Far Eastern situation and involves the whole complex of world relations. The Molotov note stresses as a new element in the situation since the Pact was signed the Japanese war against the United States and Britain, allies of the Soviet Union. In this was expressed the world-wide nature of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, and by this the Soviet Government emphasized particularly that the Far East was as much a concern of the Soviet Union, a member of that Coalition, as was Europe and the rest of the world. And in choosing the moment when Germany was rapidly nearing defeat to underline this relation, the Soviet Union dealt a heavy blow at the whole Japanese peace offensive even before it had an opportunity to get fully under way.

As with Germany, a Japanese peace offensive can be built only upon the hope of disuniting the Coalition, of exploiting real or imaginary differences between the United States and Britain or between the United States and the Soviet Union, especially the latter. If, so the Japanese military-fascist tacticians might be imagined as speculating, we

might induce the United States to accept us as a bulwark against Bolshevik Russia and a Communistward China then we would be granted the opportunity of preserving our imperialist base at home, without an empire for the time being, it is true, but with the chance of recouping later what we have lost. By reasserting the global scope of the Three-Power Coalition, with the obvious agreement of her Allies, the Soviet Union served notice that Japan could not hope to play the role in the Far East which Germany played in Europe after World War I.

This is the first effect of the more active role which the Soviet Union is now beginning to play in the Far East. That aspect was brought forth by Marshal Stalin in his speech of November 7 last, when he characterized Japan as an aggressor and urged the formation before the war was over of a world security organization directed against all aggressors. The choice of San Francisco on the Pacific as the site and April 25 as the date of the United Nations' meeting to charter the world security organization was a further indication of the course of events.

The Three-Power Coalition is to continue to operate during the Far Eastern phase of the war, after major military action in Europe is completed. Indeed, it cannot be otherwise. To begin with, the Soviet Union is the biggest power actually resident in the Far East, and it must therefore play a leading role in the

Far Eastern phase of the global settlement as well as in the European phase. The cooperation of the Soviet Union is indispensable to a settlement of the many complex questions of Asia. And it is impossible to conceive of a durable worldwide understanding to secure the peace, without the building up of Anglo-Soviet-American cooperation in the Far East. This necessity coincides with the carrying out of a concerted policy toward defeated Germany, which must serve as the keystone of the whole post-war relationship, and the setting up of a world security organization, the core of which is Three-Power cooperation. The war against Japan still must be successfully concluded along lines which will remove the danger of the resurgence of an imperialist and aggressive Japan before the era of world peace can begin. The greater activation of the Soviet Union in the Far East facilitates the transition.

EFFECT IN CHINA

The Soviet action has bearings upon a number of key Far Eastern problems. If it signifies that the Soviet Union is about to play an active political role fully in accordance with her actual position in the Far East, this is bound to affect profoundly the situation in China. The main problem here is to attain a concerted Anglo-American-Soviet policy toward China that will overcome her internal crisis of disunity, which threatens civil war and feeds the

Japanese peace offensive. It must be a policy that will encourage and aid all forces within China seeking to replace the present reactionary dictatorship in Chungking with a coalition government of all democratic and anti-Japanese elements, able to reunite the country on a democratic basis and participate energetically in the final phases of the war against Japan. Without the full participation of China—and this cannot take place under the leadership of the feudal and reactionary clique controlling the Kuomintang—the Coalition aspect of the war against Japan will remain incomplete, and China will not be in a position to assume her role as an independent and sovereign country in the post-war Far East.

In the past months there has taken place a marked deterioration in the American policy toward China, parallel with the improvement of the military situation in the Pacific. Following the collapse of the Kuomintang-Communist negotiations, first General Weydemyer and then Ambassador Hurley let it be known that the United States would not extend military aid to the Communist-led armies and guerrilla forces. In practice, this amounts to substantiation of Chiang Kai-shek's position that the Communist armies would have to be incorporated in the central forces—that is, place themselves completely under the domination of the Kuomintang generals—before political unity could be discussed.

Perhaps the weakening of the

American unity policy for China arises from the conviction that the military cooperation of China is no longer necessary in view of the Pacific victories. If so, this is a dangerous illusion. Large bodies of Japanese troops on the Chinese mainland still have to be defeated, and American landings almost anywhere along the China coast must involve immediately the cooperation of the Chinese guerrillas, for the Central troops have been cut off from these regions by the recent Japanese victories. Furthermore, the political crisis in China cannot be bypassed. Its positive solution is a prerequisite for Soviet-American cooperation in Asia.

EFFECT ON U. S. POLICY

The more direct and active participation of the Soviet Union in Far Eastern affairs means above all much greater pressure upon China for the democratic solution of her crisis. It may be that such pressure will be exerted jointly by the United States and the Soviet Union, if an agreement can be reached quickly on a policy. Pending such an agreement, and quite apart from it, the nature of Soviet political influence and policies is such as to encourage all democratic and anti-feudal elements. The Soviet Union has been entirely frank and direct in criticism of the reactionary Kuomintang leadership controlling the Chungking Government. Her policies are clearly defined; we can

now expect them to be applied even more vigorously.

This confronts the United States with the necessity of implementing its own previously expressed policy of unity for China, along lines which will coincide and not raise the prospect of a clash with Soviet and Chinese democratic policy. The defeat of Japan and the destruction of her imperialist-aggressive potential, which is as much a need of the United States as it is of the Soviet Union and China, require a united, democratic and independent China cooperating with both the Soviet Union and the United States. The solution has to be found in China, through a concerted Soviet-American policy of cooperation with the democratic and unifying forces of the Chinese people.

This becomes all the more imperative because of the recent activation within the United States of individuals and groups favoring an imperialist-expansionist policy in the Pacific. As opposed to the general plan of collective responsibility for the maintenance of security in the Pacific area, people like Senator Brewster of Maine, joined by Admiral Clark and other naval expansionists, have become extremely vociferous in their demand that islands and some territories conquered by American troops be taken over by the United States as permanent American bases. A resolution to this effect is before Congress, although the whole plan is reported opposed

by the State Department, which favors an inter-allied trusteeship in connection with the world security organization. Nevertheless, such agitation, coupled with the unprecedented growth of American naval and air power in the Pacific area, cannot but increase the uneasiness of our major Allies and of the Far Eastern peoples.

The fact cannot be evaded that the emergence of the United States as the leading naval power in the world, in addition to being the greatest industrial power, "naturally" generates such expansionist tendencies in imperialist circles. They can be counter-acted and curbed only to the extent that fuller coalition warfare is developed in the war against Japan, to take precedence over the strategy of single-handed and primarily naval and air offensives which will prove much more costly in terms of American lives. And the development of cooperative policies with all our major Allies also requires that the expansionist tendencies within the country be restrained.

Cooperation with the Soviet Union for the complete eradication of Nazism and fascism in Germany and Europe, coinciding with the final phases of the war in the Pacific, now assumes even greater importance. The tendency of the Anglo-American rivalry to grow sharper as the transition is made to military concentration against Japan is evidenced by the growing acuteness of the controversy over the col-

onial question. The Cairo agreement, in which the Soviet Union did not participate, provided that Japan was to disgorge all her territorial conquests ranging back to the conquest of Korea. But the agreement did not specify what was to be done with the Japanese mandated islands and other colonial territories in Southeast Asia. It is possible that this question may be explored further at the San Francisco Conference. And it is clear that the Soviet Union has a direct interest in the final disposal of this question, especially as it affects her own position of security in the North Pacific and Asia. Soviet cooperation is indispensable to a joint solution, not only of colonial situations which directly affect her own security, but also of such issues

which are sharply projected by the Anglo-American rivalry.

Thus, the Soviet denunciation of the Neutrality Pact with Japan opens a new phase of active Soviet participation in Far Eastern affairs as the war against Japan is about to reach a climax, and as the application of the Crimea policy to a defeated Germany became paramount. It emphasizes the world-wide continuity of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition. It affects most directly the key Far Eastern problems of the thorough-going economic, political and military disarming of Japan and of unity in China. It requires on the part of the United States a further deepening and development of its policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union.



FRANCE AND THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE*

BY M. NIKOLAYEV

AS THE DATE of the San Francisco Conference, which is to prepare the final charter of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security, draws near, there is naturally a growing interest in matters relating to the tasks of the Conference. One of the topics on this order which is being much discussed in the foreign press, and especially in the French press, is the refusal of the French Government to sponsor invitations to the Conference, and the reasons for this refusal.

The question of creating a new international organization to maintain peace, in place of the bankrupt League of Nations, was first officially raised at the conference of the three Foreign Secretaries in Moscow in October, 1943. It was then decided to submit this question for preliminary discussion to a conference of representatives of the four powers—the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain and China. It was

quite obvious that the condition precedent for the creation of such an organization was agreement among the leading powers on the main underlying principles of the organization. A conference of representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain, followed by a conference of representatives of the United States, Great Britain and China, was held at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington in the autumn of 1944. A lengthy exchange of opinions took place, and differences in viewpoint on various questions between the Governments represented were resolved by means of mutual concessions. In the end, proposals were drawn up and published in the press which may be regarded as material for the drafting of a charter of the future organization.

These proposals virtually amount to an agreement among the four Governments represented at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, under which they undertook to sponsor these proposals at the forthcoming Conference of the United Nations; not only to refrain from repudiating or amending them, but to defend them against possible attempts on the part of other participants to amend or weaken them. Indeed, if each of the initiators of the preliminary negotiations reserved for himself freedom of action and the right to move at the general conference amendments or addenda to the decisions jointly arrived at, the labor expended on these negotiations would be

* From *War and the Working Class*, Moscow, No. 6, 1945.

wasted and the success of the conference jeopardized.

At the recent meeting of the leaders of the three Allied Governments in the Crimea, it was decided to summon a conference of the United Nations on April 25 for the final preparation of a charter on the lines proposed during the Dumbarton Oaks conversations. Invitations to other countries were, of course, to be sent out by the participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations, namely, the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain and China. It was, however, deemed expedient to invite the Provisional Government of France to add its signature to the invitations. This was done, of course, on the assumption that the French Government was in agreement with the proposals drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks and that, therefore, by sharing in sponsoring the invitations it would undertake equally with other inviting powers to support and defend the Dumbarton Oaks proposals at the conference. As far as is known, the French Government had never expressed a disagreement with these proposals to anyone. Possibly it had had no suitable opportunity to do so. Be that as it may, the above-mentioned assumption was unfortunately not justified, for it has turned out that the French Government has certain objections to some of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and therefore could not undertake to associate itself completely with the inviting powers. Under the circumstances, the French

Government found it impossible to subscribe to the text of the invitation submitted to it.

That, of course, was its right. On the other hand, much as they would have liked to see France among the inviting powers, the participants at the Crimea Conference could not amend the text of the invitation drawn up in the Crimea, and thus shake the foundation on which the conference was being summoned. This is the formal side of the matter.

But one is naturally interested in the substance of the matter, namely, the objections which the French Government has to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. What exactly these objections are, we do not know. It has been freely stated in the press, however, that the French Government fears there is some inconsistency between the French-Soviet Pact and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. According to the latter, all coercive or punitive measures against any state are to be undertaken by a decision of the Security Council; the French-Soviet Pact, on the other hand, provides for automatic mutual assistance by the two powers under certain circumstances.

Put in this way, this question interests the Soviet Union as much as France. The French-Soviet Treaty was concluded in December, 1944—in other words, after the Dumbarton Oaks conversations, when it was already known that a conference of the United Nations was to be held in the near future. It is scarcely likely

that the Soviet Government would have signed this treaty if it had considered that it ran counter to the Dumbarton Oaks decisions, or that as far as its most important provisions were concerned it would remain operative only until the conference met and finally set up the new organization.

Nor, evidently, did it occur to other participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations that any treaty previously concluded by them might run counter to the decisions there adopted. True, the French-Soviet Treaty did not exist, but analogous treaties between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, and between the Soviet Union and Great Britain did exist. Although the Anglo-Soviet Treaty provides for the possibility of operation of articles relative to mutual assistance being terminated after the creation of an international organization for the maintenance of peace, such termination is made dependent upon the decision of both parties. As the Treaty states, "this Article shall remain in force until the high-contracting parties by mutual agreement shall recognize that it is superseded by the adoption of the proposals contemplated in Article III (one)"—in other words, in view of the creation of an international organization. As we see, the Treaty may remain in full force even after the creation of the international organization if both, or even one, of the parties do not consider the Treaty superfluous. In the Soviet-

Czechoslovak Treaty, at any rate, there is no reference at all to a future international organization.

If any of the participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations had considered the above-mentioned treaties to be inconsistent with the decisions adopted by them, he would have made some proposals to the effect that such inconsistency be not permitted, all the more so since such cases were provided for in the Covenant of the League of Nations, Article 20 of which reads:

The members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

In case any member of the League shall, before becoming a member of the League, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

By not proposing a similar stipulation in the charter of the future organization, all the participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations sanctioned, as it were, the Soviet-Czechoslovak and Anglo-Soviet Treaties, of which they were cognizant. In this sense no objection can be raised to the French-Soviet Treaty which, with respect to its automatic opera-

tion, is identical with the Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty.

Indeed, what inconsistency can possibly be detected between these treaties and the contemplated basis of the future international organization, which provides for the taking of measures "for the prevention and removal of threats to peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace"? Is this not the purpose of all the three above-mentioned treaties?

It should not be forgotten that the future international organization will be created by the United Nations, in other words, by nations which have proclaimed themselves at war with Germany and which are naturally interested, not only in the destruction of the Nazi seat of aggression, but also in the elimination of the possibility of such aggression arising, and in suppressing it if it does. The automatic operation of the French-Soviet Pact is provided for exclusively in the event of a new act of aggression by Germany, or of measures which may be adopted to remove a new threat on the part of Germany. If the Soviet Union, France, Britain and Czechoslovakia assume in advance a special obligation to combat German aggression irrespective of the decisions of the international organization, this can only be regarded as a special form of promotion of the organization's aims.

The operation of the treaties by no means precludes the participation of other members of the new organiza-

tion in the suppression of German aggression should they desire it, or should it be the decision of the organization. But the parties to the bilateral treaties, as it were, voluntarily obligate themselves to strike the first blow at a new act of German aggression.

It might be objected that, inasmuch as the international organization undertakes to suppress all aggression, including German aggression, the bilateral treaties are superfluous. But, alas, the melancholy experience of the League of Nations, which set itself just such aims, is all too fresh in our memories. One may and should hope that the new organization, which will embrace all the big powers and avoid the organizational and other defects of the League of Nations, will perform its duty successfully and unfailingly. But the peoples of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France and Czechoslovakia have suffered far too much from the present war, have borne too many sacrifices, to found their security on hopes. They dare not neglect any supplementary guarantees for their safety against future German aggression.

Experience has shown that individual obligations of individual states, in respect to allied assistance, are observed to a greater degree and more rapidly than obligations assumed under collective agreements. That is why the countries which are most directly threatened by German aggression value the bilateral agree-

ments they have concluded, and it is scarcely likely they will want to renounce them or agree to make their operation contingent upon the decision of an international organization which has still to demonstrate its effectiveness.

For the above-given reasons, the fear of the French Government that the charter of the future international security organization may nullify or hamper the automatic operation of the French-Soviet Treaty, seems to us groundless. The fact that the participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations did not deem it necessary to adopt any formula to remove assumed contradictions between their decisions and the existing treaties makes, as it were, their taking cog-

nizance of these treaties without any reservations a part of the basis of the future work of the conference as outlined in the text of the invitation.

However, if any further formulation is necessary, a resolution might be moved at the San Francisco Conference by which bilateral treaties previously concluded between countries most directly liable to the danger of German aggression, will be taken cognizance of by the conference itself and considered to be consistent with the general trend of policy of the future organization. One cannot believe that the members of the conference, knowing what value these countries attach to the concluded treaties, would object to the adoption of such a resolution.

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

BY WILLIAM SENTNER



"I SPENT A YEAR putting the bridge over the river; I've spent my time ever since keeping the river under the bridge."* That statement by a Missouri River engineer typifies the temperament of the Missouri, wild and uncontrolled since the days of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, in 1805, undertaken with a grant of \$2,500 from the Congress of the United States.

That was well over a hundred years ago. And the people are still trying to "keep the river under the bridge," because no bridge has ever been built capable of spanning the wide variety of problems posed by the river and the region it serves.

For more than a hundred years the national government has been spending money on Missouri River development. And George Fitch is still right in his statement "There is only one river that goes traveling side-wise, that interferes with politics, rearranges geography and dabbles in real estate; a river that plays hide and seek with you today, and tomorrow follows you around like a pet dog with a dynamite cracker tied to his

tail. That river is the Missouri."*

PART OF A NEW ECONOMIC PROGRAM

Early in the first Roosevelt Administration it was recognized that the unplanned exploitation of natural resources was threatening to strip the country of its wealth and the people of the opportunity to achieve a secure and more abundant life. It became clear that the development of co-ordinated regional programs could contribute greatly to a stable economy. In 1933 the Administration took a most important step in that direction—the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority. President Roosevelt proposed the establishment of a Tennessee Valley Authority, "a corporation clothed with the power of government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of private enterprise. It should be charged with the broadest duty of planning for the proper use, conservation and development of natural resources. . . ." He added, "If we are successful here, we can march on, step by step, in a

* *The Missouri River*, by Stanley Vestal.

* *American Magazine*, April, 1907.

like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders." TVA represents, for the first time in the history of the nation, a river valley program which recognizes that the problems in such a region are closely inter-related—that their common solutions lie in a coordinated program—that the entire economy of the region, and consequently the rest of the country, benefits from a project of this nature.

Thus, from its first year, the Roosevelt Administration has been consistent in its attention to the problems of natural resources development, and in its recognition of the soundness of a regional approach to this question. And now, in 1945, there is proposed one of the greatest steps in the direction of the goals indicated. Although war has interrupted the actual immediate operation of such a program, it has given the need greater emphasis in the light of a \$200,000,000,000 economy which must be maintained in peacetime in order to prevent a post-war economic crisis. The war has emphasized for us the need for raising American living standards in the hinterlands; it has shown that "Americas' Siberia"* can be made a fruitful region, secure from the ravages of flood and drought, its cities saved from financial collapse and contribute its share, and more, in the post-war 60,000,000 jobs program.

In keeping with Crimea and Bret-

ton Woods, and especially towards fulfilling the post-war 60,000,000 jobs program, MVA would contribute to the economic stability of our country.

MVA will mean jobs. Jobs in the construction of dams, reservoirs, power plants, irrigation canals; jobs stringing electricity transmission lines; jobs in the rerouting and reconstruction of highways and railroads; jobs in industries, manufacturing electrical, farm and plumbing equipment; jobs in maintenance and operation of MVA facilities; and jobs in the building of homes and communities for the men and women who do this work. There would be increased job opportunities on the soil; jobs in the reclamation of eroded lands; jobs in forestry and wild life conservation. With the irrigation of 4,500,000 acres of crop lands that now are arid, there would be farming opportunities for returning servicemen. For every new farm family working again on productive soil there are required two people in nearby towns to keep them supplied. Conservative sources estimate 200,000 jobs a year for a period of 5 years after construction gets started.

Power generation, combined with research, combined with increased demand, combined with the development of river transportation and the elimination of discriminatory freight rates, combined with the opening up of northwestern markets, add up to total new industries, expansion of existing industries, jobs again—in

* N. Dakota, S. Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, Montana.

short, a revitalized and progressive economy.

There are several particularly weak sections in the American economy—the South, the mid-Northwest, and the arid regions of New Mexico and Arizona. TVA has been a gigantic stride in the South, Boulder Dam in the arid West.

The Achilles' heel of our economy today is the South and the mid-Northwest. As the establishment of an Authority for the Ohio, Alabama, and Arkansas Rivers, extending the work of TVA, will bolster the economy of the South, so will MVA, serving the drainage basin of the Missouri River, contribute to the solution of this area's economic problems.

President Roosevelt proposed in his message to Congress in June, 1937, the establishment of seven river valley regional projects:

1. The Atlantic Seaboard;
2. The Great Lakes and the Ohio Valley;
3. The Lower Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers;
4. The Missouri Basin, including the Red River of the North;
5. The Arkansas Basin, including the Red River and the Rio Grande;
6. The Colorado Basin, including the rivers flowing into the Mississippi south of the California-Oregon line;
7. The Columbia River Basin.

The President reiterated this position in his January, 1945, annual Message to the 79th Congress.

In 1937 TVA was being challenged on constitutional, tax and administra-

tive grounds. Senator Norris' bill, embodying the seven valley authority proposals, was a little premature and was dropped. Since then TVA has more than proved its worth, and the road is open for strong legislative action in this direction. Ultimately there will be coordination of these programs with such development projects as the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Florida Ship Channel, and the New Orleans Channel to the Sea, and other projects to facilitate America's business and commerce.

WHY IS MVA SO IMPORTANT?

What is going on in the Missouri Valley? Here are the basic facts: the river, starting at Three Forks, Montana, and joining the Mississippi seventeen miles north of St. Louis, is some 2,500 miles long. This drainage basin consists of some 530,000 square miles (some 13 times the size of the Tennessee Valley and 17.5% of the total area of the United States). About 7,000,000 people live in the nine states of the valley—Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas and Missouri.

Between 1930 and 1940 the Missouri Valley underwent a serious economic decline. All important indices of economic conditions fell during that period. Personal incomes dropped 12%; salaries and wages, 21%; manufacturing, 30%. The population of this area gained by only 1% compared to a 9% popula-

tion gain in the Tennessee Valley region. In 1942, 1943, and 1944, a total of \$150,000,000 worth of property was lost due to floods. About 1,800,000 acres of fertile crop land are recurrently affected by floods. These losses have occurred despite the expenditure by the Army Engineers during the last 30 years of \$20,000,000 for flood control. In the '30's serious droughts in the upper part of the valley resulted in one and a quarter billion dollars being expended in Farm Credit and Farm Security Administration loans and other relief work alone by the Federal Government. There were large migrations out of the region because of the wastage of soil and its inability to yield the farmer his living. Power development in this area is very low. Seven out of every ten farms in the valley lack electricity and the bare electrical necessities. Despite the expenditures in the last thirty years by the Army Engineers of \$313,000,000 for navigation improvements, the amount of navigation on the Missouri River is negligible.

Federal agencies—some dozen or so, of which the major groups are the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation—are at present responsible for natural resources development in the valley. Most agencies and leading state officials now agree on the need for a unified plan. Missouri River States Committee, which is composed of the governors of the nine Missouri River states, adopted a resolution in August, 1944, which

stated, "that in dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin it be recognized that we are dealing with one river and one problem," and "that there must be an over-all comprehensive plan and suitable legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States which will accomplish that purpose."

In their letter transmitting this resolution to the President, they summarized their declaration as asking for "executive and legislative action toward procuring a single coordinated Missouri River development plan." However, coordination of plans is lacking, and the various agencies have developed a sense of "vested interests," which impedes the adoption of an over-all approach necessary to meet the varied needs of the people of the valley.

The National Resources Committee, and later the National Resources Planning Board, set up by the President, studied the different regions of the country and recommended the kind of program represented by a Missouri Valley Authority. Similar studies based upon a detailed examination of the problems of regional conservation and waterways developments have also been made by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, the Army Engineers, and other departments of the government.

In the report of the Missouri Valley Regional Office of the National Resources Planning Board in 1940 it was pointed out that ". . . there is a

common bond in the Missouri River Basin. Every one of these states has some degree of interest in the maximum use of the water of that river. . . . This group of states has a socio-economic homogeneity—it lies in that trans-Mississippi area bordered on the east by a great river and on the west by the Rocky Mountains.” The Missouri Valley, their report points out, is a region “based on a composite of problems. Thus, the energies of its leaders will not be focused excessively on a single situation. Instead, in the consideration of several major problems, there will more likely be created a genuine regional program properly balanced by all relevant, economic and social considerations.”

Today the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority is on its way through the legislative machinery. However, its passage is by no means certain. As far back as '33, the need was recognized and the first important step taken; in 1940 the National Resources Planning Board told us that we wasted much of our wild life, precious soil and mineral resources in our haste to satisfy immediate needs. They told us that the practices of the past compelled the immediate formulation of regional and national plans. They warned that failure to do so quickly may lead to disaster in the near future.

This general agreement is best shown by the fact that for the first time a joint plan was advanced last year by the Army Engineers and the

Bureau of Reclamation. This joint plan was embodied in two bills—the Flood Control Bill signed by the President last December, and the Rivers and Harbors Bill signed in March of this year. On November 29, 1944, the President, in a message to Congress, was right in emphasizing the fact that this joint plan was “only a beginning” and said that “other matters not within the scope of this joint report bear very materially upon the entire region.” He again urged the establishment of a single authority—an MVA.

A Missouri Valley Authority is designed to achieve that coordination. It will be locally autonomous, unified in its approach to the valley's problems, with the interests of the valley the first consideration. Multi-purpose dams will be built to deal with irrigation, flood control and power generation simultaneously. The institution of effective farming methods will retain water in the soil, and thus permit less of it to run down into the river and contribute to floods. This will protect the soil of the farms, give a greater yield to the farmer, reduce the silt content of the river, thus preventing the reservoirs from becoming filled up with silt. Power will be extended throughout the valley at low rates to farms, homes and industries.

What is the legislative status of MVA? In February, the MVA Bill in the House was introduced by Congressman John J. Cochran of St. Louis, Missouri, and is now being

considered in the Rivers and Harbors Committee. In the Senate, after a conflict over committee jurisdiction, a compromise was arrived at whereby the bill introduced by Senator James E. Murray of Montana will be considered by three committees—the Commerce Committee, the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, and the Agriculture Committee. Each is to consider the bill for no more than two months.

SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

The interest of the nation has been aroused. Support by the people for a Missouri Valley Authority, though somewhat slow in getting started, has finally begun to accelerate. On the national level, MVA has the support of the National Farmers Union, the C.I.O., and the Friends of the Missouri Valley, a new organization set up to support regional resources development legislation of this nature. This organization, chaired by Thurman Hill of Independence, Kansas, has an imposing list of initial sponsors, including such men as Gifford Pinchot, ex-governor of Pennsylvania, Thomas Hart Benton, Stuart Chase, and James Patton.

Regional support has been proceeding on a local and state basis.

Senator Murray, in his address of August 18, 1944, upon introducing his bill to create the Missouri Valley Authority, voiced the sentiment of the people when he stated:

The people of the Missouri Valley have long sensed the possibilities for the development of their natural resources and they have sought to bring it about.

And the people want results:

They want the valley's waters thoroughly and efficiently husbanded.

They want the periodic floods measurably controlled, the damages minimized.

They want the development of navigation for cheap transportation.

They want the rivers harnessed and put to work to provide electric power for homes, farms, and industry.

They want the basic resource of soil fertility protected and built up to sustain a permanent and prosperous agriculture.

They want industry developed—industry indigenous to the area and based on its raw materials, spreading its activity and the opportunities for employment widely throughout the territory and not concentrated in a few congested areas.

They want the arid and semi-arid lands of the upper basin irrigated and made rich and productive."

In Montana there has come into being a state organization, the Montana MVA Association. In Missouri, a St. Louis Committee for MVA was established early this year, including representatives of church, labor, business and civic groups. An educational and organizational campaign was started, with the result that several other local committees in the state of Missouri have been set up in St. Charles County and Kansas City. The Kansas City Committee has the

support of the Kansas City Central Trades and Labor Union (A. F. of L.), the Kansas City Industrial Union Council (C.I.O.), and the Consumers Co-operative Association, a nine-state cooperative with headquarters in Kansas City. A Missouri Conference, taking place in May and attended by interested groups throughout the state, will be the occasion for the formation of a Missouri Committee for MVA. In Missouri, MVA has the energetic support of the Missouri Farmers Association, which has 86,000 members in the state.

Labor has placed itself strongly behind the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority. The C.I.O. set up a national committee for MVA. Leaders of the American Federation of Labor are giving MVA the support of their Building Trades Councils of the nine states. Cooperative action by the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. has been consistent in the fight for an MVA.

Opposition to MVA derives primarily from private utilities, coal and fuel interests, railroads, large land-owners, and conservative elements influenced by false "states rights" arguments, as well as by demagogic ones of "socialism."

Large land-owners, farming on a corporate level, fear MVA because it specifically provides for the encouragement of family-type farming, with irrigation facilities available only to those farms of 160 acres or less. Moreover, MVA, in the disposition of 4,500,000 arid acres, which it will irri-

gate, will give preference to servicemen in the establishment of family-sized farms. The railroads fear shipping competition on the river. Coal interests fear competition of hydroelectric power with steam generated power, although the experience of TVA showed that the market in the Tennessee Valley for coal, for industrial and other purposes, rose after TVA's establishment, to heights never before experienced.

Further, as Senator Murray pointed out in the cited address:

At the present time those interested in water for irrigation and reclamation fear those interests in the lower river who want floods controlled and a navigable channel on the lower Missouri. Each interest group seems to assume that these objectives are in conflict. Each seems to assume that there cannot be enough water in the Missouri Basin to permit progress in the achievement of all three objectives, and each group is supported in that assumption by the technical and engineering judgments of agencies assigned to further one use of the river with little regard for the feasibility of its use for other purposes.

Utilities are still obsessed by the old fear of having to lower their rates through the competition of MVA power. Actually, the widespread increase in the distribution of electric power makes those low rates profitable. This was the experience of TVA and it is a lesson that even the utilities are beginning to learn. The *Electrical World*, outstanding maga-

zine of the private electrical industry, published an editorial a short time ago urging utility operators to cooperate with valley authorities, which are here to stay, and urging that utility executives match the vision of the public administrators.

Organizational opposition to MVA comes from the National Reclamation Bureau, a group supported by railroads, power companies, commercial farm operators, and similar "vested interests."

The Mississippi Valley Association, an organization of large shippers on the Mississippi, have organized a Missouri River Committee, which has already put out one publication presumably "exposing" MVA.

The legislators of Kansas, Montana, and Colorado, in spite of their August, 1944 commitment to a "single coordinated Missouri River development plan," have passed resolutions urging Congress to reject the MVA bill.

A ten-state organization, the Missouri Valley Development Association, has been recently established for the sole purpose of opposing the MVA. It has announced that it will present witnesses against the bill at the hearings before the Senate Committee considering the MVA bill. The Missouri Legislature has issued a call for a nine-state MVA conference, urging a five-man committee from each state—three men from the major party and two from the minor party.

The conference of the governors of the nine states, most of whom are Republicans, has asserted its agreement with the principle of over-all development of the Missouri Valley. Secretary Ickes, who proposed that an MVA be established with final authority lodged in the Department of the Interior, asserted by that very proposal his basic agreement and support for the same principle of regional development.*

Almost all have generally agreed that there is a job to be done in the Missouri Valley. The question over which these groups conflict is the question of *how and by whom* the job should be done. It is important that this question be resolved without jeopardizing the fullest accomplishment of the task, and at the same time retaining the fundamental agreement which exists at present.

Those who sincerely support the full development of the Missouri Valley must realize that they must unite in support of President Roosevelt's request to Congress for the passage of adequate legislation to establish regional authorities for the conservation and development of the nation's natural resources.

* "Our job soon will be to turn this vast block of power from war to peace. It is a Herculean job but I think that we can master it by shifting, gradually, if possible, from war to its nearest economic equivalent in the field of conservation; namely, regional development. But it must be regional development at its boldest. The program must embrace entire areas and their tributaries; it must provide for full and unified development of the region, and an ideal program would call for simultaneous attack on all phases of the job."
Secretary Harold H. Ickes
Department of Interior
February 23, 1945.

BOOK REVIEWS

A NEW BIOGRAPHY OF AN AMERICAN UTOPIAN SOCIALIST

By LOUIS F. BUDENZ

EDWARD BELLAMY. By Arthur E. Morgan. Columbia University Press. New York, 1944, 420 pp., \$5.00.

TODAY'S AMERICA owes much to the eighties of the last century. Social questions came to the fore, movements were cropping up, agitations were in progress, and labor initiated its large-scale trade union organization. Anything which discusses and illustrates that decade, such as Dr. Arthur Morgan's recent book on Edward Bellamy, holds an unusual interest for us all. This is more definitely the case in this instance, because of the large place that Bellamy fills in the education of America to the value of socialism.

It was in the 'eighties that "free enterprise" drove forward with such gusto as to reach the goal which brought America from fifth in industrial production among the world's nations in 1850, to first in the late 'nineties. The frontier was rapidly

passing, the free farmer was becoming a wraith; just as the decade ended, the free public lands were to disappear for good.

Moguls of monopoly, such as the Rockefellers, came upon the scene, giving Henry Demarest Lloyd his opportunity to write down the evils flowing in their wake in his *Wealth against Commonwealth*. The Republican Party leadership was finally and almost fully to turn its back on the Sumner-Stevens tradition, to leave the Negro freedman almost totally to the mercies of his former master, and to content itself with defending the national banking system and the protective tariff.

After the big national display of militancy in the railroad strike of the late 'seventies and the sufferings of the Long Depression, the trade union movement was to get its first permanent toehold in our country through the American Federation of Labor. The building of the monopolies, under Republican cooperation, made more and more necessary the rise of the trade unions. The labor movement met stiff and bloody opposition, achieved progressive political unity in the tremendous campaign in New York for Henry George in 1886, only to run into a

period of temporary frustration. It was at this latter time, as the decade ended, that Edward Bellamy wrote the next best seller to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* up to that moment—the utopian socialist fantasy, *Looking Backward*.

If we appreciate this background in which the famous book was written, we can have a more accurate measure of the work and its author. The decade had opened with an entirely different kind of best-seller, *The Breadwinners*, by John Hay, former secretary to Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State to-be under William McKinley. Marrying into a wealthy Cleveland industrialist's family, Hay had shared all the fears of his class during the big railroad strike of the late 'seventies. Particularly, his letters expressed hatred and dread of the Irish workers, who were prominent in those walkouts.

"FORECAST OF THE NEXT STAGE"

These fears of the organized workers and devotion to the propertied interests furnished the feverish theme of his book, which ran into the many thousands in its sales. By the time that ten years had rolled round, that class for which Hay pleaded had reached its initial triumphs, reflected both in the huge monopolies that were being created and in the comparative weakness of the trade union movement. At that moment Bellamy's fantasy came to give hope to the American masses, to tell them

that a state of society was possible in which the evils from which they suffered would be eliminated. That influence of the book has marched on through several generations and still can make men feel "that thrill of hope" which it furnished so vividly in its time and to which a reviewer so enthusiastically referred.



EDWARD BELLAMY

No one has told us more precisely than the author himself what he had in mind. *Looking Backward*, he wrote in 1888, shortly after the publication of his great work, "although in form a fanciful romance, is intended, in all seriousness, as a forecast, in accordance with the principles of evolution, of the next stage in the industrial and social development of humanity, especially in this country; and no part of it is believed by the author to be better supported by the indications of probability than the implied prediction that the dawn of the new era is already near at hand, and that the full day will swiftly follow."

While the "forecast" could not envisage the realization of "the full

day" as taking place across the globe in what would become the Soviet Union, it is amazing what an insight into the "new era" was Bellamy's. While, too, the book was "a fantasy in form" and not the scientific product of a Karl Marx or Frederick Engels, it stirred the labor and progressive movements forward to a notable extent. It made a decided mark upon its day and its influence is still felt on ours. It gave new hope to many members of the new-born American working class, in the midst of initial defeats on the trade union field. It aroused the interest of many people in Marxism, and encouraged them to become more fully acquainted with its views and goals.

This classic in American utopian socialism, couched in American phraseology, gave impetus to the formation of the People's Party and later on to the tendency among the Populists to move into the Socialist Party under the leadership of Eugene V. Debs. In many instances, it became an introduction to the writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels and did much to break the ground for their wider study in America.

The writing of the book began in the fall of 1886, right at the moment when the national eyes were centered on the great campaign of the united Socialists, Single Taxers and labor men in New York. It went to the publishers a year later and appeared in January, 1888. As Bellamy told the *Ladies' Home Journal* readers in 1894: "Although it made

a stir among the critics, up to the close of 1888 the sales had not exceeded ten thousand, after which it leaped into the hundred thousands." Within two years, 300,000 copies were to be sold!

How powerful the appeal of that book was to thousands of young people then and in subsequent years is attested by the influence it has undoubtedly had on Dr. Morgan. He has not been associated with any movement claiming to advance the cause of socialism in the United States. Rather, he is well known as a liberal, with many of the merits and some of the eccentricities connected with that designation.

One of our most famous hydraulic engineers, Dr. Morgan served with distinction as president of Antioch College and then as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The many years which he devoted to collecting information on Bellamy's life and writings speak eloquently of the impact of *Looking Backward* on his mind years ago.

RICH DATA, BUT MARRED

In brief estimate, Dr. Morgan's book is of value because of the subject it treats, coupled with a warm admiration which the author brings to his study. But we would have to add in the same breath that the work is seriously marred by the sometimes bizarre interpretations which Dr. Morgan places upon the rich data he has collected.

He is more or less obsessed with the idea that Bellamy is an antagonist of Marx and Marxism, that the author of *Looking Backward* represents an "American view of socialism" as opposed to the "irreconcilable class warfare" of Marxism. This leads him into the dangerous political blind alley of recording as "heirs" of Bellamy men of Social Democratic persuasions and to imply that the Communists (who are so much in the line of Bellamy's historical path) are opponents of the Chicopee man's views. It is unfortunate that he has not had a more intimate understanding of Marxism to serve as his measuring rod in dealing with Bellamy. Those who consult this book because of the original data in regard to Bellamy which Morgan brings forward, out of extensive research, will have to be on guard by this remembrance.

This is not the place to review *Looking Backward*. The book can be read for itself. In putting Julian West to sleep on May 30, 1887, and in claiming that he awakened in a Utopian Socialist America in 2000, Bellamy found the vehicle by which to say to Americans that a Socialist economy was possible. He had an appreciation that the machine system was here to stay. He had an understanding, too, that national discipline would be necessary to ensure the carrying through of Socialist economy in its first stages. But his own lack of acquaintance with the living labor movement caused him to slide over

the democratic features which throb through such discipline.

We can view with large admiration, however, the remarkable understanding of the future which he envisaged under his utopian fantasy. Just as Thomas More predicted that chickens would be hatched in incubators in his 16th Century *Utopia*, so Bellamy foresaw, for example, a crude form of the radio in his "musical telephone." In the year 2000 (and now in 1945) some might be tempted to be amused at the technological limitations of his day which caused Bellamy to consider that music could be transmitted only over the telephone wires. But we should be even more amazed that he could visualize the idea of mass reception of news, lectures and musical entertainment, as he did. We can also express our admiration for his deep appreciation that the machine system, which in his day seemed to bring so much misery in its wake, was destined to be brought under control for the benefit of mankind.

WHERE BELLAMY FELL SHORT

The failure of Bellamy to grasp fully the principles of scientific socialism made his work, of course, fall short of being a guide to action. He could show the possibility of a new system of society. But he could not, as Frederick Engels said of all the utopians in his *Socialism; Utopian and Scientific*,* "examine the his-

* International Publishers, New York.

torico-economic succession of events from which these classes [the proletariat and bourgeoisie] and their antagonisms had of necessity sprung, and to discover in the economic conditions thus created the means of ending the conflict." The materialist conception of history, the secret of capitalist production through the extraction of surplus value, and the foundations of scientific socialism, were not within Bellamy's purview. He could show hope for the future, but could not chart the road to that future.

Dr. Morgan is partly aware of this defect in the man from Chicopee. But lacking the gauge by which to measure the great utopian, he makes of him something that he is not. In this, Morgan shares some of Bellamy's own weakness, which caused him to look on himself as the architect of a blueprint for the future society rather than as a great inspirer of its coming.

The over-estimation of his own work and possibilities led Bellamy into the bypath of the so-called Nationalist Party, which he thought would be the vehicle for American Social reform. Attracting such illustrious men as William Dean Howells, but getting little foothold among the masses, this movement contributed somewhat to stimulating the movement for public ownership and kindred reforms. It also helped to stimulate in a number of places, added interest in the Populist and Socialist movements. But it was

sharply cut off from the organized American workers and lacked the scientific merit of Marxism.

Bellamy's rejection of the immediate realities of life, his complete ignoring of the scientific concept of social development, and his evasion of the existence of struggle as a major factor in all progress, decidedly limited his work.

The tendency to over-estimate Bellamy leads the author of his biography into several difficult and almost laughable positions. This is particularly marked in his comparison of Bellamy and Karl Marx. It can be said that in Morgan's eyes, Bellamy has somewhat the better of it! On page 380 the author does admit that Bellamy could have done well to have known something of the theory of surplus value and "in other respects, too, he could have profited by socialist economic thinking." But on page 136 he makes the astounding statement that Bellamy was the superior of Marx in seeing things whole!

We believe it is unnecessary here, by recalling the example of V. I. Lenin and the glass in his blasting criticism of Bukharin, to emphasize that the very essence of Marxian thinking is in seeing things in a rounded-out way. Lenin's illustration of the tumbler and our necessity to recognize the many uses to which it can be put* is the simplest and quickest manner we know of to dispose of

* See V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, pp. 65 ff. International Publishers, New York.

Dr. Morgan's childish discussion of this matter.

BELLAMY'S DIFFICULTY— AND MORGAN'S

Of course, the author of Bellamy's biography cannot fail to bring out occasionally (and more frequently than he suspects) the net of contradictions in which the utopian got himself by reason of his lack of scientific analysis. Any one who has read *Looking Backward* from a Marxist viewpoint will be surprised at its pervasive middle class atmosphere.

The transition to the utopian commonwealth was a sort of political twilight sleep. The workers had little or nothing to do with it, and they have barely more to do with the new utopia. They have no full voice in its political life until they are forty, when they are retiring from labor. Coincidentally, Bellamy's emphasis on equality of income and his allusions to "dividing up" gave a caricatured view of Socialism to many people and helped inadvertently to perpetuate one of the grossest misunderstandings of what Socialism was like. Morgan gives us glimpses of admissions on Bellamy's part that this was his weakness, as when the biographer points out that Bellamy began to see before his death "that the social process with which he was dealing was long and complex."

The difficulty with Morgan is that he lacks the key for unlocking a true criticism of such bad spots even per-

haps more than Bellamy lacked. Rather than give a scientific separation to the original proponents of socialistic ideas by grouping them as utopian and scientific, Morgan gets into a maze of misinformation by speaking of various "nationalist" schools of socialist champions. Thus, he refers to the British, French, German and Russian schools—and would even have Bellamy invent an "American" school. By entering upon such "explanations," Morgan can explain little about Bellamy; he fails to put the Chicopee man in his proper historical setting and proportions, and fills up his own pages with confusions and contradictions.

WHAT MAKES BELLAMY STAND OUT IN OUR AMERICAN LIFE?

The author of *Looking Backward* can be said to have made one special contribution to the American Socialist movement. That was the tremendous stimulus he gave to many men and women to hope in the future and to fight for that future in the American scene. To that he added, too, a stress on expressing the movement's views in the American vernacular. That was no small help. But that does not make him a scientific Socialist, to be compared in any way with Marx, nor does it benefit his memory to put him in any such false position.

Born in Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, on the outskirts of Springfield, Bellamy lived there most of his life,

in the middle class surroundings which were his by inheritance. It is to his great merit that in such surroundings he experienced revolt against the injustices and inequalities which existed in the United States and in his native Massachusetts. At the early age of twenty-one, he had expressed his belief in "the good time coming," and it was that conviction which made him stand out in our American life.

Unfortunately, Morgan does not always possess the merit of his hero in looking in the right direction. His jumbled-up view of the current world is not better exemplified than in his lumping Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin together "versus" Bellamy. How can a man of Morgan's wide reading and experience make such dastardly statements? It is a criminal parroting of the "Communazi" shibboleth which got so many mouthpieces of "public opinion" in America to aid the Axis. It flows, unfortunately, from Morgan's continued vagary that Bellamy stands out "versus" Marx and those who put Marx's views into life. To deal thus with our mighty Soviet ally which has laid down 15,000,000 lives for America's safety as well as its own, is an offense that has no mitigation.

The heirs of Bellamy, to Morgan's notion, are likewise a motley crew. A brew of Adolf Berle, Norman Thomas, John Dewey and the German Social-Democrats who prepared the way for Hitler is, to say the least,

to set up a false and fantastic relationship.

We cannot help but think it interesting that in the moment when American "free enterprise" was strengthening its sinews, Socialism was already propounded to the people in a best-seller. Though ours is decidedly not the day to put Socialism on the agenda of America, we can note that here again we have notice that the concept of Socialism is indigenous to our land. It is quite in line with the gifts which America has made to progressive social thinking since the beginnings of our country. Let us not forget the scene in our national capital 120 years ago when President John Quincy Adams and the assembled Congress heard Robert Owen and his plans to forge a socialist Utopia in the Indiana wilderness. There are the many other ventures along the same roadway, with the Brook Farm experiment standing out in Bellamy's own New England.

The study of Bellamy and his labors brings home to us again how America has so often been in ferment with social thinking of value to the world. From Benjamin Franklin, whose observations received honorable mention in Marx's *Capital*, down to our current period, the thinkers and doers of our nation have added their "bit." There is need for a continuous and deepened study of America's contribution to the world's storehouse of social advance.

VITAL DOCUMENTS

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS, APRIL 16, 1945

It is with heavy heart that I stand before you, my friends and colleagues, in the Congress of the United States.

Only yesterday, we laid to rest the mortal remains of our beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. At a time like this, words are inadequate. The most eloquent tribute would be a reverent silence.

Yet, in this decisive hour, when world events are moving so rapidly, our silence might be misunderstood and might give comfort to our enemies.

In His infinite wisdom, Almighty God has seen fit to take from us a great man who loved and was beloved by all humanity.

No man could possibly fill the tremendous void left by the passing of that noble soul. No words can ease the aching hearts of untold millions of every race, creed and color. The world knows it has lost a heroic champion of justice and freedom.

Tragic fate has thrust upon us grave responsibilities. We must carry on. Our departed leader never looked backward. He looked forward and moved forward. That is what he would want us to do. That is what America will do.

So much blood has already been shed for the ideals which we cherish, and for which Franklin Delano Roosevelt lived and died, that we dare not permit

even a momentary pause in the hard fight for victory.

Today, the entire world is looking to America for enlightened leadership to peace and progress. Such a leadership requires vision, courage and tolerance. It can be provided only by a united nation deeply devoted to the highest ideals.

A UNITED NATION

With great humility I call upon all Americans to help me keep our nation united in defense of those ideals which have been so eloquently proclaimed by Franklin Roosevelt.

I want, in turn, to assure my fellow Americans and all of those who love peace and liberty throughout the world that I will support and defend those ideals with all my strength and with all my heart. That is my duty and I shall not shirk it.

So that there can be no possible misunderstanding, both Germany and Japan can be certain, beyond any shadow of doubt, America will continue the fight for freedom until no vestige of resistance remains!

We are deeply conscious of the fact that much hard fighting is still ahead of us.

Having to pay such a heavy price to make complete victory certain, America

will never become a party of any plan for partial victory!

To settle for merely another temporary respite would surely jeopardize the future security of all the world.

Our demand has been, and it *remains*—unconditional surrender!

We will not traffic with the breakers of the peace on the terms of the peace.

The responsibility for the making of the peace—and it is a very grave responsibility—must rest with the defenders of the peace. We are not unconscious of the dictates of humanity. We do not wish to see unnecessary or unjustified suffering. But the laws of God and of man have been violated and the guilty must not go unpunished. Nothing shall shake our determination to punish the war criminals even though we must pursue them to the ends of the earth.

Lasting peace can never be secured if we permit our dangerous opponents to plot future wars with impunity at any mountain retreat—however distant.

REAL SECURITY

In this shrinking world, it is futile to seek safety behind geographical barriers. Real security will be found only in law and in justice.

Here in America, we have labored long and hard to achieve a social order worthy of our heritage. In our time, tremendous progress has been made toward a really democratic way of life. Let me assure the forward-looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people.

In the difficult days ahead, unquestionably we shall face problems of staggering proportions. However, with the faith of our fathers in our hearts, we do not fear the future.

On the battlefields, we have frequently faced overwhelming odds—and won! At home, Americans will not be less resolute!

We shall never cease our struggle to preserve and maintain our American way of life.

At this very moment, America, along with her brave Allies, is paying again a heavy price for the defense of our freedom. With characteristic energy, we are assisting in the liberation of entire nations. Gradually, the shackles of slavery are being broken by the forces of freedom.

All of us are praying for a speedy victory. Every day peace is delayed costs a terrible toll.

The armies of liberation today are bringing to an end Hitler's ghastly threat to dominate the world. Tokyo rocks under the weight of our bombs.

The grand strategy of a United Nations' war has been determined—due in no small measure to the vision of our departed Commander-in-Chief. We are now carrying out our part of that strategy under the able direction of Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, General Arnold, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz and General MacArthur.

STRATEGY UNCHANGED

I want the entire world to know that this direction must and will remain—*unchanged and unhampered!*

Our debt to the heroic men and valiant women in the service of our country can never be repaid. They have earned our undying gratitude. America will never forget their sacrifices. Because of these sacrifices, the dawn of justice and freedom throughout the

world slowly casts its gleam across the horizon.

Our forefathers came to our rugged shares in search of religious tolerance, political freedom and economic opportunity. For those fundamental rights, they risked their lives. We well know today that such rights can be preserved only by constant vigilance, the eternal price of liberty!

Within an hour after I took the oath of office, I announced that the San Francisco Conference would proceed. We will face the problems of peace with the same courage that we have faced and mastered the problems of war.

In the memory of those who have made the supreme sacrifice—in the memory of our fallen President—we *shall not fail!*

It is not enough to yearn for peace. We must work and, if necessary, fight for it. The task of creating a sound international organization is complicated and difficult. Yet without such organization, the rights of man on earth cannot be protected. Machinery for the just settlement of international differences must be found. Without such machinery, the entire world will have to remain an armed camp. The world will be doomed to deadly conflict, devoid of hope for real peace.

If wars in the future are to be prevented the peace-loving nations must be united in their determination to keep the peace under law.

Nothing is more essential to the future peace of the world than continued cooperation of the nations which had to muster the force necessary to defeat the conspiracy of the Axis powers to dominate the world.

While these great states have a spe-

cial responsibility to enforce the peace, their responsibility is based upon the obligations resting upon all states, large and small, not to use force in international relations except in the defense of law. The responsibility of the great states is to serve and not dominate the peoples of the world.

To build the foundation of enduring peace we must not only work in harmony with our friends abroad, but we must have the united support of our own people.

Even the most experienced pilot cannot bring a ship safely into harbor unless he has the full cooperation of the crew. For the benefit of all, every individual must do his duty.

I appeal to every American, regardless of party, race, creed, or color, to support our efforts to build a strong and lasting United Nations organization.

Fortunately, people have retained hope for a durable peace. Thoughtful people have always had faith that ultimately justice *must* triumph. Past experience surely indicates that, without justice, an enduring peace becomes impossible.

In bitter despair, some people have come to believe that wars are inevitable. With tragic fatalism, they insist that wars have always been of necessity and, of necessity, wars will always be. To such defeatism, men and women of good will must not and can not yield. The outlook for humanity is not so hopeless.

During the darkest hour of this war, entire nations were kept going by something intangible—hope! When warned that abject submission offered the only salvation against overwhelming power, hope showed the way to victory.

Hope has become the secret weapon of the forces of liberation!

Aggressors could not dominate the human mind. As long as hope remains, the spirit of man will never be crushed.

But hope alone was not and is not sufficient to avert war. We must not only have hope, but we must have faith enough to work with other peace-loving nations to maintain the peace. Hope was not enough to beat back the aggressors as long as the peace-loving nations were unwilling to come to each other's defense. The aggressors were beaten back only when the peace-loving nations united to defend themselves.

You, the members of Congress, surely know how I feel. Only with your help can I hope to complete one of the greatest tasks ever assigned to a public servant. With Divine guidance, and your help, we will find the new passage to a far better world, a kindly and friendly world, with just and lasting peace.

With confidence, I am depending upon all of you.

To destroy greedy tyrants with dreams of world domination, we cannot continue in successive generations to sacrifice our finest youth.

In the name of human decency and civilization, a more rational method of deciding national differences must and will be found!

America must assist suffering humanity back along the path of peaceful

progress. This will require time and tolerance. We shall need also an abiding faith in the people, the kind of faith and courage which Franklin Delano Roosevelt always had!

Today, America has become one of the most powerful forces for good on earth. We must keep it so. We have achieved a world leadership which does not depend solely upon our military and naval might.

We have learned to fight with other nations in common defense of our freedom. We must now learn to live with other nations for our mutual good. We must learn to trade more with other nations so that there may be—for our mutual advantage—increased production, increased employment and better standards of living throughout the world.

May we Americans live up to our glorious heritage.

In that way, America may well lead the world to peace and prosperity.

At this moment, I have in my heart a prayer. As I assume my heavy duties, I humbly pray to Almighty God, in the words of Solomon:

"Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge Thy people, that I may discern between good and bad: for who is able to judge this Thy so great a people?"

I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people.

THE NEW CHARTER FOR LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Text of the "New Charter for Labor and Management," signed by Eric Johnston, president of the U. S. Cham-

ber of Commerce; Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and William Green,

president of the American Federation of Labor, at Washington, D. C., March 28, 1945:

WE IN MANAGEMENT and labor firmly believe that the end of this war will bring the unfolding of a new era based upon a vastly expanding economy and unlimited opportunities for every American.

This peace-time goal can only be attained through the united effort of all our people. Today, we are united in national defense. Tomorrow, we must be united equally in the national interest.

Management-labor unity, so effective in lifting war production to unprecedented heights, must be continued in the post-war period. To this end, we dedicate our joint efforts for a practical partnership within the framework of this code of principles:

1. Increased prosperity for all involves the highest degree of production and employment at wages assuring a steadily advancing standard of living. Improved productive efficiency and technological advancement must, therefore, be constantly encouraged.

2. The rights of private property and free choice of action, under a system of private competitive capitalism, must continue to be the foundation of our nation's peaceful and prosperous expanding economy. Free competition and free men are the strength of our free society.

3. The inherent right and responsibility of management to direct the operations of an enterprise shall be recognized and preserved. So that enterprise may develop and expand and earn a reasonable profit, management must be free as well from unnecessary

governmental interference or burdensome restrictions.

4. The fundamental rights of labor to organize and to engage in collective bargaining with management shall be recognized and preserved, free from legislative enactments which would interfere with or discourage these objectives. Through the acceptance of collective-bargaining agreements, differences between management and labor can be disposed of between the parties through peaceful means, thereby discouraging avoidable strife through strikes and lockouts.

5. The independence and dignity of the individual and the enjoyment of his democratic rights are inherent in our free American society. Our purpose is to cooperate in building an economic system for the nation which will protect the individual against the hazards of unemployment, old age and physical impairments, beyond his control.

6. An expanding economy at home will be stimulated by a vastly increased foreign trade. Arrangements must therefore be perfected to afford the devastated or undeveloped nations reasonable assistance to encourage the rebuilding and development of sound economic systems. International trade cannot expand through subsidized competition among the nations for diminishing markets, but can be achieved only through expanding world markets and the elimination of any arbitrary and unreasonable practices.

7. An enduring peace must be secured. This calls for the establishment of an international security organization, with full participation by all the United Nations, capable of preventing aggression and assuring lasting peace.

We in management and labor agree

that our primary duty is to win complete victory over Nazism and Japanese militarism. We also agree that we have a common joint duty, in cooperation with other elements of our national life and with government, to prepare and work for a prosperous and sustained peace. In this spirit we agree to create

a national committee, composed of representatives of business and labor organizations. This committee will seek to promote an understanding and sympathetic acceptance of this code of principles and will propose such national policies as will advance the best interests of our nation.

THE DECLARATION OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT VOIDING ITS FIVE-YEAR NON-AGGRESSION PACT WITH JAPAN (MOSCOW, APRIL 5, 1945)

THE PACT OF neutrality between the Soviet Union and Japan was concluded on April 13, 1941—that is, before the attack by Germany on the U.S.S.R. and before the outbreak of war between Japan on the one hand and Great Britain and the United States of America on the other.

Since that time the situation has radically changed. Germany attacked the U.S.S.R. and Japan—Germany's ally—helped the latter in her war against the U.S.S.R.

In addition, Japan is fighting against the United States of America and Great Britain, which are the allies of the Soviet Union. In such a situation the

pact of neutrality between Japan and the U.S.S.R. has lost its meaning and the continuance of this pact has become impossible.

On the strength of the aforesaid and in accordance with Article 3 of the pact mentioned, which envisages the right of denunciation one year before the expiration of the five-year period of validity of the pact, the Soviet government by the present statement announces to the Japanese government its desire to denounce the pact of April 13, 1941.

The Japanese Ambassador, Mr. Sato, promised to bring the declaration of the Soviet government to the attention of the Japanese government.

THE REBIRTH OF AUSTRIA

During the summer of last year there took place in a mountain district of Austria a secret conference of leading Austrian Communists, at which a Manifesto was unanimously adopted, entitled, the "Rebirth of Austria." In the introduction, the Manifesto, after referring to the declaration of the three Allied World Powers at Moscow, states:

"The Austrian Communists stand wholeheartedly on the basis of the Moscow Declaration." They "consider the time has come to prepare also in Austria the armed rising of the people, the national people's war against the German oppressors and mass murderers."

In the second section entitled "The

Lessons of the Past," the Manifesto discloses the causes of the catastrophe that has befallen Austria. It points to the wrong policies pursued by the political parties in Austria—both bourgeois and social-democratic—in the period between the two wars, which with their orientation on Germany resulted in a weakening of the forces of resistance of Austria to the German imperialistic warmongers and their confederates.

From the section of the Manifesto dealing with the "Rebirth of Austria and the Unity of the People," we give the following excerpts:

THE NATIONAL democratic, political-moral rebirth of Austria is not a narrow class question. It is a *question of the nation*, and therefore can only be solved by the united efforts of the nation.

Special interests of individual sections of the people are subordinate to this common interest of the people. It is a question of saving and securing our national existence. Hence the National Freedom Front, the fighting unity of all freedom-loving Austrians for the liberation of Austria from the German invaders, is an imperative historical necessity. In the cooperation of Austrian fighters for freedom with the liberation armies which are shattering the military power of Hitler-Germany, Austria will rise again and a *provisional Government of the free, independent, democratic people's Republic* be formed. Such a government, on the broadest democratic basis, supported by the organs of the freedom movement which have arisen in the course of struggle, and by democratic organizations, will arise all the sooner, possess all the greater authority and bring about all

the more quickly the sovereignty and self-administration of the Austrian people, the more energetically and convincingly the masses of the Austrian people contribute to their own liberation.

It will be the task of the Provisional Government:

To declare the so-called "Anschluss" and all laws and measures of the Nazi regime null and void, to establish normal relations with the freedom-loving peoples and to strive for cooperation with them.

To liquidate the entire German-fascist apparatus of power and do away with all organizations and institutions created by or serving the invaders.

To establish and secure the democratic liberties of the people, freedom of organizations, the press and meeting.

To secure freedom of profession of belief, of religion and of Church.

To secure the democratic self-administration of the municipalities to the fullest extent.

To release the Austrian patriots and anti-fascists from the prisons and concentration camps.

To place under arrest and mete out punishment to the German war criminals and the Austrian traitors and also to confiscate the whole of their property.

To restore to their rightful owners the estates, houses, dwellings, shops, etc., stolen by the German robbers and their Austrian confederates.

To build up on a broad democratic basis a new State apparatus drawn from the ranks of patriots and anti-fascists of all strata of the people tried and proved in struggle.

Not to permit fascist organizations

to be formed anew, or any German or German orientated organizations, no matter under what cloak they may masquerade.

To take measures necessary for switching war industry over to peace production and, together with representatives of the workers and employers, to organize the provision of employment.

To secure supplies to the population and to create guarantees for the just apportionment of burdens and distribution of food.

To abrogate the compulsory agricultural measures which are inimical to the peasants and, together with representatives of the peasantry, to secure agricultural production and organize the supplying of the towns and industrial districts.

To protect the lawfully acquired private property of the peasants, business men, shopkeepers, contractors, etc., and to encourage their economic private initiative.

To organize a systematic campaign in order to sweep the whole political, moral and ideological Nazi filth from Austria.

To prepare elections for an Austrian Constituent National Assembly.

On the basis of the political traditions of the Austrian people political parties will no doubt arise again or be formed anew. The interests of the people demand that none but really *democratic* parties are permitted. We Communists will propose to the democratic Austrian parties and mass organizations the formation of a people's *bloc*, the setting up of a common program of action.

Strengthening and Securing the Unity of the Austrian People as the foundation of the People's Republic is

possible and necessary for a number of reasons; for the protection of peace, for securing Austria against German imperialism, for the defense of the economic interests of the workers, peasants and members of the middle class, for the development of the greatest possible initiative of the people and solidarity of the people for the work of reconstruction, for overcoming, politically and morally, fascist influence, and for the patriotic democratic education of the people.

For the Defense of the Economic Interests of the People it is necessary to promote and strengthen the new relations which have arisen between workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, the middle class and the progressive sections of the bourgeoisie in the fight for freedom. In the fight for liquidating the German trusts and monopolies, the *class struggle* of the workers merges with the vital economic interests of the Austrian people; the proletarian class struggle acquires a new character and broadens into the true *struggle of the people*. The workers and peasants, all too long played off against each other to their mutual hurt, recognize in the national fight for freedom ever more clearly the common political and economic interests and the common enemy—predatory monopoly. The fighting unity of the workers and peasants must be the firm foundation on which the Austrian People's Republic is erected.

Liberated Austria will be faced with the unavoidable task of expropriating completely the monopolistic German war parasites and their Austrian accomplices, placing these expropriated big undertakings and big banks under the administration of the State, and concluding agreements with the Aus-

trian shareholders regarding their compensation. Only by such nationalization will it be possible to bar the way to any attempts of German monopolies, by some middlemen or others, surreptitiously again to obtain key economic positions.

The rebuilding of Austria will demand extraordinary efforts on the part of all sections of the population. It is necessary, by the cooperation of the democratic parties and mass organizations, to arouse the creative energies of each and all, and to fill our people with confidence in their own strength and in the future of Austria. In this connection it is necessary to smash and completely eradicate *the theory of Austria's "Inability to Live."* This fundamentally false, paralyzing and demoralizing "theory" was the expression of lack of faith in the forces of the Austrian people.

Austria is incomparably richer in natural resources and forces than, say, Switzerland. It has iron ore, lignite, magnesite, lead, copper, mineral oil, timber and enormous water power. It has a highly developed industry, an advanced agriculture. The decisive prerequisites of capacity to live, therefore, exist in Austria no less than in other countries in Europe.

Of course, Austria, no more than any other country of Europe, cannot confine itself to its own natural wealth and products. It needs economic cooperation with other countries. The existence of independent States in no way contradicts the fact that they all take part in and are dependent upon world economy. The economic future of Austria lies not in a close connection with Germany, but in orientation to the geographically and historically determined

economic relations with Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, the Balkans and the Soviet Ukraine. As an independent State in friendly political cooperation and carrying on an exchange of goods with all peace-loving nations, Austria is not only capable of existence but has the chance of experiencing a considerable economic and cultural upsurge.

The Moral and Political Overcoming of Fascist Influence and Patriotic Democratic Popular Education are a common task of all Austrian democrats and patriots. Hand in hand with the ruthless exposure and punishment of the fascist criminals there must be carried on a systematic education of the people. The propagation of fascist views, of racial hatred, of the "right of the strong" shall not only be punishable by law and condemned as a common crime, but it is also necessary to impress upon the minds of the whole people that Fascism is unworthy of human beings, that a fascist is an enemy of human society like a robber and murderer. It is equally necessary to stigmatize as betrayal of the country the spread of German nationalist, "pan-German" ideas.

In the section, the "People and the Working Class, the Manifesto states:

The decisive condition for a lasting unity of the people is the unity of the working class.

The working class is the most important, most advanced and most organized class in modern society. Its essential class interests coincide in general with the interests of the people.

The working class can fulfill its task as backbone of the people, of the nation, only when it is united. The Communist Party is therefore fighting wholeheartedly and with all its might for the

unity of the working class, for united trade unions, for the coming together of the workers in a united party, which draws all the lessons from history and combines all valuable traditions of the Austrian labor movement with understanding for the new.

The workers, no matter what their former or present party allegiance, have

had stirring experiences. Therefore the labor movement cannot go on as in the past but must take into account the new experiences and tread new paths.

Until a united party of the Austrian workers has been formed, a strong Communist Party is indispensable for the fight for freedom of the Austrian people.

THE GOVERNMENT OF DR. NEGRIN

The National Union of Spaniards in France, in which are united nearly 100,000 Spaniards of many different parties, has issued a manifesto calling for unity among all Spaniards abroad. Below are the principal points of the manifesto:

AFTER FIVE and a half years of bloody fighting between the Democratic countries and the fascist aggressors, the year 1945 begins to see the final liquidation and defeat of Nazi Germany.

While in the rest of Europe a new era of liberty, democracy and social justice is beginning, Spain continues under a fascist regime, and a fascist terror continues to suppress our people. In Spain today every social class, and every honorable political party is paying with its blood for the dictatorship of Franco and the Falange.

The people of Spain know that the only method of terminating this savage repression is the united resistance of all Spanish patriots and the daily strengthening of the Movement of National Unity. The guerilleros are striking strong blows at the Falange apparatus. The mass of the people in the towns and the villages have begun to

protest and to offer an ever more active resistance.

To counteract this growing resistance, Franco and the Falange have intensified their barbaric repression and bloody terror while resorting to maneuver after maneuver to bolster their tottering regime. They are regrouping all the rottenest and wildest of Spanish reactionaries, feudal barons and financial magnates and the most retrograde leaders of the Church and Army. These elements are trying to change the face while saving the essence of Spanish Fascism. These eternal enemies of the Spanish people are endeavoring to establish a Spanish monarchy, apparently with democratic trimmings, but which would continue loyal to the regime of Franco and the Falange.

THE PROBLEM OF TODAY FOR THE SPANIARDS

The problem which today faces the Spaniards is to destroy the Franco regime and its whole basis, and to defeat the maneuvers which would install in Spain a monarchist, fascist and reactionary setup.

Faced with these maneuvers, which have the aim of depriving our people

of freedom and national sovereignty, there has arisen on the soil of Spain, with indomitable heroism, the patriotic and democratic movement led by the Supreme Junta. The Junta guides and directs the struggle of all the people, urging all Spaniards to unite and form one single bloc for struggle against Franco and the Falange.

THE WORK CARRIED OUT BY NATIONAL UNITY

The movement of National Unity has attracted towards the democratic camp many of the Catholic masses whose religious sentiments were used in previous times by reactionary elements to cause them to struggle, even openly, against the progressive and democratic forces of our country. These masses today are fighting alongside of the Republican forces against Franco and the Falange. *Under the banner of National Unity, of united struggle of all Spaniards, increased strength and numbers have been brought alongside the Republican democratic forces from elements who, by reason of the brutal Falangist repression, were previously disorganized and disorientated, except in a few cases, and who were consequently inactive in the struggle. They are now being enabled to reorganize themselves and begin again to struggle in the underground, thus regaining their former influence among the Spanish masses.*

All this wide movement of struggle against the Falangist regime of Franco is led by the Supreme Junta of National Unity which, animated by the spirit of popular resistance, is the only organization that has fought and still fights on the soil of Spain against fascist oppression, and on the side of the United

Nations against Hitler in every place where Spanish patriots are to be found.

The movement of National Unity has always considered that the liberation of Spain is bound up indissolubly with the restoration of democracy and liberty, that no solution can be found for Spain which is not based on the will of the people.

With regard to the reactionary and Franco-ite maneuvers which seek to impose a monarchist anti-popular and anti-democratic regime, National Unity, which affirmed in its very first manifesto its wholehearted fidelity to the cause of the Republic, declares today that the only means of guaranteeing independence, liberty and national sovereignty is the re-establishment of the Republic and the legal Constitution, that of 1931.

Thanks to the heroic struggle carried on by the movement of National Unity; thanks to the fact that this movement has organized the Republican and working class forces and now has firm political influence amongst the patriotic and democratic masses, thanks to the drawing in of wide Catholic forces, we can today raise the banner of the Republic under which all Spaniards willing to fight against Franco and Falange have grouped themselves.

THE REPUBLIC AND CONSTITUTION OF 1931

The democratic and progressive Constitution of 1931 can be regained anew by struggle—animated by the spirit of resistance which today characterizes the Spanish people. Its constructive principles can resolve the agrarian problem, fundamental base of the economic life of the people, getting rid of the hegemony of the great landowners and

carrying out the Agrarian Reform in favor of the peasants and of Spanish economy. The monopolists must be controlled in the interests of the nation and the people. The Army must be freed from reactionaries and fascist control, and be placed entirely at the service of Spain and not of the feudal fascist castes. The Republic will scrupulously respect all religious sentiments and the private and public practice of religion.

In the 1931 Constitution, the liberties gained by the Catalan, Basque and Galician peoples are recognized, and are accorded legally approved statutes which guarantee their national rights and aspirations.

On the basis of this Constitution there can be built a democratic and progressive Spain, where the people will find the utmost realization of their political, social and economic aims.

The Republic, the Constitution of 1931 and the aims of the struggle of the Supreme Junta, that is the program which our people need today to save Spain.

IMMEDIATE NEED OF A REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT

The favorable developments in the international situation, the growth of the struggle inside the country against Franco and Falange, the preparation for national insurrection, the Franco maneuvers seeking to continue to oppress our people under a monarchist

label, all these conditions show the necessity of forming a Republican Government of National Union of all Spaniards abroad, which in the eyes of Spain and before the whole world should be the genuine representative of the Spanish people. In this Government must take part those patriots and popular forces who fight against Franco and the Falange.

The formation of a Spanish Republican Government abroad which supports and acknowledges the Supreme Junta of National Union, as the organization leading the fight inside of Spain, would provide ways and means of increasing the help for the suffering Spanish people.

The Government with most authority, with the greatest support of the mass of the Spanish people, which can best legally represent the Republic, because it emanated from the constitution and is the proper expression of popular will, is the Government of Dr. Negrin, which symbolizes the fight of the Spanish people and their indomitable spirit for liberty and their right to govern their country democratically. This government united all Spaniards in their fight against Fascism and for National independence and today can unite all for the reconquest of Spain and the Republic. Under its banner of Unity, strengthened by representatives of all political parties, Trade Unions, of Catalonia, Euzkadi and the Army, are all those forces in the camp of democracy and the Republic.

TO UPHOLD PEACE AND SAFEGUARD SECURITY

The United Nations face the victorious conclusion of the war against Hitler Germany. The war against Germany will be won by the United Nations—of that there can no longer be any doubt today.

To win the war against Germany is to accomplish a great historical task. But winning the war is not in itself synonymous with insuring for the nations lasting peace and guaranteed security in the future. The thing is not only to win the war but also to render new aggressions and new war impossible, if not forever then at least for a long time to come.

After her defeat Germany will of course be disarmed both in the economic and the military-political sense. It would however be naive to think that she will not attempt to restore her might and launch new aggression. It is common knowledge that the German chieftains are already now preparing for a new war. History reveals that a short period of time, some 20 or 30 years, is enough for Germany to recover from defeat and reestablish her might. . . .

What means are there to preclude fresh aggression on Germany's part, and if war should start nevertheless, to nip it in the bud and give it no opportunity to develop into a big war?

There is only one means to this end, in addition to the complete disarmament of the aggressive nations: that is, to establish a special organization made up of representatives of the peace-loving nations to uphold peace and safeguard security; to put the necessary minimum of armed forces required for the averting of aggression at the disposal of the directing body of this organization, and to obligate this organization to employ these armed forces without delay if it becomes necessary to avert or stop aggression and punish the culprits. . . .

Can we expect the actions of this world organization to be sufficiently effective? They will be effective if the great powers which have borne the brunt of the war against Hitler Germany continue to act in a spirit of unanimity and accord. They will not be effective if this essential condition is violated. . . .

—JOSEPH STALIN in *For Victory and Enduring Peace*.

Revealing and Dramatic!

THE SOVIET SPIRIT

By **HARRY F. WARD**

Dr. Ward, Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary, and known for many years as an outspoken champion of progressive causes, has written an absorbing and thought-provoking book—the story of the incentives behind the victories of the peoples of the Soviet Union—in the war, in the battle for production, on the farms, and in the building of a new way of living together.

Among the chapters are : "No Fear of the Future"; "Not for Themselves Alone"; "What's Ours Is Mine"; "Everybody's Business"; "Socialist Competition"; "Workers' Initiative"; "Payment by Results"; "Opportunity for All"; "Social Approval"; "The Socialized Individual"; "The Pull of the Future."

Cloth \$1.50; Paper \$.50

RECENT PAMPHLETS

America's Decisive Battle, by Earl Browder	\$.05
Fascist Spain . . . America's Enemy, by David McKelvy White10
The Communists and the Liberation of Europe, by Maxine Levi15
The Communist Political Association, by David Goldway10
Economic Problems of the War and Peace, by Earl Browder02
The Trotskyite 5th Column in the Labor Movement, by George Morris05
China's Greatest Crisis, by Frederick V. Field10
The Coal Miners: Their Problems in War and Peace, by William Z. Foster05
China's New Democracy, by Mao Tse-tung25

o

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

A Notable Publishing Event—

LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS

VOLUME XXIII (1918-1919)

This new volume, just issued by International Publishers, assembles the speeches, articles, letters and reports of Vladimir Lenin from the spring of 1918 to the spring of 1919—the critical year following the establishment of the Soviet Republic.

This was the crucial period when the Soviet government, taking advantage of the "respite" made possible by the German "robber peace" dictated at Brest-Litovsk, was feverishly engaged in extending and deepening the socialist revolution throughout the country, organizing local administrations, drawing in representative elements of the workers, peasantry, demobilized soldiers, in order to consolidate the Soviet power in the cities and on the land. Lenin's writings during this period deal with the problems of organization of the people for the defense of the young republic against the gathering counter-revolution within and without, and for the struggle against the famine which was enveloping the cities and threatening the attempt to revive the national economy. Illuminating for today are those sections dealing with the historic roots of German imperialism which Lenin analyzed in a number of speeches and documents in the present volume.

540 Pages. Price \$2.75



NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.