

Political Affairs

20¢

JANUARY

1945

THE STUDY OF LENIN'S TEACHINGS

EARL BROWDER



AN ESTIMATE OF THE MILITARY SITUATION

ROBERT THOMPSON



TWO CONVENTIONS OF LABOR

ROY HUDSON



THE CRISIS IS IN BRITAIN—NOT ONLY IN GREECE!

EUGENE DENNIS

New and Forthcoming Publications

- THE ELECTIONS AND THE OUTLOOK FOR NATIONAL
UNITY \$.10**
by Eugene Dennis
- CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY25**
by Mao Tse-Tung. With an Introduction by Earl Browder
- FOR VICTORY AND ENDURING PEACE03**
by Joseph V. Stalin
- POST-WAR JOBS FOR VETERANS, NEGROES, WOMEN . . .05**
by Roy Hudson
- ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE WAR AND PEACE . . .02**
by Earl Browder
- THE TROTSKYITE 5TH COLUMN IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT .05**
by George Morris
- COMMUNISTS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO RIGHTS .05**
by James W. Ford, Benjamin Davis, Jr., William Patterson
and Earl Browder

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. I

Contents

JANUARY 1945

The Study of Lenin's Teachings	<i>Earl Browder</i>	3
The Crisis Is in Britain—Not Only in Greece!	<i>Eugene Dennis</i>	11
An Estimate of the Military Situation	<i>Robert Thompson</i>	20
China Needs Democracy and Unity	<i>Mao Tse-tung</i>	28
Two Conventions of Labor	<i>Roy Hudson</i>	31
The C.P.A.—Our Most Indispensable Weapon	<i>John Williamson</i>	43
The Constitution of the U.S.S.R.—Guarantee of Democracy	<i>P. Tumanov</i>	56
Universal Military Training	<i>Carl Ross</i>	60
The People Won in Texas!	<i>David Carpenter</i>	69
BOOK REVIEWS:		
A Perversion of I.L.G.W.U. History	<i>Rose Wortis</i>	78
For a Deeper Understanding of China	<i>Frederick V. Field</i>	89

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, 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.

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

EUGENE DENNIS, a Vice-President of the Communist Political Association, is the author of the important newly published pamphlet, *The Elections and the Outlook for National Unity*, which is a searching analysis of the forces and issues in the historic Presidential elections of 1944, and of the perspectives for the further strengthening of the national democratic coalition. * * * ROBERT THOMPSON, a Vice-President of the C.P.A. and a veteran of the Spanish people's anti-fascist war of 1936-39, is also a recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross in the present war. * * * MAO TSE-TUNG, Chairman and veteran leader of the Communist Party of China, is the author of *China's New Democracy*, which is reviewed in this issue. * * * ROY HUDSON, a Vice-President of the C.P.A. and Labor Editor of *The Worker* and *Daily Worker*, has just published a pamphlet entitled *Post-War Jobs for Veterans, Negroes, Women*. * * * CARL ROSS is the Executive Secretary of the American Youth for Democracy. * * * DAVID CARPENTER is President of the People's Educational and Press Association of Texas. * * * FREDERICK V. FIELD, member of the Executive Board of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Affairs, is a distinguished analyst of Far Eastern problems.

With the launching of *Political Affairs* as successor to *The Communist*, we should welcome expressions of opinion from our readers regarding the new format, as well as suggestions of a general character for improving the form and content of the magazine.

The articles to appear in the February issue of *Political Affairs* will include discussions of the President's Message to the 79th Congress, international labor unity in the light of the coming World Trade Union Conference, and the Polish question.

THE STUDY OF LENIN'S TEACHINGS

(ON THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNI-
VERSARY OF LENIN'S DEATH)

By EARL BROWDER



THERE HAS BEEN some discussion about the immediate practical value of the study of Lenin's writings, because today our world is enormously changed from that of Lenin's time, changed in many ways precisely because of Lenin's contribution. There has been some expression of a fear that emphasis upon the study of Lenin, among the workers and especially the youth now coming to political activity, could result in a tendency to apply automatically Lenin's formulations of the problems of 1914-1918 to the fundamentally changed problems of the present war.

We must answer this question boldly, that the only cure for incomplete understanding of Lenin lies in an ever more emphatic demand for deeper study of Lenin, as well as his great predecessors, Marx and Engels, and his successor Stalin. In the works of these giants of the human intellect we have the highest achievements of social science; we must only learn how to utilize them, not by repeating their words as sacred formulae, not by dealing with them as abstract truths independent of the situation to which they were applied, but on the contrary, as the supreme

examples of how the human mind can grasp and command *the particular and unique historical present moment* only through a correct understanding of the past. More, much more, emphasis upon the study of the classics of Marxism, and especially of Lenin, is called for now and in the coming years, if we are to be able honorably to meet the demands of history.

CLASS COLLABORATION OR CLASS STRUGGLE?

At the crisis of World War I, Lenin fiercely denounced class collaboration with capital and demanded class war against capital. Today, in the crisis of World War II, we, Americans who are proud to consider ourselves disciples of Lenin, are in practice collaborating with capital, and fiercely denounce those who advocate a class war against capital in the United States today. Superficially considered, this presents a glaring contradiction. But the contradiction is only apparent, not real; and those who really study Lenin can quickly dissolve it.

Let us turn back to Lenin, and see

concretely how he dealt with that question.

On May 19, 1917, Lenin published an article entitled: "Class Collaboration with Capital, or Class War Against Capital?" The first paragraph said:

That is the way history puts the question; and not history in general, but the economic and political history of the Russia of *today*. (*Selected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 137.)

Thus, with his first words, Lenin emphasized that he was not laying down a formula for all countries in general, but for Russia; and that he was not even speaking of Russia in general, but the Russia of May, 1917. He had analyzed the problems of one country at a particular historical moment, and his conclusion was that in that country and that moment the problems could be solved only by the working class making war against capital; but this conclusion was based not upon abstract theory but upon the concrete facts of the situation, which he set forth. Because his judgment of the facts was accurate, his policy was correct, as it was proved later by events.

Lenin remorselessly cited *facts* to prove "the futility and hopelessness" of the Menshevik program of collaboration with capital. He showed that it would not solve the problems of the nation, but only make them more insoluble, only throw the nation deeper into crisis. Those facts could be summed up in the statement that

capital, the bourgeoisie, was united on a fully reactionary program that ignored the interest of the nation, and therefore, inevitably, such collaboration meant subordination to that reactionary program.

Today, in America, the *facts* are fundamentally different from those upon which Lenin based his conclusion. First of all, capital, the bourgeoisie, is conducting a just war as an ally of the Soviet Union, the great socialist state; this alliance is necessary to victory in the war and cannot be discarded; and therefore the whole policy of the war, which includes victory for the first socialist state, takes a progressive path toward the liberation of peoples. Secondly, while capital inevitably continues to generate reactionary tendencies, the bourgeoisie is no longer united upon a program of reaction, but a section of growing size and influence is consciously taking the progressive path; and therefore the problem is no longer how to combat the whole bourgeoisie but how to strengthen the progressive against the reactionary sector; under such circumstances the policy of class war against capital would only strengthen the reactionary forces against the progressive.

If we are judging the facts accurately, therefore, we will find that our policy is in fundamental agreement with, not contradiction to, Lenin. The problem is no longer on the plane of theory, but only one of accurate judgment on the facts of the situation. Since we have stated and

analyzed these facts at length elsewhere, it is not required in this article to go over that ground again.

"UNCOMPROMISING" REVOLUTIONIST?

The superficial observer says that the present policy of American Marxists, professed disciples of Lenin, is based upon a compromise and is therefore a departure from the teachings of Lenin, who is pictured as an "uncompromising revolutionist."

When one really knows Lenin, however, one learns that he specifically repudiated the characteristic of being "uncompromising." Lenin was ready for any "compromise" which would smooth the path of progress, minimize or eliminate violence, find peaceful means for solving the people's problems. He opposed only those "compromises" which in reality solved nothing, but only made the final solutions more difficult.

An outstanding example of Lenin as a master-compromiser, was his proposal on September 14, 1917, to "guarantee the peaceful advance of the whole Russian revolution" by supporting a government of the Socialist Revolutionary and Menshevik parties without participation of the Bolsheviks. His arguments on this proposal were most illuminating for today, for they reveal Lenin as one who was willing to risk "even one chance in a hundred" to find a peaceful road of development. Lenin said:

The usual idea of the man in the

street regarding the Bolsheviks, an idea fostered by the systematic calumniation of the press, is that the Bolsheviks are opposed to all compromises, no matter with whom and under what circumstances. . . . The truth must be told; this idea does not correspond to the facts. . . . The Russian revolution is experiencing so abrupt and original a turn of events that we, as a party, may propose a compromise . . ." (to the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks). "At this moment, and only at this moment, *perhaps only for a few days*, such a government might be set up and consolidated in a perfectly peaceful way. It is extremely probable that it would guarantee the peaceful advance of the whole Russian revolution. . . . For the sake, and only for the sake, of such a peaceful development of the revolution—a possibility *extremely rare in history and extremely valuable*, a possibility that comes only in exceptionally rare cases—the Bolsheviks, partisans of world revolution and of revolutionary methods, may, and should, in my opinion, consent to such a compromise. . . . Perhaps this is *already* impossible? Perhaps. But if there is even one chance in a hundred, the attempt to achieve such a possibility would still be worth while. (*Ibid.*, pp. 208-214.)

Two days later Lenin wrote, in view of new events: "Apparently the proposal for a compromise is already too late." Despite this, however, he was so determined to find a peaceful path through compromise "if there is even one chance in a hundred," that on October 9, 1917, less than one month before the great turning point of world history (November 7) he

again developed, in a programmatic article, the proposal "of securing a peaceful development of the revolution." Lenin said:

If this opportunity is allowed to pass, the entire course of development of the revolution, from the movement of May 3 to the Kornilov affair, points to the inevitability of a bitter civil war between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Inevitable catastrophe will bring this war nearer. To judge by all the signs and considerations comprehensible to the human mind, this war is bound to terminate in the complete victory of the working class and its support by the poor peasantry in carrying out the program set forth above. The war may prove arduous and bloody and cost the lives of tens of thousands of landlords and capitalists, and of army officers who sympathize with them. The proletariat will stop at no sacrifice to save the revolution, which is impossible apart from the program set forth above. On the other hand, the proletariat would support the Soviets in every way if they were to avail themselves of their last chance of securing a peaceful development of the revolution. (*Ibid.*, p. 249.)

Thus we see that even in the dark days of 1917, when there existed none of those great world factors which underlie and make possible the program of American Marxists today, Lenin was searching with a keen eye for any and every small possibility for peaceful paths of social progress, for mitigating or avoiding class war, for "compromise" to that end even

if it had only one chance in a hundred of success. Surely Lenin would see, if he were with us today, much more than one chance in a hundred of success for the present policy of American Marxists.

So it turns out, again, that the more we study Lenin today, the more we are confirmed in the correctness of our present line of policy; in fact, we can say without hesitation, that the only factor which creates doubts about the theoretical soundness of our policy is lack of sufficient knowledge of Lenin and his profound thought—unless one also doubts the theoretical soundness of Lenin himself!

Of course, we also must say, with Lenin, that it takes two sides to make a compromise and, therefore, our own most serious determination to carry through a line which is a compromise between conflicting class interests is not, and cannot be, a guarantee that it will succeed. Only the bourgeoisie can finally determine whether the path of inner development will be a peaceful one; if and when the bourgeoisie commits itself to its own narrow class line again, we will have to repeat with Lenin the question: "Perhaps this is impossible? Perhaps. But if there is even one chance in a hundred, the attempt to achieve such a possibility would still be worth while." And in that case, we will be all the stronger among the masses of the people because of the fact that we determinedly explored every possible way out.

DO COMMUNISTS TRY TO "WRECK CAPITALISM?"

A few confused persons who consider themselves Communists said they were "shocked" when, in January, 1944, I expressed "the perspective of a capitalist post-war reconstruction in the United States" and said that the Communists "are ready to cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively . . . with the least possible burdens upon the people." But such persons would not have been shocked if they had studied Lenin sufficiently, and Lenin's teachers, Marx and Engels. For I was expressing not some new idea but a commonplace of Communist thought; it needed to be emphasized at the present moment, not for informed Communists, but rather for the benefit of misinformed capitalists and the general public, who have been fed the false idea that the Communists are out to "wreck capitalism" as their basic program.

For the benefit of those who have been unconsciously influenced by the slanders against the Communists, or by the Trotskyist caricature of "Communism" in the service of the reactionary bourgeoisie, let us make it very clear that since Marx it has never been in the program of the Communist movement to "wreck capitalism." That is an anarchist or Trotskyist concept which has nothing in common with Marxism.

"It is manifest," wrote Lenin, "that Marx deduces the inevitability of the

transformation of capitalist society into Socialist society wholly and exclusively from the economic law of the movement of contemporary society." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 39.) ". . . Discarding subjectivism and free will in the choice of various 'leading' ideas or in their interpretation, showing how all the ideas and all the various tendencies, without exception, have their roots in the condition of the material forces of production, Marxism pointed the way to a comprehensive, an all-embracing study of the rise, development, and decay of socio-economic structures . . . to a scientific study of history as a unified and true-to-law process despite its being extremely variegated and contradictory." (*Ibid.*, p. 26.)

It is clear that in such a concept of history, there is no room whatever for the "subjectivist and free will" idea of "wrecking capitalism" in order to clear the way for socialism to be established in its place. The whole Marxian analysis of capitalism shows, on the contrary, that it is an enormously powerful system which can be wrecked only by one force—and that is itself, its own inner contradictions which grow stronger even more rapidly than capitalism itself grows. Only capitalism can wreck capitalism, and if it does not wreck itself, then it will live indefinitely. With such an understanding it is impossible for a Marxian movement to play with such childish ideas as to itself undertake such a task. (For a brief but comprehensive survey of the chief features of the Marxian demolition of subjectivist and Utopian so-

cialism, see Lenin's Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, pp. 15-46, also published separately as a pamphlet, *The Teachings of Karl Marx.*)

Indeed, it is a commonplace of Communist thought that, in the economically backward areas of the world the Communists actively support the growth of capitalism as opposed to all pre-capitalist forms of economy—and they are not fooled when these pre-capitalist forms present themselves under the mask of a spurious "socialism." Thus in China, it is in the area under the leadership of the Chinese Communists that capitalist economy is flourishing, while in the area dominated by the Kuomintang the capitalist economy is being choked to death by a centralized economic dictatorship which masquerades under "socialist" phrases, but which is in reality semi-feudal or even fascist. This can be confusing only to those shallow and vulgar thinkers who see in every governmental intervention in economic matters a "step toward socialism" and therefore a step of progress. But economic intervention by the state may be, and often is, reactionary rather than progressive.

Frederick Engels, whom Lenin never tired of praising as the co-founder with Marx of scientific socialism, or communism, over seventy years ago, castigated such "spurious socialism" in an immortal footnote in his famous book, *Anti-Duhring*. Engels said:

For it is only when the means of

production or communication have *actually* outgrown management by share companies, and therefore their transfer to the state has become inevitable *from an economic standpoint*—it is only then that this transfer to the state, even when carried out by the state of today, represents an economic advance. . . . Recently, however, since Bismarck adopted state ownership, a certain spurious socialism has made its appearance—here and there even degenerating into a kind of flunkeyism—which declares that *all* taking over by the state, even the Bismarckian kind, is in itself socialistic. If, however, the taking over of the tobacco trade by the state was socialistic, Napoleon and Metternich would rank among the founders of socialism. (P. 303.)

At another point Engels explains the historical prerequisites for socialism thus:

Since the emergence in history of the capitalist mode of production, the taking over of all means of production by society has often been dreamed of by individuals as well as by whole sects, more or less vaguely and as an ideal of the future. But it could only become possible, it could only become a historical necessity, when the material conditions for its realization come into existence. Like every other social advance, it becomes realizable not through the perception that the existence of classes is in contradiction with justice, equality, etc., not through the mere will to abolish these classes, but through certain new economic conditions. (P. 307.)

But it is not only in economically advanced countries, where capitalism

is strong and therefore the Communists "cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively with the least possible burdens on the people"; it is not only in backward pre-capitalist lands, where Communists welcome and assist the development of capitalism as a general advance forward; under certain conditions, even a working class holding the state power in its hands under Communist leadership, a dictatorship of the proletariat, may find it correct policy consciously to cultivate a capitalist economy for a certain time. This is not only theoretically possible, it actually happened as a matter of history, in the Soviet Union, under the leadership of Lenin, in the famous New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) of 1921-1927. We can very profitably re-study today the writings of Lenin in the period of the inauguration of the N.E.P. (1921), and understand how the "retreat" to capitalism was the absolutely necessary pre-condition for the successful Five Year Plans which some years later completed the foundations of a socialist economy in the Soviet Union. (See Lenin, Vol. IX, *Selected Works*.)

The working class cannot advance to socialism simply by an act of will or heroism. It cannot prepare the ground for socialism by trying to "wreck" capitalism. Every variation of such ideas is only an expression of anarchism or Trotskyism, of "revolutionary" phrase mongering, and has nothing in common with Marxism, or scientific socialism, or com-

munist; such lines of thought, and policies influenced by them, can lead not to success but only to defeat and frustration.

CONCLUSION

We need today not less, but more, study and understanding of Lenin and the other great teachers of Marxism. We do not need the mechanical repetition of slogans from other times and circumstances, taken out of their historical connections, which is sometimes put forth in Lenin's name out of ignorance or malignancy.

Serious and sustained study of Lenin will equip us to solve more successfully and quickly all our problems of today and tomorrow.

Marxism, which finds its highest expression in the writings of Lenin and Stalin, is not an esoteric doctrine confined solely to the moment of transition to socialism; it is the science of history as a whole, and is the guide for each and every step and stage in the development of history. It is the sure guide to progress in all phases of the historical process, including that particular one through which we are now going, which is at once unique and at the same time a link in the whole chain of history.

A deeper and clear understanding of Lenin, of Marxism, will also help at this particular moment in combating the Red scare in America, one of the most important political tasks of the day. It will enable us more effectively to cooperate with such

men as the progressive Republican, Senator Ball, who expressed in his own form a central thought of this article, in a speech on December 10 at Baltimore, reported by the Associated Press as follows:

Senator Ball said last night that Americans must overcome an unwarranted fear of Communism if the United States is to work successfully with Russia for a lasting peace in the post-war period.

Addressing a rally in honor of the Soviet Union and the eleventh anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between that government and the United States, Senator Ball declared that Communism can never replace the capitalistic system in this country unless the capitalistic system fails.

'Therefore, those who believe in the capitalistic system, instead of attacking the Communist doctrine, should concentrate on making their own system

meet the country's needs—jobs and a decent living for every one.'

The Minnesotan added that if the capitalistic system succeeded in that 'we needn't worry about Communism. If it doesn't, all the anti-Communist resolutions in the world won't prevent a change.'

The Senator is correct. Not only that, but he can count upon the help of the Communists in every sincere effort to make the present system meet the country's needs in both domestic and foreign policy. That is not a special, emergency, decision of American Communists, departing from the basic teachings of their movement; it flows logically out of the facts and is confirmed by the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. And it is based today upon the joint declarations in Teheran of Roosevelt, Churchill, and the greatest living Marxist-Leninist, Stalin.

THE CRISIS IS IN BRITAIN— NOT ONLY IN GREECE

By EUGENE DENNIS

THE REACTIONARY ASSAULT of British troops against Greek democracy in December, 1944, has been characterized by the American press as "the crisis in Greece." It is true that there is a critical situation in Greece. But this is a product of a crisis in Britain. It is the outcome of a crisis in the policy of the Churchill Government towards a number of the liberated countries. For, as of this writing (December 15), His Majesty's government has been intervening in the internal political affairs of other United Nations in a way and manner that is harmful to the anti-Hitler camp, to the cause of democracy.

Passing from weapons of criticism to the weapons of arms against the Greek National Liberation Front, the EAM, and its anti-fascist armed forces, the ELAS, the British government has violated the Moscow agreements. Its recent interventions in Greece, as in Belgium and Italy, likewise constitute actions in violation of the spirit of the Declaration of Teheran. While there is no question but that British policy in Greece will have to be and will be changed, it is

nonetheless a fact that Britain's actions have already caused great damage.

When Churchill, in his speech before Parliament on December 8, momentarily departed from his position as Britain's great war leader, as the head of its national victory coalition, and assumed, exclusively, the partisan role of leader of the Tory imperialists, villifying the heroic guerrilla fighters of Greece and, in effect, of the other formerly Nazi-occupied countries as "gangsters and murderers"—he gave aid and comfort to the Hitlerites and the pro-fascists in all countries.

Coming as this did in the course of the heavy fighting on the approaches to Nazi Germany and on the eve of the final and all-out assault of the combined armed forces of the Allies from the West and the East against the fortress of Germany itself, the Nazis were encouraged to prolong the war. For the Hitlerites saw in this reactionary British adventure a chance to create disunity amongst the United Nations, especially amongst its leading tri-power coalition, which is their only chance of obtaining a negotiated peace and the conditions to prepare for future aggressions to establish German world domination.

And their pro-fascist counterparts in the Western democracies, such as the Hearsts and McCormicks in America, also were encouraged. These imperialist Anglophobes seized upon the occasion of repres-

sive British intervention in Greece to applaud Churchill's "realism" and to besmirch and belittle the idea and foundations of international collaboration of the democratic nations. They renewed their frenzied anti-Soviet campaign in order to intimidate America with the spectre of the "Bolshevization of Europe." They renewed their attacks against the alliance of the United Nations and warned of the "dangers" of American entanglements in post-war Europe if the United States ratifies the Dumbarton Oaks decisions to establish collective security to prevent new aggressions and to maintain the coming peace.

However, from within the anti-Hitler camp on both sides of the Atlantic the policy of the British government towards Greece met a different answer. The Churchill Government was challenged and sharply rebuffed. In Britain, powerful forces spoke out, which may yet save the British Tories from themselves. The decisive sections of the British labor movement demanded that its national war-government put an end to the disastrous policy in Greece. Likewise, important groups of British capital represented by the *London Times* and *Manchester Guardian*, adopted a similar position.

In the United States, the State Department, as well as the labor and other popular forces, urged that Britain alter its course. The American people are resolute in their demand that Britain firmly adhere to the

Moscow agreements. They insist that the peoples of Greece and the other liberated countries shall be allowed to determine freely their own destiny and their own form of government on an anti-fascist basis.

Only the pro-fascists, grouped around the McCormick-Hearst-Patterson Axis press, the Fifth Column, and the reactionary Social-Democrats of the *New Leader* stripe expressed themselves to the contrary and came to the aid of Churchill's reactionary policy in Greece. And in so doing they intensified their anti-Soviet incitements, particularly by renewing their attacks against the Soviet Union's policy of liberating and aiding the peoples of Poland and the rest of Europe.

As for the Greek people, they met the reactionary interference of the British government in their internal affairs by rallying in defense of their country and in the interests of all the United Nations. The heroic people of Greece which had fought the Metaxas dictatorship and which, under the leadership of the EAM, played a decisive role in the liberation of their country from the Nazis, once again took up arms in the cause of national freedom and democracy.

By so doing, the Greek people have helped assure that the peoples and nations of Europe will find it easier to avoid or surmount similar trials. The anti-Hitler Greeks have written in blood further guarantees against the establishment of the status quo ante in Europe. They have made an-

other noble and self-sacrificing contribution to help enable all anti-Axis peoples to shape their governments and way of life in accord with their own desires and freedom-loving aspirations.

* * *

What is the explanation for the reactionary course which the British government has pursued in the recent past in Greece as well as in Italy, Belgium and France? How is it that one of the leading members of the anti-Hitler coalition, Britain, which continues to mobilize its forces and resources in concert with the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. for completing the destruction of Hitler-Germany—attacked a prostrate ally, acted contrary to its own national interests and endangered the unity of the United Nations?

There are many reasons for this. For one thing, the forces of Munichism, the pro-fascists, the anti-Sovieters in Britain, who still retain positions of power and high responsibility, while not dominant, are still strong and active. At each turn of events they create difficulties and bring pressure on Churchill and the government. Not infrequently, they temporarily succeed in influencing British policy in specific situations away from its main anti-Hitlerite orientation. This was true, heretofore, in their efforts to postpone the opening of the Second Front in Western Europe, as well as in their past activities to block official British recogni-

tion of the National Liberation Front in Yugoslavia headed by Tito, and in their present endeavors to do the same with regard to the Polish National Liberation Front headed by the Lublin Committee. And today, in the midst of the most sharp Anglo-American economic rivalries, these sinister forces try, unfortunately not without certain success, to fish in troubled waters.

Then, too, sections of the British bourgeoisie, influenced, not only by its pro-fascist cliques, but also by the petrified conservatives of nineteenth century outlook, the Colonel Blimps, have looked upon their reactionary intervention in Greece as a means of "protecting the life-line of the Empire." They have viewed and condoned the armed attacks against the Greek people as a means to prevent the spreading influence of the mighty national liberation movements in Europe to the peoples and nations of the Near East and of India.

But the basic reason and factor underlying current British policy in Greece is the desperate position in which the British empire finds itself and faces the future. Great Britain is emerging from the war weakened economically and with her previous positions of vested political influence curtailed in Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and the Far East. Britain approaches the post-war period, faced with a mounting national debt, with an impaired economy and productive capacities, with gigantic losses in overseas capital holdings

and investments, and with diminished shipping and trade facilities. Britain is haunted by the new military and economic power of the American colossus whose aggressive "isolationist" and reactionary imperialist monopolists, as demonstrated at the recent business and aviation conferences at Rye and Chicago, are seeking to freeze her out of the world market and turn her into a second-rate junior partner.

Moreover, Britain is confronted with a qualitatively new political relation of class forces on the Continent and in the Pacific. The anti-national and anti-Soviet plots and activities of the Munichites which brought Britain to the brink of disaster in 1939-40 have been shattered and rendered null and void by the growing unity and power of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. But in the process of redeeming her national honor, Britain has had to pay a heavy price for the former Chamberlain policy. Her international position as well as her economic power has been weakened. Furthermore, today, in the new world conditions in which German fascist imperialism is being destroyed, the age-old Tory aspirations for creating a British-controlled "Western Regional Bloc" have likewise been scattered to the winds. The recent Franco-Soviet Alliance and Treaty of Mutual Assistance, which is a corner-stone of world security directed against the recurrence of German aggression, indicates that the old Tory game of "balance of power

politics" in Europe can no longer succeed.

Instead of facing this changed world situation in a new way, instead of relying and basing herself on new allies from amongst the peoples and United Nations, the Churchill Government sporadically acts in the Tory tradition as it has done recently in respect to Greece, Belgium, and Italy. The British have pursued a desperate, backward, and stupid policy in these countries, as in Spain, with the aim of coping with and surmounting some of the complex problems connected with Britain's weakened position as a world power in the post-war period. Instead of alleviating her position, the "Greek features" of present British policy aggravates the British position on the Continent and in the Near and Far East, now and for the future. The fact is that whatever may be the intent and the immediate "advantages" of current British policy in respect to Greece or Italy, such a policy is doomed to fail.

First of all, the anti-Hitler coalition is so strong and the common interests of Britain, the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. are so great and compelling, that Britain, for instance, cannot pursue, for any length of time or to any degree of success, a foreign policy which violates or contravenes the mutual interests binding the coalition together. The permanent and lasting interests of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition are based upon the common national needs of the

great powers to destroy Nazism-fascism, to prevent the recurrence of new aggressions, and to establish an enduring peace, world stability, economic prosperity and orderly progress.

These interests are so forceful and dominating that existing differences and unsolved problems confronting the leading coalition of the United Nations are now essentially of a transitory nature and can and will be harmoniously resolved by, for and in the common interests of the anti-Hitler coalition and all liberty-loving peoples. Furthermore, there is no government that could remain in power in Britain for twenty-four hours which did not reckon with this outlook and base itself, in the main, on this premise and with this long-range peaceful and democratic perspective.

Secondly, the strength of the national liberation movements in the countries formerly occupied by Nazi Germany are so powerful that no government could endure for long in those countries if it is not based upon the all-inclusive national unity of the anti-Hitler forces. And contrary to Mr. Churchill's assertions, the Greek people, just as the peoples of Italy, Belgium, France and Poland, are not seeking to establish a "Communist" regime or a government of the "Left."

They are working to complete victoriously the military struggle against Nazism. They are striving to uproot fascism and its Quislings,

lock, stock and barrel. They are basing their reborn democracy upon the national liberation fronts and movements which played such a decisive role in liberating their countries from the yoke of Nazism—upon a united national front which includes all patriots, from all classes, from anti-Hitler conservatives and monarchists to Communists. They are trying to reconstruct their national economy upon the basis of bringing the war to a speedy conclusion, of assuring the maximum output and employment in industry and agriculture within the framework of established conditions of enterprise and production. They are not advocates of anarchy and disorder but champions of anti-fascist national unity and an orderly, democratic solution of all problems. Not they, but those who are intervening to restore the old reactionary and pro-fascist regimes are guilty of bringing about chaos and disorder.

Thirdly, the relation of forces within Britain is such that the anti-Hitlerite forces influencing and leading the nation are being strengthened. The decisive sections of all classes in Britain, labor and bourgeois, favor and support the epic Anglo-Soviet alliance and Treaty of Mutual Assistance as the foundation of British foreign policy and as the basis upon which Britain can build a progressive and prosperous future. Profound anti-fascist changes have occurred in the British trade union movement and even the British La-

bor Party is not what it used to be; it is no longer the private property of the modern Ramsey McDonalds.

On such a cardinal question as Britain's relations with the Soviet Union, or on such key matters as Britain's policy towards Greece, the *London Times*, *Daily Herald*, and *Daily Worker* find themselves in substantial agreement on the main issues. And when Labor Minister Bevin fraudulently tries to justify Britain's recent policy towards Greece on the spurious assertion that Roosevelt "initialed" this and "Russia agreed"—all responsible quarters of British public opinion reply in the negative. Even some fifty per cent of the British M.P.'s absented themselves or refrained from voting on Churchill's recent call for a vote of confidence.

And while everyone knows that the anti-Hitler coalition may have assigned Britain the task of helping maintain military security and anti-Axis order in Greece, together with the Greek National Liberation Front, so as to hasten the complete annihilation of fascism—every intelligent person equally knows that Britain was and is expected to carry out the joint policies of the three great anti-Nazi powers. She is expected to implement the policies embodied in the Moscow agreements. She has no authorization for, nor is she expected to follow a Tory policy and try and impose on Greece an unrepresentative government subservient to the British Lion.

Every intelligent person knows further that, on the other hand, Soviet policy in the countries being liberated by the Red Army is successful, such as in Poland, Finland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and elsewhere. This is so because in accord with the established foreign policy of the Soviet Union, its policy in the liberated countries is predicated on the Declarations of Moscow and Teheran, is designed really to crush fascism and to enable the peoples genuinely to exercise the right of self-determination. This is so because the Soviet Union and its Red Army, whether in Poland or Rumania, support, aid and rely upon the patriotic national liberation forces of all groups and classes which have actively struggled to free their country and people from fascist bondage.

* * *

Obviously, the reactionary features of recent British policy toward Greece, Belgium and Italy, will not be changed automatically. Nor is it certain that variations of the Greek situation may not arise in the future. *The fulfillment of the Moscow Agreements and the Concord of Teheran, which are operative and dominate the main course of world development, must be resolutely struggled for now and tomorrow.* This is one of the main lessons arising out of current British-Greek relations.

Only those who are naive or those who wish to deceive the people have

ever contended that the peaceful, democratic anti-Hitler world of tomorrow would take place without difficulties and differences. The realization of the historic promise of Teheran will not take place without heartaches and sorrow, nor without a sustained struggle of all anti-fascist forces, especially on the part of labor and the common people.

It should be remembered that the anti-Hitler coalition itself was formed only during the course of the greatest struggle in the history of mankind, during the course of this great people's war of national liberation. It was formed only with the direct intervention of the peoples. The historic concord of Teheran, too, was a product, not only of the growing unity and collaboration of the governments of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain, but also of the political struggle of the masses of America and Britain. This was especially true in respect to the effort of the people to help achieve a concerted military strategy of the Allies to defeat Hitlerite Germany and to achieve lasting friendship and cooperation of the three great anti-Nazi powers and their peoples in the post-war era for building a durable and prosperous peace.

The American people, out of their own direct experience, are coming to learn the basic but elementary fact that the perspective of Teheran must be struggled for. This was and is one of the biggest lessons arising from the greatest political struggle in

American history; namely, the 1944 presidential elections. For in these fateful elections the national anti-Hitler coalition gathered around the Commander-in-Chief waged a most determined and difficult electoral struggle to defeat the enemies of Teheran, the enemies of our nation.

* * *

The program of Teheran for destroying Hitlerism and establishing a durable peace can and will be realized. And it is not too far-fetched to expect that in this connection the recent policy of the British government towards Greece can and will be rectified. It is not too much to expect that Britain's policy towards Greece can and will be brought into harmony with the national war effort of Great Britain, with the democratic aspirations of Greece, and with the vital interests of all the United Nations.

Nor is it too much to expect that Winston Churchill who is one of the great architects of the Atlantic Charter, of the United Nations, of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, and of the Declaration of Teheran, will make further notable contributions towards helping resolve the existing problems confronting the anti-Hitler powers, towards helping achieve a still greater unity and cooperation within the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. It is not too much to expect all this, because Britain's future is indissolubly bound up with the unity and future of the Big Three,

with the continued and further democratic and peaceful collaboration of America, the U.S.S.R. and England.

To help assure that these expectations are realized most rapidly, it is necessary, among other things, that the American people, especially labor, combine their protests against recent British policy in Greece and Italy with the most positive reaffirmation of the concords and agreements entered into at Moscow and Teheran by the U.S.A., Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

It is necessary that the American people scotch the vile maneuvers of the pro-fascists in the United States who rally to the support of Britain's reactionary policy towards Greece, and try to use this as a springboard to question the aims and purposes of the anti-Hitler coalition. It is necessary that all patriotic Americans expose and combat the propaganda and activities of the Hearsts and McCormicks who are hypocritically trying to counterpose the rights of the small nations against the liberating role of the great freedom-loving powers. And in this connection it is especially urgent that the American people help expose the evil, pro-fascist machinations of the Polish government-in-exile and its friends in the West, and resolutely support the Polish National Liberation Front headed by the Lublin Committee which is the de facto governmental power of the Polish people.

It is necessary that the American people unmask the anti-United Na-

tions elements who attack and try to undermine American-Soviet friendship and collaboration, which is the basis of effective world cooperation to win victory and establish a durable peace. It is imperative that the people rout the America First crowd which is seeking to nullify the Dumbarton Oaks decisions and to frustrate the establishment of an international security organization capable of smashing new aggressions and assuring world peace. It is essential that American labor help guarantee the establishment of world labor unity as a vital pre-requisite to strengthen further the anti-Hitlerite alliance.

Towards preventing the recurrence of those reactionary aspects of British foreign policy such as have been manifested in the Greek situation, and towards guaranteeing the fulfillment of the Teheran concord generally, one of the big political battles which the American people must now fight through to a successful conclusion is to guarantee that American capital shall adopt a United Nations program of international economic collaboration in accordance with the basic policy of our government as expressed in the concord of Teheran. For, as Earl Browder has signalized, this will help minimize, adjust or resolve some of the most pressing points of economic conflict between the United States and Great Britain.

This is not merely nor so much a matter of making economic concessions to the British ruling class. This

is one of the cardinal necessities for strengthening the unity of the United Nations. This is essentially a question of providing a firmer economic basis for assuring the most effective cooperation between America and Britain, in concert with the Soviet Union and the other United Nations, to hasten victory in the war, to build a stable peace, speed economic reconstruction and promote orderly democratic progress throughout the world.

In the interests of this great goal of humankind, an end must be put to Britain's armed assault upon the Greek sister-people of the United Nations.

We in the United States, all who cherish the great anti-fascist aims for which our armed manhood is fight-

ing, now have the special task of insuring that the declaration of our State Department on December 5, in behalf of the unhampered freedom and democratic life of the liberated countries shall be resolutely supported and implemented.

Let the Greek national liberation forces, as well as those of Belgium, Italy and the other liberated nations, reconstruct their ravished lands and their way of life, freely, upon democratic foundations! Let the unity and fighting strength of all the United Nations be welded further to speed and complete the destruction of the common enemy—fascism!

Dec. 15, 1944.

AN ESTIMATE OF THE MILITARY SITUATION

By ROBERT THOMPSON

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR has been a year of gigantic operations and great triumphs for the armed forces of the United States, and for the armed forces of our Allies. Our troops, navy and air forces, have performed feats which have no parallel in the long and rich military history of our country. It is with great pride that we can record the fact that they have contributed in a major way to making the fourth year of this war a year of decisive victories against Germany, and of important gains against Japan.

The year 1945 opens with the European theater of operations occupying, as it has in the past, the key and determining position in relation to the war as a whole. Events of the past year have, however, fundamentally changed the situation within this theater.

THE BATTLE FOR GERMANY

Thanks to the carrying out of the Teheran decisions the main forces of the three great Allied powers have been brought into concerted

action against Germany. The strategic encirclement of Germany is now an accomplished fact. Both in the East and in the West the Allied armies possess the necessary positions from which to launch the final blows that will destroy the Nazi Wehrmacht. The final phase of the military operations of the anti-Hitler coalition against Germany—the battle for Germany itself—is now in the process of unfolding.

At this writing (December 11), large-scale operations by the American 1st, 3rd, and 7th Armies are taking place in the West in the direction of the Ruhr and Saar regions. In the East, Soviet forces are conducting operations of a comparable magnitude in the direction of Budapest and the Austrian border. These operations in the West and in the East have already attained a scale and an intensity which make them battles of attrition. They are preparing the ground for playing the trump card of Allied strategy—simultaneous offensives on all fronts by a maximum of available forces.

The advance of Allied Armies from all directions into the heart of Germany and the territories still under her sway will make it possible not only to strike at the Wehrmacht where its defenses are still strong, but also to take full advantage of those sectors where the enemy is no longer able to create strong defenses due to depleted forces. In the battles that are in the immediate offing Germany's last strategical re-

erves will be fully contained, and she will be deprived of the possibility of maneuvering reserves, not only from one front to another, but also from one sector of a given front to another. The depleted state of Germany's reserves is the main strategic factor which determines the further prospects of the Allied offensives now under way and in the process of preparation.

The Nazi enemy is still capable of offering desperate resistance. The possibility of German counter-offensives of a basically defensive character on given fronts is not to be ruled out. Difficult and bloody battles are still to be fought. But it is already clear that the complete defeat of Nazi Germany is a matter which can be guaranteed in the near future by the further development of vigorous and coordinated offensives, and by the final climactic assault against Germany of all armies of the anti-Hitler coalition.

OPERATIONS OF AMERICAN FORCES IN THE WEST

Allied operations in France and Belgium as well as in Italy have been joint undertakings of British and American arms and have been shared in by the resistance movements of these countries. The Italian zone is marked by a predominance of British forces and the Western front by an increasing predominance of American forces. The effective coordination of these three forces achieved through unification of com-

mand at the top level has been an indispensable factor in the successes achieved during the past year.

On June 6 powerful American and British ground, naval and air forces launched the invasion of German-held France. In its boldness of conception, magnitude, and skillful organization and execution, this gigantic amphibious operation holds a unique place in military annals. In this operation military science, especially with respect to the coordination of services and arms, achieved new high levels.

In the initial stages of the invasion the armies of Generals Montgomery and Bradley breached the formidable Atlantic wall fortifications of the enemy; consolidated beach heads; and developed powerful offensive maneuvers resulting in the overrunning of the Cherbourg Peninsula and the capture of the Port of Cherbourg. In the weeks following, General Eisenhower, through remarkable organization of the services of supply, built his forces on the Peninsula into an irresistible striking force. Events after this period of initial preparation have been determined, not only by the numerical and material superiority of the forces under General Eisenhower's command over the forces available to the Germans, but also by the superiority of the Allied command operating under General Eisenhower over the German command in the West.

Preparatory to the breakthrough out of the Cherbourg Peninsula, Gen-

eral Montgomery's forces maneuvering on the left flank of the Allied line led the Germans to expect the main force of General Eisenhower's blow to fall in the area of Caen. Consequently the German command was duped into weakening its forces facing the Americans on the right. This was a major factor enabling General Bradley to effect his quick breakthrough out of the Peninsula in the region of Avranches, which opened the corridor through which General Patton's forces spilled forth into Brittany and the interior of France. Even at this point the German command failed to grasp the real meaning of the situation and instead of withdrawing its forces south of Caen it mounted a counter-attack even further south in the direction of Avranches. The rapid exploitation of this German blunder by the Allied command resulted in the partial encirclement and destruction of a substantial part of the German Seventh Army in the battle of the Falaise gap and ensuing operations. In these instances the superior staff work of General Eisenhower's command was a major factor in smashing the German hope of delaying indefinitely the advance of American and British forces into the heart of France.

Another example of the superiority of the work of General Eisenhower's command over the German command in the west is to be found in the supplementing of the Allied effort in the Normandy and Brittany

regions with landings in the south on the Mediterranean coast of France.

An August 7 official spokesman for the German High Command told correspondents that Germany did not need to fear additional Allied landings. Acting on this assumption the Germans rushed troops from other sectors to the Normandy and Brittany sectors, including troops of the German 19th Army which were to defend the Mediterranean coast. A week after the above statement large American and French forces, supported by airborne troops, landed in the Toulon and Marseilles areas of Southern France. This operation, supplementary in character to the main effort in Western France, in addition to enabling the French Forces of the Interior to play a major part in the south of France, also contained and destroyed substantial German forces in the south, thereby rendering important assistance to the main Allied forces in the north.

Audacious large-scale maneuvers, swift development of offensive operations and relentless pursuit of the enemy have been the characteristic feature of American, as well as British, forces in the period following the initial breakthrough into the interior of France. There have been numerous instances of American motorized and tank columns advancing at the rate of 50 and 55 miles in 24 hours. Such advances are possible only under conditions where

the enemy suffers from a scarcity of forces; but the exploitation of these conditions is a tribute to the daring and initiative of our Army Command and to its mastery of the art of mechanized warfare.

The operations of the forces under General Eisenhower's command have brought results fully as decisive as those attained by the Germans in 1940. The entire territories of France and Belgium have been liberated. Our armies are now operating on German soil. In the neighborhood of 40 German divisions have been wiped out or destroyed as effective fighting organizations. These operations in the west have resulted in the further draining of Germany's material forces and have irreparably weakened her strategic position. They have rendered powerful support to the operations of the Red Armies on the Eastern Front.

OPERATIONS IN THE EAST

In the past year the Red Army has dealt Germany a series of ten crushing blows in great battles extending all along the Soviet-German front from the Arctic districts to the shores of the Black Sea.

Practically all Soviet territory has been cleared of German forces. Soviet troops have reached the German frontier and have penetrated the territory of East Prussia. They have cleared the Germans from Finland, Rumania and Bulgaria. It is a tribute to the power of Soviet arms and the correctness of Soviet policy

that these former satellites of Germany have now turned their forces against her. Soviet forces are assisting the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia to regain their independence and freedom.

As this is being written, the armies of Tolbukhin and Malinovsky are engaged in an offensive which is opening the back door to the Reich. This offensive has already deprived Germany of the Balkans as a military base and as a source of vital war supplies and manpower. In its great sweeps through Hungary and Czechoslovakia, it now threatens the vital German-held Czech and Austrian war industries. The further progress of this offensive will help to outflank the German defenses of Silesia and will contribute to the unhinging of the entire German Eastern defense line.

It would seem that there could be only one possible evaluation of this Balkan offensive of the Red Army, namely, that it is a powerful blow against Germany and is helping to shorten the war and save American lives. Yet there are some writers, who in their desire to create difficulties for the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, are willing to attempt the impossible and to make an altogether different evaluation. For example, the editors of the *Army and Navy Journal* are responsible for permitting a writer in that journal to make the outrageous charge that the Red Army's Balkan offensive is motivated by political considerations and that

it is responsible for prolonging the war!

In its December 12 issue the *New York Times* reacted to the slanderous and irresponsible nature of this charge and in addition to chiding the *Army and Navy Journal* stated the obvious fact that:

A Russian invasion of Austria would be of tremendous importance; a Russian penetration into Bohemia would be even more so. The Germans are fully persuaded of the truth of Bismarck's maxim that whoever dominates Bohemia dominates Europe, and the Russians are likely to agree to the extent that wresting control of Bohemia from Germany would be a mortal blow to Hitler's Reich. That may explain why they have concentrated on the campaign through the Balkans and Hungary rather than on a frontal assault along the Polish-East Prussian front. . . .

An especially noteworthy feature of the operations of the Red Army is the manner in which each major offensive operation of Soviet troops has paved the way for new offensives forming part of the general strategic plans of the Soviet Supreme Command. For example, as a result of the winter and spring operations of the Red Army the main mobile reserves of the German Command were drawn into battle on the southern sector of the Soviet German front south of the Pripet River. In June, Soviet troops struck in the north, in Byelorussia, and forced the Ger-

man Command to adopt belatedly the measure of transferring a large part of these mobile reserves to the northern sector of the front to protect the borders of East Prussia. The next Soviet blow was in the extreme south, in the Kishinev and Jassy direction, and this blow caught the German Command with only two tank divisions available in the sector as a mobile reserve. In this manner the Soviet Command has forced the Germans to shuttle their operative reserves from one sector of the front to another and has prevented these reserves from rendering timely and effective assistance to any sector. In contrast to the Germans, the Soviet Command has made remarkably skillful use of its strategic reserves and has secured for Soviet troops a superiority of forces at crucial moments and in decisive directions.

The gigantic battles on the Eastern Front during the past year have resulted in disastrous losses for the Nazi Wehrmacht. German reinforcements achieved through "total" and "super-total" mobilizations have been more than consumed. In the course of these actions 120 divisions of German and satellite troops have been routed and put out of action.

The offensive operations of the Red Army, especially its mighty summer offensives which contained 200 German divisions in the east, prepared the ground strategically for the Anglo-American landings in France, and were a decisive factor

contributing to the success of this brilliant operation.

The Teheran plan for concerted attack on Germany is being fully realized both in the east and west. In Italy, where the attack from the south has not fully materialized, the explanation does not lie in military considerations but in political considerations arising out of failure to fully carry out the Moscow Conference agreement on Italy.

GERMANY'S POSITION

Germany's continuation of the war can no longer be justified by military considerations. In any real sense the Germany army no longer has a war plan. It has irrevocably lost the initiative in this war and without the ability or prospect of assuming the initiative there can be no real war plan. All possibilities of a German war plan for this war lie buried at Stalingrad and in Normandy.

The primary motive for Germany's continued desperate resistance is the hope that prolonging the war will result in the splitting up of the coalition opposing her. She is banking on mounting casualty lists and increasing war weariness to produce negotiated peace sentiments in the democratic countries. She is banking on disharmony developing among the major powers of the United Nations. Her aim now is to end the war under conditions which will enable her to organize another war for world domination in a few short years. In these hopes she

is counting heavily on the talents of journalists like Constantine Brown of the *Washington Star* and Hanson Baldwin of the *New York Times*, who fabricate lies about lack of co-ordination in the military operations of the Allies and slander the Soviet Union's great military contribution by charges that she is not faithfully executing her part of the Teheran plan.

The proven stability of the anti-Hitler coalition makes this last hope of Germany's a vain one. The anti-Hitler coalition is growing stronger, not weaker in the course of this war, and the armies of this coalition are not going to stop short of full destruction of Nazi Germany.

THE BATTLE FOR THE APPROACHES TO JAPAN

The offensive operations of our naval, air and land forces in the Pacific are assuming an ever wider scope. A series of sharp and intense operations have won for us dominating positions in the Marshall, Gilbert and Marianas Island groupings. Saipan in the Marianas has been made into a giant B-29 base only 1500 miles from Japan proper. Concurrent with this General MacArthur's forces in a series of leapfrog amphibious operations have pushed a thousand miles along the Northwest coast of New Guinea and from there through the Schouten and Halmahera Islands. At present our first great land operation against the

Japanese is taking place on Leyte Island in the Philippines. This operation is aimed at reconquest of the Philippines, at severing Japan's north-south sea lanes, and is a preliminary to large-scale land operations on the west coast of China.

In the course of the past 12 months of fighting in the Pacific, amphibious operations have become a routine matter for our forces, and in this most difficult of military operations they have developed remarkable techniques and skill. Daring initiative and resolute perseverance are characteristic features of all the actions undertaken by our forces under the command of General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz in the Pacific.

Our Pacific fleet is now more powerful than the combined Japanese Navy. In waters adjacent to the Philippines it has engaged a major proportion of the Japanese Navy in battles comparable in scale and intensity to the Battle of Jutland, and has scored substantial and undisputed victories. In all amphibious operations our Naval Forces have played a major role.

The operations of the past year against Japan, in addition to resulting in important gains, have demonstrated the fact that the defeat of Japan will demand the maximum efforts of all forces of the anti-Japanese coalition. A vast area of Asia still remains a source of materials and manpower, and a base of military operations, for this deadly enemy

of the United States and world security. We are only now fighting the battle for the outer approaches to Japan.

The problem of securing the speediest and least costly defeat of Japan is in the first place a problem of establishing the conditions for full-scale coalition war on the part of the forces of the United States, Britain and China. The minimum price of failure to realize such a coalition effort will be a protracted war against Japan, heavy American losses, and an unstable post-war Asia.

The degree to which such a coalition effort is realized against Japan will depend in the main upon three factors:

1. The speed with which military operations against Hitler-Germany are brought to a victorious conclusion and America and Britain enabled to concentrate their full efforts against the enemy in the Pacific.

2. The course of internal developments in China, *i.e.*, on the speed with which differences between the Kuomintang leadership and the Chinese Communists are resolved and the forces of a unified and democratized China brought into action.

3. The degree to which commercial antagonisms between the United States and Britain can be controlled and resolved through specific trade agreements. The further development of unbridled rivalries between these two most powerful powers of the anti-Japanese coalition would most certainly affect disastrously the

prospect for effective joint military operations against Japan.

In the last analysis the most urgent requirement of the Pacific War is a political strategy which will provide a sound foundation for an effective coalition military strategy. The foundation and pattern for such a political strategy in Asia exists in the Teheran accord. Important elements of this strategy are present in United States policy with respect to China, where it is a positive factor in working to bring about a response from Chungking to the repeated appeals of Chinese Communist leaders for national unity and the beginnings of a democratic regime.

The further unfolding of a sound, political war strategy for Asia demands in the first place the adoption of policies and measures which will ease and control conflicting American and British economic interests in the East. Whether or not such policies and measures are adopted in time will largely determine the outcome of such vital problems of the war in the Far East as: The further role in the war of India; unified Anglo-American policy towards

China; fully concerted Anglo-American military operations against Japan; the future status of the peoples and nations of Asia.

* * *

The remarkable achievements of the armed forces of the United States in Europe and in the Pacific during the past year are in the first place a tribute to the brilliant strategic direction given them by their Commander-in-Chief, President Roosevelt. Thanks to the leadership provided by this great man, the year 1945 opens under conditions wherein victory over Germany can be guaranteed in its early months, and wherein victory over Japan is possible before its end.

The appeals of our military leadership for uninterrupted and increased production must be met in full. National unity must be further consolidated around the leadership and policies of our Commander-in-Chief, President Roosevelt. The unity of the United Nations, and of the leading three-power coalition, must be maintained and further reinforced.

CHINA NEEDS DEMOCRACY AND UNITY

By MAO TSE-TUNG

We publish here an important interview given on June 12 by Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, to Chinese and foreign correspondents visiting Yen-an, the capital of the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region. In view of recent developments in China, it has special world significance, throwing further light on the position of the Chinese Communist Party and on the needed policies for effecting China's unity and liberation.

"I HEARTILY WELCOME you all coming to Yen-an. Our war aim is the same as ever, and the same as that of the entire people of the world—to defeat Japanese militarism, to defeat the fascists. The whole of China, as the whole of the world, is united on this issue.

"Your visit to Yen-an coincides with the opening of the Second Front in Europe. This is an historic moment for the whole world, because the Second Front will have profound influence not only upon Europe but upon the Pacific and Chinese theaters of war as well. China together

with the rest of the world is anxious to go forward, to achieve the final victory.

"All the anti-Japanese forces in China must now concentrate their entire efforts on fighting the Japanese militarists side by side with this decisive offensive in Europe. The present offers a great opportunity to us.

"You must all be very anxious to learn about the internal situation in China. Here I shall speak a few words: the attitude of the Chinese Communist Party towards Kuomintang-Communist relations has been defined over and over again in the declarations and manifestoes of the Chinese Communist Party and its organs. I shall repeat them here again:

"The Chinese Communist Party has never wavered from its policy of supporting Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the policy of continuing the cooperation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party and the entire people, and the policy of defeating Japanese imperialism and struggle for the building of a free democratic China. This was true in the first stage of resistance. This was true in the second stage of the war. This is also true today, because this is and has always been the wish of the entire Chinese people.

"But China has drawbacks and they are serious ones. They can be summed up in one phrase—the lack of democracy. The Chinese people

are badly in need of democracy, because through democracy alone can the anti-Japanese war gain strength, China's internal and external relations be put on a proper basis, the victory of the war of resistance ensured and the country be built upon sound foundations. It is democracy too that can ensure China's post-war unity."

Questioned by the correspondents, Mao announced that the negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party have been going on for a long time and he hoped that there would be fruitful results out of these negotiations. He could add nothing new for the present.

As for the Second Front, he added:

"In future it will be seen that the repercussions of the Second Front are felt in the Pacific as well. Apparently at the moment it might seem that its effects on China are not direct. But China's problems have to be settled by the Chinese themselves. The improvement of the situation outside by itself cannot solve China's own problems.

"In order to defeat the common enemy, to achieve sound and peaceful internal relations and also sound and peaceful international relations, we hope that the National Government and the Kuomintang and other parties will carry out a thoroughly democratic policy in different spheres. The whole world is in the midst of the war. The war in Eu-

rope has entered a decisive phase, while decisive battles are also approaching in the Far East.

"But China is still in need of more democracy, which is necessary to further the anti-Japanese war. Only through democracy can our resistance be strengthened. This has been proved by the experiences of the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., and Great Britain. The experiences in the past and particularly of the last seven years of resistance have also proved it.

"Democracy must be all-sided—political, military, economic and cultural, as also in Party affairs and internationally. All these spheres must be democratized and everything must be unified. But this unity must be based on democratic foundations.

"Political unification is necessary, but only on the basis of freedom of press, platform and organization. Only a government based on democratic franchise can strengthen the political unification of the country.

"No doubt, unity in the military sphere is more necessary, but even this could be achieved only on democratic principles. If there is no democratic life inside the army, democratic relations between the officers and men, between soldiers and the people, and also between the different armies, then such armies cannot be unified.

"As to economic democracy, what is meant is the introduction of an economic system which is based not on restriction of production and lack of provision for consumption by the

vast mass of the people; but one which will give impetus to further production and ensure proper distribution and uniform consumption.

"And only democracy can promote the development of education, thought, the press and the arts. This is cultural democracy.

"Party democracy means that there should be democratic relations inside the Party and among the different parties.

"I repeat that we are today badly in need of unity, but only the unity that is based on democracy can be real and abiding. It is true for China's internal problems, but it is equally true for the coming League of Nations. Only by democratic unification can fascism be uprooted and a new China and a new world be established. That is why we

stand for the Atlantic Charter, and the declarations of the Moscow, Cairo and Teheran Conferences. And these are what we expect of the National Government, the Kuomintang and other parties and other people's organizations.

"These aims are what the Chinese Communist Party itself is striving to achieve. In our efforts to defeat the Japanese imperialists, we, the Chinese Communists, have introduced a new spirit of democratic centralism in all our work.

"It is on this basis that we can build a new China, defeat our enemies and build in the future sound and peaceful internal and external relations."

(Reprinted from *People's War*, Bombay, August 20, 1944.)

TWO CONVENTIONS OF LABOR

By ROY HUDSON

THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., held in late November at Chicago and New Orleans, respectively, took place in a momentous hour of American and world history. The twelve months following the epochal tri-power conference of Teheran brought about a decisive turn in the direction of United Nations' victory. The armies of the fighting coalition achieved the penetration of German soil from West and East. This victorious advance was made possible by the implementation of the Teheran accords for coordinated coalition warfare and by the tremendous contributions of the national-unity forces on the home front, in which labor, solidly supporting the Roosevelt war program and adhering to its no-strike policy, performed a major role in the interests of the entire nation.

The two conventions took place shortly after the great national elections in which the people of our country returned Roosevelt to office with a mandate for the decisive defeat of fascism and the inauguration of an era of peace, security, and economic well being, to be realized in firm cooperation with our leading

Allies, Britain and the Soviet Union. These aims, for which the people voted, can be realized only to the degree that the coalition of forces that made victory possible is now consolidated and strengthened.

Therefore, the conventions of America's two main trade union centers were confronted with the task of strengthening the working-class core of our national unity to enable labor to come forward with maximum solidity and efficiency as the nation's most consistent and resolute democratic force. It is from this point of view that we must approach the estimation of the deliberations and decisions of the two central organizations of the labor backbone of anti-fascist national unity.

* * *

As a result of the decisions of the C.I.O. convention, the first steps in consolidating the pro-Roosevelt coalition that won the election has been taken. This is of decisive importance because it established a guarantee that the main goal can be realized. Those who conspire to break up the coalition received a rude shock when the C.I.O. declared against any third party and voted to continue its non-partisan political activity on a permanent basis under the chairmanship of Sidney Hillman.

The C.I.O. convention adopted a program that provides an answer to the question: On what basis can the pro-Roosevelt coalition of forces, composed of labor, farmers, business

and middle class elements, remain united now that the elections are over? It also provides the means for strengthening this coalition by securing the support of many patriots, who, out of confusion, shortsightedness, or partisan considerations, voted for Dewey.

Helpful in this connection was the presence of such important figures as Wallace, Ickes, Mrs. Roosevelt, and La Guardia, who made the C.I.O. convention the occasion for stating their views on following up the election victory.

Declaring that "the people of the nation have given a forthright mandate to the President to make real the Economic Bill of Rights" the convention adopted a program entitled "Sixty million jobs and prosperity for all." This resolution states that the realization of this goal requires "the expansion of the mass-purchasing power for our domestic market" and the "expansion of world trade" on the basis of the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods Conferences. Declaring further that "national unity and the coordinated effort which has directed our mobilization for war must be carried through for reconversion," the convention resolved that "the C.I.O. offers its sincere cooperation to the many forward-looking industrialists and farmers as well as to other sections of the population to plan and work together with government to formulate the necessary program and policies to actually se-

cure the Economic Bill of Rights. . . ." Also, in demanding speedy adjustments to bring the Little Steel Formula into line with the increased cost of living, the C.I.O. emphasized that such action was necessary to help realize the goal of full production after the war by maintaining the purchasing power of the masses.

This is a program that undertakes to establish greater security of employment and sixty million jobs with a rising standard of living by fighting for policies that will result in the operation of American industry at full production levels. Cooperation on this basis is in the interest of the employers, for only this course leads to the profitable operation of industries. If management demonstrates an understanding and spirit of cooperation, as expressed in the C.I.O. program, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the continuation of national unity in the post-war period will be assured. The very nature of this program indicates the high degree of maturity achieved by the C.I.O. leadership and the extent to which it recognizes its responsibilities and approaches every question from the viewpoint of the interests of the nation.

Thus, the program of the C.I.O. on political action, full production, and related questions forms the basis on which the entire labor movement may help to maintain and strengthen national unity. The adoption of these decisions has already had a far-reaching effect in steering other

political forces and non-labor groups in a correct direction. Therefore, instead of drifting toward a breakup, the various forces that won the election victory are now moving in the direction of consolidating and strengthening the coalition and of working out a common program of action.

* * *

A further major accomplishment of the C.I.O. convention was the impetus it gave to the realization of international labor unity. Today, as a result of its decisions, the representatives of the C.I.O. have met with the representatives of British and Soviet Labor in London and have arrived at an agreement on the agenda of the World Trade Union Congress, to be held in February.

This meeting is of great significance to the entire world. It establishes guarantees for strengthening the United Nations. It will help speed victory, bring an enduring peace and a prosperous post-war world. It will reinforce the fight for implementation of the Teheran decisions and of the recommendations of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and it will sound the death knell for the advocates of a "soft peace." It will insure, as nothing else would, the re-birth of united trade unions in the liberated countries and an end to interference in the rights of the Greek and other peoples to establish a democratic government of their own choosing.

Historically, the participation of the C.I.O. in the London meeting, just concluded, marks the end of the split between American and Soviet labor. This important fact is a momentous contribution toward completely healing the split by breaking, once and for all, the power of a handful of reactionaries who want to prevent the seven million members of the A. F. of L. from registering their real desire for unity with the rest of world labor.

* * *

The decisions of the C.I.O. convention on the Negro people are of the greatest importance in several respects. First, the C.I.O. recognized the need to take special measures to insure that employers will not be able to use the period of reconversion to wipe out the rights of Negroes to work where it has been established during the war. It is of the greatest importance that, on the basis of this general policy, concrete programs be worked out to uphold the right of the Negroes to secure work in each industry.

Secondly, in regard to the general problems of the Negro people, the C.I.O. adopted a rounded-out program that fully meets the responsibilities of labor to the Negro people. This program reflects an ever greater degree of understanding on the part of the C.I.O. of the problems of the Negro people and of labor's responsibility in connection with them. It is a guarantee that the election victory

will result in a greater and more determined effort upon the part of the American people and their government to put an end to Jim Crow in all its forms. In urging adoption of this resolution, President Philip Murray said:

This organization, the C.I.O., is the home of the persecuted. This organization is a haven of rest and refuge for the Negro. This organization offers to the Negro things guaranteed him but not lived up to by the Constitution of the United States of America and the repeated declarations made down through the ages by our nation's most distinguished statesmen, that all of our citizens, regardless of color, creed or national origin stand equal before the people and in the eyes of God.

I regard this work, this particular work, of advancing and protecting the cause of the Negro as a holy and noble work, the kind of work that all right-thinking citizens, regardless of their status in life or their affiliation with other groups, should dedicate themselves to.

With six million organized workers standing behind this statement, and reinforced by the victory of the people on November 7, the Negroes, united as never before, can face the future, confident that the coalition that elected President Roosevelt and a better Congress will, in the coming period, finish the job that Lincoln started in 1860

* * *

An important step forward has been taken in the struggle against

Red-baiting, and we can say that today the Red-baiters are in a weakened position. The facts speak for themselves.

The C.I.O. convention showed that the only effect of the Red-baiting attacks launched against it by Dewey and Co. was to produce a greater unity. In the face of the unanimous approval of the work of Sidney Hillman, in the face of the overwhelming unity of the delegates, Communist and non-Communist, behind the leadership of Philip Murray, the few delegates that continue to Red-bait in their own unions remained silent at this convention. This firmer unity and more consistent support for the established position of the C.I.O. against Red-baiting is not confined merely to conventions. The beginnings of a definite trend to overcome the effects of Red-baiting where it has been temporarily effective can be noted. For instance, it is reported that the Executive Board of the Shipyard Union, by unanimous vote, ruled that, as a result of the actions of the union's recent convention, the former ban against Charles Velson's right to run for office no longer obtains.

The action of the C.I.O. in reaffirming its no-strike pledge has added significance in view of the rebuke given by Murray to any action or any force that would undermine unqualified adherence to the no-strike pledge for the duration. Likewise, the C.I.O. undertook to mobilize speedily its forces for the

solution of those manpower and production problems that are now threatening to interfere with the great offensives of the United Nations, launched against fascist Germany and Japan. It can be said that the actions of the C.I.O. on these issues were reinforced by the constructive decisions of the A. F. of L. in reaffirming the no-strike pledge and in meeting emergency production problems.

THE A. F. OF L. CONVENTION

On the no-strike pledge and the manpower question it can be said that the A. F. of L. adopted decisions in line with those of the C.I.O. This is also true in regard to certain aspects of labor's responsibility to the veterans. On this issue, not only was the A. F. of L. resolution constructive, though of a limited nature, but many of the important Internationals reported on their own programs, in a manner that reflected serious concern with the problems of returning servicemen. It is important to note these positive steps of the A. F. of L. convention because it shows that even the die-hards that put across their program in New Orleans did not dare disregard the win-the-war sentiments of the membership on these two fundamental war issues.

While this is true, the same can unfortunately not be said of the general proceedings of the A. F. of L. convention. The outstanding fact is that while the A. F. of L. convention

was confronted with problems identical with those that faced the C.I.O., and notwithstanding that the A. F. of L. organizations as a whole demonstrated in the elections, and on other occasions, that their stand is similar to that of the C.I.O., yet the conclusions arrived at in New Orleans are the opposite of those arrived at in Chicago. On the basis of the programs adopted one could conclude that the two conventions took place in different worlds.

At the A. F. of L. convention no resolution referred to the outcome of the elections or so much as pretended to draw any lessons from them. The goal of 60,000,000 jobs was not specifically endorsed but was referred to for the purpose of casting doubt on the possibility of realizing such a degree of employment and on the intentions of the Roosevelt Administration really to fight for it. The convention had words of damnation for the C.I.O. and praise for John L. Lewis and his defeatist policies. Although the membership of the A. F. of L. upheld the program of the Roosevelt Administration and many of the leaders present had worked for his election, the convention program is anti-Roosevelt in character, notwithstanding the efforts made to conceal this fact. After registering lip-service to the cause of world peace, the convention proceeded to snipe at the recommendations of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. The convention did not endorse the World Labor Unity Conference called by

the British Trades Union Congress but maintained its die-hard anti-Soviet and anti-C.I.O. position. The die-hards did not budge one inch from their anti-Negro position.

In essence these are the policies that were repudiated in the national elections. Isolated and weakened by this defeat, the A. F. of L. leaders responsible for these policies, nevertheless continued to advocate them at the convention, thereby increasing their isolation from the main forces in the nation and the world. Certainly, this proves them to be people who would risk ruin rather than renounce their reactionary policies. They are also men who refuse to accept the results of the election. They are the agents of that section of monopoly capital that promoted Dewey's campaign and that is still determined to see America rule the world instead of cooperating with Britain and the Soviet Union to achieve victory, maintain peace, and establish an orderly world economy. These Hooverite capitalists still dream that they will gain greater profits by using the might of America to dominate the world and thus increase their ability to exploit world markets, plunder other peoples and suck the blood out of the American people and workers. Their line of policy is—use the war to isolate the Soviet Union, eliminate Britain as a rival in world markets, prevent war-torn Europe from reconstructing its industries, carry through a program that will destroy the ability of Amer-

ican workers to maintain their purchasing power. They seek to wipe out their defeat in the elections by promoting disunity in the nation and within the United Nations. Hutcheson and Company seek to aid them by undermining support for the program of President Roosevelt, by inciting war against the C.I.O., by using John L. Lewis to strengthen their domination in the A. F. of L., and by blocking world labor unity. This unholy crew hopes that if their anti-United Nations masters win, then they will not fail to reward their labor lieutenants who refused to bow to the sentiments and will of 7,000,000 organized workers.

Hutcheson, Woll, Dubinsky and their Charley McCarthy, William Green, imposed this reactionary program on the convention mainly because leaders who are not in agreement with its content, and who fought against it in the elections, nevertheless remained silent in New Orleans. But, notwithstanding this fact, the New Orleans convention itself shows that while the Hutcheson minority are still able to impose their program on the convention, *they no longer have the old power to enforce these decisions when they are challenged!*

For instance, the Executive Council again bowed to the will of Mr. Hutcheson and refused to protect the jurisdiction of the International Association of Machinists. But the leadership of this powerful union promptly served notice that they re-

fused to submit to this arbitrary infringement of their rights and that a special convention would be called to consider this violation of democracy. There can be no doubt that the 600,000 members of the I.A.M. will be fully justified in leaving the A. F. of L., if that is the only alternative to submitting to reactionary and undemocratic policies which are harmful to the cause of organized labor. Thus, the A. F. of L. convention witnessed the spectacle of its most important affiliate serving notice that it would refuse to accept the undemocratic decisions dictated by Hutcheson and Co.

Next, the Executive Council for years had prevented the British Trades Union Congress from establishing fraternal relationship with the C.I.O. and from taking the initiative in calling a world trade union congress. However, at the New Orleans convention, the representatives of British labor served notice to the A. F. of L. leaders that they would be welcome at the conference, but that if they refused to sit down with the C.I.O. and the Soviet trade unions, the conference would take place without them. Thus, the A. F. of L. Executive Council now lacks the power to prevent the rest of the world trade union movement from joining hands.

Thirdly, the Executive Council proclaims that no trade unionist shall be seated as a delegate if he is a Communist. But in their own convention, the Executive Council

deemed it inadvisable to enforce this undemocratic ruling, at least as far as one of the delegates from Britain was concerned.

Nothing dramatizes the increased difficulties of the Red-baiters more than the picture of William Green, Matthew Woll, and Frey sitting on the same platform at a convention of the A. F. of L. with a great trade union leader who is a member and an acknowledged leader of the Communist Party of Great Britain! That fact poses questions that many people will seriously ponder. Must they not ask: if the British trade union movement chooses to elect a Communist to speak on behalf of six million organized workers, if because of this fact the A. F. of L. convention had to choose between swallowing prejudices against Communists and separating itself from the British trade union movement, then does not this fact cry to high heaven that Communists are an integral part of the trade union movement, that they are part of the camp of democracy and progress, and that therefore the Communists must be accepted as part of the labor and democratic life of the nation?

The anti-Soviet, anti-Communist views of Messrs. Woll and Dubinsky and other professional Red-baiters, will not be changed even though they sat on the same platform with Mr. Arthur Horner. But there is ground for expecting that some responsible leaders of the A. F. of L., having seen a Communist in the

flesh, having heard him speak and perhaps broken bread with him, will no longer feel so inclined to embrace the policies of Hutcheson and Woll every time they yell "Reds" or "Moscow plot." If events confirm the correctness of this opinion, then truly an advance has been made in the fight against Red-baiting and America will owe a great debt of gratitude to the British trade union movement for the assistance they gave in eliminating the anti-Communist issue from the labor movement and from American public life.

Fourthly, the convention showed that the problems of the Negro people have become one of the key issues that are thorns in the side of those who temporarily rule the A. F. of L. This thorn is making their rule more and more uneasy, and in the face of the powerful speech of A. Phillip Randolph on the floor of the convention hall, the die-hard reactionaries found it difficult to defend their anti-Negro policy. The sheer courage of Mr. Randolph and his contempt for those who sought to silence him by open threats even shamed one white delegate to rise and speak in defense of the Negroes and Mr. Randolph.

There is a crying need for every A. F. of L. progressive to speak out on this issue with the same courage that was displayed by Mr. Randolph. They could have done far more in preparing for the convention and seeing that the real sentiments of the A. F. of L. rank and file were ex-

pressed. At the same time, one cannot refrain from wondering if Mr. Randolph does not by now draw conclusions that his association with Red-baiters, with opponents of the war effort and enemies of the C.I.O., does not win him allies in his fight. Did Mr. Dubinsky come to the defense of Mr. Randolph, speak on his behalf and vote against the resolution Randolph condemned? Is it not time that Mr. Randolph recognize that the real allies of the Negroes are the C.I.O. and the progressives in the A. F. of L., which include the Communists?

Fifthly, for years the Executive Council has demanded that the C.I.O. return to the A. F. of L. under conditions dictated by Hutcheson and Co. But the C.I.O. has refused to comply and, instead of being destroyed by Green and Co., has continued to live and grow stronger.

The Executive Council time and again has ordered its affiliated bodies to desist from cooperating with the C.I.O., but more and more bodies of the A. F. of L. find ways and means of joining forces with the C.I.O. to realize common aims.

Finally, the Executive Council declared that the A. F. of L. should be non-partisan in the elections and should abstain from endorsing a presidential candidate. This policy was overwhelmingly repudiated by nearly every organization affiliated to the A. F. of L. and by many of its national leaders.

Do not these facts show that the

major crisis existing in the leadership of the A. F. of L. has been deepened by the convention? Do they not show that silence is harmful to the interests of the A. F. of L., and is leading to disaster, and that those leaders who fought for the election of Roosevelt must either help put an end to the influence of Hutcheson, Woll, Dubinsky and Lewis or surrender the A. F. of L. to this reactionary minority? But do not these facts also show that conditions already exist to secure the defeat of Hutcheson and Co., should their policies be challenged by the pro-Roosevelt majority?

But the convention shows that the A. F. of L. membership cannot and must not leave the responsibility for resolving the crisis in the hands of the Roosevelt supporters in the Executive Council. Such leaders as Tobin, Flore, Lindloff, and others can be relied upon to take the initiative only when the rank and file take things into their own hands and demonstrate that such initiative will have the support of the masses.

The refusal of the A. F. of L. convention to endorse the coming World Labor Conference cannot be allowed to stand. To do so would create as many dangers as if the A. F. of L. organizations had remained silent in the elections and failed to work for the election of Roosevelt. It would mean that the workers of Greece, Italy, France, and other liberated countries now reestablishing their unions would be denied the active

support of the American Federation of Labor. It would mean that President Roosevelt would not yet have the united and active support of the A. F. of L. to apply the program which the people endorsed on Election Day. It would mean that the peoples of the world would still be uncertain as to whether America would continue to adhere to the policies of Teheran.

Let the organizations and membership of the A. F. of L. take up the fight for international unity with the same determination that they exercised to elect President Roosevelt. If this is done, then the World Labor Congress will have the support of A. F. of L. organizations. Such action will also lead to the complete isolation of the Hutchesons and Wolls and bring about a consistent stand upon the part of the pro-Roosevelt majority of the Executive Council.

A NEW ERA REACHED

The A. F. of L. and C.I.O. conventions are a picture of sharp contrasts. One convention expressed above all what is new and permanent—the other primarily what is outdated and dying. Chicago showed that labor has entered new territory and has both feet planted on firm soil. New Orleans showed that the ground on which labor now stands is still littered with the debris of bankrupt reactionary programs, carry-overs from the past, which must now be

removed from the scene if labor is to proceed to build upon the foundation already established. But the balance sheet of these two conventions is a victory for all the people.

Today the trade union movement is armed with a program which can enable labor to strengthen its political activities on a non-partisan basis and help unite win-the-war Republicans, Democrats, Communists and independents — businessmen, labor, farmers, professionals, and Negroes — solidly behind the program of President Roosevelt.

On the basis of this program labor can enable the nation to speed victory, ensure enduring peace and a prosperous world. With its help, labor can fight for and win full production and jobs for sixty million workers with wage scales and a standard of living never before realized. This program was worked out at the C.I.O. convention—but it is a program for all of labor. The job now is to win all of organized labor for this program.

The C.I.O. is the decisive factor in the labor movement. Its convention knocked into a cocked hat the gloomy predictions that the C.I.O. was digging its own grave by its P.A.C. activities; or that the struggle in the recent automotive, ship, and rubber workers' conventions was the beginning of the end; or that at its annual convention the C.I.O. would be split wide open, Murray's leadership would be repudiated, Hillman would be sent back to the land of his

birth, the Communists would be kicked out, and the Trotskyites and other disruptive forces headed by Walter Reuther would take over what was left of the C.I.O. Instead, the C.I.O. registered the greatest strength, unity and understanding in its history, and as a result of the convention is in a stronger position to work with the A. F. of L. membership to influence the course of the nation and help consolidate the coalition of forces that made possible victory on Election Day.

The record shows that the membership of the A. F. of L. and many of its leaders are already moving in the direction charted by the C.I.O. The failure of the A. F. of L. convention to register this fact will deepen the gap that already exists between the Executive Council and the main organizations of the A. F. of L. which time and again have rejected the position of the Executive Council and pursued instead a course that coincided with that of the C.I.O. *Events show that Hutcheson and Woll and Dubinsky can impose their will on the A. F. of L. only when their policies are not challenged.* Their policies were challenged and defeated in the elections. Let the A. F. of L. organizations and membership continue to do so, and the unholy alliance headed by Hutcheson can be smashed and even the Executive Council will express the true sentiments of the A. F. of L. organizations which are to work together with the C.I.O. to assure victory, an

enduring peace and a prosperous post-war world.

The entire nation now recognizes that fundamental changes have taken place in the ranks of the working class that have a profound effect on labor's relations with other forces and in determining the course of the nation. A significant expression of this fact is to be noted in the remarks of Mr. Eugene Meyers, owner-publisher and editor of the *Washington Post* which has striven to be a consistent win-the-war paper, even though it made the serious mistake of supporting Dewey in the elections. Mr. Meyers wandered into the C.I.O. convention and was invited to address it by Mr. Murray. Mr. Meyers informed the delegates that he was on his way to catch a plane for Washington when he had a hunch to give up Thanksgiving dinner with his family, call off his trip and visit the C.I.O. convention. In explaining his reasons for doing so Mr. Meyers told the convention:

What made me come back to attend the Convention for a few hours and listen and learn? I was trying to analyze the significance of this Convention taking place at this time and in these circumstances. I have the feeling that this Convention meets at the end of an era and at the beginning of a new era of even greater significance. You have in this election departed from previous precedent in taking an organized part in the political campaign. That in itself is the beginning of a new era. The significance of it I think even you and

your leaders and any of us meeting here today may not fully realize.

It is a sign of the times that such men as Eugene Meyers recognize that something of fundamental importance has happened. Such men may not have desired it and may not yet fully understand how the new role of labor will affect the nation, but they are realists and patriots enough to recognize a fundamental fact of great importance that now exists. That fact is that labor has emerged as a political force in its own right. In the election campaign and at the C.I.O. convention the various political trends that formerly existed in the C.I.O. have crystallized in a higher degree than ever, into one political force with one program and one leadership.

This fact means that a historic milepost has been reached and that a decisive section of American labor has matured as an independent political force. For generations, day in and day out, fair weather and foul, American Communists have fought for this goal. Marxism teaches that the best interests of the people is served when labor acts as an organized political force working in cooperation with other patriots and defenders of democracy, because the working class is the most consistent defender of democracy and of the true interests of the nation. This scientific principle at long last has been fully confirmed by the experience of the workers and people in the war effort and the elections. This fact

confirms the confidence of the Communists in the ability of America to provide an even happier and more secure life for its citizens and to become an even greater force for progress in the family of nations to the end that there may be peace, that all people may be free and that none shall be denied a decent standard of living. With unwavering faith in the ability of American labor to fulfill

its responsibilities to the nation and with a deeper sense of our own responsibilities, the Communists will seek to explain and apply the scientific teachings of socialism which history proves are an indispensable weapon to all peoples united to destroy fascism, to insure peace and to secure the independence of their nation and build a better and happier world.

THE CPA—OUR MOST INDISPENSABLE WEAPON



By JOHN WILLIAMSON

ONE OF THE GREAT political battles in American history has just been concluded. Patriotic Americans of all classes won a resounding victory on November 7. The re-election of President Roosevelt was made possible by a great people's coalition which embraced the forward-looking sections of democratic America—of businessmen, of labor, both A. F. of L. and C.I.O., of the Negro people, of independent voters, of professionals, of many Republicans and of the Communists. Our nation met the challenge of the reactionary camp and defeated it. The election victory was a confirmation of the anti-Axis course of the Administration. More favorable opportunities now exist for realizing and implementing the policies so vitally necessary to speed victory in the war, to create a durable, lasting peace, to guarantee full production and employment, by further strengthening the United Nations coalition—the key to victory and peace.

The election victory presents the whole camp of national unity with new conditions of work and new responsibilities which must be met, if this victory is to be consolidated. The members of the Communist Political Association must master the lessons

of these elections so that they can contribute, as they have done during the whole period of the election campaign, their clarity and understanding, their hard and conscientious effort, to the further strengthening and consolidation of the democratic coalition. It is in the light of the new tasks that face our nation and the people, that we review the problems of the further consolidation and building of our organization as a necessary and vital part of the democratic coalition of our country.

Some of the main factors in the work and life of our Communist Political Association to which we must direct our attention are:

1. The overwhelming majority of our members are more active than ever before in mass work, as members of various mass organizations. This activity reached a new high level in the election campaign when tens of thousands of Communists devoted their best energies to help secure victory for the people's coalition.

2. Various mass organizations, and their leaders, recognize that the C.P.A. is a force that "makes things tick," although they are still reluctant, or consider it as yet inadvisable, publicly to recognize this fact.

3. There is a gradual process developing where individual Communists, who are publicly known as such, are accepted and recognized by their collaborators. This is not yet identical with acceptance of the organization as such, but is nevertheless a definite step forward.

Among the Negro people, where we are most widely accepted by the masses, we have the highest development of this trend. Benjamin J. Davis, Jr. and Doxey Wilkerson were included in the Independent Negro Voters Committee side by side with outstanding non-Communist Negro leaders. It was not by chance that Secretary of the Interior Ickes included in his Harlem speech a quotation from Ben Davis to convince the Negro people to vote for F.D.R.

Another recent example, is the action of Mayor Lapham of San Francisco in appointing our local C.P.A. President, Oleta O'Connor Yates to his committee on civic unity.

4. There is far greater collaboration today between leaders of the C.P.A. and local leaders of the Democratic Party, C.I.O., A. F. of L., and other organizations. While such relations are not new, the normal everyday manner in which they now express themselves, differing in no way from those existing with other organizations, is new.

The largest sections of our members have turned their energies to mass work, to work among the people, establishing new relations with the trade unions, with community

and other organizations, devoting their major time to the work and development of these organizations.

This development is a great step forward. We must do nothing to hinder its continuation and further expansion, and everything to extend and strengthen it. However, this situation has, as Earl Browder emphasized, "meant the draining away into these new fields of activity, of much energy which used to be expended in solving the problems of our organization as such. We don't want to reverse that trend; we know that it's got to continue along that line of development. But we must find the way in which to prevent that from weakening our Association. . . ." The problem that stands before us today is: to face frankly all those questions and problems which have expressed themselves in our organization in recent months which require solution so that the new conditions of mass activity will not weaken our Association.

OUR ROLE OF

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

Parallel with this development of increased mass work and improved collaboration with people's organizations there is a certain by-product which reflects itself in our organization that must concern us, since it can become dangerous if not corrected. First of all, there is a continuous decline in the organized contact between the C.P.A. and its membership, and a constant lessening of or-

ganized political direction of the members' activities. This is evident in the poor attendance at club meetings—an average of not more than 30-35 per cent over a period of three months. Clearly, we are not in direct political contact with the majority of our membership in any state or district.

The other aspect of this development is expressed in a tendency to underestimate the effectiveness of the C.P.A. as an organization—as an organized force in stimulating and leading mass movements. There has even been some talk that the C.P.A. has no special role to perform as distinct from other labor and people's organizations.

How does this tendency express itself? The majority of our members, integrally connected with the main stream of the win-the-war coalition, no longer face any obvious obstacles as far as immediate policy is concerned. Consequently, in contrast with the past, they are not regularly contacting the C.P.A. to discuss policy and hammer out answers to political questions to carry back to the mass movement for its consideration. This in itself, of course, reflects an underestimation of the role of the Communists in influencing the course of development by deepening the understanding of the masses and the organizations constituting the "main stream." Wherever such underestimation exists, members forego or lose systematic political contact with the C.P.A.;

they tend to merge ideologically with the general progressive camp, gradually accept leadership of others instead of exercising leadership themselves, and eventually, they will see no need of maintaining their organized political relationship with the C.P.A.—namely, their membership.

These tendencies do not arise out of wrong policies, or, because we have "bad" members. There are certain conditions out of which they arise that we should recognize and understand.

This situation has become somewhat more aggravated precisely because the C.P.A. convention changed the form of our organization and outlined a new approach to our work. This demanded a severe change in the thinking, habits and practices of the organization and its members. Simultaneously with these abrupt, but necessary changes, the entire organization threw itself vigorously into the election battle. There is no doubt that this created problems in making clear our present-day role and function.

Further complications arose from the fact that while we contributed every effort and force of the C.P.A. to the coalition for election victory, we were not yet accepted as a legitimate part of the coalition. We correctly avoided any action that would play into the hands of the reactionaries who tried desperately to make Communism the central issue of the elections. We even cancelled certain mass meetings and radio talks. This,

together with the fact that the great majority of our members conscientiously participated in the work of P.A.C., A.L.P., Democratic Party or independent committees established during the campaign, as well as the limited independent character of the work of the C.P.A. clubs themselves, contributed to this general atmosphere of underestimating the specific role and activities of our organization.

In some of the discussions analyzing these developments two opposite points of view are brought forward as the solution. Certain people wish to direct all the activity and work of our members into the C.P.A. clubs. Others, propose to center everything in the various mass organizations constituting the coalition, to the exclusion and neglect of the C.P.A. and the clubs. We must reject both of these proposals. The correct solution is a combination of both these proposals: the majority of our members to be active in the growing and developing political mass movement and trade unions, while the C.P.A. clubs conduct simultaneous activity with the aim above all to extend the systematic political contact with and development of *all* C.P.A. members, to enable them to make the maximum political contribution to the entire democratic camp of national unity.

What conclusions shall we place before the entire organization to solve this problem?

1. We must never forget that the

national convention made the changes in our organization on the basis of long-time perspectives arising out of the Teheran Conference declaration. These are perspectives of the extension of national unity into the post-war period, including the long-time active collaboration of Communists in the democratic coalition, to realize the broad democratic objectives of Teheran. In making the organizational changes we saw the necessity of solving and advancing the burning democratic issues of the people within the traditional two-party system. The successful outcome of the elections makes it easier to carry forward the fight for these democratic perspectives and creates more favorable conditions for the full development of the work of the C.P.A.

While continuing to do everything to strengthen the democratic coalition, to improve greatly our active participation, we should now feel free to discuss with the masses everywhere and in the most extensive manner the role of the C.P.A. and the policies it advocates. This must be done in such a way, however, as to forge ever stronger the camp of national unity and to integrate ourselves more fully with the mass movement. In the course of this activity we shall strive to achieve that which Earl Browder so correctly emphasized in a recent article evaluating the elections, namely, "that Communists also have a legitimate place in the national unity on their merits

in facing the nation's problems of the day, in America, just as in China, France, Italy, Yugoslavia and other countries."

2. There is general agreement with our convention decisions based upon the perspectives arising out of the Teheran Concord. (Earl Browder's book, *Teheran*, remains our most effective weapon and should continue to receive wide-scale circulation.) Nevertheless, there is need to reinforce this understanding of our membership with a theoretical background and firmer foundation, especially on certain specific aspects of our perspectives for America and the world. This will have to receive our concerted attention.

3. We must especially clarify for our members and all whom we influence, the all-class character of the camp of national unity, especially the significant role of labor in maintaining and expanding that unity. Tribute is paid to the fact that labor has emerged from these elections as a decisive political force within the nation. There is something new in the role of labor which must be fully grasped by all. Labor expressed great political maturity in these elections because it left behind its former one-sided political activity around the special interests of the labor movement, assumed its share of the responsibility for the welfare and security of our nation, and conducted its campaign in a true spirit of working class statesmanship. It is this new quality in the role of labor

which gave it its important place in the broad coalition that crystallized in the campaign.

We must re-emphasize this elementary fact because some people mistakenly see national unity as a merging of classes instead of their collaboration around certain common interests and aims in behalf of the nation as a whole. If our members understood clearly this concept of national unity, and the decisive role of the working class within the camp of national unity, then they would see more readily the indispensable role of the C.P.A. Our members must fully grasp the significance of the C.P.A. as the most advanced and consistent political organization of the working class, helping labor to play that independent role which strengthens and consolidates the camp of national unity. Growing out of such an understanding would necessarily come the conclusion that we must strengthen our Communist position among the workers, through extending the circulation of our press and literature, and the recruiting of new members.

The strengthening of our organization among the coal miners and the rubber workers; in the A. F. of L.; in such cities as Flint, Toledo, Akron, Buffalo and Schenectady, would greatly help to overcome existing confusions in regard to fundamental policies among sections of labor. It would help to undermine the damaging influence of the Lewises, Hutchesons, Trotskyites and

others, whose activities continue to threaten the effectiveness, the unity and great patriotic role of labor.

4. We must make clear that there is no contradiction between our emphasis on the common interests we hold with the democratic camp and our simultaneous emphasis on the necessity for the development of the independent life and activity of the C.P.A. itself. The maintenance of our political and organizational identity is not a partisan interest but a necessity to help advance the democratic camp and its democratic perspectives. One thing is certain. We cannot maintain our organization for long without having political identity, and we cannot have political identity without maintaining our organization in full strength.

5. We still have a situation in which some members, especially those who for years have been publicly known as Communist leaders, hesitate to acknowledge that they are Communists once they become active in mass organizations. This is a mistaken concept carried over from the past when Communists as well as other progressives suffered from all forms of threats, intimidation and blacklisting, and when Red-baiting was the predominant fashion. Today we must liquidate once and for all the frequently self-imposed underground status of our members while working to convince our collaborators, and to spur them to act upon that conviction in the interest of national unity, that the

Communists have a rightful place in all people's organizations.

6. We will make every effort to bring forward publicly more trade union leaders in C.P.A. leading committees. This will not only further improve the quality of leadership but will be effective in curbing the tendencies to underestimate the necessary role of the C.P.A.

7. Above all, we will guarantee that there is established the most systematic and consistent political relationship between the C.P.A. and *all* its members, including those who for one reason or another do not attend club meetings, and especially those who are leaders or active workers in economic and political mass organizations. There must be burned into the consciousness of everyone that without such political contact whereby specific as well as general issues and problems are discussed collectively between the members concerned and the C.P.A. leadership of the club, county or state, we cannot fulfill our responsibility to our nation.

Members who operate for long periods of time without systematic discussions as part of the collective work of the C.P.A. will run dry like an automobile battery. The collective political discussions between these members and the leadership, irrespective of the forms, serve to politically recharge the battery. Without this, the Communists will gradually become no different from other progressive workers and lose the one

thing which makes them Communists—their political foresight, initiative and understanding, arising from the Marxist program of the C.P.A., which guides all its thinking and action.

NEW METHODS IN GUIDING CLUBS

What, then, is the role of the C.P.A. club? What activities and responsibilities do we expect today from our members? This is the second major problem we should consider in detail.

When we dissolved the Communist Party and organized the C.P.A. we emphasized that the C.P.A., as a political-educational association, must learn to function differently. The report to the convention on the role and activities of the C.P.A. placed a new emphasis on the political-educational character of our activities and outlined in some detail what these specific activities should be. Frankly, we must say we have as yet made insufficient changes in our way of functioning and particularly in our methods of leadership. This is true in the national center no less than in the state organizations.

The way we work results in a condition in which the club leaders are so overburdened with the directives hurled at them, that instead of making an effort to involve the entire membership in the fulfillment of the tasks in the course of their mass work, this small handful of loyal comrades jell into an ever tighter

group, who, without rest, keep going themselves, trying to carry the entire load. This condition exists even in centers like New York and Chicago where there is a sufficient core of old members to carry on the work. In other places, like Detroit, where two-thirds of the membership is less than a year in the organization, and where not even 10 per cent has been in the organization for a number of years, many of the tasks handed down to the clubs are either not tackled at all or inadequately fulfilled.

We must stop demanding that the C.P.A. carry the burdens of other mass organizations. We must reduce and simplify the direct tasks we give to the C.P.A. clubs. At present we determine our tasks and hand out quotas on the basis of members on the roll of each club. But we tend to forget that half or more of the members are actively engaged in fulfilling the tasks of a trade union, an A.L.P. club, the P.A.C., or other mass organization, and that we have not yet solved the problem of having them assume their share of responsibility for subscriptions, fund drives, bundle orders of our paper, etc., as part of their mass work. The result is that those who handle the club's necessary day-to-day work are expected to bear the burden and account to the county or state in results for a membership several times its actual size as far as available manpower is concerned.

In our own relationship with the

clubs certain fundamental changes must take place. We have to find those methods in guiding the clubs which will eliminate once and for all the "directive" type of leadership. Instead of making constant demands on the clubs, we should orient our work to servicing the clubs so as to stimulate their own independent thinking, initiative and activity. This will require, first of all, greater long-term planning of campaigns; reducing the number of campaigns; directly involving the clubs in determining their share of responsibility in minimum nation-wide campaigns; normalizing certain phases of Communist activity to eliminate emergency mobilizations and pressures, and providing the clubs with that type of information which will enable them to stand on their own feet.

Recognizing these developments and the present status of our membership and their relationship to the mass movement, we must face the fact that we cannot expect to be the same well-knit Communist organization we were when we were smaller and composed of a group of conscientious and tested Communists. When we say this, it does not mean that we shall relax all our tested organizational principles and become a loose, meaningless body. We remain a Marxist political organization, and as such maintain the essential features of the Communist movement. When we emphasize the changes in the character of our organization demanded by the new

conditions, this cannot be an excuse for the impermissible dues situation in some districts, the neglect of *Daily Worker* club subscriptions and *Worker* circulation, or failure to distribute our literature and the *Political Affairs* monthly. Each of these phases of our work can and should be improved.

THE C.P.A. CLUBS AND THE DEMOCRATIC COALITION

The problem in regard to which there is least clarity, and around which numerous discussions have taken place, is the specific role of the C.P.A. club and its relationship to the mass movement, to the camp of national unity. Everything we said at the national convention was correct and merits re-reading.

The apparent difficulty arises because many members of the club are involved in the mass political organizations that comprise the local foundations of the democratic coalition. Since we have no immediate objectives separate and apart from the program of the democratic coalition, some people cannot see fully the specific role and contribution of the C.P.A. club as such in the community.

What we must make clear, on the basis of experience, including the rich experiences of the recent election struggle, is the role of the C.P.A. club itself in raising and clarifying the numerous issues: how it can help achieve maximum unity behind the program of action necessary for the

broad coalition; how it can effectively answer the arguments of the enemy and avoid the mistakes of some allies within the democratic camp who, like the liberals, often want to make secondary questions the main issues, and thereby endanger the existence of the coalition; how it can develop activities that will mobilize and activate the masses in support of the coalition; and above all, how the entire coalition shall pursue a consistent line and "keep its eye on the ball."

Each of us could cite a hundred experiences from the recent election campaign showing how the C.P.A. did precisely these things. In the larger scope of things we know that our specific contribution to the campaign was not only in hard work during the key weeks of the campaign, or in assistance on current tactical questions, but above all our early and clear presentation of policy for this campaign over a year ago. Let us not forget that the key question to be settled in the first place was support for the fourth term for F.D.R. After analyzing the situation, knowing what was at stake in this election, the non-partisan character of the coalition that had to be created, the forces available to lead the campaign, our stand was clear and unequivocal. However, at that time the decisive sections of the C.I.O. had not yet taken a stand on this question. They were still not convinced. The Dubinskys and the New York *Post* were still raising all sorts of secondary

issues on Roosevelt's record, to create hesitation, vacillation and even opposition to the idea of a fourth term. Our bold initiative, clear-cut arguments and persistent efforts to influence the people and first of all the labor movement on this key question, as on so many others, were successful. One can give numerous other examples which emphasize the indispensable role the C.P.A. played during this crucial year.

To fulfill its political-educational role, the C.P.A. club, if it is to grow and exercise its maximum influence, must simultaneously have a life of its own. It is not enough that our large community clubs issue statements, organize the systematic sale of the *Daily Worker*, *The Worker*, and other literature, distribute leaflets and organize forums, important and necessary as all these activities are. The C.P.A. club must stimulate community mass movements around the major issues, in which it will itself be accepted as a cooperating part. On occasion, the C.P.A. club may have to initiate and itself organize a particular activity, if the rest of the labor or progressive movement is not fully aware or clear as to its significance. However, in most cases, the latter will not be necessary if we are firmly rooted in the mass movement.

While we must eliminate any sectarian attitude of competitive mass activities with the democratic coalition, at the same time we should be clear that we do not and cannot reduce our role to working *through*

other organizations. We must emphasize working *with* other organizations. And this requires that the C.P.A. shall develop activities in its own name together with other organizations. Otherwise, we shall have a conception of our association as being exclusively a cadre organization, which means we should not have C.P.A. clubs but merely variations of the old fractions. As a matter of fact, it is precisely in the communities that we can most easily attain that "legitimate place in the camp of national unity on the basis of our merits" of which Earl Browder spoke. We already have excellent examples of clubs which have attained that status and are now fully accepted by the community.

Some may consider as contradictory this method of functioning, whereby large numbers of our members will be active in various mass organizations on the basis of an immediate program that corresponds to our own immediate goals, while at the same time our C.P.A. clubs develop their own independent activities. We must understand, however, that out of this seeming contradiction progress for the entire democratic camp will be forthcoming, and with it our own legitimate place in the democratic camp. To the extent that we establish our citizenship within the democratic coalition the specific complications we experience today will be greatly reduced.

This brings us to the question: What organizational forms are nec-

essary for functioning under these conditions?

SOME ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS

The large community club remains the basic unit of the C.P.A., with an approach to size as outlined in my article, "Problems of Club Leadership and Democracy in the C.P.A.," in the *Communist* for November. However, we must recognize that we have suffered temporary setbacks as a result of the dissolution of the shop and industrial branches. These setbacks consist in our inability to influence the political thinking of the labor movement down below in the shops and locals as effectively as in the past. We are not adequately bringing our ideas, through the medium of the press, pamphlets, forums and general individual education, to ever larger sections of shop workers and local union activists as in previous years.

What we suggested at the time of the dissolution of the shop and industrial branches as a means of meeting this anticipated difficulty, was carried through very inadequately. We must say frankly, that in the main, our Communist trade union leaders are desirous of working more effectively on the basis of greater Communist understanding, but do not, and for the immediate period will not, get from the average club that necessary political assistance in answering the complex problems that confront them as trade union lead-

ers. And yet, these are the most valued capital of our organization, precisely because they lead and influence the mass labor movement.

There is no simple answer to this problem; we must find the solution in a combination of forms and methods which will result in greater political guidance to this very decisive section of our membership.

All those who belong to clubs and have greater or less contact with the clubs should of course remain in that position. Each state leadership, in consultation with the clubs, as well as with the two categories here indicated, should work out supplementary forms of C.P.A. organizations that will achieve the main objective of bringing the members together to discuss their problems in the light of the general program and strategy of the C.P.A.

Without outlining any hard and fast organizational form to answer the problem, the following ideas should receive consideration:

1. The organization of educational meetings of all trade unionists belonging to one club or a combination of clubs; in some cases these meetings can be limited to a specific industry or be made to include a number or all industries.

2. Greater attention to the further improvement in the work of the Club Labor Secretary and Labor Committee.

3. The establishment of a small committee in each industry on a city scale, responsible to the County

Committees, which can on occasion call meetings of the members in its respective industry.

4. The establishment of *Worker* Press Clubs on a shop or local union basis, to consist of C.P.A. and non-C.P.A. readers of *The Worker*, whose main interest will be increasing *The Worker* circulation in the shops and unions while at the same time carrying through political discussions on issues affecting labor and the nation.

5. The organization of smaller C.P.A. branches to answer the needs of these specific members; the exact form of these branches shall be left to each district to work out, the determining consideration being what will best serve the purposes of the closest political contact with the particular group of members.

Among the several thousands of members who need special forms of C.P.A. organization, it would be well to consider carrying through a special campaign to get all of these members to agree to a few minimum responsibilities: reading the *Daily Worker* regularly; securing a special subscription that would entitle them to *Political Affairs* for a year and to every pamphlet that is printed during the corresponding period; reading and helping to distribute the literature dealing with the problems discussed at their C.P.A. meetings.

The rapid training of a broad C.P.A. leading cadre equipped with the political understanding to assume the responsibility of club leadership

is another critical question which demands solution. This problem was dealt with in some detail in the article in the November *Communist*, which outlined the fundamental questions in relation to the training of leadership. However, some additional points should be stressed.

STRENGTHENING THE CLUB LEADERSHIP

In carrying through our correct orientation of directing everyone into mass work, there were occasions when this policy was vulgarized, resulting in the weakening of many club leaderships. The convention policy was meant for the entire organization, yet we did not weaken the state or national leadership, although there is no doubt that everyone of the state and national leaders could do effective work in mass organizations. We must guarantee that there is an able and adequate club leadership, approaching its selection with a firm understanding that the C.P.A. club leadership is just as important as leadership of any other community mass organization, and that it is important mass work. In fact, without capable club leaders we cannot and will not have the most effective mass work in the communities.

The new club cadres who substituted for the experienced cadres now in the armed forces have under the circumstances done a splendid job. Nevertheless, we must recognize that we suffer from the absence of an experienced cadre trained in long years

of struggle and activities. In New York City, where we have a corps of five to six thousand members of some years' standing in the Communist movement, who have accumulated knowledge and experience, the problem is not aggravated. New York also has an extensive training program whereby people are constantly given Marxist education and systematic training for leading posts. It is otherwise, however, in Detroit. Here the cadres are not only without previous experience as club leaders, but they have no reservoir of past knowledge and experience, because they are in the majority new members themselves. Most of the club leaders in Detroit are not ten steps ahead of the members, and the average member differs but little in political development from a progressive trade unionist, except that he belongs to our organization.

In every city throughout the country we must establish a systematic training program for our club cadres, as well as for other leading forces, to meet this situation and solve many of the acute organizational questions facing the Association.

* * *

The problems raised here are not solely organizational. They are political problems, questions of key importance, related to the future influence of our Association. Any underestimation of the effectiveness of the C.P.A., any tendency to minimize its special role and contribution, will

endanger the existence of the democratic coalition as a whole, will seriously impede the necessary clarity and understanding of its new tasks. If the C.P.A. is to help provide a practical answer to the new problems, if we are to help maintain and extend the people's coalition in support of the Administration and its program, if we are to help labor assume its role of leadership in this great people's movement, then we must remove every obstacle in the way of the further consolidation and building of our Association. To ful-

fill the great responsibilities which history sets before us, we must guarantee that our membership, armed with Marxist science, contributes that clarity, resoluteness, foresight, and activity which will help fortify the people's unity to advance on the democratic path of development opened up by the new epoch of world history in which we live. In the words of Earl Browder, "our Association is our basic, our most indispensable weapon and base of operations without which everything else would fall to pieces."

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE U. S. S. R.— GUARANTEE OF DEMOCRACY

By P. TUMANOV

EIGHT YEARS AGO, on December 5, 1936, the new Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was adopted. This new Constitution came to be called by the people the Stalin Constitution, and rightly so, for Stalin was its initiator and also personally directed the work of the drafting commission and the commission which worded the final text.

Furthermore, it was under Stalin's leadership that the great victories of the Soviet people embodied in the Constitution were achieved.

The new Constitution, which was adopted by the Extraordinary Eighth Congress on December 5, 1936, is a document worded with great precision and clarity. It defined the fundamental rights and political liberties of the citizens of the U.S.S.R., and marked a new stage in the development of the Soviet Socialist State as a democratic political system.

The new Constitution invested the citizens of the Soviet Union with broad political rights and democratic

liberties: it guarantees their right to work, to rest and leisure, to education, to maintenance in old age, sickness and loss of capacity to work, and the right to unite in public organizations, as well as inviolability of person and home and privacy of correspondence.

All Soviet citizens enjoy equal rights, irrespective of their nationality or race, property or professional status, sex, education or social origin.

A distinguishing feature of this Constitution is that it does not confine itself to defining the formal rights of citizens, but stresses the guarantees of these rights, and the means by which they can be exercised. It does not merely proclaim democratic liberties, but insures them by legislatively providing material means for their enjoyment.

Constitution Day is an annual holiday in the Soviet Union and a reminder that consistent democracy, developed to the full, has triumphed in the U.S.S.R.

What is the essential feature of Soviet democracy? It is that the working people in their millions have a share in the administration of their State, that the country is governed by the people themselves through Soviets of Working People's Deputies.

The Constitution establishes that the Soviets of Working People's Deputies constitute the political foundation of the U.S.S.R., and that all power belongs to the working people of town and country as represented by the So-

viets of Working People's Deputies. In other words, the Soviets are organs of State power and the working people of the U.S.S.R.—workers and intelligentsia—directly administer the affairs of the State through the Soviets.

The Soviets—from the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., as the highest organ of State authority, down to the rural Soviets as organs of State authority in localities—are the true vehicles of State power.

The Soviets of Working People's Deputies are democratic organs. They are elected by all citizens of the U.S.S.R.—men and women who have reached the age of 18, irrespective of race or nationality, religion, education, residential qualifications, social origin, property status or past activities—with the exception of insane persons and persons who have been convicted by a court of law and whose sentences include deprivation of electoral rights.

Elections are by electoral areas, on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage and secret ballot.

The composition of the membership of the Soviets and the fact that no limiting qualifications are placed on the right of people to vote is a vivid practical demonstration of the principles of Soviet democracy.

The number of deputies elected to all the Soviets—the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous Republics and the rural Soviets—in the years 1938-1940 exceeded 1,400,000.

Between 98 and 99 per cent of the electorate took part in voting, and some 20 million persons, representing public organizations and working people's societies sat on the electoral commissions which supervised the elections.

The Constitution establishes equality of suffrage for men and women, and women hold an honorable place in all Soviets. There are 227 women in the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., 1,525 women in the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous Republics, and 456,673 women in the local Soviets. In other words, over 458,000 women have a direct share in the administration of the State, which represents 33 per cent of the total number of deputies.

The Constitution declares that equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, State, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of rights of, or conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges, for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness, or hatred or contempt, is punishable by law.

The equality of the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. is vividly reflected in the national affiliations of the deputies to the Supreme Soviets. National equality is also reflected in the fact that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. consists of two Chambers:

the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. Both Chambers have equal rights; both have equal right to initiate legislation, and the members of both Chambers are elected for a term of four years. The Soviet of the Union is elected on the basis of one deputy for every 300,000 of the population. The Soviet of Nationalities is elected on the basis of 25 deputies from each Union Republic, eleven deputies from each Autonomous Republic, five deputies from each Autonomous Region, and one deputy from each National Area, irrespective of size or population of the Republic, Region or Area.

The present deputies to the Supreme Soviet belong to 64 different nationalities; deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, to 37 nationalities; deputies to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, to eight; deputies to the Byelorussian Republic, to nine; to the Azerbaijan Republic, to 16; to the Georgian Republic, to 11; and to the Uzbek Republic, to 19.

The same diversity of national make-up characterizes the Supreme Soviets of other Union and Autonomous Republics. For example, the national affiliation of the deputies of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic is as follows: 123 Turkmen, 69 Russian, 11 Uzbeks, seven Ukrainians, three Kazakhs, three Jews, two Tatars and one each from the Azerbaijanian, Armenian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Kirghiz, Moldavian,

Turkish and Chuvash nationalities.

The make-up of the local Soviets is similarly multi-national. Deputies to the territorial and regional Soviets belong to 51 different nationalities; to the district Soviets, to 83 nationalities; to the city Soviets and city district Soviets, to 68; to the rural Soviets, to 85.

An interesting feature is that the proportion of deputies to local Soviets belonging to each nationality is roughly equal to the proportion of the total number of members of that nationality to the total population of the U.S.S.R. For example, Russians constitute 58.4 per cent of the total population, while the number of Russian deputies to local Soviets constitutes 55.5 per cent of the total number of deputies. Corresponding figures for the Ukrainians are 16.6 per cent and 17.6 per cent; Georgians, 1.3 and 1.6 per cent; Turkmen, 0.5 and 0.6 per cent, and similarly for the other nationalities.

The Stalin Constitution is an embodiment of the unshakable friendship that binds the multi-national peoples of the Soviet Union. All this shows convincingly that the organs of State power in the Soviet Union are genuinely democratic; that the people govern themselves.

But this does not exhaust the essential character of Soviet democracy. Through the Soviets and through their professional organizations, the Soviet people — workers, collective farmers, office employees, engineers, technicians, agronomists, doctors,

teachers, and other workers by hand or brain—take an active part in the public and political life of the State, and, in time of war, in the effort to defeat the enemy.

This is the fourth successive year that the Soviet Union celebrates its Constitution Day in the midst of the Patriotic War against the German-fascist invaders. War in general is a searching test of states and peoples, of the stability of the political system of the belligerent countries. The Soviet Union has stood the test of war with credit.

When they attacked the Soviet Union, the Nazis counted on the Soviet system being unstable, and believed that after the first serious blow and the first reverses suffered by the Red Army, conflicts would break out between workers and farmers, quarrels would begin among the peoples of the U.S.S.R., uprisings would occur and the country would fall to pieces. But the Germans sadly miscalculated. The reverses of the Red Army at the beginning of the war did not weaken but only served to strengthen both the alliance of workers and farmers and the friendship of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

The fight put up by the Soviet people and its Army against the German invaders in the three and one-half years of war is a striking confirmation of the stability and firmness of the Soviet system, and of the friendship binding the Soviet peoples.

As Stalin said: "It is not only military defeat that the Hitlerites have sustained in this war, but moral and

political defeat as well. The ideology of equality of all races and nations which has taken firm root in our country, the ideology of friendship among the peoples, has emerged completely victorious over the Hitlerite ideology of bestial nationalism and racial hatred."

The Soviet people are heroically defending against the fascist barbarians their political rights and democratic liberties established in the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. The immense significance of the new Soviet Constitution of 1936 is not confined to the Soviet Union; it is international. In his speech introducing the Draft Constitution at the Congress of Soviets, Stalin said that it would be an indictment of fascism, inasmuch as it testified that socialism and democracy are invincible, and that the new Constitution would be a moral support and a real backing to all who were combating fascism. The whole course of events has corroborated this statement.

The people of the world who are faithful to the democratic principle have united to form a single camp against the fascist foe of mankind.

The Soviet peoples are united under the banner of the Stalin Constitution and, led and inspired by their great leader and teacher, Marshal Stalin, have been and will be in the foremost ranks of the United Nations in the fight for the earliest defeat and complete destruction of Hitlerism, and the establishment of enduring peace, for the happiness and prosperity of nations.



UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

By CARL ROSS

AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION almost unanimously holds that post-war peace and security can be assured only by a "United Nations" organization along the lines envisioned at Teheran and Dumbarton Oaks.

The first guarantee of the peace is, of course, the utter destruction of the German and Japanese war machines which are being relentlessly shattered by the overwhelming might of the American, British and Soviet armed forces. When that final victory is won an effective monopoly of the world's military strength will remain in the hands of the three great powers leading in the establishment of an orderly and peaceful world. This strength is already pledged to carrying through, in cooperation with their allies, the armed occupation of the enemy nations and jointly enforcing the peace.

Each member of this coalition must, of course, maintain the post-war military forces necessary to fulfill these obligations. If any partner in this coalition was to declare that when victory is attained it will dissolve its military strength or withdraw from its commitments, the whole structure upon which victory and the peace rests would be weakened. On the other hand, the coal-

ition will immediately be strengthened by an assurance that its component States will maintain the military strength necessary to enforce the peace. It is particularly in this spirit that we should approach the establishment of a system of post-war universal obligatory military training in the United States as an *immediate* question.

Universal military training is an essential corollary to our international commitments and for assuring our national security. It is the most effective and democratic method by which the United States can build and maintain a military establishment geared to the needs of the post-war world.

Such responsible military leaders as Secretary of War, Stimson; Secretary of the Navy, Forrester; and Chief of Staff, Marshall, have declared recently their unequivocal support to a post-war system of universal military training. General Marshall, in his directives concerning the planning of the post-war military establishment of the United States, assumes that "the Congress will enact (as the essential foundation of an effective national military organization) that every able-bodied young American shall be trained to defend

his country; and that for a reasonable period after his training . . . he shall be incorporated into a reserve."

Here we have the argument for universal military training in a nutshell; it is the "*essential foundation of an effective national military organization.*"

This argument rests upon the sound premise of hard earned experience in this war and past wars. The responsibilities of modern war with all its enormous technological advances in military science cannot be thrust upon the shoulders of young men who are militarily illiterate. Pearl Harbor found the youth of this country inadequately prepared to assume the job of combat against the seasoned troops of Germany and Japan. The precious time during which we mobilized, trained and equipped these previously untrained young men through war-time Selective Service was dearly paid for in the blood and lives of hundreds of thousands of our courageous allies. The best guarantee that we shall never be at the mercy of an aggressor or be unprepared to fulfill our obligations in checking aggression lies in training our young men in peace time.

In proposing precisely this, our military leaders are modernizing our concept of national defense and bringing our military policy into harmony with the realities of the world. Under modern conditions the fundamental democratic principle that every able-bodied citizen should be trained to defend his country can

only be assured by a system of universal obligatory military training. Brigadier General Palmer, Advisor to the Special Planning Division, War Department, recently declared that the "reservists of the future" must be trained in time of peace and our experience in the present war has shown that "they should have at least one year of continuous and progressive training as individuals and as members of an effective military team, before they enter the Reserves. The reserve organization of the future must therefore be highly flexible. . . . It is obvious that a nation-wide organization of territorial divisions as in the plan of 1920 [based upon voluntary National Guard enlistments, C.R.] will not meet these conditions."

Expressing the opposite view is the statement of policy of the recent pre-election Conference of Republican governors under Governor Dewey's leadership which clearly inferred opposition to universal military training under the guise of defending "our traditional State National Guard System" and opposing a "centralized federal" military establishment.

Opposition to universal military training, no matter how disguised, reduces itself to a rejection of the essential military commitments that we must make to maintain the peace. The opponents of universal military training offer no other *more effective* means of re-enforcing our international agreements. They leave us with the inevitable conclusion that

they have rejected the whole policy of Teheran and Dumbarton Oaks which must stand or fall upon the ability of the United Nations to implement it in the military as well as the political and economic field.

Those who suggest that action on universal military training should be put off until after the war are, whatever their intention, bringing grist to the mill of its open opponents and are seriously endangering our post-war security. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ, for instance, states that action at this time "might be so interpreted as to prejudice the post-war settlement and jeopardize the possibility of achieving the kind of world order reflected in our government's war aims." How can a declaration of our intention to maintain arms to enforce the peace "prejudice" or "jeopardize" the post-war outlook? On the contrary, precisely the lack of planning for implementing our post-war pledges would place our future in jeopardy. These churchmen are insisting that the United Nations discuss a system of post-war security without considering the matter of how the United States will put teeth into it.

Norman Thomas, who speaks most articulately for the pacifist and defeatist views on this issue, has made clear that his opposition to post-war military training is based upon opposition to the policies represented by our President.

He charges that Roosevelt recommended study of this question dur-

ing the Dumbarton Oaks Conference because he had no faith in the possibility of maintaining the peace. Once again the accomplices of the war-makers attempt to parade as the champions of peace. Just as the Norman Thomases demagogically opposed collective security on the grounds that it would have meant war and thus helped to disarm the democratic world in the face of fascist aggression, they now urge us to enter the post-war world utterly unprepared to deal with aggression—ready to fall victim to the future violaters of the peace.

Surely we have learned in the bitter struggles since Munich and in this war that only those people are truly for peace who are willing to organize ruthless war against the fascist war-makers. Arms, the mightiest aggregation of arms ever assembled, have become today the instruments for re-establishing the peace. In the hands of a world organized for peace they will be the strongest bulwark of world security.

Of course, pacifists refuse to recognize the plain historic facts. To them all wars are inherently evil and reactionary in their consequences—even the truly great liberating war against fascism and aggression. Thus the pacifists as a camp became accomplices of the fascist war makers in the days of Munich when the democratic world might still have averted a world-wide conflict by smashing the aggressors in Spain and China. And today the pacifists cry out for a

soft peace that would most certainly give us nothing better than a short interlude between wars. Pacifism—masking itself in the cloak of love for peace—remains a deadly, corroding influence upon our efforts to win the war and the peace. Already its influence is at work to undermine the bases for post-war security by raising a clamor against armament and universal military training. The pacifists will endeavor to lend a cloak of respectability to the die-hard defeatists in their design to wreck the peace.

Marxists have never shared with pacifists the illusion that the mere existence of armaments leads to war. Essentially armaments are instruments of policy, serving and executing the policy that is directing them. Armaments lead to war only in the hands of aggressors bent upon war and conquest. In the hands of nations seeking peace they become effective instruments for defending the peace. Thomas and his associates conjure up wild dreams of a post-war armament race leading inevitably to new-world war and counsel against a system of universal military training as leading to such an armament race. This is utter nonsense. The policies of Teheran and Dumbarton Oaks lead to the only rational possibility of international agreements for limiting armaments and avoiding armament races. If the policies of Thomas which nullify Teheran and Dumbarton Oaks were to prevail, then indeed we would witness the outbreak of imperialist antagonisms, civil

strife and armament races among the nations of the world preparatory to new wars on a scale our imagination cannot possibly picture.

The most reactionary enemies of Teheran in the United States dream of replacing the outlook for a stable and secure world with a drive toward world domination by a reactionary American imperialism. Some of these spokesmen of a rampant U. S. imperialism, who have been roundly defeated at the polls, also advocate military training for American youth. The Hearst press and the *N. Y. Daily News* give editorial support while at the same time attempting to whip up a feverish war spirit particularly against the Soviet Union. They want to train American youth in a Nazi spirit and to saddle the nation with an unprecedented race for American arms superiority over the rest of the world in order to do the job that Hitler failed to do. By the re-election of Roosevelt the American people have rejected the policy of these imperialists for whom the Hearst press and *Daily News* speak. Thus our nation has also rejected the kind of support to universal military training that these reactionaries give. This serves to emphasize the fact that arms without correct policy are ineffective in assuring our security—that fundamental to all else is the issue of strengthening our policy of collaboration with the Soviet Union and Great Britain as the bulwark of our peace and security.

WASHINGTON FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The advocates of universal military training wish to continue our democratic military tradition. As stated by General Marshall, "all our great wars have been fought in the main by citizen armies, the proposal for an organized citizen army reserve in time of peace is merely a proposal for perfecting a traditional national institution to meet modern requirements which no longer permit extemporization after the outbreak of war." Universal military service was first advocated by George Washington in 1790, but unfortunately was never adopted as a permanent basis of military policy. The aversion of early Americans to the enforced conscript service of European tyrants was so strong as to establish a long American practice of universal service *only in time of war*. Now, however, to leave the matter of determining the method of mobilizing and training our armed forces until after the outbreak of war is to deprive us of the forces needed to prevent or quickly to eliminate aggression. Never in our country's history was an effective peacetime military policy so necessary; for never before did such an opportunity exist for organizing the world for peace. Our best course is to continue in the footsteps of the Father of Our Country who so wisely anticipated America's needs. We would do well also to heed his advice and act now before the les-

sons of this war are lost on succeeding generations of young people. Washington once wrote in regard to his plan for universal service:

"I am particularly anxious it should receive as early attention as circumstances will admit, because it is now in our power to avail ourselves of the military knowledge disseminated throughout the several states by means of the many well-instructed officers and soldiers of the late Army, a resource which is daily diminishing by death and other causes. To suffer this peculiar advantage to pass away unimproved would be to neglect an opportunity which will never again occur, unless, unfortunately, we should again be involved in a long and arduous war."

Universal military service is consistent with American democratic concepts and tradition. It is the most democratic system of military service. It is the very antithesis of the system of Prussian militarism developed to its apex by Hitler; which is based upon enslavement and regimentation of the people and their indoctrination with poisonous "race superiority" concepts. A democratic system of universal military service creates a citizen army, an army close to the people, and enhances the ability of the people in a democracy to guide their own destiny and defend their own national welfare.

FOR A DEMOCRATIC CITIZEN ARMY

This has been demonstrated by the operation of the Selective Service Act during this war. In all the great democratic wars fought by the U. S.

there has been a bond of close solidarity between the people as a whole and the armed forces. But never has that bond been closer than in the present complete identity of purpose existing between our armed forces and the people at home, between the armed forces and the organized labor movement. Our armed forces today are flesh and bone of the nation and are stirred by the same will to victory. Contrast this for a moment with the Hitler armies whose hardened core has been composed of the corrupted and enslaved generation of German youth doing the bidding of their Nazi masters.

The difference is most clearly demonstrated in the high democratic morale that imbues our fighting men, a morale strengthened by the army command on the assumption that a true citizens army must know what it is fighting for. While the Nazi armies are fed poisonous Hitlerite lies and anti-democratic filth, our armed forces are imbued with a devotion to democracy, an ever-growing knowledge of the character of the enemy, a deepening understanding of our Allies. Morale education is being developed more and more systematically in our armed forces. The latest and best example is the order of the army command that the army morale program counteract the vicious anti-labor slanders that are being promoted in an effort to divide the armed forces from the labor movement. Its main fault lies not in any limitation of its democratic con-

tent but in its, as yet, inadequate execution on the part of the whole lower military organization.

A post-war system of universal military training must continue and enormously expand this type of education in conjunction with training in the arts of war. There is no effective substitute for this combination of military and citizenship training. The war-time benefits of eliminating illiteracy, broadening the outlook of the individual soldier, creating a new sense of civic responsibility—these would be multiplied in time of peace and become an important factor in giving a firm foundation to the democratic morale of the whole nation.

Great progress can be recorded in building a citizen army during the war, despite intolerable hangovers of undemocratic practices. Under the leadership of the Commander-in-Chief a new direction has been given to the armed forces. The Jim Crow ridden peacetime professional army has begun to give way to the citizen army in which nearly a million Negroes are proud soldiers. Many Jim Crow barriers have fallen, the latest action being the army order barring discrimination in army posts. However, the basic system of segregation and discrimination still continues to exist as a symbol of the fact that this nation still tolerates practices that can only be justified by Hitlerite theories of white supremacy. This problem stands at the root of every anti-democratic practice that still remains in the armed forces.

Until full equality for every citizen in military service is established, we shall not have full democracy for all, nor shall we have the most efficient military organization. Military necessity is compelling a new direction of democratic development that must be so continued as to shatter the time-encrusted practices of Jim Crow. Universal military service would make it possible to establish all wartime advances toward full military equality as permanent features of our national life. At the same time, it must not be allowed to fix the Negroes' status in military service anywhere short of full equality. The final blows must be struck *now* in the course of the war itself as an aid to speedier victory. We cannot afford to enter the post-war period with the damaging effect of these anti-democratic practices carried over from the slave-market past. The effort to eliminate discriminatory practices in the armed forces should also be directed toward establishing the full rights of Negro ex-servicemen under such legislation as the G.I. Bill of Rights.

MILITARY TRAINING IS THE REAL ISSUE

Universal military service enables every citizen to share equally in both the responsibility and privilege of defending the nation. As pointed out by General Marshall, the type of military organization maintained by Germany and Japan concentrates control of the armed forces "and the

international political policy associated therewith" in the hands of a small "special class or caste of professional soldiers." Universal military training directed toward building a mass citizen reserve opens the ranks of the armed forces and the military command to the wide mass of citizens, as in fact has been the case in this war. The positive steps thrust upon us by the war toward extending the officer cadre beyond a limited and privileged circle should not be cancelled out by a return to the pre-war status in which the vast body of citizens were excluded from knowledge of, and participation in, military affairs.

Undoubtedly a system of universal military service will benefit the health and welfare of young people. Our war-time experience has revealed these possibilities in the excellent medical work and physical training done by the armed forces. Startling statistics brought to light by Selective Service show a crucial problem with respect to youth health. But no one will suggest that a program of military training be regarded as a substitute for a national health and fitness program. It can best be a valuable corollary. This obviously is the intent of the recommendations of our military leaders and the President's proposal for military service that would include some aspects of civilian training. The issue is not between "pure" military training and social welfare, as some would make it.

There are those who confuse the issue by proposing a vague scheme of "national service" as a substitute for military training under military leadership. This seems to be the case with the President and faculty of Oberlin College whose "national service" plan is being widely circulated. Needless to say, their outlook is closely akin to a pacifist outlook; for there is fundamentally only one sound justification for a system of compulsory youth training, that is, that it be primarily military in character.

LEGION TAKES THE LEAD

A major battle both in the nation generally and in Congress is shaping up on this issue. The recent American Legion Convention has pledged the powerful influence of that organization to a drive for enactment of legislation this winter by Congress. The other veterans' organizations likewise have indicated their support. Army publications all confirm the fact that servicemen's opinion is solidly favorable. This initiative and leadership from organized veterans will register with great impact upon the nation. But this is not an issue for veterans' action alone. Without extended cooperation among all patriotic groups it would be next to impossible to visualize the passage of legislation over the heads of the "isolationist" bloc in Congress and a powerful pacifist lobby.

The basis for broad unity exists. Every public opinion poll shows a

substantial majority of the people behind the principle involved. The *Fortune Magazine* Poll records 69.1 per cent in favor, as proof that this is not a minority opinion. The most recent group to record its support to universal military service is the United States Chamber of Commerce in a resolution along substantially the same lines as that of the Legion.

Labor as a whole, especially the CIO, has yet to be heard from on this issue, though support to universal military training is entirely consistent with the whole policy of the major sections of the labor movement who are united in support of the President's foreign policy. The resolution of the recent A. F. of L. Convention expressing opposition cannot be regarded as the voice of labor any more than that convention voiced the true sentiment of labor on other important issues. It is to be hoped that the trade unions will begin to speak out favorably on this question. There are few issues upon which a solid basis for labor-veteran cooperation can be built so effectively.

Universal military training is a prime issue for the American youth and their organizations. Only the American Youth for Democracy has declared its unequivocal and energetic support, though an ever larger number of youth groups are being drawn into the public discussion of this issue. Above all, the pacifist minority of the youth movement, egged on by the followers of Norman

Thomas, must not be allowed to pretend that they speak for all the youth. The initiative rightfully belongs with those who speak for the majority opinion. Once the issue is raised, broad support will be forthcoming from wide circles of the youth and student movement. Youth leaders should not make the mistake of believing that this will be an "unpopular" question. On the contrary, any youth movement that hopes to work with and command the respect of the youth, particularly of the returning veterans, must register its stand in favor of universal military training in unequivocal terms. Around this question a new coopera-

tive relationship can be developed by the youth movement with the veterans' organizations and other important groups.

* * *

The fight for universal military training is an integral part of the fight for assuring that America plays its full role in the great coalition of democratic powers that is winning the war and organizing the peace. Firm unity of the whole nation behind the leadership of President Roosevelt and his policies is the best assurance that this important step toward guaranteeing our future security is taken in the near future.

THE PEOPLE WON IN TEXAS!

By DAVID CARPENTER

THE OVERWHELMING election victory of Roosevelt in Texas on November 7 was the culmination of the greatest political struggle which has taken place in Texas and the South since the Civil War. When the patriotic forces supporting Roosevelt, national unity and international cooperation defeated the reactionary remnants of feudal Bourbonism, which had ruled in Texas and the South and countless generations, they set into motion the restless forces of Southern progress, stifled all too long, to decide the future of Texas and the South. The significance of this great political struggle for the South and the entire nation cannot be measured truly today. Its reverberations will resound down the decades to come as the people of the Southern states forge the magnificent destiny implicit in the immense untouched resources of human talents and materials of the South.

"The Democratic Party has been liberated." In these words, former Gov. James V. Allred announced the victory of the forces of national unity and Roosevelt at the September 12 Texas Democratic convention.

This was the second time since the

Civil War that the people of Texas sought to recapture for themselves the heritage of democracy forged in the American Revolution.

Once before they had tried it. In the 1880's and the 1890's, the anger of the Texas farmers, sorely tried by the railroads and their masters of Wall Street, burst through. They organized a People's Party which fought the entrenched Democratic Party machine, mouthpiece of these reactionary elements. And in 1894, they almost succeeded in wresting power from this political machine.

They lost then because they were fighting the traditional institutionalized one-party system of the South, as represented in the Democratic Party, which had once articulated their aspirations, desires and needs, but which had been frozen into a symbol of backward-looking unity after the Civil War by the reactionary elements who were seeking to preserve the feudal agricultural economy of ante-bellum days.

The people of Texas lost then because the entrenched political machine was able to poison the minds of the citizens with racial prejudice. They lost because the People's Party was unable to overcome the intimidation of the Negro people by the dominant feudal slavocracy.

They lost then because there was no industrial working class in the cities of Texas with which to unite.

But this time—in 1944—the people of Texas won because the struggle was carried on within the framework

of the traditional institutionalized one-party system of the South. They won because there was a national Democratic Party with a people's leader and a set of principles representing their needs and aspirations, to which they could attach themselves.

The people of Texas won this time, because the great War of Liberation we are now fighting created a tremendous industrial working class in the cities of Texas, which became a great political force for democracy and with whom the embattled farmers and pro-F.D.R. sections of industry could unite. They won because the United States Supreme Court had already handed down its momentous "white primary" decision laying the basis for freeing the Negro people of Texas politically.

THE CONTENDING FORCES

Who were the oponents in this great struggle? They were never described more clearly than in a leading article in the *Texas Democrat*, campaign newspaper of the Texas Democratic Executive Committee, by Ralph G. Bray, Galveston Democratic leader.

On one side, Mr. Bray wrote, were "huge oil companies, squandering selfishly our vast natural wealth; big insurance companies, who use their power to prejudice government; large sulphur intersts that have made a half billion dollars from beneath our soil, and who maintain vicious lobbies in Austin and Washington;

railroads, flushed with prosperity, but who use their henchmen to frustrate the public interest; big newspapers, taking their cue from the Hearst-Howard-McCormick axis to corrupt democracy; some big ranchers, who fear that taxation may force them to disgorge; millionaires, now spending the legal limit or more to undermine progressive politics; professional labor-baiters, hired by Joe Pew and others to defeat liberalism; rotten demagogues who start newspapers to slander our President and fool the gullible . . . Red-baiters who shriek of Communism while sabotaging democracy . . . selfish business men who hate necessary war restrictions; bigots, who would disfranchise our Negroes, poor whites and Mexicans with the rotten poll tax; the disloyal who favor a negotiated peace with Hitler, and those on the lunatic fringe."

On the other side, those supporting Roosevelt, as Mr. Bray described them, were "the true patriots, who place love of country above all else; the genuine Texans, who remain loyal to their party; the liberals, who feel that the world is paying for something better; the radicals, so-called, in violent revulsion against reaction; organized labor, which knows it has a true friend in the President; farmers seeing this Administration as their best friend; teachers, with thoughts focussed on the coming generation, believing that progress necessitates Roosevelt; soldiers who appreciate the fact that

their Commander-in-Chief would rather spend dollars than their lives; mothers, fathers and sweethearts, with loved ones at the front, who believe that the war can only be won quickly through Roosevelt; students who believe that democracy must be shaped to a dynamic era to follow the war; Negroes who appreciate new freedoms won from those who believe in racial injustice; Latin-Americans who see in the Good Neighbor policy a beacon light of hope; party stalwarts who look to Roosevelt as they looked to Cleveland and Wilson; independents whose perspective rises above party lines, and others who see the destiny of Texas interwoven with that of the Democracy of 1944."

The great political struggle carried on in the last few months, which reached a peak in the Presidential election campaign, originated in the councils of the strategists of the reactionary Roosevelt-hating Republicans of the North in the early part of 1944. These elements saw in the solid Democratic South an almost insuperable obstacle to their return to power in the United States. They recognized the necessity for destroying this obstacle. They felt that it could be done if they worked cleverly through the feudal Bourbon elements who controlled the Democratic political machines in the "one-party" Southern states, whose continuance in power was menaced by the policies and actions of the national Democratic Party under the lead-

ership of President Roosevelt. They counted on a close election in the rest of the nation. If, therefore, they could split off one or more of the Southern states from the Roosevelt column, it would be possible for them either to win a majority for the Republican candidate in the Electoral College, or, at worst, to throw the election into the House of Representatives. There, they felt, a coalition of reactionary Republicans and Southern Bourbon Democrats could proceed to choose a President who would do the bidding of the defeatist minority.

As early as mid-1943, Earl Browder warned that this reactionary conspiracy was being hatched. At the meeting of the Communist Party National Committee, held in June, 1943, he stated that "the main current of thinking in the defeatist camp turns in the direction of securing a three-way division of the electoral vote that will deny a majority to any candidate, thus throwing the election into the House of Representatives, which is controlled by the reactionary coalition . . . splitting the Southern poll-tax states away from Roosevelt or Roosevelt's candidate, behind a rival Democratic candidate named by a rump convention which will keep Roosevelt off the ballot in the poll-tax states."

Because Texas has 23 electoral votes, the largest number in the South, and because in that most economically developed State there is the closest connection between many

leaders of its industry and commerce and the reactionary section of North-ern capital, the Republican strategists decided to concentrate their money and efforts on Texas.

They proceeded to bore from within the Democratic Party and captured the May 23 Texas Democratic Presidential Nominating Convention, which traditionally selects the presidential electors.

The voters of Texas were apathetic to the precinct nominating conventions which are the ultimate source of delegates to the state convention, because in the past these quadrennial conventions had been mere formalities. Six months before the State Nominating Convention, some sections of the progressive movement had vainly warned against this apathy. The Republicans moved en masse into these precinct conventions and elected their own friends as delegates to the state convention.

When the State Democratic Presidential Nominating Convention met in Austin on May 23, therefore, these elements were in control, and were able to select a slate of presidential electors pledged to vote against Roosevelt in the Electoral College. They attempted to use their control to force concessions from the President and the Democratic Party nationally.

This would have meant that the voters of Texas would not have the right to vote for their choice between the Presidential candidates of the two major parties, but would be voting

for the Republicans whether they cast their ballots in either the Republican or Democratic column on election day. An overwhelming wave of indignation swept the state.

One opportunity remained for the people to nullify this plot: the September 12 state Democratic Convention, the political complexion of which would be determined by precinct conventions held on July 22, Democratic Primary Day. Feverish efforts were put forth by both sides to win these precinct conventions.

The forces of national unity came out victorious and were able to control the September 12 convention. They threw out the slate of disguised Republican electors chosen by the May Convention, and selected a slate pledged to vote for Roosevelt.

The reactionary Republicrats were not idle in preparation for the September 12 Convention. They poured millions of dollars into Texas to influence the votes of delegates to the convention. They won most of the large city delegations, because the labor movement, which had done a magnificent job in the anti-poll tax campaign, was unable to move its forces into action in the precinct conventions in the urban centers. A further reason was the fact that the city middle class, which was predominantly pro-Roosevelt, did not recognize the importance of the struggle within the Democratic Party. To capture the Convention, the reactionaries needed only to split off a section of the rural counties, which had in-

structed their delegates to vote for Roosevelt electors. Where money could not do the job, they attempted labor-baiting and Red-baiting.

But when the smoke of battle had cleared at the State Convention, the Roosevelt forces had won. The Texas farmers and their representatives, who had once shown their sympathy with organized labor by their open espousal of the cause of the railroad strikers of 1886 in their fight against Jay Gould and Wall Street, could not be baited by anti-labor propaganda. The vote of the rural counties defeated the big city delegations, controlled by the reactionary Republicans.

Two courses of action were open to the reactionary forces. They could either unite under the Republican banner, or set up a third party. They chose the latter course, calling themselves the Texas Regulars. They reasoned that the voters of Texas would under no circumstances vote for the Republican nominees, but that it might be possible for them to win over a sufficient number of Democratic voters on the basis of false issues to defeat Roosevelt in the state.

THE BATTLE FOR VOTES

The election campaign itself was probably the most amazing political event which has ever occurred in a Southern state. The Republicans were silent throughout. It was the Texas Regulars who carried the ball for the reactionary pro-Dewey forces.

Their propaganda was the most vicious and vituperative in the history of politics in the state. They described Roosevelt as the captive of the Communists. They labor-baited and Negro-baited, using as one of their main slogans: "Keep the white in Old Glory."

On the other hand, the Democratic Party led by the Roosevelt forces carried on its campaign on a high political level. It strove for unity of all the pro-Roosevelt forces behind its banner. The paramount issue in the Democratic campaign was the selection of the best leader of the nation for winning the war and building the peace.

The results of the elections were: The Texas Regulars had fewer than 150,000 votes; the Republicans fewer than 200,000, while the Democrats, the party of national unity, had an overwhelming majority of more than 800,000 votes.

Despite the injection of spurious issues, the forces of Bourbonism, feudalism and reaction were able to increase their strength by only a little more than 10 per cent of the popular vote over the previous presidential election, while the progressive Democrats maintained numerically the same vote as in 1940, despite the absence of almost 500,000 Texans in the armed forces, of whom a vast majority undoubtedly would have voted for Roosevelt, if they had not been barred by the un-American poll-tax law.

It is important to stress two points

in the Texas election results. The first is that, while in the other states of the South and the entire nation, there was a loss of total votes, the Texas vote increased over 1940 and gave Roosevelt the biggest numerical majority in the nation. Secondly, unlike almost every other state, the rural vote, despite strenuous efforts by the reactionaries, voted almost 90 per cent for Roosevelt.

But the significance of this overwhelming victory cannot be measured only in its magnificent affirmation of support for President Roosevelt's war and peace policies. This election was also a repudiation of the former leaders of the Democratic Party and a vote of confidence in the new leadership which promises to guide the people of Texas along the road of progress in unity with the rest of the nation.

A SET-BACK TO THE NEGRO-BAITERS

The U. S. Supreme Court decision in the Texas "white primary" case, which affirmed the right of Negro voters to participate in primaries, played a part in the campaign, the importance of which cannot be over-emphasized. It gave the Negro people of Texas the very practical opportunity of participating fully in the political life of Texas and the South, and made it possible for them to join with the other forces of national unity in the state to win the overwhelming majority for Roosevelt. It relieved the Negro voter of the Hob-

son's choice of participating in a minor role in the corrupt, inconsequential Republican Party or not participating in politics at all.

Judge Fleetwood Richards, of Lockhart, declared at a caucus of the Roosevelt delegates to the September 12 convention that the anti-Roosevelt forces would like to make the Negro the issue, but that this was not the issue. Judge Richards also pointed out that the Negroes of Texas have sent their sons, brothers and husbands to fight for our nation; that the Negro people are participating on the home front, in factories and on the farms to produce the materials the armed forces need. The Judge declared that it was not the Negro people who were trying to steal the right to vote away from the white voters of Texas, it was the disguised Republicans in the Democratic Party, he charged, who were trying to rob the citizens of Texas of their free electoral choice. At the conclusion of Judge Richards' speech, one of the two main addresses to the caucus, the four hundred delegates present applauded enthusiastically.

THE NEW ROLE OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE

The next day, at the convention itself, George Butler, then State Democratic chairman, tried to stam-pede the delegates toward the anti-Roosevelt camp by urging amendment of the rules of the State Democratic Party to circumvent the Su-

preme Court decision. But he did not sway the delegates.

The two great new factors influencing the elections were the participation of the Negro people and the organized labor movement.

When the litigation over the "white primary" reached the U. S. Supreme Court, the Negro people began a vigorous campaign for the payment of poll taxes, which brought about a registration of 100,000 Negro voters, either through the payment of poll taxes or the filing of exemptions. About one-ninth of the total Negro population of the state became eligible to vote, an unprecedented number for any Southern state. This compared favorably with the one-fifth of the state for all races and colors. Of the more than two hundred thousand increase in the number of eligible voters over the previous record level of 1940, the Negro people therefore accounted for almost one-half.

Recognizing the importance of getting out the Negro vote, a number of leaders organized a Negro committee for this purpose, with two points in its program: support of the Roosevelt forces within the Texas Democratic Party and the re-election of Roosevelt. This committee organized practically every precinct with a large Negro population in the state. Typical of their work was Dallas, where in each of the 62 precincts having Negro voters there was a precinct committee.

This was the first real experience

of the Negro people in the political life of Texas since the 1890's. (As late as 1895 there was a Negro in the Texas House of Representatives, and he had been seated with the aid of white Democratic votes in the Legislature). Without a doubt, the Negro people will now go forward at a rapid pace.

ORGANIZED LABOR MAKES ITSELF FELT

The second great new factor to enter upon the political scene in the last period was the organized labor movement. In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the nascent trade unions of Texas participated with the farmers in the Union Labor Party. Later they collaborated in the People's Party. In 1885 Houston elected a Labor mayor and board of aldermen. But the trade unions were unable to play a significant role in the politics of Texas, then still a preponderantly agricultural state.

Within recent years, however, it has become a great industrial state. Even before the war it was the third largest manufacturing state west of the Mississippi. And the war, with its great need for armaments to supply the armed forces of the United Nations, has greatly accelerated this process, to the point where more than 450,000 new workers have entered industry since 1940.

A majority of these workers have joined trade unions, at a time when political action was the only real avenue of activity for the labor

movement. The first trial of the new labor movement was its effort to defeat Senator W. Lee O'Daniel in 1942. It failed then because it had neither united with the other forces opposing O'Daniel nor engaged in the work of getting out the vote.

In the recent campaign, however, the trade unions learned from the past. In the first place, the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods united in a number of places for concerted political action. It was this united trade union movement which played a very important role in bringing about the largest registration of voters in the history of Texas, through the payment of poll taxes and the filing of exemptions—nearly 1,600,000 voters despite the absence of almost 500,000 in the armed forces. The united trade union movement of Beaumont, Port Arthur and Orange drove out of office the infamous Martin Dies, thereby rendering the entire nation a great service. Subordinating its own special interests to the broad national interest, organized labor did a yeoman job in mobilizing the various sections of the patriotic citizenry to cast their ballots on election day.

Its main weakness in this period, however, was its inability to realize sufficiently the significance of the struggles at the two state conventions. While some sections of the trade union movement were moved to act in the preliminary precinct conventions, the majority did not put forth the effort necessary to defeat

the well-oiled machine of the reactionaries in the big cities.

A VICTORY FOR THE DEMOCRATIC FORCES OF ALL CLASSES

In alliance with these two new forces in Texas politics the farmers and their middle class allies of the cities were able to defeat the reactionary minority.

Certain sections of business, finance and industry played no small role. While it is true that the representatives of reactionary Northern capital were on the opposite side, fighting bitterly and cunningly to defeat the will of the people, a large group of local financiers and businessmen whose future is tied up with the future of Texas understood who their allies were.

One can see a change in the attitude of these forces taking place today. Let us take the cotton shippers as an example. Cotton is one of the biggest producers of income in the South, especially in Texas, where one third of all farm income is derived from it. Late last year the directors of the American Cotton Shippers Association held a meeting at which they declared:

It is plain that unless world markets for American cotton are restored the American cotton producer faces disaster. *The only hope of avoiding this common disaster to American agriculture, labor and industry is in the development and realization of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.*

In February of this year a committee of cotton shippers met with President Philip Murray of the C.I.O.; William Green of the A. F. of L., and President Roosevelt, to work out plans for cooperation in achieving a foreign policy that would make possible the free flow of trade and raw materials among the nations of the world.

There have been victories of the forces of progress in Texas before; but they have been only temporary. The forces of reaction always managed to win their way back into the leadership of the Democratic Party. This time, however, the forces of national unity are establishing the guarantees to make this impossible. Immediately after the elections, Chairman Harry L. Seay of the State Democratic Party announced that the present party machinery would be maintained and strengthened in the various precincts throughout the state to prevent the recurrence of a plot by the reactionaries. This will be the first time in the history of the Democratic Party in Texas that it will have a functioning apparatus between elections.

The reactionary feudal elements who have been read out of the Democratic Party will have to find some other political apparatus through which to present their program. They could try a third party. But they did that in the last election, and showed an even weaker balloting strength than the Republicans. The reactionary feudal elements remained

in the Democratic Party as long as they did, because that was the only way they could continue their rule over the people of Texas. And the national Democratic Party in previous times had afforded them leeway so long as they carried their states for the national ticket in Presidential election years. But under the leadership of Roosevelt, with a broad program of national unity, this is no longer possible. Since their position coincides with that of the national Republican Party under its present leadership on all major questions, one can expect them to take leading positions in the Texas Republican Party.

Whereas for a number of decades, the Republican Party in Texas as in other Southern states, trading on its historic role under the leadership of Lincoln, has been the traditional party of the Negro, its development in recent years has tended to make it the repository of the "white supremacy" advocates in Southern states. As one Republican leader stated:

"For years the Negroes were always solidly Republican and we had no standing in the South. In Texas we organized the Lily Whites, and the Negroes became the Black and Tans of our party with a gradual elimination until we too had become a white man's party."

The first phase of the political struggles in Texas has thus ended with victory for the forces of national unity and progress.

BOOK REVIEWS

A PERVERSION OF I.L.G.W.U. HISTORY

By ROSE WORTIS

TAILOR'S PROGRESS. By Benjamin Stolberg. Doubleday Doran, New York, 1944. 360 pp.

THE International Ladies Garment Workers Union is one of the oldest, largest and most firmly established unions of the A. F. of L., with a membership of more than 300,000. Its rich history provides many valuable lessons for its own membership and the labor movement as a whole. The union came into existence some forty years ago through the efforts of Jewish immigrants, driven to our shores by religious persecution and tsarist tyranny in their Russian homeland. They imparted to their union the experience, revolutionary fervor and enthusiasm of the Russian Socialist movement in which they were trained. This background contributed greatly to making the I.L.G.W.U. an experimental ground for developing progressive policies both in the field of employer-labor relations and in the sphere of internal trade union organization. Through the years American organ-

ized labor has learned much from the I.L.G.W.U.

The I.L.G.W.U. was the first union in the A. F. of L. to develop the idea that a trade union is not merely an agency for the defense of the narrow economic interests of the workers, but an educational and political instrument of tremendous potentialities. It was the first among the A. F. of L. unions to take issue with the Gompers policy of "pure-and-simple trade unionism" and to advocate a policy of labor's active participation in the political life of the nation.

These advances by the I.L.G.W.U. did not, of course, come about automatically. They were the result of bitter and costly struggles against employers, as well as struggles between a militant rank-and-file membership and an opportunist leadership. Many of the advanced policies first initiated (and still fought for by the workers of the I.L.G.W.U.) are now the accepted policies of progressive A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions.

* * *

Several months ago a book appeared, entitled *Tailor's Progress*, publicized as the unofficial history of the I.L.G.W.U. An objective account of that union, written by a responsible labor historian, could be a great contribution to the evaluation of labor's role in the nation, to furthering the unification of labor's

forces, and to strengthening national unity.

The increasing numerical strength of the organized labor movement and the high degree of patriotism it has shown in its contribution to the war and the recent election have won for labor a new place of honor in the life of the nation. The publication today of any book dealing with the history and problems of the labor movement thus arouses great interest, not only among the millions of organized workers, but also among the general public.

Certainly, therefore, Benjamin Stolberg, with his record of reactionary prejudice, Red-baiting, vulgar cynicism, and intellectual dishonesty is the last person for such a task.

Through the influence of the very efficient publicity department of the I.L.G.W.U., *Tailor's Progress* was reviewed and popularized by the most important newspapers and magazines in the country. Those papers and commentators who have been least friendly to labor have been most enthusiastic in their evaluation of the book. Included among these is the notorious labor-baiter, Pegler, who made use of the material in Stolberg's book for his rantings against "foreign" labor leaders. In labor circles, including leaders of the I.L.G.W.U., the book has aroused a great deal of protest.

Most recently, a sharp controversy has again flared up around the book, precipitated by two vice-presidents

of the I.L.G.W.U.—Joseph Breslaw and Charles Zimmerman, both of whom condemn the book unmitigatedly. Since their sentiments reflect those of thousands of rank and filers, the discussion has been taken up again in the press, particularly the Yiddish press, resulting in a full-dress, heated debate. The Yiddish press condemned the book, the only exception being the Social-Democratic *Jewish Daily Forward*, the mouthpiece of Mr. Dubinsky. The book was likewise publicly criticized by the widow of Morris Hillquit. Emil Schlesinger, son of the former I.L.G.W.U. president, Benjamin Schlesinger, in an interview for the *Jewish Morning Journal*, denounced Stolberg as a liar and a scandal-monger.

* * *

Now for a glance at the book itself.

What contribution does *Tailor's Progress* make toward an understanding of the history of the I.L.G.W.U. by the millions of newly organized workers, including the workers of the I.L.G.W.U. itself? To what extent does this book help to clarify labor's vital role in the life of the nation?

Some background data are here in place. Last May, the I.L.G.W.U. celebrated its 40th anniversary at its Boston convention. On that occasion President David Dubinsky—much to the surprise of his colleagues on the General Executive Board—announced the publication of a new book by Benjamin Stol-

berg, which he described as an unofficial history of the I.L.G.W.U. As such, it was distributed among the delegates as a gift of the International. Dubinsky also announced that arrangements had been made with the publishing company whereby every member of the International might purchase a copy at a reduced price, and urged all delegates to see to it that members of the International purchased and read the book. In his capacity as President, he officially thanked Mr. Stolberg for the book and in a very flattering introduction presented him as an honored guest speaker. Thus *Taylor's Progress* actually became an integral part of the convention.

Once, however, the delegates began to sample Stolberg's concoction, a storm of protest developed which has been brewing in inner circles since the convention and has reached the crescendo already referred to.

Mr. Dubinsky's colleagues have become accustomed to taking much from their chief; but this book, it appears, has gone beyond all bounds. Instead of an accurate union history they found the book to be a most shameful distortion, filled with calumny, and carefully planned and executed to create the proper atmosphere for the glorification of David Dubinsky and the strengthening of his control over the union. To build up the stature of Dubinsky as the great savior of the garment workers, his predecessors, as well as many of his present colleagues (par-

ticularly those who at one time or another have disagreed with him, especially with regard to his attitude towards the Soviet Union), are portrayed as nincompoops, neurotics, opportunists, Tammany politicians, Hutcheson bureaucrats. For example, Benjamin Schlesinger, his immediate predecessor, is paid the tribute (through the device of "quoting" an unnamed cloakmaker) that he "was a son-of-a-bitch. But he was *our* son-of-a-bitch" (p. 105). Dubinsky's opponents—the Left Wing leaders—are pictured as foreign agents, irresponsible fanatics and crooks, enmeshed in a net of gangsterism. From the first page to the last this "history" is a travesty on the record of the garment workers.

In his opening pages, Stolberg cynically dissociates himself from "the professional immigrant lovers" who idealize the East Side. This is what he has to say about the thousands of Jewish men and women who came to this country in the early years of the 20th century as a result of religious and political persecution:

Many of them were in the grip of a semi-barbarous and reactionary priesthood and of a bigoted racial isolationism. In the old country they had lived in that classless limbo of the ghetto, part ragged proletarian, part ragged bourgeois—hawkers, hucksters, and cobblers, shoe-string middlemen—all preying on each other's poverty (p. 8).

But a good many of them were half-baked and semi-educated, vehemently misinformed and vociferously muddled.

More often than not their early training had been of the orthodox Jewish variety, which in those days in Eastern Europe was really nothing but a mumbo jumbo of vulgar scholasticism. With this background, against which they had rebelled, it was no wonder that their radicalism often turned into a new orthodoxy, an equally hair-splitting body of prejudice to be defended with more heat than light. Today, as one looks back with the perspicacity of hindsight, it becomes clear that all these varieties of left-wing doctrine fundamentally reflected the Byzantine socialism, the mongrel mixture of Western Marxism and Eastern nihilism, which has characterized the Russian Revolution from Bakunin to Stalin (p. 6).

Such a portrayal of the immigrant garment workers, from whose ranks came forward stalwart and enlightened trade union activists who built their union in face of the greatest difficulties, is an outrageous insult to be condemned by every self-respecting American trade unionist. Is it any wonder that the *Jewish Morning Journal* declared that Stolberg's volume is excellent propaganda material for anti-Semites?

However, it is not only of the early builders of the union that Stolberg speaks with such contempt. He shows no greater regard for the garment workers of today. Particularly cynical are his remarks about women workers, who to this day are among the most advanced workers of the I.L.G.W.U. and have been in the forefront of the fight for progressive

policies in the union. In the chapter on workers' education, Stolberg says:

It was soon discovered that motives which made the average working girl enroll in the Workers' University had rather little to do with a thirst for knowledge. More often than not these students were moved by some different urge—a desire to make nice friends, especially young men; interest in a sentimentally rather than academically fascinating instructor; or the plain wish to escape the loneliness or a narrow and dreary family circle (p. 290).

This intellectual snob, who earned Pegler's praise as the "mocking skeptic of the left-wing," is here revealed as the mocking skeptic of all labor's deepest-going aspirations. He sneers at the very idea of workers' education. "All democratic theories to the contrary notwithstanding," a cloakmaker or a dressmaker, says he, cannot engage in serious class work involving discussions of wage structure or economics of industries. It is characteristic of Stolberg's arrogance and shallow-mindedness that this view should be advanced in the face of the widespread educational activities of many trade unions and the wide response that has been shown to the Jefferson School, the George Washington Carver School, and other such popular educational centers. If the I.L.G.W.U. workers are staying away from union classes, it may be because they resent the distortions and the Red-baiting taught there even today, and have given up hope of gaining any real under-

standing of their own union, or of the world around them from Trotskyite and Social-Democratic professors.

Cynical contempt for the masses, so characteristic of both Stolberg and Dubinsky, pervades the entire book. Workers are divided into four categories. The cloakmakers are characterized as spittoon philosophers; the pressers as uncouth ignoramuses (*balagulas*); the dressmakers as starry-eyed idealists, while the cutters, from whose ranks hails the chief character of the book, David Dubinsky, are described as the realists, responsible for all the achievements of the I.L.G.W.U.

This distorted characterization is belied by the facts of history, as Stolberg himself reveals in the book when he shows that the dressmakers were the first to organize and to lead to victory the mass strike of 1909 which firmly established the union.

The book falsifies the history of the internal struggles of the union, between the militant rank and file and the bureaucratic leaders. These struggles have centered throughout on basic issues: the right of workers to determine union policies without interference from the employers; a more militant policy in defense of economic interests; union democracy and freedom of political opinion. But Stolberg describes the early struggles in the union known as "the Biznow and Horowitz affairs," for example, as merely unprincipled feuds of top leaders. He ignores the

fact that it was just these early struggles that laid the basis for the powerful rank-and-file movement in the later period. That movement, despite the Left-wing defeats, seriously influences the life of the union to this very day, and accounts for much of its progress.

* * *

The most shameful pages of the book are those dealing with the mass expulsions which have come to be known as the struggle of the Joint Action Committee.

The years between 1920 and 1930 marked a crucial stage in the history of the American labor movement, characterized by sharp internal struggles around basic policies such as the organization of the unorganized, industrial unionism, a labor party, recognition of the Soviet Union, international labor unity, etc. These struggles found their sharpest expression in the I.L.G.W.U., whose membership was among the most advanced section of American labor. Stolberg disposes of the whole business with one pat phrase—it was a "Communist conspiracy"—instigated by the Communist International and financed by Moscow gold to capture the union!

One is reluctant at this time to rake up old quarrels and differences; however, since Mr. Dubinsky saw fit to have this book published at this time, to spread these poisonous distortions among the thousands of new workers unfamiliar with union his-

tory, it becomes necessary to expose at least some of the crassest falsifications.

A civil war began in the I.L.G.W.U. in 1922 with the expulsion of the overwhelming majority of the International membership by the General Executive Board, and continued for ten years thereafter. It was not precipitated by the Left Wing which had the support of the membership (a fact which even Stolberg is forced to admit), but by the leadership of the International in an effort to maintain its dictatorial rule over the membership. Dubinsky was one of the leading lights on the General Executive Board at the time.

In 1926, after a struggle lasting for ten weeks, the International leaders were forced to reinstate the expelled local joint boards and leaders. An agreement was officially concluded pledging the International leaders to tolerance of differences on matters of policy, and to the democratization of the union. But their real intent was not peace and unity, as was soon proved by subsequent events. The agreement they had signed in the face of defeat was violated at the first opportunity at the 1926 Philadelphia Convention packed with delegates of "blue-sky" locals. Stolberg ignores the fact that for three years from 1926 to 1929, the expelled locals and leaders fought for unity on the basis of the reinstatement into the organization with full rights of membership, and that the Needle Trade Workers In-

dustrial Union was organized only after all efforts toward unity had failed.

Time and again Stolberg is forced to admit that the overwhelming majority of the workers supported the Left-progressive leadership on the vital issues, that at every opportunity of expression, whether at meetings or at elections, the workers demonstrated their confidence in the Left-progressive leaders. But what does all this matter to Mr. Stolberg, when the purpose of the book is not to draw the lessons from history but to justify a policy of disruption and Red-baiting?

In fact, this whole section is taken from the prejudiced pages of the *Jewish Daily Forward* whose leadership instigated, led and financed the civil war in the needle trades unions so as to maintain its control of them. Until this day the *Forward* continues as the fountain-head of disunity.

Stolberg devotes forty-eight pages of his book to these distortions. He accuses the Communists of the use of gangsterism, in face of the facts, known to all, that the Left Wing workers and leaders were the victims of terror and violence at the hands of the bosses and reactionary leaders.

Stolberg falsifies the history of the cloakmakers' strike of 1926 called against the demand of the employers for the right to discharge 10 per cent of their workers every season, aimed at undermining the job security won by the union. He states that

the strike was called at the order of the Communist Party. This contradicts the publicly known facts that the decision to reject the demands of the employers and to declare the strike was unanimously voted at a meeting of 20,000 cloakmakers at Madison Square Garden, addressed by the I.L.G.W.U. President Morris Sigman and William Green, President of the A. F. of L. The workers zealously fought for their demands on the picket line in a strike that lasted seventeen weeks, despite the sabotage of Dubinsky, then chairman of the settlement committee. On the eve of the settlement which gave the workers a partial victory, the General Executive Board once more resorted to mass expulsions. They knew that because of the long and exhausting strike, the workers would not be in a position to fight these new expulsions with the same vigor and determination that they had demonstrated six months earlier. These are facts known to every worker who participated in the strike. But the facts, of course, are of no account to Dubinsky's poison-pen artist.

Stolberg justifies this new expulsion on the ground that the Union had to be saved from the "Communist menace." How familiar this sounds to every anti-fascist! What crimes have been committed under the guise of fighting the "Communist menace!" How costly this bogey of Communism has been to the civilized world!

Stolberg charges that the Communist leadership squandered three and one-half million dollars during the strike. This scandalous lie will be repudiated by every responsible worker, including opponents, who have never challenged the integrity of the Left-Wing and Communist leaders of the I.L.G.W.U.

* * *

In dealing with the current period, Stolberg reflects Dubinsky's coldness, if not his underlying hostility, to the basic foreign and domestic policies of the Roosevelt Administration. The entire book reeks with opposition and sniping at the national administration. A characteristic example worthy of the most ardent Dewey supporter is the following pen-sketch of one of the early progressive leaders:

He had a cloakmaker's propensity for ideological hair splitting and interminable gab. . . . He loved power without knowing what to do with it, and would have made a perfect New Dealer of the benign variety, (p. 80).

Or such a gem as this characterization of Dubinsky:

He is all for the "social gains" of the New Deal—without totalitarian undertows (p. 157).

Is it any wonder that Dewey should gleefully quote Dubinsky in his attacks on President Roosevelt?

Hosannas are sung in the book for the defeatist, anti-Semite John L. Lewis. Stolberg boasts of Lewis' high

regard for Dubinsky and the latter's efforts to bring Lewis back into the A. F. of L. Another Stolberg hero is the reactionary Hoover-minded labor politician, Matthew Woll.

On the other hand, his treatment of Sidney Hillman is revolting. It goes beyond all bounds of decency, surpassing the master of Red-baiting Pegler himself. It reveals, not only the pettiness and vindictiveness of the man who held the pen, but of the man who was his mentor. For example, we read in regard to Hillman:

He has always been incapable of dealing democratically with ordinary workers. . . . Of all American labor leaders of foreign birth . . . Sidney Hillman is the only one who has never been assimilated by our institutions.

In politics he is an opportunist who will make alliances in the most disparate strata of society. He never really understood the democratic process.

[What ready copy this makes for the alien-baiting campaign speeches of the Dewey-Bricker camp!].

Dubinsky, through his ghost writer Stolberg, lectures Hillman on democracy at the very time when in the I.L.G.W.U., seven prominent rank and filers—political opponents in the last election—have been suspended from Dubinsky's own local for a period of three years because they dared oppose his anti-Soviet, anti-unity policies! Dubinsky, who is a big gun in the *Forward* clique that carries on clandestine relations with

the Christian-Front *Brooklyn Tablet*, which reprints *Forward* articles; Dubinsky, who champions the defeatist Lewis, defends the anti-Semite Polish government-in-exile, and is the darling of Hearst, lectures Hillman on opportunism!

* * *

This perversion of union history is more than even some of the vice-presidents of the union could take. Joseph Breslaw, on his return from the convention, minced no words in denouncing the book. He was authorized by the membership of Local 35 to publish his views in a pamphlet, *A Cloakmaker Looks at Stolberg's 'Tailor's Progress'*, which is now being distributed among the members. At a recent meeting of his local, Breslaw reported that he had received messages of congratulations from the Joint Boards of Toronto, Baltimore, and many other locals, thus proving the widespread resentment against the book. He assured the members that he would continue to expose the lies, falsifications and slanders contained in the book.

Since the Breslaw pamphlet created a sensation in union circles, it is in place to quote from it. Breslaw branded the book as "a cruel and heartless caricature."

It is a smear at our history, a desecration of our leaders. *The cloakmakers who built our International would not recognize it from the description in this book.* It is written with bias.

Page after page, it is a continuous record of distortions, misrepresentations, inaccuracies . . . it is sensationalist journalism . . . of the type to destroy our faith in our past (p. 45).

Breslaw brands Stolberg's charge of the use of gangsterism, as vicious, as something "which Pegler would really have enjoyed writing." "It is true," says Breslaw, "that we had to fight gangsters, but we did so with our own pickets. *Our strength has been the members of our Union.* . . . Now a new labor-baiter appears upon the scene," who "furnishes labor's enemies with a new reference work on 'labor union criminals' . . . his attack, incredible at the outset, is entirely uncorroborated and unproven" (pp. 17, 18).

Answering Stolberg's charge that he is "playing quite cynically with the Communists," Breslaw states that he has not supported Communist organizations but has supported Russia and has aided the anti-Nazi campaigns. "I supported Russia because of the great admiration I have felt for its progress. . . . Is it so inconceivable to the Stolberg mind that a person can have *honest* convictions, based on personal observation and study? *He prefers cynicism to honesty, politics to principles!*" (p. 21).

Breslaw thus summarizes his indictment of Stolberg: "He has travelled the gutters looking for that type of sensationalist stuff that sells books, no matter how distorted and untruthful. The pain and grief this causes the cloakmakers and others

who built our International are not even considered. . . . Even where there is truth in the book, it never comes through to the reader because it is surrounded with a setting of lies, distortions and defamations, so as to give an unworthy impression. It is the method of the Nazi who tells you that the Jews want to make war on Hitler because of his atrocities against the Jews. The Nazi fails to tell you of Hitler's atrocities against all mankind. . . . Chapter after chapter by implication the innocent reader gets a feeling that the whole structure of the past thirty-five years was a history of mean, petty men interested only in themselves" (pp. 5, 6).

Charles Zimmerman, another vice-president, though somewhat belatedly, also sent a public statement to the press protesting the Stolberg distortions of the internal struggle in which he had been an active participant.

He accuses Stolberg of misrepresenting the conflict centering for many years about the issue of proportional representation in the union as an attempt of the Communist Party to fortify its control of the union. Zimmerman points out that this was a basic issue of union democracy.

He disputes Stolberg's assertion that the 1926 strike was called on orders of the Communist Party for political purposes, showing that the basic issue of the strike was job security. He denounces as utterly false

Stolberg's statement that of the three and one-half million dollars spent in the strike only a half million went for strike benefits, pointing out that two and one-half million dollars were spent for that purpose. Zimmerman asks indignantly where Stolberg got his figures. This rhetorical question is out of place, since Zimmerman knows well that the source of Stolberg's information is none other than his own president, Dubinsky. As secretary of the 1926 strike, he denies Stolberg's charges of the use of professional gangsters, stating that: "There is not one iota of truth in the complicated, sensational story about the Left-Wing conspiracy with Arnold Rothstein."

It is interesting to note that Zimmerman's statement to the press was refused publication by the *Jewish Daily Forward*. That paper, however, used the occasion for a diatribe against Zimmerman, reproaching him for taking issue with Stolberg and suggesting that he might do better by stating that his Communist past was nothing but youthful folly.

* * *

The publication of the statements of Breslaw and Zimmerman are only symptoms of the broad rank-and-file discontent with the bureaucratic and disruptive policies of Dubinsky. Their main weakness is that they are directed only against Stolberg, evading the whole issue of Dubinsky's responsibility for this infamous book. The vice presidents know full

well that the real author of the book is Dubinsky, who merely used Stolberg's poison pen to put his own views on paper. This Stolberg admits in so many words in his introduction, which states:

But my greatest debt is to President Dubinsky, to Max Danish, the editor of *Justice*, and to Will Herberg, research director of the New York Dress Joint Board.

It is attested to by Dubinsky's activity in the preparation and distortion of the book.

Summed up, the political objectives of *Taylor's Progress* are not only the glorification of Dubinsky, but the consolidation of the stranglehold of the inner *Forward* clique, headed by Dubinsky, upon the union. Not all of the I.L.G.W.U. leaders were happy with the anti-unity policy adopted at the last convention. There were disagreements on the questions of Soviet-baiting and of support to the Polish government-in-exile. There was serious disagreement on the question of the organization of the Liberal Party. It is true none of these disagreements reached the light of day; but Dubinsky is nervous. The smear of Breslaw in the book is intended as a warning to those leaders of the International who are not part of the inner clique and at times retain a certain independence of action, that Dubinsky and his henchmen will not hesitate to discredit them if they persist in their attitude. As for Zimmerman, who is portrayed

as the white-haired boy at present in Dubinsky's confidence, the book was a gentle reminder that his past has not been forgotten or forgiven.

The publication of *Taylor's Progress* explains many actions of the International. It exposes the domineering hand of Dubinsky, not only over the rank and file, but even over the top leaders and exposes Dubinsky's type of "free" trade unionism. It is the freedom for Dubinsky to do as he pleases without the knowledge or consent of the leading bodies of the union. It means freedom for Dubinsky to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of union money to carry on anti-Soviet, anti-unity campaigns; freedom to make alliances with the defeatist, anti-Semite, John L. Lewis; freedom to defile the most sacred aspirations of the membership. It means freedom to publish a so-called history of the International which defames, not only the Left Wing, but Right-Wing leaders, dead and living. It explains the hesitancy of vice presidents, in their justified protests against this infamous book, to name the real culprit.

Dubinsky and his anti-Soviet clique have not fared so well of late. The victorious advance of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition has blasted their anti-Soviet hopes. Dubinsky's attempt, through the medium of *Taylor's Progress*, to destroy the influence of some of his dissenting associates is already meeting with resentment among wide sections of the membership and, it is to be hoped,

will help bring out in the open some of the fundamental differences in the union.

The leaders of the International who believe in a policy of unity cannot maintain the full confidence of the workers and continue as leaders of the workers in the true sense of the word by submitting to the dictates of Dubinsky. The workers will enthusiastically rally to support every effort to do away with one-man leadership in the organization and to make the I.L.G.W.U. a force for unity.

* * *

The intent of Stolberg's book is to foster clique domination and disruption in the union which will only serve to isolate the I.L.G.W.U. from the new and vital forces in the labor movement.

The book is particularly injurious with respect to its possible influence on the new workers in the union.

The bulk of the I.L.G.W.U. membership is new, numbering tens of thousands of young Italian, Negro and native white American women, who came into the organization in 1933 without any union background.

Like the thousands of U.E., maritime and auto workers who have come forward in the leadership of their unions and are the sparkplug of the labor and political movement, this new generation of garment workers could, under proper leadership, take their place in the front ranks of the progressive labor move-

ment to carry on the tradition of their militant sister garment workers who wrote heroic chapters in the history of our labor movement.

In the poisonous atmosphere generated by the leadership of the I.L.G.W.U., as revealed in Stolberg's book, which thrives on factionalism, disunity and Red-baiting, the native abilities of the workers are warped, given no channel for expression.

After eleven years of membership in the union, the new workers, especially in the smaller centers, are still not considered competent to elect their organizers, who are subservient appointees of the general office.

To assimilate these new workers, to develop them as conscious trade unionists, it is necessary to give them a feeling of pride in their union. For they are the new stock from which the future leaders of the union will have to be drawn. But Stolberg's distorted picture can only call forth in them contempt for the union; alienate, rather than give them a better understanding of the union and the labor movement.

The motive of the book is to poison the minds of these new workers not familiar with union history, to sow distrust and disunity, to serve the factional purposes of the ruling clique. Instead of encouraging independent thinking and democratic expression of these workers on matters of union policy, instead of stimulating their initiative, the workers are taught to accept everything Dubinsky does or says as right; they are

taught that if they want to get ahead in the union they had better line up on the "right side," find favor with the leadership in power.

The whole direction of the book is in conflict with the general progressive trends in the labor movement, the growing unity of all constructive forces, the trend toward obliterating factional lines and uniting around a common program of action, as demonstrated at recent trade union conventions.

Tailor's Progress plays into the hands of the labor-baiters and reactionaries who want to portray the labor movement as a gangster-ridden camp of irresponsibles. For the sake of the I.L.G.W.U. and the labor movement as a whole, this libellous book should be withdrawn from circulation.

FOR A DEEPER UNDER- STANDING OF CHINA

By FREDERICK V. FIELD

CHINA'S NEW DEMOCRACY. By Mao Tse-tung. Introduction by Earl Browder. Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1944. 72 pp.

IN NO AREA of the world has the United States since Pearl Harbor taken more initiative to bring about the cohesion of the forces of democracy than in China. If our policies

in the period before the war were open to severe criticism on the ground of appeasing Japan and slighting China, it must be asserted that since Pearl Harbor they have taken a forthright progressive direction. President Roosevelt must be credited with farseeing vision and sound realism in giving leadership to a policy toward China which would help our ally strengthen itself internally for the supreme test against the common enemy, Japan. How important this matter is considered by our government is indicated by the succession of high-ranking emissaries whom the President has sent to the Chinese capital, and in some cases to the Communist headquarters in Yen-an. China is as vital to the future of the United States as we are to China, as vital to the United Nations as they are to China.

No document more important than *China's New Democracy*, by Mao Tse-tung, the revered Chinese Communist leader, has emerged from that nation since the beginning of the war. It is unquestionably the most significant contribution to the foreign understanding of the problems and perspectives of our Far Eastern ally available to us.

The book was written exactly a year before Pearl Harbor and published in the Border Region capital, Yen-an, in January 1941. It pre-dates, therefore, the momentous historic developments of June 22 and December 7, 1941, the Concord of Teheran, the opening of the second

front against Hitler, and the shaping of a progressive American policy toward China. But as Earl Browder has pointed out in his introduction to the American edition, "already in 1940, the Marxists of China had defined clearly their program which in the most essential points prepared them to lead their country fully into the main stream of world democratic development."

We are confronted today with the threat that our Chinese Ally will collapse from the obstinate opposition of Chinese feudalists and Chinese pro-Japanese to the program for democratic unity which the Chinese Communists have repeatedly put forward and which gains full expression in the booklet under review. From this threat we are today led to the possibility of being forced to revise the grand strategy for defeating Japan, a revision which would eliminate the continental approach to the enemy and discount China as a fighting ally. Such an alternative, if it were forced upon us, would have the most disastrous military and political consequences. It would prolong the war and thus make it more dangerous and more costly to all the democratic peoples of the earth. It would remove the chance of developing a genuine anti-Japanese coalition of nations and of peoples.

If China is not able to fulfill its historic destiny in the war against Japan, the entire world will thus be affected. Reaction will be strengthened everywhere by the failure to

achieve democracy in one vital sector. The imperialist forces in the United States, for instance, those whose spokesmen grouped themselves around the Dewey-Bricker campaign, will find nourishment in a backward China, in a China which has failed to evolve as an independent democracy during the course of the war. They will be weakened if China and the other colonial and semi-colonial areas of the world rid themselves of the shackles of feudalism and colonialism.

The perspectives for the American people are closely linked with whether China follows the road to strength and independence and victory outlined by Mao Tse-tung or stagnates into the oblivion represented by the Ho Yin-chings, the H. H. Kungs, the Chen brothers, the Tai Lis and the other apostles of medievalism. We have, then, a tremendous stake in understanding and in giving support to the perspectives given by the great figure of Chinese democracy, Mao Tse-tung.

China's New Democracy is essentially a theoretical analysis of the Chinese revolution. Being a Marxist analysis, the theory is an integral part of the practice, and vice versa. The revolutionary perspective given by Mao has been given an example in the Border Regions and northern guerrilla areas throughout the period of the war. Many of the steps to establish democracy in China, which is the pre-condition for rendering more effective the fighting against

the enemy can today actually be found, in an advanced form, in the vast regions under Communist leadership. And they were found, and by and large honestly reported by the group of foreign correspondents who were finally permitted to visit the North and Northwest last summer and fall. They have been found by the American Military Mission currently stationed in Yen-an. They have been described by many first-hand observers, notably by such writers as Agnes Smedley, Rolf Ilona Sues, Edgar Snow, Michael Lindsay, and Col. Evans Carlson.

The notorious blockade of the Border Regions by the Chungking reactionaries and the severe censorship imposed upon honest reporting from the Chinese capital have sought to keep secret the accomplishments of Chinese democracy in the Northwest. Lies have been deliberately manufactured by those Chinese whose one fear in life is the spread of democracy. These lies have often found expression in the American yellow press, a category of journalism recently augmented by Henry (American-Century) Luce's *Time* and *Life*. Until its own correspondents began cabling news direct from the Border Regions a few months ago, the so-called respectable press, either through ignorance or political indecency, failed to convey to the American public the slightest conception of the magnificent achievements of Chinese democracy in these regions.

The progressive journals in this country, in which the predecessor to *Political Affairs* is to be conspicuously mentioned, have, however, kept us informed of the position and practice of the Communist-led regions. It is thanks mainly to this sector of American journalism and to the handful of writers such as those mentioned above that the Chinese democracy about which Mao writes in *China's New Democracy* is to some Americans a living reality. When he speaks of a coalition of classes in this new democracy we know concretely what he means. When he speaks of the necessity of giving active support to the workers and peasants we know some of the steps taken in that direction in the Northwest. When he speaks of the real heritage of Sun Yat-sen, of the *New San Min Chu I* in contrast to the pre-1924 version, our minds turn to specific measures taken in and around Yen-an to abolish feudalism, to stimulate independent producers, to modernize agriculture, to spread education and public health.

What is China's new democracy? Where does it fit in the march of history? What is its relation to the war against fascism?

First, what kind of society has China today, or as Mao puts it, what is the "national condition" of contemporary China? Since the aggression of foreign capitalism over a century ago, he answers, "China gradually turned into a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. At pres-

ent, in the occupied territories, the society is colonial in character; in the non-occupied areas, it is semi-colonial; while in both of them the feudal system still dominates."

Historically the Chinese revolution must be divided into two stages: first, the democratic revolution "to change the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal form of society into an independent democratic society"; and, secondly, the socialist revolution. China is now in the first stage, the creation of a bourgeois democracy. This revolutionary movement began with the Opium War in 1840 and has continued to this day, passing through a series of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal wars.

The orientation and character of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution changed in the period around 1919. Before that time, "the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution belonged to the category of the old bourgeois-democratic revolution of the world, and was part of it." It was geared to the establishment of capitalism under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Two decisive events intervened to change the character of the Chinese democratic revolution. The first was "the disintegration of the three big imperialist countries—Russia, Germany and Austria," and "the wounding of two of them, Britain and France." The second event was the successful October Revolution in Russia and the establishment of Soviet power.

From then on the orientation of

China's bourgeois-democratic revolution was toward the new proletarian-socialist revolution. From then on the revolutionary movements in the colonies and semi-colonies "should not be considered the allies of the counter-revolutionary front of world capitalism, but allies in the front of the world socialist revolution."

The turning point for China was the May 4th (1919) Movement. Writing on the historical characteristics of China's cultural revolution, in the latter part of the book, Mao Tse-tung notes that before the May 4th Movement "the struggle on China's cultural front was a struggle between the new culture of the bourgeoisie and the old culture of the feudal class. . . . However, because of the weakness of the Chinese bourgeoisie, and the fact that the world has already reached the stage of imperialism, this bourgeois thought of China could not stand for long, and was soon defeated by the reactionary alliance of the slave thought of imperialism and the antiquity-restoring thought of feudalism."

The May 4th Movement, which in itself was restricted to the bourgeois intelligentsia, paved the way for greater demonstrations the next month involving city workers in Shanghai. From then on the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie participated in increasing proportion and militancy in China's revolutionary movement. Landmarks of this new phase of the revolution were the formation of the Chinese Communist

Party in 1921, an event which both symbolized and carried forward the new character of the revolution, the alliance with the Soviet Union and the Second (Great) Chinese Revolution of 1924, the famous Hongkong strike and blockade of 1925-26, and the great Northern Expedition of 1926.

If we recall that the Chinese revolutionary movement, historically considered, falls into two stages, the democratic and socialist, we find that China is today still in the first stage. But the first period of that first stage, the period before 1919 when the bourgeoisie and only the bourgeoisie assumed leadership and in which its leadership was bound to fail, has passed. China is now in the second period of the democratic revolution, the period characterized by a coalition of revolutionary classes allied with the forward-looking advance toward eventual socialism rather than with nineteenth-century capitalism.

The completion of the new period of China's bourgeois-democratic revolution is the New Democracy of which the Chinese Communists have been the leading architects.

In January, 1924, at the First Congress of the Kuomintang, a formal coalition of China's revolutionary elements was established. That was the beginning of the period of the United Front. It was then that the fundamental program of the new phase of the bourgeois-democratic revolution was agreed upon. The

San Min Chi I (three principles of Nationalism, Democracy and People's Livelihood) which had hitherto been the instrument of the intellectual bourgeoisie was revised and thereafter became the instrument of a coalition of peasants, workers, petty-bourgeoisie and certain elements of the bourgeoisie itself.

Mao Tse-tung devotes a special section of his booklet to distinguishing between the old and the new San Min Chu I. The new, revised version, it is important to remember, is to be found in the Declaration of the First Congress of the Kuomintang (January, 1924) in which the three principles of Nationalism, Democracy and Livelihood are linked with and made part of three revolutionary policies. The latter were the new element introduced into the San Min Chu I; they remain today the essence of the program of the democratic revolution.

What are these three revolutionary policies? They are, first, friendship with the Soviet Union; secondly, cooperation with the Chinese Communists; thirdly, protection of the interests of peasants and workers. They constitute the minimum program of the Chinese Communist Party, today as in 1924. Chinese Communists will work with any group and any person who will abide by the new San Min Chu I thus defined. It considers any violation of any one of these principles as treacherous to the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution. But let Mao Tse-

tung speak on this cardinal point.

"It is only this kind of San Min Chu I," he writes, "that the Communists recognize as 'China's necessity today,' and declare themselves 'willing to struggle for its thorough realization.' It is only this kind of San Min Chu I that is fundamentally coincident with the minimum program of the Communists or the Communist political program for the stage of democracy."

Mao speaks again of the contrast between the old San Min Chu I without the three revolutionary principles and the new version of 1924 on which the United Front was based. "There is not any fundamental resemblance between the old San Min Chu I and the Communist minimum program, because that kind of San Min Chu I is something of the old period, something out of date. If there is such San Min Chu I which opposes the Soviet Union, the Communists and the peasants and the workers, it is a reactionary San Min Chu I. It not only has nothing in common with the minimum program of the Communists, but is its enemy. No compromise of the two can be considered."

In 1927 the bourgeoisie deserted the revolutionary coalition and under the banner of Chiang Kai-shek joined forces with feudalism and imperialism. Only the proletariat and petty-bourgeoisie (including the peasantry and revolutionary intelligentsia) remained faithful to the fundamental program of the demo-

cratic revolution. Leadership was carried by the Communist Party alone. The cost of the desertion was incalculable. During the nine years of civil war, in which Chiang Kai-shek's government was actively aided by the imperialist powers, it was not only that hundreds of thousands of China's finest and most advanced people were mercilessly slaughtered. The corollary to the Kuomintang's anti-Communist campaigns was the penetration of Japanese military-imperialism deep into Chinese territory.

A new period was ushered in in 1937. A new united front was formed of larger scope than in 1924. "In the upper class," Mao writes, "it includes all the rulers; in the middle class, all the petit-bourgeois elements; and in the lower class, all the proletariat. In short, all the classes and strata of the nation become members of the alliance for the firm opposition to the Japanese imperialists." But writing even as early as the close of 1940, Mao notes that the ranks of unity have already begun to break at the top. "After the fall Hankow . . . a portion of the big bourgeoisie surrendered to the enemy, while others wished and still wish to conclude the war of resistance."

Looking back over the scene four years later we can see that these defections became so serious that throughout 1943 and 1944 China was on the terrifying edge of renewed civil war. A new and treacherous alliance had been fashioned between certain defeatist or pro-fascist ele-

ments in the bourgeoisie and backward feudalism. (Cf. reviewer's article in *The Communist*, September, 1944.)

In the cultural field this evil alliance of backward and cowardly forces received its fullest expression in the book, *China's Destiny*, purportedly written by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek who had permitted himself again to be captured by the most reactionary elements in the nation. (Cf. the notable analysis of that book by the Chinese Communist leader, Chen Pai-ta, in *The Communist*, January, 1944.) Politically this betrayal of the revolutionary principles of China has resulted in the virtual breakdown of the authority of the Chungking government over the nation's economy and armed forces and in the serious deterioration of China's relations with her Allies. Disaster has nearly overtaken China in the military sphere as well.

China's New Democracy thus reaches the English-speaking public just as the Chinese nation faces the sharpest test of its history. It is well that the book has become available to us at this time, for it provides the most substantial foundation that we have yet had for deeper understanding of the problems confronting our heroic allies, the Chinese people. If we thoroughly comprehend the lessons which Mao Tse-tung here teaches us our efforts to support those policies which will result in a regeneration of China will be immeasurably strengthened.

It is fortunate that the Workers Library Publishers has included as an appendix to Mao's work the circular telegram issued from Yenan on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the war against Japan, a telegram which consists in an appeal for unity and for opposition to civil war. This gives the reader the Chinese Communist Party's estimate of the national condition of China in the summer of 1943 and the slogans for that period. Since 1943 the situation has changed—for the worse. Solutions which might have saved the nation eighteen months ago fall somewhat short of the mark today. It is important to remember that as the authority of the central government has deteriorated under the feudal-fascist clique the prestige of the Communist Party and of the Communist-led armies has risen. The conditions of today have given rise to the demand for a coalition govern-

ment; that was not so in July of 1943.

The introduction to the American edition of *China's New Democracy*, written by Earl Browder, is an integral part of the document; for it translates into American terms a situation which otherwise may seem somewhat remote. Earl Browder notes that "This booklet may present a few difficulties to the average American reader, for it is thoroughly Chinese and at the same time thoroughly Marxian, and proceeds from many assumptions and conceptions of Chinese and Marxian origin which may not be familiar to the reader." A careful reading of this noteworthy introduction along with a study of Mao Tse-tung's text will assuredly overcome most of these difficulties. For its author has drawn true parallels and exposed false ones whereby the Chinese scene of today can be compared with episodes familiar in American history.

Recent Publications —

WALT WHITMAN — POET OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

By **SAMUEL SILLEN**

A new study of the great American poet, together with a discerning selection from his prose and poetic writings which throws light on Whitman's views on the Civil War, democracy, labor, internationalism, culture, etc.

Price \$1.50

MORALE EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN ARMY

By **PHILIP FONER**

In this new study, a distinguished American historian brings to light a wealth of material, including documents and speeches by Washington, Jackson and Lincoln, letters from soldiers, contemporary newspaper articles and editorials, resolutions and activities of workers' and other patriotic organizations backing up the fighting fronts, all skillfully woven together to make an illuminating analysis of the role of morale in the three great wars of American history—the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War.

Price 20¢

MARX AND ENGELS ON REACTIONARY PRUSSIANISM

An important theoretical study which assembles the writings and opinions of Marx and Engels on the historical roots, character and reactionary political and military role of the Prussian Junkers, and illuminates the background of the plans for world domination hatched by the German general staff, the modern industrialists and the criminal Nazi clique.

Price 20¢

o

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway

New York 3, N. Y.

Thoughtful Americans—the worker, the student, the man of action—all who wish to follow and understand the new political, social, economic forces and relationships that are emerging out of the crucible of the war, will want to subscribe to

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*A Marxist Magazine Devoted
to the Advancement of Demo-
cratic Thought and Action*

Here is a magazine of, by and for American labor, for all genuine progressives and forward-looking people in every walk of life who seek authoritative, scientific analyses of political issues and problems as they unfold in the national and world arenas. Edited by Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis and V. J. Jerome, *Political Affairs*, like its predecessor, *The Communist*, is the leading journal of Marxist thought and opinion in the United States. Among prominent figures whose writings have appeared in past issues, in addition to a distinguished list of American political analysts, are such world leaders as Maurice Thorez of France, Mao Tse-tung of China, Marshal Grigori Zhukov of the U.S.S.R., Palmiro Togliatti (Ercoli) of Italy, Blas Roca of Cuba, George Dimitrov, hero of the Reichstag Fire Trial, Dolores Ibarruri (Pasionaria) of Spain, R. Palme Dutt of England, Tim Buck of Canada, and many others.

To be schooled in the best thought produced by the social science of our age—Marxism—read and subscribe to *Political Affairs*.

Single copies 20 cents. Subscription \$2.00



NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway

New York 3, N. Y.