

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. 6

Contents

JUNE, 1945

V-E Day Tribute	<i>Frontispiece by Hugo Gellert</i>	
After V-E Day—What Next?	<i>Earl Browder</i>	483
The Greatness of the Red Army's Contributions to Mankind's Victory	<i>Robert Thompson</i>	487
The Danger of American Imperialism in the Postwar Period	<i>William Z. Foster</i>	493
Roosevelt—Architect of American-Soviet Friendship	<i>A. B. Magil</i>	501
Strengthening National Unity Under the Truman Administration	<i>Adam Lapin</i>	511
Democracy	<i>A. Sokolov</i>	518
Disposal of Government-Owned Plants	<i>Betty Gannett</i>	527
The Tide Must Be Turned in China	<i>Chou En-lai</i>	539
A Refutation of Chiang Kai-shek's March 1st Speech		551
BOOK REVIEWS:		
Man Under Socialism	<i>Ralph Bowman</i>	558
VITAL DOCUMENTS:		562
V-E Day—United Nations Conference on International Organization—Soviet-Polish Relations.		

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.



WAG
GALCAY

V-E DAY TRIBUTE



THE v
war in
Soviet
still to
before
Ameri
Roosev

Inev
What
was w
Hitler
peace
out of
a stab

The
be fo
curren
press
will p
Japan
right
Soviet
losses
small
Union
witho
Amer
partic

Wh
first o
happ



AFTER V-E DAY— WHAT NEXT?

By EARL BROWDER

THE WAR IN EUROPE is over. The war in the Pacific, in which the Soviet Union is not a belligerent, is still to be finished. Less than a month before V-E Day, the architect of America's war policy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, died.

Inevitably the question is raised: What next? Will the Coalition that was welded in the fires of war against Hitlerism be continued to shape the peace of Europe, and to secure that out of the defeat of Japan shall come a stable peace in Asia?

The answer to this question must be found quite independently of current speculations in the bourgeois press as to whether the Soviet Union will participate in the war against Japan. Americans have no moral right to raise this question with the Soviet Union, at least while our losses in this world war remain a small fraction of those of the Soviet Union. Only the Soviet Union itself, without any gratuitous advice from America, can decide the form of its participation in Pacific affairs.

What is to come after V-E Day is first of all a question of what is to happen in Europe. That will also

determine the final shape of things in Asia, for in Europe is now being determined whether the Great Coalition continues after the war, or whether the death of the Nazi State also meant the end of the Coalition.

If this question were to be answered now according to the subjective moods and ideological trends of ruling circles in Britain and America, there would be grave doubts as to the Coalition long surviving V-E Day. The death of Roosevelt has resulted in a sharp change for the worse in these moods and trends. At Teheran it had been Roosevelt and Stalin who projected the Coalition beyond the war into a long-term stable peace; Churchill, who had always limited his conception of the Coalition strictly to the war, was forced willy-nilly to go along, for it is obviously impossible for Britain to stand alone in a major world issue. That was the moment when Roosevelt took the initiative from Churchill in the direction of the war.

Now that Roosevelt is gone and the war in Europe ended so far as major fighting is concerned, there are growing signs that Churchill, re-

gaining the initiative in Anglo-American relations, has also reverted to his original conception of the Coalition. His speech on V-E Day, proclaiming the end of the war, was studiously correct in its attitude toward the Soviet Union. But his speech to the Empire, facing the problems of the future, studiously avoided any mention of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition but did place great emphasis upon continued Anglo-American cooperation, while his warning of dangers to be fought in Europe identified the enemy only by the word "totalitarian," which is a cipher used in the anti-Soviet camp of the whole world to identify the Soviet Union and fascism.

It is no secret that Anthony Eden, British Foreign Minister, from the moment of his arrival to attend President Roosevelt's funeral, lost no opportunity to urge upon Washington official circles the "advisability" of an "Anglo-American front" at the San Francisco Conference vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. In the confusion following the loss of Roosevelt, Mr. Eden scored a remarkable "success" in breaking the unity of the sponsoring powers and seating the fascist Argentine government, long under British protection; Senator Vandenberg, under the sunshine of Mr. Eden's patronage, emerged as the strong-man of the American delegation.

All these things, and a thousand smaller manifestations of similar significance, including the vile unre-

strained campaign of anti-Soviet incitations that have flooded the American newspapers for the past several weeks, *without a single major voice in American public life being raised in rebuke*, indubitably register the fact that the trend of Anglo-American ruling opinion is moving in the direction of the termination of the Coalition with the Soviet Union.

Of decisive significance in this regard is the failure to implement the Yalta decision on Poland, followed by the refusal to seat Poland in San Francisco. American newspapers and public officials speak blandly of "Stalin's failure" to carry out this decision. The Yalta agreement, however, was obviously not an agreement that the Polish government should be "reconstructed" with a majority of members from the government-in-exile in London who individually and collectively repudiate the Yalta agreement. Yet it has become obvious that the Harriman-Kerr-Molotov sub-committee has been stalled in its task by Anglo-American insistence upon precisely that self-contradictory interpretation of the Yalta agreement, and by a refusal to agree that the Poles in Poland shall have any effective voice in the composition of their own government.

This Anglo-American intransigence in interpreting the Yalta agreement on Poland in a form to destroy the substance of that agreement, augurs very badly for the future joint work of stabilizing and reconstruct-

ing Eur
whole p
country
border
Soviet a
way lie
Europe
conflict
Asia.

The
place o
the Sov
of mo
slict o
pressed
cently

The
vail. T
between
is on th
quette
been, v
der the
the two

If c
factor
Big T
otherw
est and
interes
prets i
that i
under
ship p
indep
tries.
alignm
solutio
Union
I wi

ing Europe. It starts into operation a whole process of the division of every country of Europe from the Soviet border to the Atlantic into a pro-Soviet and an anti-Soviet camp. That way lies the path of civil war in Europe, and eventually a new world conflict that would also embrace Asia.

The alignment apparently taking place of Britain and America against the Soviet Union expresses a *conflict of mood and opinion but not a conflict of interest*. This fact was expressed by Walter Lippmann recently in the following words:

The realities of the situation do prevail. They are that while intercourse between the Soviet Union and America is on the plane of ideology and of etiquette as difficult now as it has always been, whether under the Czars or under the Bolsheviks, the vital interests of the two countries are not in conflict.

If conflicting interests were the factor making for a division of the Big Three, the alignment would be otherwise. For the sharpest and deepest and most far-reaching conflict of interest, as each government interprets its own interest, is that conflict that is reflected in San Francisco under the heading of "the trusteeship problem." It is the issue of the independence of the colonial countries. On that issue the inevitable alignment, if there is to be no joint solution, is America with the Soviet Union against Britain.

I wish to express my profound con-

viction that coincidence of interest between America and the Soviet Union (and not least, precisely, because it is the *Socialist* Soviet Union) will override and overrule the surface conflict of ideology and etiquette (to use Lippmann's phrase), and that Britain when confronted with Soviet-American unity plus a joint desire to help Britain solve her problems will also rejoin that unity.

There are only two alternatives to such a course. One is an Anglo-American war against the Soviet Union, which is military and political insanity. The other is an "armed peace" directed against the Soviet Union, which is another name for diplomatic and economic war without drawing the military conclusions, and this condition, shattering the prospects of a stable peace even while refraining from war, would cancel all prospects for a rapid expansion of the world markets so vital for America's postwar economy. Either of these alternatives would be a disaster for America.

The dissolution of Hitlerism under the final blows of the two-front war removed the menace which had welded the unity of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition. The death of Roosevelt, a decisive architect of that unity, further weakened it. We are now living through a resurgence of all the forces that would break that unity. But the menace of a postwar world of chaos and disorder, which will be the consequence of disunity, will quickly reveal itself as a danger

that rivals Hitlerism, and will force the re-welding of the Coalition.

There is not much time, however, to be wasted in this process. Events do not stand still awaiting dilatory statesmen. Life goes on, decisions must be made, governments must be formed, policies must be crystallized. If this current of life does not receive the joint guidance of a firm Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, then it will take other paths. The longer the delay, the more difficult the eventual

solution. Time does not soften the problem but only makes it harder. Temporizing, too long continued, becomes itself a negative decision.

The democratic, progressive and labor camp in America, brought to unity under Roosevelt's leadership, must now find new ways to enforce its will since Roosevelt is gone. We know what Roosevelt would have done. Let us all act together to achieve those things.

May 12, 1945.



On
Ann
of the
Soviet

ON M
world
and u
ler G
liberty
joining
Reich,
most
rialists
sive d
"New
smash
land
the in
the br
ering
determ
Europ
the re
project
In
Ameri
long,
road t
more
this ro
tasks a



THE GREATNESS OF THE RED ARMY'S CONTRIBUTION TO MANKIND'S VICTORY

By ROBERT THOMPSON

On the Occasion of the Fourth Anniversary of the Commencement of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, June 22, 1941.

ON MAY 8 AND 9 the civilized world celebrated the ignominious and unconditional surrender of Hitler Germany. Wherever people love liberty and progress there was rejoicing at the death of the Third Reich, that monstrous creation of the most predatory and piratical imperialists in the world; at the conclusive destruction of the Nazi-fascist "New Order" in Europe and the smashing of the menace of "Deutschland über alles" which threatened the independence of all nations; at the bright prospects for the full flowering of democracy and national self-determination on the continent of Europe which is so indispensable to the realization of the postwar goal projected at Teheran and Yalta.

In these days of triumph the American people look back on the long, hard, and sometimes winding road that has led to V-E Day in order more fully to learn the lessons of this road and be armed for the great tasks and trials which still lie ahead.

There are many such lessons; but the one which is written most indelibly in the hearts and minds of the American people is the immense and magnificent role of the Soviet Union and its glorious and invincible Red Army as the cornerstone of the mighty Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition. The masses of the American people, the all important masses of American people, know that the chief reason the United States is able to celebrate victory over its arch enemy Hitler-Germany is that it is an ally of the socialist Soviet Union which in this war has waged the most magnificent and self-sacrificing struggle known to history.

The American people know that recognition of the role of the Soviet Union and the Red Army is not a formal matter, nor merely a gesture of international good will and courtesy. They recall the lies and slanders of an earlier day against Soviet policy and Red Army strength and remember that these lies and slanders disastrously influenced United States policy during the period of Munich, and harmfully colored the outlook and plans of many of our Government and Army leaders in the days

following June 22, 1941, and in the period of long delay and postponement of the Second Front. They note the intensified efforts of a large section of the press to belittle the historic role of the Soviet Union and the Red Army in the crushing of Hitler-Germany and in the liberation of Europe, and they recognize that these efforts are a blatant insult to their intelligence and sense of decency. They know that such falsehoods and slanders are directly connected with the anti-democratic, anti-Soviet activities of the Hoover-Vandenberg clique, and the forces who follow or are led by the nose by this clique. The American people know that when national spokesmen for the United States, men who should know better, fail to react to anti-Soviet actions and slanders, and omit recognition of the splendid role of the Soviet Union as an indispensable ally of our country and cornerstone of the United Nations, then there is cause for deep concern and for greater intervention of labor and other democratic forces in our national life. All this causes the American people to keep even more firmly in mind the role of the Soviet Union and the Red Army as the greatest bastions of strength of the democratic and truly patriotic forces of all nations of the world.

PEOPLES WAR VS. FASCIST BLITZKRIEG

Before Hitler-Germany attacked

the Soviet Union, country after country in Western Europe, including France with one of the largest armies in the world, toppled before the Nazi Wehrmacht. When Hitler turned against the Soviet Union he had at his disposal the bulk of the resources and most of the military equipment of Western and Central Europe.

When Germany utilized ten or twelve armored car and tank divisions against France in 1940 the world was astounded at such a display of strength. Against the Soviet Union Hitler hurled at the outset over 60 mechanized divisions backed by over 70 divisions of regular infantry and supported by an estimated force of from 15 to 20 thousand planes.

With such unprecedented forces at his command Hitler counted on destroying the Soviet Union by a lightning stroke before the Soviet Union had the opportunity fully to mobilize, much as he had overrun Poland and France. His object was to encircle and destroy the whole of the Red Army in the first months of the war.

The Soviet High Command, guided by the military and political genius of Marshal Stalin, opposed the strategy and tactics of Hitler's total war and blitzkrieg with the strategy and tactics of a people's war backed by the unique economic, military, moral and political resources of the socialist country.

In the first stage of the struggle

this
fo
1)
whi
tow
sibl
and
of l
the
Red
were
of th
2)
guer
Germ
privi
sourc
score
3)
ing
mach
mans
possib
of th
4)
enorr
the p
the v
of off
destr
Germ
In
again
lost t
guns,
Durin
Army
lost 7
planes
war t
to fr

this people's war was made up of four main elements.

1) The tactics of active defense in which every line, every village and town was defended to the last possible moment in order to gain time and in order to inflict the maximum of losses on the enemy, but where the main strategic reserves of the Red Army were not committed and were safeguarded for the assumption of the offensive at a later stage.

2) The organizing of widespread guerrilla warfare in the rear of the German forces together with the depriving of the Germans of all resources and spoils through the scorched earth policy.

3) The evacuation and transplanting of a maximum of plants and machinery from the path of the Germans so as to preserve at the highest possible level the industrial capacity of the Soviet Union.

4) The training and equipping of enormous strategic reserve forces for the purpose of turning the tide of the war and of developing a series of offensives that would result in the destruction and occupation of Hitler-Germany.

In the first two months of the war against the Soviet Union Germany lost two million men, ten thousand guns, 8,000 tanks, and 7,200 planes. During the same period the Red Army suffered 700,000 casualties and lost 7,500 guns, 5,500 tanks and 4,500 planes. In these first two months of war the ability of the Soviet Union to frustrate and defeat the Hitler

plan of lightning conquest was conclusively demonstrated. The legend of the invincibility of the Nazi Wehrmacht was irrevocably shattered. The German time table and plan of attack against the Soviet Union had to be radically revised.

THE BATTLE OF MOSCOW

The first great turning point of the war on the Eastern front came with defeat of the October and November offensives of the German Army against Moscow, and the launching of the first great counter-offensive by Soviet forces on that front on December 6, 1941. In the second and greatest of his attacks against Moscow Hitler used a force of 51 divisions, including 18 panzer divisions. After stopping this attack on the approaches to its capital, the Red Army launched its counter-offensive which by the middle of January, 1942, had driven the Germans back over 250 miles and had killed over 300,000 of Germany's crack troops. This Soviet victory on the approaches to Moscow ended Hitler's attempts to take Moscow by frontal assault. It transformed the war in the East into a protracted war, which was Hitler's greatest fear. It insured the United States time in which to mobilize, train and deploy its armed forces. It made possible the forging of the Big Three and United Nations coalition.

STALINGRAD

The second great turning point of

the war took place at Stalingrad.

In July, 1942, Hitler began a great summer offensive aimed at reaching the Volga, capturing Stalingrad, and then turning northward to encircle Moscow from the rear and capture it. The epic struggle of Stalingrad is well known. For three months its defenders held out against unbelievable odds. In the middle of November the Red Army launched its counter-blow. By November 22 a solid ring of Soviet forces had been forged around the German Army on the outskirts of Stalingrad. The battle of Stalingrad cost Hitler 850,000 officers and men killed and over 340,000 captured.

The battle of Stalingrad ushered in a new phase of the Patriotic War of the Soviet Union—a phase marked by the wholesale destruction of German forces on Soviet soil and their wholesale ejection from that invaded soil.

THE BATTLE OF THE KURSK SALIENT

The battle of the Kursk salient which began July 5, 1943, ended the last hope of successful German offensive operations against the Soviet Union and began the general rout of the bulk of the German armies concentrated on the Eastern front.

At the beginning of the summer of 1943 the Red Army held a deep salient extending into German positions, its center resting on Kursk. Red Army possession of this salient

constituted a serious threat to the Germans and prevented them from developing any large-scale operations either to the north or the south of it. A force of 20 mechanized and 18 infantry divisions was massed for the purpose of reducing the salient. This was to have been the preliminary to another attempt to capture Moscow.

The German offensive against the salient lasted for a little over two weeks. It ended in complete failure. In this period the Germans lost 70,000 dead, 2,100 tanks, more than 1,000 guns, and about 1,500 planes. After decimating the German forces by defensive operations the Red Army passed to the offensive, capturing Orel and Belgorod and pushing forward to the Dnieper while inflicting enormous losses on the routed Germans.

THE RED ARMY CHANGED THE COURSE OF HISTORY

In these great battles the Red Army broke the back of Germany's military power, turned the tide of the war, and changed the course of world history. In these battles the forces of the Soviet Union brought about the downfall of the plans of Hitler and his Japanese accomplice to conquer and loot the United States and to rule the world. This fact is written into the history of these times, into the lives of all nations, and into the hearts and minds of all honest men. Neither evil nor petty men will be able to efface it.

It was these victories won on the Eastern Front which made possible the great victories of American and English forces in North Africa and in Italy, which prepared the ground as early as 1942 and '43 for the opening of the Second Front, and which made possible the Teheran and Yalta plan of co-ordinated blows from East and West. The battles fought and won by Soviet forces between June 1, 1941, and the end of 1943 laid the foundations which in 1944 enabled the armies of the Soviet Union and the forces under General Eisenhower to liberate most of Eastern and Western Europe, and which by May 9, 1945 enabled them to complete the liberation of Europe and placed them in command of the entire Reich. To the Red Army, which in its operations killed and captured over 12½ million Nazi soldiers and officers, belongs the honor and the glory of being the main force which has brought about the downfall of Hitler-Germany.

SOURCES OF RED ARMY STRENGTH

The great and unique strength of the Red Army arises directly from the fact that the Soviet State is the most broadly supported and therefore most powerful State the world has ever known, and from the fact that the socialist system is the most dynamic and stable social system that has yet existed. The Red Army's successes were possible because the socialist economy of the Soviet

Union was able to supply it with modern weapons in greater quantity and of a higher quality than the enemy's; and because all of the Soviet people dedicated its full strength and devotion to the cause of its patriotic war. The successes of the Red Army were also facilitated and made possible because it fought as a part of a firm coalition, the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, and its efforts merged with those of its partners in the Coalition.

Three specific features of the Red Army, defined in the following words by its great leader Marshal Stalin, also account for its unique strength.

1) "The first specific feature of the Red Army is that it is the army of the emancipated workers and peasants, it is the army of the October Revolution, the army of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

2) "Our Army differs radically from colonial armies. Its whole being and whole structure rest on the cementing of the ties of friendship among the nations of our country, on the idea of protecting the freedom and independence of the Socialist Republics which constitute the Soviet Union."

3) "The strength of the Red Army lies in the fact that from the moment it was born it was trained in the spirit of internationalism, trained to respect other nations, to love and respect the workers of all countries and to maintain peace among nations."

CONCLUSION

The men in our Armed Forces, the men and women who man our production lines, together with democratic Americans in all walks of life, have already drawn the main conclusion from the great role of the Red Army in the defeat of Hitler-Germany, and they will draw this conclusion still more clearly and firmly in the months and years ahead. This conclusion is that the Red Army is their friend, their trustworthy and powerful Ally, their partner of today and tomorrow in the great struggle to bring into being an anti-fascist, democratic and peaceful world. They have learned that working together, the Red Army and the splendid Armed Forces of the United States, are capable of effecting and protecting a democratic and peaceful world and they are determined that these two great forces shall forever work together in the common interests of their respective countries, as well as in the interests of all peace-loving nations. They are drawing the conclusion that the alliance and friend-

ship of our country with the Soviet Union, which has proved indispensable for our national existence in the war is indispensable also for the peace for which the two great nations have fought in victorious alliance.

It seems that there are some people in America who are not capable of drawing this conclusion. It is to be hoped then that they will prove capable of drawing other equally, and perhaps for them more obvious conclusions.

First, the existence of the Red Army supporting the democratic forces and will of the peoples of Europe, removes the remotest possibility of enthroning, let alone stabilizing, reaction in Europe in the years following this war.

Secondly, what the anti-democratic and anti-Soviet forces of the world could not do when Hitler was in command of the resources of Europe, namely crush the Soviet Union, these forces can never hope to accomplish now that the "banner of victory of the people and of peace among nations" flies over Europe.

THE
OF
IM
PO

THE
whic
bring
smas
time
thro
cist r
bid f
rialis
also
min
thro
worl
must
capit
the
tries
ing f
that
U.S.S
for f
capit
hinde
ment
towa
In

THE DANGER OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

By WM. Z. FOSTER

THE MILITARY DEFEAT of Germany which is now an accomplished fact, bringing daily nearer the ultimate smashing of Japan, is at the same time a shattering defeat of reaction throughout the world. For the fascist menace was more than a ruthless bid for world domination by imperialist Germany and Japan; it was also an attempt by powerful fascist-minded capitalists everywhere throughout capitalism to set up a world fascist system. The world must not forget that reactionary big capitalists in France, Great Britain, the United States, and other countries gave active support to developing fascism in Germany in the hope that Hitler would destroy the U.S.S.R. and make the world safe for fascism—a world in which the capitalist exploiters would not be hindered by trade unionism, parliamentary democracy, and mass trends toward Socialism.

In the course of the present great

peoples' war of democracy and national liberation the fascist states of Germany, Japan and Italy, which once were helped so blithely by reactionary capitalists in the democracies in their reckless strivings for a fascist world, have now been largely shattered militarily. But it would be a mistake to conclude that the menace of fascism would automatically be ended with military victory by the the United Nations.

This would mean to overlook the trend of present-day reactionary forces toward fascism in all capitalist countries. The world capitalist system is sick, very sick; as the two world wars and the great economic crisis, all within one generation, eloquently testify. The system is full of active and latent contradictions; between productive capacity and markets, between workers and capitalists, between colonial lands and imperialist countries, and between the great capitalist states themselves. To this must be added pernicious anti-Soviet campaigns by world reaction. Hard-bitten reactionaries continue to try to resolve their capitalist contradictions along the lines that Hitler did through plans leading to fascism, imperialist aggression and war.

This danger cannot be defeated by military means alone. To mitigate the basic capitalist contradictions and therewith to destroy the poisonous source of fascism, will require, besides military victory over Germany

and Japan, the vigorous application of the whole series of political and economic measures, definitely outlined or clearly forecast by the program adopted by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at the Crimean Conference.

To wipe out the remnants of the great conspiracy to establish a fascist world which is now being broken up by the armies of the United Nations, and, therefore, to destroy the very basis of fascism, will be no mere mopping up process. It will require many major operations. Numerous strong fascist groupings and tendencies, most of which, in some measure at least, will survive military defeat, will offer serious obstacles to the new democratic governments and programs born out of this war.

There will be in the liberated and ex-fascist countries large numbers of big capitalists and landlords, the real instigators and backers of fascism, who, unfortunately, almost all over Europe, are not being punished as real war criminals. In the postwar period, therefore, their fascism-breeding power will have to be curbed by powerful democratic governments, strong labor movements, and effective political and economic measures.

There will be also desperate remnants of the broken-up fascist parties, armies and other reactionary mass organizations in the former Axis countries and their satellites. These will have to be ruthlessly liquidated.

There will be, too, for a time at

least, such European poison centers of fascism as Franco-Spain and Portugal. These will have to be cleaned up by their peoples, with the active help of the United Nations.

There will be also the powerful fascist fifth column in Argentina and other Latin American countries, which is full of danger to democracy in this Hemisphere and the world and which must be defeated. The entrenched reactionaries in Kuomintang China, who are a serious threat in the Far East, must be defeated.

There will also be the pro-fascist policy of the Vatican to contend with. All through the war this has been an active danger, and in the postwar stage it will definitely have to be counteracted.

But the most powerful concentration of reactionary danger will reside in the United States. With the downfall of Nazi Germany and militarist Japan, the reactionaries here will undertake to develop the center of world reaction in the United States. Its core will be the aggressively imperialist elements typified by Hoover, Vandenberg, Dewey, Hearst, Wheeler, Gerald K. Smith, Gannett, Lindbergh, McCormick, duPont, Girdler, Coughlin, etc.

AMERICAN IMPERIALIST REACTION

By far not all American capitalists favor a policy of aggressive imperialist expansion. Large numbers of them follow the general Roosevelt line. These more far-sighted ele-

men
Kai
ing
with
ders
Uni
wor
are
dow
Th
secti
imm
their
tion
sent
ever,
prese
for
dom
are
The
hand
ers
whic
and
talist
Belgi
Brita
weak
other
dama
incon
powe
milita
mine
imper
The
imper
popul
specif
plans

ments among the capitalists, the Kaisers, Krugs, Nelsons, etc., realizing that their class interests dovetail with the nation's interests and understanding that any attempt of the United States to go it alone in the world would result in sure disaster, are accepting the general policies laid down at Teheran and Yalta.

The more militantly imperialist sections of the capitalists, who are immensely powerful and have at their disposal the bulk of the nation's press, as well as strong representation in Congress, believe, however, that the present world situation presents an unequalled opportunity for the United States to acquire domination internationally. They are out to achieve this at all costs. These reactionaries see on the one hand, that the great imperialist powers of Germany, Japan and Italy, which formed the Axis, are ruined, and that the rest of the capitalist countries including France, Belgium, Holland and even Great Britain herself have been greatly weakened by the war; while on the other hand, the United States, little damaged by the war, is emerging incomparably the strongest capitalist power, industrially, financially, and militarily. Hence, they are determined to register this strength in imperialist world domination.

The Hoover-Vandenberg-Hearst imperialists, in view of the mass unpopularity of imperialism, do not, in specific terms, outline their grandiose plans of domination. Several years

ago Henry Luce, with his "American Century" theories, stated pretty clearly just about what such people have in mind; but generally the militant imperialists do not go in for such frankness, which would make them too plain a target for the democratic forces. The stark imperialism of their program, however, can be readily seen in their stand on current questions centering around the great issues of Teheran and Crimea.

The biggest obstacle they see in their path of imperialist conquest is the U.S.S.R. They conceive of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., not as friends who must work together along the lines of the Crimean agreement, in peace as in war, but as enemies. And their line is to make the U.S.A. the master. To their old hatred of the U.S.S.R. because of its socialism, they have added a new hatred, in that they consider the U.S.S.R. as the most serious force blocking their fascist-imperialist way.

In their attitude all through the war, the reactionary clique has actively expressed this imperialist line by trying to load the burden of the war effort onto the U.S.S.R.; by striving for a separate, negotiated peace with Hitler; by trying to keep reactionary governments in power in the liberated countries; by scheming to do away with the unconditional surrender slogan and to make a soft peace with Germany; by plotting to protect the war criminals; etc., etc.

Toward the question of consolidating the United Nations, their atti-

tude is one of plotting to give the United States major control of the new peace organization. They are working to create disharmony among the "Big Three" powers; they are working to keep the Security Council of the United Nations weak by transferring much of its power to the Assembly, in which they hope to control the majority of the votes with the aid of a big bloc of Latin American nations; they want to keep the new world organization in a state of turmoil by cultivating every spurious national demand against the U.S.S.R.

Toward Great Britain their arrogance is but thinly disguised. They are casting avaricious eyes upon British dominions, especially Australia, New Zealand and Canada. They are full of contempt for Latin America and consider all the countries to the south of us veritably as United States dependencies. Their conception of China is that of a golden field for American exploitation. They want American air and naval bases all over the world, and, in the postwar period they want to keep our armed strength at extravagant levels—obviously for eventual war against the U.S.S.R.

Toward the U.S.S.R. their attitude is one of insolent antagonism. They blow up every difference between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. into a crisis (as they have done with regard to Poland), and they are brazenly dining into the ears of the American people the sinister notion that a war with the U.S.S.R. is inevitable. This

attitude Vandenberg made especially clear at the San Francisco conference of the United Nations. Thus the American delegation, following Vandenberg's lead, brazenly rejected the Soviet Union's proposal to seat the democratic Polish government and was responsible for admitting the delegates of fascist Argentina in the face of strong opposition from the U.S.S.R. and other countries. It was a deliberate attempt of the Hoover-Vandenberg reactionaries to lay the basis for an imperialist world line-up against the U.S.S.R. The whole incident gravely weakened America's democratic prestige.

The international economic policies of the Hoover-Taft-Hearst-Vandenberg imperialists dovetail into their military and political policies. In the postwar period they want a free-for-all scramble for markets, being confident that the United States, because of its vast industrial resources, can out-distance all trade rivals. Consequently, they are inveterate enemies of the Roosevelt international economic policies, which fit in with those of the Crimean agreement and which call for lower tariffs and international collaboration for economic reconstruction as developed in the Bretton Woods proposals. To the rabid imperialists all these plans are but so much "boondoggling."

The national political and economic policies of the Hoover brand of imperialists, naturally enough, fit into their expansionist foreign policies. They constantly warred upon the

Ro
triv
tion
sion
are
duc
they
Roo
Rig
as
cont
whi
grea
as th
en
doub
of th
of th
men
bins
impe
DAN
AC
Th
pecia
this A
expan
and
vious
that
plied,
conse
other
Amer
Britai
ican
tions,
could
Gover
the re

Roosevelt Administration and are trying now to hamstring the application of its policies; they lose no occasion to sabotage national unity; they are opposed in principle to full production and full employment, and they look upon the late President Roosevelt's New Economic Bill of Rights and his 60,000,000 job program as virtually Socialism; they shout continuously for "free enterprise," by which they mean a free hand for the great monopolies to do pretty much as they please. They strive to weaken the labor movement; they redouble their efforts to seize control of the Government. The activities of their stooges in the labor movement—Woll, Lewis, Hutcheson, Dubinsky, *et. al.*—fit right in with the imperialist program of this clique.

DANGERS TO GUARD AGAINST

The fascism and war danger, especially in the post war period, of this American program of imperialist expansion, backed as it is by huge and powerful forces, should be obvious. For it is absurd to suppose that such a program could, if applied, have anything but disastrous consequences. Great Britain and the other capitalist powers will resist American domination. Already Great Britain is much disturbed by American pressure and imperialist ambitions, and if the Hoovers and Tafts could induce or force the American Government to apply their policies, the result could only be a major

collision with the British. It is absurd, too, to think that the great U.S.S.R. would submit to American imperialist dictation. Likewise, the attempt to apply the Hoover imperialist policy of unrestrained international economic competition would surely produce an unprecedented world crisis.

A policy of active American imperialist expansion, colliding as it would, with the still more powerful aggregate of world economic and political forces, as well as with a strong labor movement and other democratic forces on our own shores, could not possibly succeed. It would be the broad, straight road to national and international catastrophe. Hoover imperialism will constitute the main reactionary danger in the postwar world. To realize where it would lead to, if its advocates could have their way, all we have to do is to consider the deplorable situation the world would have found itself in now, had Dewey succeeded in capturing the Presidency, which he missed last fall by a narrow margin.

The Hoover-Dewey-Vandenberg imperialists are now actively organizing their forces for another attempt to secure control of the Federal Government in the elections of 1946. While they have suffered many heavy setbacks in the recent past, including the defeat of Dewey, the success of the Teheran and Crimean conferences, the mass rejection of isolationism, the growth of broad mass friendliness toward the U.S.S.R.,

the political awakening of the trade unions, etc., they nevertheless remain strong and dangerous. From our knowledge of the economic and political strength of these people, judging especially from the big fight they made in the 1944 elections, it would be folly to underestimate them. They are a menace which must be fought resolutely by the anti-fascist coalition, particularly with the elections of 1946 in mind, and with the enormous problems facing us as we enter into the reconversion stage.

The end of the war in Europe, is now here, and this will bring about according to the statement of Mr. Vinson, War Mobilization Director, a cutback in war production which will soon run as much as 30 per cent. Obviously in this situation there is great economic danger, unless proper preventative measures are taken. The Roosevelt Administration made many proposals, including the Bretton Woods plans, suggestions to lower tariffs, the 60,000,000 job program, etc., etc.; but Congress, under the pressure of the reactionary opposition, has dilly-dallied all along, doing nothing constructive. This refusal to act properly and fast means to invite an economic holocaust in the postwar period.

Such an economic breakdown, evidently, is what the Hoover imperialists want. Their whole outlook is based upon a perspective of economic chaos following the end of the war. An economic crash, they hope, would help them as the "we-told-

you-so" opposition, to get their men elected to Congress in 1946 and generally it would further their disruptive game of weakening the labor movement. It would be a blow to the entire program of Yalta. It would provoke sharp internal class conflicts and lay the basis of new wars as the good old "way out"; it would sharpen once more the danger of fascism. Such are the grave perils involved in the present sabotage of constructive domestic and foreign policies by the opposition in and out of Congress.

THE STRUGGLE AHEAD

The United States, precisely because it is so extremely strong and the other capitalist countries relatively so weak, bears a tremendous responsibility for the accomplishment of the goals of Crimea. This is true of the further prosecution of the war, and especially is it true in the economic field. This country *must* show democratic economic leadership, for its own and the world's benefit, or the Crimean program of victory, peace, democracy and prosperity cannot be realized. The United States now faces the greatest world responsibility in all its history.

The key position of the United States in present-day world affairs makes triply dangerous the existence of aggressive imperialist trends in our midst. These destructive forces must be beaten; they must not be allowed to block a vigorous application of the Roosevelt policies,

or to serve as the center for a new rallying of world reaction and fascism.

If the United States, after the United Nations victory over the Axis, is to play a progressive role in strong economic and political collaboration with our Soviet and British allies, with whom we jointly won the war, a very heavy responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the American labor movement, which is the backbone of the anti-fascist coalition fighting for the Roosevelt policies. The unions must unite their huge forces to checkmate the maneuvers of the Hoover-Vandenberg-Hearst imperialists by vigorous mass political action; they must bring pressure upon the Truman Administration toward a firm orientation to carry through quickly and decisively the far-reaching economic and political measures requisite to realize the program of the United Nations.

The trade unions must be particularly alert to back up the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods proposals, without emasculating amendments. These are the very heart of the Crimean postwar program, and it would be a disaster if the reactionary opposition were allowed to devitalize them as it is now trying to do.

The trade unions must likewise show great activity in demanding the lowering of the tariff, the development of programs of industrialization in undeveloped countries, the general application of the late President's New Economic Bill of Rights

and his 60,000,000 jobs program. They must warn the country that the present refusal of Congress to accept the Roosevelt economic proposals is threatening us with a serious economic dislocation at the end of the war.

Organized labor must, too, more than ever, be the driving force in strengthening the nation's anti-fascist unity. A new instrument it can use effectively for this purpose is the recently formulated Charter of Labor and Management. By a firm, united and intelligent policy, the trade unions, under this new cooperative agreement with large sections of the employers, can greatly diminish postwar industrial strife, raise the living standards of the workers, extend labor organizations widely into new fields of white collar workers and workers in rural areas. It can draw whole new segments of the population into the nation's anti-fascist unity behind the Roosevelt policies. The trade unions, however, must be on guard against the injurious class collaborationism of Social-Democracy, which chained labor to the chariot wheel of reactionary capitalist interests.

International trade union unity is another matter that must receive first-line attention, especially from the progressive forces in the A. F. of L. A labor movement, solidly united internationally, is indispensable for carrying out the program of the United Nations, especially in the postwar period. All sections of the

American labor movement must therefore affiliate to the new world trade union federation of labor now being born. The isolationist, anti-Soviet policy of the A. F. of L. leaders, which helps the aggressive imperialism of the Hoovers and Vandenberg, must be reversed.

In all their struggles against the reactionary opposition and for the nation's anti-fascist unity in support of the Roosevelt policies, the trade unions should especially keep in mind the Congressional elections of 1946. The Republican reactionaries, counting on the inertia of the workers in "off" election years, are planning a sneak victory in 1946, much as they won in 1942. Were they to succeed, this would be a real calamity to our domestic situation and to the whole program of the United Nations. Organized labor must, therefore, go into the 1946 elections politically united and prepared to administer a first-class defeat to reaction. This means that preparations for the election must be pushed now, and vigorously.

Very important is it, too, in fighting against the Hoover-Vandenberg-Taft opposition, that the imperialist program of these people should be fully exposed. It is not enough merely to denounce them as reactionaries. The American people must be taught that the reactionary opposition is against the whole plan of a democratic collaboration among the nations and is fighting for American

imperialist world domination. By thus exposing the real aims of the Hoovers and Deweys and showing the national and world disasters inherent in their program, the fight against them will be greatly strengthened.

The overwhelming masses of the American people are in favor of the general objectives laid down in the great conferences of Moscow, Téhéran and Crimea. But these objectives have to be fought for in order to make them prevail over the demagoguery and stratagems of the militant American imperialists. The fate of our country and all its people depends upon how well the trade unions understand the basic character of the fight they are engaged in and upon the vigor with which they carry on that struggle.

The death of President Roosevelt makes it all the more necessary that the trade unions carry on this political fight for the program laid down at Crimea. The Vandenberg, et al, realizing that by Mr. Roosevelt's passing the world democratic movement has lost a great leader, are redoubling their reactionary activities.

It devolves, therefore, upon the trade union movement, by its mass political activity within the framework of the nation's anti-fascist unity, to help bring about the assurance that the main line of policy laid down by Roosevelt is effectively realized.

WH
the
drive
coast
Gerr
whic
the p
to th
week
whic
com
aims
terrib
D. F
Unit
nized
viet
junct
milit
more
armie
an er
dime
rema
Presi
with
been
and
demo
lost.
war



ROOSEVELT — ARCHITECT OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

By A. B. MAGIL

WHEN FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT died, the American armies, which had driven eight hundred miles from the coasts of France into the heart of Germany, and the Soviet armies, which had stormed 1,500 miles from the plains of Moscow and Stalingrad to the gates of Berlin, were just two weeks short of that historic junction which richly symbolized a dynamic comradeship in arms, in work and in aims shaped in the fires of this most terrible of all wars. When Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, the United States had not even recognized the legal existence of the Soviet Union. Between the diplomatic junction of the two nations and the military junction of their armies lies more than time and space: the two armies, the two nations have spanned an era and lifted history to a new dimension. That must for all time remain the principal measure of President Roosevelt's stature, for without it our country would have been lost, engulfed in the Nazi tide, and the fruits of three centuries of democracy would have been likewise lost. Collective security, whether in war or in peace, has been proved

impossible, politically and strategically, without the participation and leadership of the two most powerful countries in the world, the United States and the U.S.S.R. Their collaboration is the cornerstone of the entire structure. Roosevelt's role in bringing the two nations into intimate partnership for common democratic goals was thus decisive, not only for America, but for all the capitalist democracies—for capitalism as a world system.

THE ENDING OF "SOLIPSISM"

When Franklin D. Roosevelt took office he inherited an evil legacy. For fifteen years the United States, under four successive administrations, had refused to recognize the right of the Russian people to order their own affairs and had treated as an outlaw a government which had proved itself the most stable and peace-loving in Europe. By that policy the administrations of Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover effected a breach with a country with whom we had maintained friendly relations almost from the birth of our republic—a country which had

aided us diplomatically in every one of our liberating wars: 1776, 1812 and 1861. That this breach occurred not because Soviet Russia threatened our national interests, but because the Russian people had thrown out their own tyrants and established a new people's democracy, only underlined the reactionary, anti-American nature of the non-recognition policy. By this stupid diplomacy, the United States, instead of isolating the Soviet Union, only succeeded in isolating itself; for country after country established diplomatic relations with the new Russia, though some continued to intrigue for eventual war to reconquer the Soviet domain for capitalism. Reactionary circles in all countries, including the aspiring Nazis of Germany, looked to the United States as a bulwark in their crusade against "Bolshevism." Thus, the fascist and appeasement forces, which later emerged with such virulence, were nourished by what had for fifteen years been official American policy.

The resumption of diplomatic relations in November 1933 at the initiative of President Roosevelt was therefore the first step toward a profound historic reversal. As the first Soviet ambassador, Alexander Troyanovsky, pointed out in an article on Roosevelt's death, "the present cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in the fight against Hitler aggression would have been impossible were it not for the

establishment of diplomatic relations in 1933." (*Red Star*, April 14.) It is interesting to recall Joseph Stalin's appraisal of Roosevelt's role shortly after he had ended the diplomatic blockade of socialist Russia. "Roosevelt to all appearances is a resolute and courageous political leader," Stalin told Walter Duranty in December 1933. "There is a philosophical system called solipsism, which means you do not believe in the reality of anything outside of yourself, but only in your own ego. For a long time it looked as if the American government was 'solipsist'—it did not believe in the existence of the U.S.S.R. But Roosevelt evidently is not a supporter of that strange theory. He is a realist and knows that the facts are as he sees them."

Undoubtedly in taking this step the President was, apart from his own liberal impulses, actuated by a number of factors. Normal relations with the Soviet Union would help check the aggressive aims of Japan, which directly threatened American interests in the Far East, and of Hitler in Europe. Diplomatic recognition was favored by a growing number of important business groups which at a time of severe economic crisis particularly welcomed opportunities for increased trade with Russia. Among workers, liberals, and the public as a whole, many of the old anti-Soviet prejudices had worn thin and the Five-Year Plans had

evolv
vivi
It
dipi
stro
den
U.S.
safe
con
For
the
nah,

I
pelli
conv
conc
and
both
stren
of th

Sir
tervi
acter
as "a
—pol
chan
nomin
trane
our c
tween
nally,
opera

OBST
SO

Uni
which
tertain
adequ
Soviet

evoked widespread interest in the Soviet system.

It is noteworthy that the aspect of diplomatic relations which was most strongly emphasized by both President Roosevelt and the leaders of the U.S.S.R., was their value in helping safeguard peace. The day after the conclusion of his negotiations with Foreign Commissar Maxim Litvinov the President, in a speech at Savannah, Georgia, said:

I believe sincerely that the most compelling motive that has lain behind the conversations which were successfully concluded yesterday between Russia and the United States was the desire of both countries for peace and for the strengthening of the peaceful purpose of the civilized world.

Similarly Joseph Stalin, in his interview with Walter Duranty, characterized the resumption of relations as "an act of paramount importance—politically, because it improves the chances of maintaining peace; economically, because it eliminates extraneous considerations and enables our countries to discuss questions between them on a business basis. Finally, it opens the way to mutual cooperation."

OBSTACLES TO AMERICAN-SOVIET COOPERATION

Unfortunately, the high hopes which both Roosevelt and Stalin entertained were only partly and inadequately fulfilled. As far as the Soviet government was concerned,

its desire for genuine friendship with our country was indicated in many ways, as former Ambassador Davies testifies in his *Mission to Moscow*. In a confidential report to Secretary of State Hull on April 1, 1938, he wrote: "Despite some irritations that must needs arise, in my opinion it can nevertheless be safely asserted that the mission of the government of the United States here has received more consideration and favor from this government during the past year than has any other foreign state. I have it on the word of Commissar for Foreign Affairs Litvinov himself that 'the Soviet Union would do more for the United States than any other nation.'" And several months after Munich, on January 18, 1939, Davies wrote President Roosevelt from Brussels: "The leaders of the Soviet government have stated to me that there is only one government in the world that they trust and that is the United States government under your leadership."

In view of this and of President Roosevelt's own expressed hope at the time of recognition that relations between the two countries would grow "closer and more intimate with each passing year," why, then, did no rapprochement take place in the critical years before Hitler unloosed World War II?

Two principal factors operated to keep the two countries apart. First, though the official "ideological" war against the Soviet Union had ended

with the inauguration of President Roosevelt and the establishment of diplomatic relations, a heavy legacy of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist prejudice and suspicion remained, fed by reactionary business and clerical interests, by large sections of the press led by the Hearst-McCormick-Patterson axis, and by such agencies as the Dies Committee. Within the State Department itself anti-Soviet influences were active. And when, at the instigation of these forces, our State Department in the summer of 1935 sent a sharp note to the Soviet government protesting certain speeches that had been made at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, the pro-fascists and appeasers rejoiced, while the cause of American-Soviet cooperation suffered a definite setback. That this protest was directed against that very gathering at which the representatives of Communist Parties of many countries rallied the anti-fascist forces of the world for a People's Front to halt fascist aggression is an ironic commentary on the misguided policy represented by the American protest. As on so many other occasions, anti-Communism revealed itself as a potent menace to our national interests.

A fresh impetus was given to anti-Soviet propaganda during the Moscow treason trials of 1936, 1937 and 1938. Despite the information it received from Ambassador Davies, which left no doubt as to the guilt

of the accused, our government did nothing to counteract this propaganda.

An even more serious obstacle to American-Soviet cooperation was the relative passivity of the United States in regard to European developments during the explosive years when Hitler and Mussolini were by threats, bribes and infiltration establishing the springboards for their global war of conquest. Those were years in which the dominant big business groups in this country were wedded to reactionary policies in both the domestic and foreign spheres. Roosevelt was able to win the battle against these groups for domestic reform because he had the overwhelming support of the labor movement and of the people as a whole; he lost the battle for foreign policy reform primarily because on this question labor and the people were divided or apathetic. Even the most advanced sector of the labor movement, the C.I.O., gave only belated and limited support to collective security, though a few unions did actively aid Spanish democracy and campaigned for concerted action to save the peace. In liberal circles the situation was not much better. In and out of Congress well known liberals subscribed to the isolationist dogma, as did the influential liberal weekly, the *New Republic*.

In this state of affairs and in the wake of the collapse of the World Disarmament Conference, the Ad-

ministration abandoned the tentative efforts at collective security it had made in 1933 and 1934 and swam with the isolationist tide. That tide thrust into the center of our country's foreign policy the Neutrality Act—an act which President Roosevelt later publicly regretted he had signed. Willy-nilly this isolationist drifting eventually moved us into collaboration with the appeasement governments of Britain and France—a course which proved so disastrous in the Spanish war—rather than with the one power that genuinely worked for collective security, the U.S.S.R. President Roosevelt sensed the danger early enough to have undone much of the damage, had he been effectively supported. His "quarantine the aggressors" speech in October 1937, one of the landmarks in the evolution of his foreign policy, was a powerful warning and a summons to action. But while it served to raise the issue sharply before the public, the speech was so unproductive of practical results that he was later moved to write in the introduction to the 1939 volume of his public papers and addresses that his appeal "fell upon deaf ears—even hostile and resentful ears. The pronouncement became the subject of bitter attack at home and abroad." It should also be said that the Administration's policy on Spain, where Hitler and Mussolini won the first battle of their war against world democracy, worked at

cross-purposes with the quarantine-the-aggressor policy and helped immobilize the people. Roosevelt's efforts to repeal the arms embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act in order to provide a brake, however inadequate, on the Nazi plunge to war also proved unavailing until the bloody conflict had burst upon the world.

In this situation American-Soviet cooperation, which the President had hoped, as he said in welcoming Ambassador Troyanovsky, "will inevitably be of the highest importance in the preservation of world peace," proved still-born. For if such cooperation was the core of collective security, it was also true that in the absence of strong popular support for collective action any real partnership with the U.S.S.R. was for all practical purposes checkmated. How decisive the joint efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union could have been in those years is attested by Rhea Foster Dulles in his recent book, *The Road to Teheran*. "They were," he writes, "potentially the two most powerful nations in the world, and the two most strongly dedicated . . . to the maintenance of peace. Had they somehow been able to agree upon a common policy, throwing their tremendous influence behind the battered cause of collective security even at this late date [the end of 1938] Hitler would at least have faced a united world." Unfortunately, what seems obvious to-

day was understood at that time by only a relatively small number of Americans. Foremost among them was Earl Browder who, like the Abolitionists of the last century, was a pioneer pathfinder of national salvation: his work nourished the soil out of which later sprang the great oak of American-Soviet unity.

While America drifted, Hitler acted. And thanks to Chamberlain and Daladier, instead of facing a united world, he faced a divided world. Once again, though under far more perilous circumstances, those who had sought to isolate the Soviet Union only succeeded in isolating their own countries and opening the gates to the enemy. When war finally came, many, all too many, did not understand that fascism could not be defeated on terms of that very isolation which Hitler had triumphantly achieved, but only by uniting the capitalist and socialist sectors of world democracy. President Roosevelt and his Administration fell victims of reactionary pressures and prejudices which beclouded national interest. It is significant that this painful interlude in our relations with the Soviet Union was the only period in the last twelve years when the saturnine figure of Herbert Hoover appeared to command popular support; his work as the organizer of aid to the Finnish fascists in their war against the Soviet Union, though certainly not accepted in its full implications by the Administra-

tion, nevertheless, seemed to bear official sanction.

So long as aid to Britain was combined with hostility to the Soviets, our country was being driven into a dangerous *cul de sac*: by deepening the cleavage between the two powers without whose joint efforts Hitler could not be stopped, that policy played into Hitler's hands and at the same time threatened to involve America in war under circumstances most favorable to our enemies. Thus, while the question of aid to Britain divided interventionists and reactionary non-interventionists, actually both groups were in the decisive sense isolationist.

HISTORY'S MIGHTY LEAP

By invading the Soviet Union Hitler at one stroke achieved that which the efforts of years had been unable to accomplish: the rapprochement of the United States and the U.S.S.R. By that act he made possible the great three-power coalition and assured his own defeat. On June 22, 1941, history took a mighty leap, and it is to the eternal glory of Franklin D. Roosevelt that he did not lag behind. Yes, at times he had blundered. He had not always clearly and consistently pursued the path of American-Soviet cooperation. Men, however, are judged finally not by their mistakes, but by the total consequence of their acts. By that test Roosevelt's greatness would be assured if it rested only on the fact

that he more than any other figure in the capitalist world helped build a bridge between western capitalism and the Soviet Union. Thereby he became the architect of victory and of a peace that can be made to endure.

The first statement issued by Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles on the Nazi invasion was cautious and equivocal; while denouncing the latest German aggression, it clung to the anti-Sovietism of the past. But there were no such ambiguities in President Roosevelt's attitude when he met the press two days later. According to the *New York Times* of June 25, 1941, "President Roosevelt pledged today that the United States would give all possible aid to Soviet Russia in its defense against Nazi Germany." He ordered the Treasury to release \$40,000,000 of Soviet credits which had been frozen and shortly thereafter he dispatched Harry Hopkins to Moscow to learn at first-hand what the Soviet needs were. In August, at the conference with Prime Minister Churchill which issued the Atlantic Charter, he and Churchill sent a joint message to Stalin pledging to speed shipment of war goods and proposing a conference in Moscow of American, British and Soviet representatives (the Harriman-Beaverbrook mission) to place assistance to the U.S.S.R. on a long-term basis.

Nor did the President content himself with providing material aid: he

encouraged the efforts to free Americans of misconceptions concerning the Soviet Union as a means of furthering the friendship of the two peoples. He gave an example of this when only a little over two months after the Nazi invasion he told a press conference that the Soviet Constitution protects religious freedom, as well as the right to propagandize against religion, and that this was virtually the same situation as prevailed in the United States—a statement which aroused the ire of political and religious bigots. (Incidentally, it was in flat contradiction to a passage in the Welles declaration on the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R.) And on frequent occasions Roosevelt publicly rebuked those who sought to sow distrust toward the Soviet Union or our other allies.

As a rule it is idle to speculate what would have happened if someone else had been in the place of the person who stands at the nation's helm; but in this case such an alternative to Roosevelt is so much a part of our public life and still so potent a threat to our nation that it may serve a useful purpose to consider what that alternative means. There is no need to guess what would have happened if Roosevelt's opponent in the 1932 election, Herbert Hoover, had won and if he or successors in his image had been in office throughout these years. The record is plain for all to read; here

let us limit ourselves to a few of the highlights that concern relations with the Soviet Union. Of all the Presidents responsible for the policy of non-recognition and the *cordon sanitaire* Hoover was most truculently anti-Soviet. In the years since the American people retired him to private life he has remained unreconstructed. In April, 1940, writing in *Collier's*, he demanded the recall of our ambassador in Moscow and described recognition of the U.S.S.R. as "a gigantic political and moral mistake." This thought was also uttered about the same time by an ambitious young protege of Hoover's, Thomas E. Dewey. When the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union, Hoover declared that "collaboration between Britain and Russia . . . makes the whole argument of joining the war to bring the Four Freedoms a gargantuan jest." And another one of his pupils, Senator Taft, said: "A victory for Communism would be far more dangerous to the United States than a victory for fascism." (Actually, of course, the issue was not Communism versus fascism, but freedom for all nations or fascist enslavement for all.)

THE GROWTH OF COLLABORATION

The relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in the four years that have passed since June 22, 1941, may be roughly divided into four periods. The first

was the phase of emergency action when the Nazis were devouring Soviet territory and economic resources and the survival of the Soviet Union hung in the balance. The second was inaugurated with the visit of Foreign Commissar V. M. Molotov to Washington and London in May-June, 1942. The limited Soviet counter-offensive of December and January had revealed the possibility of shifting to the strategic offensive against Germany, provided Hitler were compelled to divide his forces in a two-front war. During Molotov's visit an understanding was reached "with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a second front in Europe in 1942," the Anglo-Soviet mutual assistance pact was negotiated, and a comprehensive mutual aid agreement of indefinite duration was signed with the United States—an agreement which also projected the idea of economic collaboration after the war.

The full story of the understanding on the second front must await the publication of the diplomatic archives, but there seems to be little doubt that the President made a commitment which he hoped he could carry out and that Churchill, who at first was against the commitment, was finally persuaded by Roosevelt to agree. There also seems little doubt that throughout this period Roosevelt and the American General Staff favored the western invasion of Europe, but were op-

posed by Churchill and the British General Staff. The North African invasion and the Italian campaign, which nibbled at the periphery of German power, were in fact reluctant concessions to British strategic conceptions.

As a result of the failure to open a Western Front, relations between the Soviet Union and her two principal Allies deteriorated dangerously in 1943. The glaringly unequal distribution of the burdens of the war threatened the very existence of the Grand Alliance. Victory itself was in jeopardy.

The Moscow and Teheran conferences resolved these difficulties on an entirely new plane, welding together the coalition and ushering in an unprecedented period of American-Soviet cooperation. It was at Teheran that Roosevelt emerged in his full stature as the consolidator of the coalition, for it was he who was primarily responsible for overcoming Churchill's objections to the continental invasion that would make possible simultaneous blows from east and west to crush the fascist beast. At Teheran Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill made the decisions that guaranteed the victory of the United Nations and set the feet of mankind on a new historic path: collaboration of the capitalist and socialist systems in peace as in war.

The Yalta Conference in February, 1945, which continued the work of Teheran, pointed and still points the way in which American policy must

be developed, if fascism is to be eradicated and an enduring peace is to be achieved. At Yalta problems of the postwar—problems concerned with Germany, with the liberated countries, with the establishment of a United Nations security organization—were for the first time uppermost. President Roosevelt helped to shape the pattern of the future, but he did not live to guide the unfolding of that pattern. At San Francisco the conference, decided on at Yalta, which is to set up an international security organization to enable the family of nations to live in peace, is now taking place. The key to this organization is that it is designed to institutionalize and anchor the leading coalition of the five major powers within the larger association of member nations who have been joined in the common struggle against fascism. What was so alarming about the conference vote on the question of admitting Argentina was not that differences arose among the major powers—this is nothing new—but that instead of being resolved, as in the past, in a way that strengthened the coalition, the differences were resolved in a way that threatened its existence. In the actions of the American delegation, not the spirit of Roosevelt, but of Hoover-Vandenberg gained the ascendancy.

In fact, at San Francisco, despite formal progress in adopting a charter of the new security organization, there is no doubt that American-Soviet relations have been seriously

strained and the coalition has been greatly weakened, ironically at the very moment of supreme victory in the European phase of the war. With Roosevelt gone and the pressure of military necessity removed, American reactionary imperialists have moved forward to impose their program on our country. The American delegation has so conducted itself as urgently to raise the question of whether the whole course of Teheran and Yalta is not in danger of being reversed. To grasp what has happened it is important to understand Britain's role. As the weakest member of the Big Three and the one in sharpest conflict with each of the other two, Britain has always sought to strengthen its position and secure the political initiative by preventing the relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. from becoming too close. This was the meaning of Churchill's offer after the Quebec conference in 1943 of an exclusive Anglo-American alliance—a proposal which was eagerly echoed by Governor Dewey, but evoked no response from the Roosevelt Administration. For Roosevelt, perceiving our country's real interest, frustrated these maneuvers, and by drawing closer to the Soviet Union, made it possible for the United States to assume decisive leadership in world affairs.

Within a short time after Roosevelt's death, however, the British, by maneuvering to bring about disunity between the two most powerful

countries in the world, have regained the political initiative and are using it in an effort to nullify the democratic implications of Teheran and Yalta. The American delegation, whether through incompetence or design, has fallen in with this game. This is most clearly evident on the Polish issue. It has been revealed by Walter Lippmann and by Bert Andrews, New York *Herald Tribune* correspondent at San Francisco, that in the controversy over carrying out the Yalta commitment on Poland Roosevelt disagreed with Churchill rather than with Stalin. In other words, on this question our government has clearly abandoned the Roosevelt policy.

From all this the defeated Nazis and the still-to-be-defeated Japanese take heart, while Senator Vandenberg and his cohorts are filled with an inner glow. Hitler may be dead and his empire lies shattered, but his heirs are not extinct either in Germany or the United Nations. The time has come for the heirs of Roosevelt—the American people, with labor in the forefront—to insist and organize pressure upon the President and the State Department to compel adherence to the Roosevelt policies. This is necessary in order to preserve and nurture that which is most precious in the Roosevelt heritage: friendship and intimate cooperation with our great Soviet ally, as a guarantee that the peace being won at the cost of so much blood and treasure shall not be betrayed.

STRENGTHENING NATIONAL UNITY UNDER THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

By ADAM LAPIN

THE HISTORIC EVENTS culminating during the first month of the Truman Administration have brought in their wake a whole series of new problems: the problems of defeating Japan and of utterly destroying beaten German imperialism, of reconstructing Europe and building a lasting peace, and of mobilizing the home front for the final phase of war while beginning orderly reconversion to a peace-time economy. On an international scale the solution of these problems will require the highest degree of unity of the Big Three, and here in the United States it will require a greater development of national unity behind the program of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It was inevitable that the succession of Truman to the presidency followed so soon by the defeat of Germany should have marked the start of determined efforts by the most reactionary and disruptive forces in American life to reverse the

whole course set by Roosevelt both in foreign and domestic policy. This was partly because there was a new President in the White House, partly because the carrying out of the Yalta decisions with regard to Germany represented the most acute and immediate danger for the forces of fascism and reaction all over the world.

REACTIONARY PRESSURE INCREASES ON DOMESTIC FRONT

The first month of the Truman Administration has made it clear that the struggle for the Crimea Charter and all it means for America and the world, far from being over, enters a new and decisive phase, reaching a new intensity.

In his address to Congress only three days after the tragic death of the great Roosevelt, Truman told the nation and the world that he would continue the policies of his predecessor. He specifically pledged unwavering adherence to the goals of unconditional surrender, cooperation with our Allies, and sternest punishment of the war criminals. He assured the "forward-looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common man."

But this did not, of course, terminate the campaign to swerve the new President from the Roosevelt policies. Truman was deluged with flattery from the most fascist-minded sections of the press. The Hearst papers,

for example, ran ecstatic editorials about him day after day. The conservative newspapers and the big wire services predicted a sharp turn to the Right, all-out appeasement of the anti-Roosevelt forces in Congress, a break with the labor movement, and a drastic shake-up of administration personnel in the form of a purge of staunch Roosevelt supporters.

This wishful thinking was designed to influence Truman by sheer force of repetition in practically the entire press. But right from the start Truman reiterated his support of such major Roosevelt goals as M.V.A. and F.E.P.C. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, one of the key Administration men most frequently slated to go, was actually asked to remain. John W. Snyder, a St. Louis banker who had made an excellent record at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was named Federal Loan Administrator. Robert Nathan, a capable young liberal who had fought vigorously for planning of war production, was picked as deputy to Fred Vinson, director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Harold Young, the Texas lawyer who had long been Henry Wallace's right hand man, was made Solicitor of the Agriculture Department.

The major home front development following the defeat of Germany was Vinson's report which was a detailed plan for continued mobilization of the national resources

against Japan. It was an informative statement of the problems ahead. But it underestimated the danger of unemployment in the immediate period ahead and the need for planning the return to a peace-time economy. O.P.A. Administrator Chester Bowles followed by announcing a re-conversion price policy for products reappearing on the market aimed at 1942 price levels.

There was no evidence that Truman had yielded to the demand for a basic departure from Roosevelt's policies for 60,000,000 jobs and for constant advancement of the people's living standards. His appointments seemed well balanced, calculated to promote national unity. It was apparently his strategy to make formal concessions to conservative Democrats without compromising on policy. This was most strikingly illustrated by his action in asking Senator Kenneth McKeller, now president pro tem of the Senate, to sit in on Cabinet meetings, while turning down his request that David Lillenthal be rejected for another term as T.V.A. chairman. He had made a friendly gesture to the vindictive and powerful Tennessee Democrat without changing the direction of T.V.A.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST ROOSEVELT'S FOREIGN POLICY

The campaign to swerve Truman from the Roosevelt foreign policy,

the key in a real sense to the future development of America and the whole world, was even more carefully planned and had more powerful support than the drive against Administration domestic policy. Only a few days after Roosevelt's death Herbert Hoover delivered in Philadelphia what was perhaps his most avowedly anti-Soviet speech of the last few years. He projected an alliance of "Western civilization" against the Soviet Union. Instead of hailing the liberation of Europe from the Nazi yoke, he complained that the area of freedom was shrinking in Europe, a not so indirect way of saying that he preferred Nazi terror to progressive governments friendly to the Soviet Union.

It was this speech which put in proper perspective the Hoover-Vandenberg amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks Charter. These amendments were ostensibly aimed at achieving justice. Actually, they were aimed at the whole basic concept of unity of the United States and Great Britain with the Soviet Union; they were aimed at supplanting the Soviet Union's friendly neighbors with anti-Soviet, fascist or near-fascist governments. These amendments were accompanied by a barrage of newspaper stories, columns and editorials urging Truman to "get tough" with the Soviet Union, to reverse what was termed Roosevelt's "appeasement" of the Soviet Union—actually, to reverse Roosevelt's pol-

icy of building close relations with the Soviet Union, to eliminate his policy of cooperation of the Big Three as the foundation of broader world cooperation.

Truman at his first press conference stood firm by the Roosevelt policies of economic cooperation as embodied in the Bretton Woods plan and in the legislation for reducing tariff barriers. Even earlier he had refused to postpone the San Francisco conference. But it must be admitted that the campaign against Roosevelt's foreign policy was not without effect.

At San Francisco it was reported by men as conservative as columnists Walter Lippmann and Major George Fielding Elliott and by Eugene Meyer, publisher of the *Washington Post*, that anti-Soviet thinking was deeply rooted among American delegates. Senator Vandenberg briefly took over the leadership of the American delegation. The result was the shameful performance in which Argentina was seated at San Francisco. Earl Browder bluntly raised the question of "whether the U.S.A. is still following the path marked out by the great Roosevelt or whether we are now in the process of departing from that path to go over to the path of Senator Vandenberg." Due largely to the intervention of Cordell Hull and other powerful figures, Vandenberg's leadership of the delegation was later minimized. Vandenberg's principal amendment for revision of treaties was rejected.

But the danger of the Vandenberg policy and of any yielding to it became all too apparent. The new Administration had made a serious and costly mistake.

Unfortunately there has been no tangible evidence so far that President Truman appreciates fully the crucial importance of Soviet-American cooperation and friendship and the significance which Roosevelt attached to the Big Three as the basis for lasting peace. And there have on the other hand been disturbing signs of departures from the Yalta agreement on Poland and other issues. President Truman has not checked this retreat from the Roosevelt policy.

It is not the purpose of this article, of course, to discuss the San Francisco conference. But one significant thing which is worth noting here is that Vandenberg's dominant influence at the conference was checked, not by mass pressure, not by the intervention of the people, but by the angry protest of high figures like Hull. It was checked by the belated realization in top political and business circles that Vandenberg was taking America into a suicidal blind alley which could only lead to war.

Broader questions remain even after the immediate impact of the Argentina fight has diminished. Why was it that the trade unions did not react to the danger to the nation's basic foreign policy apparent in the Argentine decision? Why was there

no real campaign by the people against the maneuvers of Hoover and Vandenberg which led straight to the Argentine fiasco? These are serious questions. They go to the heart of the problem of national unity in the months ahead.

The strength and importance of the great democratic mass movements which grew up during the twelve years of Roosevelt cannot be underestimated. The labor movement broke down the confining shackles of A. F. of L. bureaucracy and organized the mass production industries. A heightened political consciousness and understanding developed among the people. Through such organizations as the C.I.O. Political Action Committee, the labor movement actively and on a large scale entered politics to support the Roosevelt policies. The organizations of the Negro people reached new strength and political maturity. Roosevelt encouraged and stimulated these movements. At the same time they were indispensable to the successful execution of his policies. The people and their organizations were always a source of strength to Roosevelt.

But the fact remains that Roosevelt's brilliant leadership, his understanding of the correct policies needed to maintain national unity, frequently minimized mistakes of omission and commission and weaknesses in the labor and progressive movements. There was a

tendency to leave things to Roosevelt, to expect him to carry almost unaided the crushing burdens of war leadership. There was also a tendency in some liberal circles, particularly those under Social-Democratic influence, to engage in negative, carping criticism of Roosevelt. These weaknesses emerged all too clearly during the final weeks of his term in office when the labor movement largely failed to adopt a constructive position on the manpower legislation which he urged. If these mistakes did not have more serious consequences, it was frequently because of Roosevelt's personal leadership which was both a product of social forces and in itself a great historic factor.

The death of Roosevelt inescapably left a major impact on the American political scene. When V-E day came almost immediately afterwards, the stage was set for major battles on foreign policy and on such immediate domestic issues as the lifting of war controls during the war with Japan. The thin camouflage of G.O.P. pledges to support Truman did not last long. With only twelve honorable exceptions, House Republicans lined up solidly against Truman's veto of the Tydings amendment deferring agricultural workers. Immediately after V-E Day Senator Taft plunged into action to scrape wage and price controls, merging the objectives of those who, like the Patterson-McCormick newspapers,

seek a negotiated peace with Japan and of profits-as-usual lobbyists. There is little doubt that big political battles are ahead in Congress, particularly when Bretton Woods, the tariff and Dumbarton Oaks come up for discussion.

TASKS BEFORE LABOR AND THE PEOPLE'S MOVEMENTS

The democratic people's movements which came into being under Roosevelt and which functioned so effectively during the 1944 election campaign now assume a new importance. The labor movement and all progressive organizations now have the central task of exerting influence upon the Truman Administration to carry out Roosevelt's policies, to resist the enormous pressure from reaction. This is not a simple task, and it entails a number of serious responsibilities:

First, it means greater initiative on the part of the people's organizations which in a very direct sense will now have to play a role in shaping policy. The simple fact is that in too many instances the people's movement has lagged behind the needs of the moment. This has been particularly true in the field of foreign policy where the substantial popular movements for Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods were too general in scope. They did not cope with the specific problems of combatting the Hoover-Vandenberg amend-

ments to Bretton Woods, or with the use by disruptive forces of such issues as, on the one hand, Argentina and, on the other, Poland. The same need for initiative exists in dealing with the vast problems of reconversion. Labor particularly has the job of giving positive leadership, of submitting programs for national consideration and governmental action. Initial statements issued by C.I.O. committees on the Vinson and Bowles reports did not fulfill this function, did not contribute to national unity and were generally negative in tone.

Second, it means that greater unity of the labor movement is now imperative. If the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and Railroad Brotherhoods should fail to agree on basic policy, this will weaken national unity as a whole and will make it much more difficult to realize the Roosevelt program. The time is now ripe for renewing Philip Murray's offer for joint action between the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. on legislative and home-front problems. But there will obviously be little joint action without a sharp fight against the diehards in the A. F. of L. Executive Council who have so far balked unity and have spent most of their time conducting a vendetta against the World Labor Congress. Labor unity also requires a more vigorous campaign against John L. Lewis and his satellites within C.I.O. ranks.

Third, it means that the labor-

management cooperation, highlighted in the historic charter signed by William Green, Philip Murray and Eric Johnston of the Chamber of Commerce, must be implemented and carried out locally and on specific issues. Certainly there is every need for labor-management conferences to develop joint programs on reconversion based on full employment and to agree on wage policies designed to increase the mass purchasing power.

Fourth, it means strengthening all organizations and movements uniting labor and non-labor groups around the Roosevelt program. This embraces the broad community organizations, including middle-class and business people, church bodies, Negro organizations, and others supporting Dumbarton Oaks, as well as groups formed during the election campaign, like the Committee of the Arts and Sciences.

Fifth, it means strengthening within the Democratic Party the adherents of the Roosevelt policies, the supporters of the Yalta agreement.

Finally, the Communist Political Association and its press which unflaggingly worked throughout the war for speedy victory and the maintenance of solid national and Allied unity, are now confronted with even more important responsibilities and tasks than ever before. This has become particularly clear during the first month of the Truman Administration. The Communists almost

alone warned of the Hoover-Vandenberg threat to the San Francisco conference. The Communists quickly called for unity to carry out Roosevelt's basic policies which were summarized by Browder as continuing cooperation of the Big Three, the gathering of the family of nations around this nucleus in an orderly system of international relations, maximum utilization of America's tremendous productive capacity to provide full employment and a constantly rising standard of living and unity of all Americans of good will in support of this program. To achieve these objectives, the political clarity and understanding provided

by the C.P.A. and its press will be indispensable.

In this hour crucial to the peace program of the United Nations, Earl Browder has spoken out to the people of America:

It is necessary for those who supported Roosevelt now to raise their voices in firm insistent demand for a return to the Roosevelt policies.

Our collective efforts must fill the empty place of the departed F.D.R.

We must raise such a storm around the high official places in Washington where policy should be made, that stupid officials will be awakened from their hypnosis under reactionary and British influences, and pressed back to the American policies of Roosevelt.



DEMOCRACY*

By A. SOKOLOV

RECENTLY CERTAIN ORGANS of the press in the Allied and neutral countries have commenced very energetic researches into the question of what democracy is. These researches by no means bear a purely abstract character. On the contrary, they have been prompted by an obvious dissatisfaction with the very concrete forms in which the will of the peoples has been finding expression in a number of liberated European countries; and the terminological researches of the dissatisfied authors usually result in one and only one discovery, that there is a fundamental difference between the two "conceptions" of democracy, namely, the Soviet and the Anglo-Saxon.

Thus the English liberal *Manchester Guardian* says: "It would seem to be necessary to have some international agreement on the meaning of certain fashionable expressions." And it goes on to explain which fashionable expressions are perplexing. It would like to know: "What is a democrat, a Hitlerite and a fascist? And no less important, what is an anti-fascist?"

Another English newspaper, the conservative *Observer*—in an article

by its reviewer who writes under the very promising *nom de plume*, "Student of Europe"—expresses itself even more definitely. It asserts that in the Soviet Union "democracy appears to mean something different from, and in some respects even the opposite to, what the English-speaking world understands by the term." To these "differences in definition" the newspaper attaches "very great political importance."

It cannot be denied that there is an extremely important difference between the democracy that prevails in the Soviet Union and that which exists in a number of other countries. That there is a difference between the social systems and ideologies of the USSR and the Anglo-Saxon countries is beyond dispute. It is equally beyond dispute that this difference should not serve as an obstacle to firm and durable cooperation among the Allies.

Of course, a country which knows no exploitation of man by man, a country in which not only political but also economic equality prevails, a country in which democratic liberties are not only proclaimed *de jure* but are fully guaranteed *de facto* by the material conditions of social life, a country in which genuine freedom of nations exists and indestructible friendship between these nations has been created—such a country has undoubtedly made more progress along the road to democracy. It is also true that Soviet democracy cannot be regarded as identical with English de-

* From *War and the Working Class*, Moscow, No. 8, 1945.

mocracy. That the economic basis of society in the Soviet Union is different from that in England is commonly known. This directly affects the question of democracy, in that it is precisely the economic system of the Soviet Union that guarantees the people the opportunity of exercising their democratic rights, including such fundamental and vital rights as the right to work, the right to education, freedom from exploitation and from national or racial discrimination, etc. . . .

Under these circumstances, the difference between Soviet democracy and, for example, English democracy, is of course not only a "difference of definition." Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Soviet people and the democrats in other countries cannot find common ground and a common criterion of what should be regarded as democratic. . . .

* * *

It is particularly easy to dispel doubts on this score at the present time, when the war against the brown plague of Hitlerism is still in progress and when the cornerstone of the future world order which will make the recurrence of fascist aggression impossible, has to be laid; for in our days democracy is revealed in the struggle against fascism. In our days a democrat is one who resolutely and relentlessly fights fascism. A democrat is one who not only in words but also in deeds is prepared to wage a struggle until

all fascist elements and all fascist influences are completely extirpated; for the pernicious nature of fascism, the monstrous danger it represents to the freedom and very lives of the peoples, is clear to every right-thinking man. Freedom for the peoples means death to fascism.

It is on the recognition of this general principle, on which the Soviet people and the sincere supporters of democracy in other countries can find common ground, that the decisions of the Crimea Conference rest. The three great Allied powers pledged themselves to help the peoples of liberated Europe "to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems." They also made provision for a policy which will "enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice." The three great Allies agreed to help the peoples, where conditions require it, to "form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

Thus the Crimea agreements recognize the need for the democratic solution of all urgent and important problems that arise as a result of the liberation of Europe from destructive fascist tyranny. One would think that the clarity of these decisions, per-

meated as they are with a spirit of respect for the democratic rights of European nations, would preclude the possibility of all misinterpretation. But as the saying goes, even multiplication tables could be interpreted in different ways if it suited anybody's purpose to do so.

Many newly-hatched champions of democracy appear to argue that to achieve the complete triumph of democracy it is simply necessary to restore all the forms of political life that existed in European countries before the present war. It is sufficient to glance back at the past to convince oneself of the unsoundness of such an argument. It is no secret that in a number of European countries, not to speak of fascist Germany and Italy of course, the political system that prevailed before the war had very little in common with democracy.

* * *

It is sufficient to recall, for example, the regime that existed in pre-war Poland. This regime arose as a result of a violent *coup d'etat* against the people brought about by Pilsudski and his clique in 1926. The fascist constitution of 1935; the inhuman national oppression of eleven million Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Lithuanians; the disfranchisement of workers, peasants and progressive intelligentsia; the feudal latifundia, nearly as large as whole counties, owned by the Radziwills and the Sapiehas; the notorious concentration camp in Bereza-Kartushka and

the Brest central prison in which were incarcerated all those who dared raise their voices against the rule of the corrupt clique of reactionary politicians; the venality and obscurantism in all spheres of domestic politics; the reckless flirting with Hitler Germany, and the constant anti-Soviet intrigues in the sphere of foreign policy—such are the most memorable features of that regime, of the restoration of which the bankrupt Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique, their abettors and patrons in reactionary circles in Allied countries, are still dreaming.

It is common knowledge that democracy in countries like Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria fared no better. During the two decades between the First and Second World Wars, the reaction which reigned in those countries strangled the virile popular forces. Not only was the Communist Party driven underground, but every expression of progressive political thought was severely punished. Race hatred and brutal chauvinism were systematically cultivated; imperialist tendencies and great power plans of aggression were encouraged. Under these conditions the carpetbaggers of Hitler imperialism at the proper moment quickly found common ground with the reactionary ruling cliques of these small countries, who unhesitatingly flung their peoples into the bloody vortex of the war of aggression unleashed by the Germans.

Nor can the regimes in pre-war Yugoslavia and Greece be described

as democratic from any point of view. In Yugoslavia, for example, during the elections to the *skupschina* which were carried through by the Stojadinovic government in December, 1938, a number of candidates on the official ticket were declared elected although they had polled only 10 to 20 votes; whereas the opposition candidates, who had polled votes running into the tens of thousands, were declared not elected. In Greece the fascist dictatorship of Metaxas was rampant for a number of years before the present war. The Australian author Aldridge, who was in Crete with an Allied Expeditionary Force in the spring of 1941, shows fairly clearly in his novel *The Sea Eagle* that the struggle waged by the Greek partisans against the "ironheads," as they called the German invaders, was a direct continuation of the self-sacrificing struggle they had formerly waged against Greek fascism, against the brutal Metaxas regime.

Our picture would be incomplete if we did not mention also the notorious regime of pre-war Finland. Was it democracy which gave the Finnish warmongers every opportunity to plunge the country into two disastrous wars against the Soviet Union? No sane person can deny that this is an extremely important criterion of the regime that prevailed in Finland. To characterize this regime it is sufficient to recall the fact that it had outlawed the party which now, at the very first elections held under something like free conditions,

polled one-fourth of the total vote in spite of the fact that it had neither the time nor the opportunity to make preparations for the election campaign.

Such was the situation in a number of East European countries. But even in the West European countries, which have old democratic traditions, the political structure in the pre-war years was so honeycombed with reaction that fascist agents were able unhindered to intrigue against the people and to weave their net of treachery and national betrayal. This was the situation not only in France, but also in Denmark, Norway, Belgium and Holland. As for the countries of the Iberian Peninsula, the anti-popular regimes established there were as like the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini as peas in a pod.

* * *

This obviously unsatisfactory state of affairs as regards democracy in many countries on the European Continent primarily explains Hitler's easy victories in the first stage of the war, before he attacked the Soviet Union. Had democracy not been so enfeebled, had it really reigned in pre-war Europe, the world would have been saved from the tragedy of Dunkirk, and from the humiliating farce in the Compiègne woods, from the long years of domination of the Hitler invaders in a number of West European countries, and from a large share of the extremely

heavy sacrifices the freedom-loving peoples were obliged to make on the altar of the struggle against the German-fascist aggressors.

Hardly anybody would dare deny today that Germany's initial victories were not due to the "invincibility" of the German-fascist army or to the "brilliant intuition" of the corporal-strategist Hitler. But these victories were not accidental. Such accidents do not happen. Fundamentally, as all thoughtful and unbiased observers belonging to the most diverse political camps admit, they were due to the fact that democracy was on the decline in the countries which became Hitler's victims and strangled in those which became his allies. On the other hand, as a result of the notorious Munich policy of abetting the aggressor, the great democratic powers of Western Europe—Great Britain and France—were not prepared to offer resistance to the German-fascist hordes.

* * *

Is it surprising then that the peoples of the liberated countries of Europe want to have a democracy free from the fatal defects it suffered from in the pre-war years, a democracy renovated and pulsating with youthful vitality? A democrat is one who bravely looks ahead and not one who furtively looks back. Such indeed were the great democrats and popular leaders of whom civilized nations are proud. The peoples who have passed through the ordeal of the most

arduous of wars want their will, their desire for a progressive policy which will insure a durable peace and international security, to be really respected.

The will of the people finds different expression in different countries; but the European, and not only the European peoples, have drawn very similar conclusions from their experience of the present war. They want to build up their political and social life in such a way as to leave no loopholes for fascism. It is not only a matter of extirpating the remnants and all influences of present-day fascism, but of creating conditions that will prevent the birth of a new fascism.

The peoples do not want a resumption of reckless policies in foreign affairs, including reckless policies directed against the Soviet Union. Lastly, the peoples, and those of a number of countries in Eastern Europe in particular, wish to settle such burning questions affecting their lives as the abolition of feudal and semi-feudal relations in the agrarian system and of national oppression and strife between nations.

Can it be denied that the break-up and distribution of the feudal latifundia among the small peasants is a democratic measure, or that the struggle against the agrarian reform is a struggle against democracy?

Can it be denied that the path of peace and friendship between nationalities, which has now been taken by Yugoslavia and Romania, for

example, is a democratic path, or that the forces which, like the Serbian or Croatian chauvinists or the Romanian "historical parties," are fighting to prevent the solution of the national problem, are thereby exposing themselves as downright enemies of democracy?

The pseudo-champions of democracy reveal their true colors most glaringly when they talk about Poland. From the point of view of democracy, the so-called Polish problem is absolutely clear. The Polish people, liberated from the German-fascist yoke, are building up their new life on democratic principles. The work of restoring Polish statehood is being directed by the Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland and which is headed by leaders of the four Polish democratic parties, who came to the fore in the course of the self-sacrificing struggle waged by the Polish patriots against the Hitler invaders. This government is exercising power throughout the entire territory of Poland; it is supported by the people and is carrying out their will.

But the pseudo-champions of democracy are conducting a fierce and unscrupulous campaign against the Provisional Polish Government, while at the same time pleading the cause of the bankrupt politicians in the emigre Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique. They are indignant when the Polish reactionary émigré camp is called pro-fascist. But what else can it be called? Everybody knows

that this camp played a baneful role in pre-war Poland and bears grave responsibility for the disaster of September, 1939. Venting their spite and hostility toward the Soviet Union in every possible way and basing all their calculations on the possibility of disagreements arising among the Allies, these people have been acting as mouthpieces and abettors of the German fascists throughout the whole period of the war.

Lastly, if any more proof were required that these reactionary politicians who have become completely divorced from their country are the bitterest enemies of democracy, they themselves have provided it by their hostility toward the Crimea decisions. Why do they so fiercely attack the agreement reached in the Crimea? Because that agreement is based on democratic principles and the Polish reactionaries are perfectly well aware that they are utterly played out unless the former anti-popular regime is restored in Poland, unless there is a return to the fascist constitution of 1935, and unless the basis of feudal land ownership is preserved.

Thus no special researches are needed to determine who are the friends of democracy and who are its foes. From the democratic point of view, and in this case it makes no difference whether one takes the stand of Soviet democracy or that of Anglo-American democracy—it cannot be denied that gentlemen like Radescu in Romania; Linkomies,

Tanner and Ryti in Finland; Raczkiewicz and Arciszewski among the Polish émigrés, and the corresponding political figures in other countries, are foes of democracy, are pro-fascists; and that those who support these elements are acting against the interests of the people. Obviously, the road of "democrats" of this type is not the road of the Soviet Union, nor can it be the road of sincere champions of democracy in other countries.

* * *

The pseudo-champions of democracy often advance an argument which the *Observer's* "Student of Europe" formulated in the following manner: "In Western usage, freedom of opposition and free competition of several parties for the votes of the people (including the upper and middle classes) are of the essence of democracy."

From this the conclusion is drawn that the rallying of the forces of the people in a united front against pro-fascist groups and tendencies is a violation of democracy, that it leads to totalitarianism, and so forth. It is not difficult to expose the hypocrisy of this argument. Why indeed should not the forces of the people in the countries just liberated from Nazi tyranny organize and form a united front in the struggle against the beaten, but not yet vanquished, foe? Why should they, to please the dubious "students," and still more the dubious friends, of Europe, engage

in "free competition," in other words, split up their forces and thereby weaken them, when the enemy is continuing to weave his intrigues and is striving to recapture his lost positions by every means in his power?

In the "Student of Europe's" country, the political parties decided to abstain from "free competition" at elections for the duration of the war—in the interests of the common struggle against the enemy, in the interests of uniting all the forces of the nation for this struggle. If this is the case in a powerful country like Great Britain, how much more imperative is it to rally all democratic elements in a united front in the liberated countries of Europe which have only just entered upon a new path.

Can these peoples forget that it was precisely the disunity in the democratic camp, the division of the democratic forces, that was one of the most important factors in the establishment of fascist regimes in a number of countries? The fascists were able to turn to their advantage the fact that the democratic elements in many countries of pre-war Europe were unable to find a common ground. In particular, even the supporters of democracy were so blinded by anti-Communist prejudice that they emphatically refused to have any dealings with Communists, losing sight of the fact that thereby they were splitting the anti-fascist front and easing the task of fascism.

The bloody lessons of the past few years have taught not only that a split is harmful, but also that unification of the popular forces is beneficial. The Communists fought the Hitler invaders side by side with the representatives of all patriotic, all anti-fascist parties, groups and trends. The result was united action, cemented with the blood of the best fighters for freedom. The peoples of the liberated countries of Europe do not wish to repeat the fatal blunder of the pre-war policy; they do not wish to pursue a path of splitting the democratic forces. It is not for nothing that the Crimea decisions speak of insuring national unity in the liberated countries of Europe. But unity can be achieved only by uniting the popular forces and not by splitting them, by uniting all genuine democrats and not by inciting some democratic elements against others.

Democracy is a historical phenomenon. One cannot speak of one unchangeable democracy for all times and for all peoples. As is the case with every phenomenon in social life, democracy develops and goes forward. Present-day democracy bears little resemblance to the democracy, say, of ancient Athens; and the present political system of Great Britain, for example, differs very much from the system which existed in that country in Cromwell's time. Even on the basis of the same social and economic system, extremely di-

verse forms of democratic statehood arise.

Hence it would be quite hopeless to demand that democracy should be built up in all countries of Europe on a British or American model. This would be a totally unwarranted attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples, an attempt to impose definite political canons upon them from the outside. Such an attempt would of course have no chance of success because it would contradict the very spirit of democracy, would contradict the indisputable right of peoples "to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

Does this mean that sincere champions of democracy need not now, when the fate of German fascism is already sealed, concern themselves with what is taking place outside their countries? It would be, to say the least, premature to draw such a conclusion. Quite apart from universally-known cases of the grossest violation of democracy in European countries such as Greece, it is sufficient to recall the state of affairs in the colonial world. To this day, as is well known, there is not even a whiff of democracy in the colonial countries, where a very large part of the population of the globe resides. This is where those who come out as the champions of democracy should direct their zeal.

When, however, they strike a Hamlet pose and express doubts about the liberated countries of Eu-

rope which have taken the path of political renovation, their concern appears affected and out of place. We must not forget the maneuvers of the German-fascist provocateurs. It is common knowledge that the latter at once proclaim every event connected with the democratization of political life in any country on the European Continent as a "Kerensky regime" and "Bolshevization." The Hitlerites affix the label "Kerensky" indiscriminately to political leaders of the most diverse complexion, and brand as "Bolshevization" every progressive measure, every democratic reform, every step taken to punish war criminals and traitors to their country.

It is not difficult to see through the Hitlerites' maneuvers. They harp on the old tiresome string that the only alternative to fascist rule in Europe is "Bolshevization," that fascism is the only conceivable "bulwark against Bolshevism." It is well known that the English-speaking countries did not allow themselves to be caught by this bait, even when Germany was at the zenith of her power. Still more transparent are these provocative tactics now when the doom of fascist Germany is not only inevitable but imminent. Who except the played-out Hitler adventurers stands to gain by convincing the British and Americans that the European Continent is faced with only one alternative—that is, either fascism or the Soviet system?

The German imperialists are already making their preparations for a third attempt to achieve world domination. To thwart their crafty designs, the sternest vigilance must be maintained toward the perfidious enemy; and democratic states, strong in their unity, must be set up in the liberated countries of Europe.

Only those who place the selfish interests of groups above the national interests of their country can wish the difference in ideology and character between the social system of the Soviet Union and that of its Allies to prevent the three leading great powers in the anti-Hitler coalition from marching together in solving the problems affecting the arrangement of the postwar world. The stern experience of the period between the First and Second World Wars has shown what grave danger lurks in the absence of unity among the peace-loving nations. In the light of this experience, it is clear that groundless prejudices against democratic regimes in the liberated countries of Europe may become a serious barrier to the establishment of lasting peace among the nations and of general security.

The present war must be consummated in such a way that no loopholes are left for the re-emergence of the forces of fascism and aggression. This is in the interest of all the peace-loving peoples who are engaged in the common struggle against Hitler Germany.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED WAR PLANTS

By BETTY GANNETT

WITH THE DEFEAT of Nazi Germany attention will now turn increasingly to problems of our postwar economy—especially reconversion to peace-time needs. The complete transition to production for peace will, of course, not be realized until

after the defeat of Japanese imperialism. Many restrictions on civilian production, except to the degree necessary to conduct all-out war against Japan, will, however, soon be lifted.

The country will face immediate problems of contract terminations and cut-backs, shut-down of plants, lay-off of workers. In fact, cut-backs in production of certain aircraft items have already started, shipyard activity will fall off sharply in the coming months, and contemplated cut-backs in munitions production will by general estimates increase to about 35 per cent within six months. Speedy reconversion of plants to assure a smooth and orderly transition



to civilian production, without undue hardships for our war workers and returning veterans, is today an urgent task.

Reconversion requires the maximum utilization of our entire industrial capacity, including the highly efficient newly constructed government war facilities. This article is limited to a discussion of the scope and character of the government-owned facilities, the problems connected with their disposition, and their convertibility to civilian production.

SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED FACILITIES

Industrial America has added many cubits to her stature during the war. New plant and equipment constructed in the past few years totals by conservative figures about 22 billion, of which 15.7 billion is government-owned. On the basis of the last pre-war census (1939) of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, it has been estimated that the replacement value of all pre-war industrial plant approximates 55 billion dollars. The government's addition to our country's productive capacity, allowing for war-inflated construction costs, amounts to about 20 per cent of total pre-war industrial capacity. In some industries the proportion is much higher. The government has financed the building of nearly all the synthetic rubber capacity, nearly all the high octane gas capacity, 92 per cent of the magnesium, 90 per

cent of the aircraft, and half of the aluminum and machine tool capacity.

The relatively low level of private investment of capital during the war, motivated by fear of postwar competition and insufficient profitable postwar returns on investments, brought the government into production in a big way, to meet the war emergency requirements.

The Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, controls the largest holdings of government property with facilities totalling 6.8 billions. Its holdings include aircraft 3.0; iron and steel 1.0; non-ferrous metals 1.0; synthetic rubber 0.6; machine tools and electrical equipment 0.6. The War Department's holdings aggregate 5.4 billions and consist largely of arsenals, powder plants, shell-loading facilities, etc. The Navy Department has 2.8 billions, principally for naval ordnance and shipbuilding and ship repair. The Maritime Commission has 0.5 billions, largely in merchant ship construction facilities. The remaining 2.3 billions are principally owned by R.F.C. and its other subsidiaries. Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, has a number of facilities in the farm states for producing hemp fibre.*

In terms of efficiency the new government facilities are even more im-

* These figures are cited from A. D. H. Kaplan's *Liquidation of War Production*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1944. Research Study prepared for the Committee for Economic Development.

pre
bes
issu
por
this
mo
bee
thru
and
faci
pal
per
T
new
(ty
com
only
per
inv
mor
lars
tot
mill
num
rese
men
scal
sent
thre
ects
divi
the
we
the
M
cent
than

*
Plant
Corpo
1944.

pressive. They are the latest and the best. As described in the "briefalog"* issued by the Defense Plant Corporation, "The properties listed in this briefalog are among the most modern in the country. They have been constructed during the past three or four years, using the latest and most up-to-date equipment and facilities." They constitute a principal factor in the rapid rise in output per-man-hour during the war.

There are approximately 2,500 new government-owned projects (typically structures and equipment combined, but sometimes structures only or equipment only). Over 70 per cent of the government's total investment are in projects costing more than one hundred million dollars and less than 4 per cent of the total cost in plants costing under a million. 57.8 per cent of the total number of government projects represent only 4 per cent of the investment, whereas at the other end of the scale, the ten largest projects represent an investment of more than three times the value of all the projects under a million dollars. If we divide the total public investment by the number of projects established, we get an average of six millions as the average cost per project.

Measured in floor space, the concentration is equally striking. More than half the total floor space is in

that 9 per cent of the plants having a million or more square feet apiece.

An estimated 2.5 billion dollars' worth of the government's facilities consist of plant and equipment built on property of private companies or leased to them and integrated with their own equipment, dependent for their operation on the facilities of the private corporations.

This vast expansion of our industrial resources has lifted the total volume of American production to the phenomenal peak of nearly 200 billion dollars—more than twice the gross national production of the pre-war year of 1939, with the war expenditures of the national government accounting for 43 per cent of the national product.

FULL UTILIZATION OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

War production has also added enormous manpower to our industries. While farm employment fell about 1.3 million during the period of 1939-44, non-agricultural employment rose by about 7.9 million, even though the armed services absorbed 11 million men. Millions of housewives, students, professional workers, Negro men and women were drawn into industry for the first time. While a section of these men, women and young people will drop out of the labor market at the end of the war, it is estimated that, with the return of the servicemen, our working population will rise to new, unprecedented levels.

* "Advance Listing of Industrial Plants and Plant Sites to Be Disposed of by Defense Plant Corporation"; D.P.C., Washington, October 14, 1944.

This outline is presented to give some idea of the magnitude and diversity of the new productive facilities in the hands of the government. It is designed to drive home the important truth that while these facilities were built for war purposes, they are a tremendous addition and an indispensable part of our productive potential today. These new industrial facilities must be continued in operation if our peace-time economy is to provide jobs for the millions of war workers and returning veterans, and to maintain a national income sufficient to sustain an expanded market with an increasing standard of living.

No precedent exists for the smooth and orderly transference of government-owned facilities to private industry. During the last war there were few government-owned plants. The increase in industrial capacity for war purposes was largely the result of private financing which amounted to some 9 billion, while public funds accounted for about 600 million invested primarily in shipbuilding. But even the handling of this relatively small share of public-owned facilities and the surplus in government-owned goods caused serious repercussions. The government had no over-all plan for liquidating any of its investments, or for transition to a peace-time economy. Some of the facilities were sold to the highest bidder at a fraction of the original cost, some retained for military purposes, and others aban-

doned. Only one-sixth of shipping facilities were eventually sold, while most vessels were scrapped.

Any large-scale destruction, dismantling or wastage of plant and equipment would not only arouse great public indignation, but would be disastrous for the future welfare of the country as a whole. The disposal of government plant must become an integrated part of a reconversion program geared to an economy of expansion. Only this will assure the maximum utilization of the new industrial capacity. "Proper handling of surpluses," says the Baruch-Hancock report, "will be a most significant factor in preventing inflation, speeding reconversion and avoiding serious unemployment." R. J. Thomas, President of the United Automobile Workers, in testifying before the Senate Sub-Committee on War Contracts, on April 26, 1944, forcefully presented the position of labor when he said: "We are unalterably opposed to plowing under or scrapping, whether it takes place openly or covertly."

THE SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT

After months of Congressional hearings, an Act was passed to govern the disposal of surplus property, including government-owned facilities. The Surplus Property Act of 1944, effective last October 3, is a compromise between the House bill closely patterned after the recommendations of William Clayton, then Surplus Property Administra-

tor
Sen
uct
Sub
min
was
shou
istra
sing
for a
Mur
surp
ly g
scan
whic
the r
of th
Boar
sents
A
eral
over
allow
The
mun
bill
guar
rega
into
1.
Con
posa
facil
thes
pose
ties
repor
2.
begi
of a
\$1,00

tor under Executive Order, and the Senate bill which was largely a product of Senator James E. Murray's Sub-Committee on Contract Termination. The principal controversy was over an administrative issue: should there be a one-man administrator or board? Clayton urged the single administrator idea. Demand for a board came from Senators like Murray, who wanted the disposal of surplus property to be democratically governed, so as to prevent the scandalous practices of the last war which resulted in untold profits for the monopoly interests at the expense of the public welfare. The three-man Board set up under the Act represents a victory for the people.

Another phase of the same general controversy was the discussion over the amount of freedom to be allowed the administrator or board. The House bill provided a minimum of controls, while the Senate bill introduced a number of "safeguards." Three principal safeguards, regarding facilities, were written into the law:

1. The Board must submit to Congress a report indicating its disposal plans for each major type of facility. In the case of twelve of these types, the Board may not dispose of (except by lease) any facilities until after Congress has had the report for thirty days.

2. Any disposal agency, when it begins negotiations for the disposal of any plant which cost more than \$1,000,000 must notify the Attorney

General, who is to advise, within 90 days, whether proposed disposition will violate the anti-trust laws.

3. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is empowered to purchase any surplus property for resale to small business.

It is argued that at least the first two of the safeguards will delay the disposition of these facilities and may unwittingly benefit some reactionary monopolist interests anxious to keep the hands of government plants out of the hands of progressive industrialists or to withhold them entirely from the market, thus preventing their operation in competition with older plants of lower efficiency. Perhaps it may be found necessary for Congress after additional investigation to make some revisions in the Act. But the fact remains that the underlying motive for the introduction of these safeguards cannot and must not be overlooked. They propose to ensure that the disposition of government facilities to private capitalist interests shall be guided by the primary objective of continued operation; that entrepreneurs like Kaiser and Reynolds shall not be deprived of the possibilities of securing facilities; that small business shall be given adequate consideration; that reactionary trust interests shall not regain complete control of important industries to put into operation unrestricted monopoly practices which would endanger the postwar perspective of full employment; and that the public welfare shall be pro-

tected through guarantees that government property will not be scrapped, destroyed or sold to speculators.

CONVERTIBILITY

Varied estimates have been made as to the proportion of government-owned plant convertible to peacetime production. Former Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, James F. Byrnes, in his report of January 1, 1945, stated that approximately \$10,000,000,000 of government-owned facilities are "immediately or potentially usable for civilian production." He included approximately all the aircraft and synthetic rubber capacity, most of the aluminum and magnesium, and a large proportion of steel and machine tools. Of the balance about \$1.4 billion is in expanded arsenals and Navy shipyards directly operated by the government which will no doubt be retained by the War and Navy Departments as part of the program of national defense, to provide equipment for the peace-time army and

navy. Byrnes estimated that an additional \$4.5 billion is invested in facilities "so specialized as to have little peace-time value," such as smokeless powder plants, shipyards, shell-loading facilities, etc. It is anticipated that the Services will designate a number of these as standby munitions plants.

We reproduce here a table prepared by A. D. H. Kaplan which attempts to rank the various types of facilities, classified by industry, according to their physical convertibility to peacetime production. According to the table, a very large proportion of the new facilities cannot be readily utilized for other than their present purposes. But physical convertibility as reflected in the table is by no means an adequate index of possible postwar usefulness of these facilities. Actual use will depend, not alone on engineering factors, nor on the rapidly advancing technology and scientific research, but primarily on the economic and political relationships which will dominate the postwar economy at home and abroad.

PHYSICAL CONVERTIBILITY OF NEW GOVERNMENT-OWNED WAR FACILITIES

(Arrayed in rising order of convertibility)

TYPE OF FACILITY	Original Cost (In billions of dollars)
1. Explosives; ammunition assembling and loading	\$2.85
2. Shipyards	2.0 \$4.85
3. Iron and steel	\$1.2
4. Nonferrous metals (including 150 million mining). Mainly in aluminum and magnesium	1.35 2.55

5. Chemical operations:		Engines	1.3	
Synthetic rubber	\$0.61	Engine parts	0.35	
High-octane gas and other petroleum products	0.21	Aircraft parts	0.8	3.11
Other chemicals	0.58			
	1.40			
6. Ordnance other than explosives:		8. Machinery:		
Ammunition, shells, bomb cases, etc.	\$1.09	Motor vehicles, combat and other	\$0.42	
Guns	0.81	Metalworking equipm't	0.14	
	1.90	Machinery and electrical equipment	0.49	
		Miscellaneous manufac- turing equipment	0.24	1.29
7. Aircraft — frames, en- gines, parts:				
Frames	\$0.66	Total	\$15.10	

Source: Kaplan, *op cit.*, p. 96.

No one denies that under "normal" capitalist conditions many of the facilities designed for specific war purposes and located far removed from the sources of raw materials or markets would not be put to productive use. An expanding domestic and world market, however, can and will absorb an unprecedented volume of all types of goods which the world and our people have for years either done without or never enjoyed at all.

Let us take some examples.

The iron and steel facilities are listed in Kaplan's table near the top because they were constructed principally for rolling heavy plates for ships. Kaplan points out that the Geneva plant, at Provo, Utah, together with the Kaiser steel plant at Fontana "would supply many times the need for plate on the West Coast, and the expense of conver-

sion from plate to lighter steel sheets could hardly be justified by the size of the Pacific coast market." (P. 99.)

But the Pacific Coast market cannot be limited to the western coast of America. It must include the vast potential market, still largely untapped, for industrial machinery and other goods, in China and other Asiatic countries, once Japanese imperialism is defeated. The transformation of these backward nations into economically advanced industrial countries is an essential condition for the realization of the economy of expansion looked to by America and the United Nations. Under such conditions, new perspectives open up for the full use of the Geneva plant without increasing the dangers of shutting down other plants, more favorably located perhaps, but with less efficient equipment. Doubtless, this outlook is

behind the current investigations of the Geneva plant, the magnesium plant in Las Vegas, Nevada, the synthetic rubber plants and others, to determine their postwar possibilities. Problems now being studied are: supplementary facility necessary to enable these plants to operate in the postwar economy; new outlets for products; by-products that can be produced; improvement of processes; the cutting of operating costs and improvement in transportation costs; and the use of war-time discoveries for new products.

The tremendous airplane and shipyard capacity far exceeding our peace-time needs offers a particularly challenging and difficult conversion problem. Yet their conversion to the production of other peace-time necessities are essential to our postwar economy. The United Automobile Workers, as well as the maritime and the shipyard unions, are engaged in specific studies of the adaptability of aircraft plants and shipyards to the production of other commodities. Such recommendations as the reconversion of aircraft facilities for the construction of prefabricated houses, bathrooms, kitchens, heating and air-conditioning units are but one of the many examples of the practical solutions to utilize fully the present surplus in aircraft facilities. Similar studies are being made of the shipyards. Senator Murray has proposed that airplane plants shall be redesigned for the manufacture of necessary products,

with others to be converted into industry marts similar in nature to the Merchandise Mart in Chicago.

The extent to which a substantial proportion of our aircraft and shipyard facilities will be in operation in the postwar period is dependent also upon a much broader question—upon the role of each nation, including our own, in postwar international trade. Whether world relations will be characterized by a relentless competitive struggle for world markets, or conversely, by international economic agreements for expanded world trade in which each nation will have an honorable share, will certainly greatly influence the disposition of our ships and planes. Expanded world trade, possible only under conditions of world peace and stability, will vastly enhance the perspectives for world commercial and civilian air and ocean travel. For America that will mean greater utilization of our airplane factories and shipyards for construction of modern transport, cargo planes, and ships, as well as for the maintenance and repair of the old.

The C.I.O. Maritime Committee's Postwar Program published in May, 1944, indicates a valuable orientation: "The United States must take the lead in calling for an immediate open-table United Nations conference on shipping at which preliminary agreement on a fair distribution of the world's tonnage can be reached. The central theme of the conference must be organization of

worl
an e
Agr
limi
conf
ons
oper
vent
and
prac
to u
crete
use
nag
and
sear
as a
airc
PRI
O
A
is t
sale
the
the
mer
con
erin
mer
ate
duc
sam
rea
ing
tion
I
issu
the
opr
wa

world shipping to fill the needs of an ever-expanding world economy. Agreement must be reached on a limiting of the spheres of economic conflict and a widening of the horizons of economic opportunity. Cooperation must be effected to prevent ruinous competition, rate wars, and restrictive and discriminatory practices." The plan then proceeds to unfold a very specific and concrete program for the most effective use of America's vast shipping tonnage to guarantee its profitable use and maintain full employment for seamen—a plan which can well serve as a guide for similar studies in the aircraft and other industries.

PRICE AND CONDITION OF SALE

A question that comes to the fore is that of price and the condition for sale to private enterprise. While it is the aim of the government to obtain the best possible returns on government-owned property, it is generally conceded that the objective of recovering the largest return on investment must and should be subordinate to the necessity of maximum production and employment. At the same time, there is significant public reaction against any tendency of selling government property at a fraction of the original cost.

In a statement of national policy issued by the Research Committee of the Committee for Economic Development on July 16, 1944, a warning was given to business to keep in

mind inevitable repercussions to sales "which give an unearned windfall to firms which happen to be in a position to pick up facilities at bargain prices." There is further evidence of this sentiment in public reaction to dangers of speculation and the demand for publication of information on auctions and sales dealing with surplus property.

Practically all plants leased from the government by private corporations, with the exception of aluminum, magnesium, synthetic rubber and components, pipelines, and a miscellaneous group of plants, including the modernly equipped plants like the Geneva Steel Works, provide for an option to purchase by the present operator. These options provide that the lessee can, within 90 days after the expiration of his lease, purchase the plant at the original production cost (less cumulated rental, or depreciation, whichever is larger). Since these costs are by far out of line with normal costs under competitive conditions, there is little likelihood that the options will be taken up under this clause. The Defense Plant Corporation has fallen back on replacement cost, less depreciation figured at 5 per cent a year. Negotiations with present lessees (they have under the options an additional 90 days in which to match any offers which D.P.C. may receive from other prospective purchasers) or with others, will presumably be on this basis.

Smaller War Plants Corporation

is urging a wholly different concept—capitalized peacetime use value—and proposes that the purchaser be allowed to put up as little as 5 per cent in cash. This might entail leasing as a preliminary, until actual value in use could be established, and so avoid protracted negotiations. Such a policy would certainly result in a smaller return to the government, but may perhaps be a practical method to insure speedy disposal and full utilization. It is stressed that outright sale—with appropriate credit arrangements—is preferable, because it frees the government quickly of further direct responsibility. Leasing, however, has some advantages in providing opportunity for prospective buyers to ascertain the actual operating value of the property, and will enable a larger number of businesses, which may not have large financial resources, to secure some of these facilities.

A disproportionate share of government facilities are being operated by the biggest corporations in the country. The lessees listed in the D.P.C. briefalogs read like a directory of American Big Business. Actually, 150 corporations are operating government facilities valued at 11.5 billions, or more than 75 per cent of the total. These large interests, not only have first priority on the options, but large accumulated capital reserves to purchase the most efficient and modern plant equipment. There is justification for the fear that some monopoly interests may purchase

government facilities either with the objective of shutting down these new plants or eliminating other, less efficient operations that formerly supplied the market. Therefore, increasing support is developing for the proposal to include in the sales contract a clause requiring as a condition of sale that the plant be continuously operated for a specified period of years.

PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

If war-time levels of production are to be maintained, however, the facilities of small business must be effectively utilized and full opportunity afforded to small enterprise to maintain and improve its position in our postwar economy.

To give small business access to the new facilities and also to help in assuring their utilization, Smaller War Plants Corporation is pushing a plan for "multiple industrial tenancy" of large industrial plants, particularly of those that may be considered too large for a single manufacturer. The Corporation is also supporting leasing in addition to sale, as well as easier credit terms, to make available plant and equipment to small business.

The multiple-rental plan is patterned after such successful ventures as the Bush Terminal in Brooklyn; the Chicago Central Manufacturing District; and the Amoskeag Industries, Inc., in Manchester, N. H. The plants would be bought on easy

terms (or leased) from the government by management corporations established for this purpose in the localities where the plants are. The floor space would then be leased out to small industries in amounts to fit the need of the individual business. Power and other facilities would be available through the managing agency. This plan has tremendous possibilities. The D.P.C. has made a number of surveys and has reported that from an engineering point of view the plan is feasible, while the Baruch-Hancock report recognizes the necessity of sub-dividing larger units into a number of smaller units to assist small business.

PLANTS IN NEW COMMUNITIES

Particularly controversial is the question of the disposal of plants in new communities. Many important establishments were constructed in new areas formerly lacking industry, to tap fully the existing labor supply; and others, like the aluminum plants, were built in areas with large blocks of electric power. While the major share of the war plants were established in the industrial East, a substantial number of plants were developed in the West, the Southwest, and the South, in areas formerly largely agrarian or not fully developed industrially. An undercurrent of strong sectional conflict characterizes the numerous proposals that have come forward for the handling of these plants. Proposals from the Eastern districts, often motivated by

fear of competition, demand the shut-down of these new plants as "uneconomical." Senator Patrick McCarran of Nevada, on the other hand, calls for the closing down of the Eastern plants in order to make possible the utilization of the plants in the South and West.

Henry Wallace, in a speech at Minneapolis on February 14, 1944, stressed that the war plants built in the West and South must be kept in full operation. Senator Murray has emphasized the necessity of incorporating in Congressional policies the principle of achieving national economic balance by overcoming the industrial backwardness of some areas as against others, through assistance in maintaining the new-found industrial base in the West and South.

The condition for the solution of the above-stated conflict is precisely the full utilization of our industrial capacity in the interest of the further industrial expansion and development of the country as a whole.

Amoskeag offers the way out. When this community was faced with the shut-down of its largest industry, local business and banks bought the plants and equipment, even inducing outside industry, new industry and local firms to move into the vacated property. Thus, the multiple-rental system offered as a measure to advance the interests of small business, can also provide the approach to plants in isolated and newly industrialized communities.

Finally, there is the relationship of labor-management committees to the disposal policy. The nation-wide agreement for cooperation between management and labor to ensure a smooth transition to a peace-time economy should encourage the establishment of similar committees in the states and cities, and give new vitality to labor-management committees in the various plants. It should be the responsibility of such labor-management committees to take a more direct interest in the

specific plans for conversion of these plants for peace-time use. Labor can play a leading role in bringing about community cooperation in developing community-wide plans for effective use of the plants. Its concern with the problems of specific plans for the conversion of government-owned facilities will help implement the policies of the Surplus Property Board and the agencies responsible for the sale and lease of government-owned plants and equipment.



THE
MU
IN

TODAY
the v
Repu
natio
unde
man
wor
The
pres
vict
be d
the
tinu
the r
tele
in co
the r
defe
is v
that
colla
Why
on t
lines
vict
of t

THE TIDE MUST BE TURNED IN CHINA*

By CHOU EN-LAI

TODAY IS THE National Holiday of the thirty-third year of the Chinese Republic. Just now, when the international and domestic situation is undergoing rapid changes we have many thoughts to express and many words to say.

The war situation in Europe is at present one of winning victory after victory, and before long Berlin will be directly attacked. In the Pacific, the Allies are also advancing continuously. In our country, however, the regular battlefront and the battlefront behind the enemy lines stand in contradistinction to each other. On the regular front there is defeat after defeat. Behind the enemy lines there is victory after victory. Why is it that our regular front is unable to collaborate with Allied victories? Why is it that we have victories only on the battlefront behind the enemy lines? This is the key issue in the victory or defeat, the rise or decline of the Chinese Republic. We must

arouse the Chinese people to pay attention to answer this question.

At present, the position on the regular front in China is that of grave defeat. In the Honan campaign we lost forty-five cities within forty-four days. In the Hunan and Kwangsi campaigns, many big towns like Changsha, Hengyang, Lingling, Paoching, Chaoching, and Wuchow have fallen in succession, and the enemy is now pressing closer to Kewilin, threatening Liuchow. Even Kunming and Kweiyang are being considered as objectives by the enemy. In the campaigns along the coast, Wenchow and Foochow have fallen in succession. As a result, no comparatively big ports along the coast remain in our hands. Why has this continuous series of defeats occurred this year? Why have they taken place at a time when Japan's situation has become unfavorable? This is certainly not coincidence. It has been caused by the Kuomintang defeatist policy of a half-hearted and superficial war of resistance, which depends only on foreign aid, and the policy of preparing for civil war. It has been caused by the Kuomintang policy of one-party dictatorship in the areas it controls, excluding all others and oppressing and exploiting people through fascist policies. The accumulation and development of these mistakes have, therefore, in the Kuomintang-controlled areas, in face of the enemy's attack, gradually resulted in a serious military, political, economic and cultural crisis

* A speech delivered on October 10, 1944, the anniversary of the beginning of the Chinese Republican Revolution.

never before seen since the war of resistance.

Militarily, the Kuomintang authorities have always permitted only the government to carry on the war of resistance. They have not wanted the people to join in the struggle. Because of this, our rousing of the people behind the enemy lines to resist has been slanderously called "partitioning by armed forces and disobeying military orders." In the Chungking-controlled areas, however, they have absolutely refused to mobilize or organize the people and have instead only driven off conscripts roped together and used conscription as a source of squeeze. Recruits for the army have, therefore, become less and less. The more the army fights, the weaker it becomes, while the longer the government carries on the war of resistance, the less strength it has. Especially during recent years has the abnormal policy of the Kuomintang government been a halfhearted war of resistance, but active opposition to the Communist Party. Because of this, when we fight actively behind the enemy lines we are slandered as "traitor party and traitor army" and meet sabotage and attacks from the Kuomintang. They, however, are passively looking on the war on the regular front without launching any offensive. If the enemy does not come, they work with them to run contraband and prey on the people. When the enemy comes in small numbers they make a show of fight-

ing to deceive the people. When the enemy comes in large numbers, they retreat without stopping for several hundred miles.

THE KUOMINTANG DOUBLE-FACED POLICY

Even worse is their pretense, on the one hand, of carrying on the war of resistance so as to deceive the people, get aid from the Allies, and enjoy the fruits of victory from sacrifices of the Allies. On the other hand, they contact the enemy and puppets, hoping to slow down the attack, thus leaving the way open for a compromise in the future to resist the present foreign Allies, to form a balance of power, and to oppress the people and carry on civil war. This contradictory double-faced policy cannot in any way long avoid exposure.

The British Premier, Mr. Churchill, considers this serious military setback and defeat of the Kuomintang Government as "very regrettable" and "most disappointing and vexatious." The American President, Mr. Roosevelt, also openly announced that Allied aid to China, which has increased from two to three thousand tons to twenty thousand tons monthly, is a great and excellent achievement. This refutes the pretext of the Kuomintang Government that military defeat is due to insufficient Allied supplies. Is it really true that defeat is due to insufficient Allied supplies? No, absolutely no. Were not troops under Tang En-po

and Hauch-yo equipped with American guns and small arms? Why were they defeated so quickly and so tragically? Are not the troops under Hu Chung-nan equipped with even more American guns and small arms as well as tanks? Why is Hu Chung-nan, instead of sending so many troops armed with American equipment to the front where the war situation is so critical, using them only to blockade the anti-Japanese Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region? Moreover, it is also untrue that without American supplied material, the troops cannot win victories. In the Honan battle the troops which fought well at Hylakwan and Loyang were not the American equipped troops of Tang En-po but local troops which had received no American arms. On the front behind the enemy lines, our Eighth Route Army and New Fourth Army and all the other anti-Japanese troops of the people were not only hindered by the Kuomintang Government from getting material aid from Allied countries, but were not given any equipment by the Kuomintang Government itself. Despite this, we are existing, developing and winning battles behind the enemy lines. Again, are not Chinese troops in India and Burma under General Stilwell, which are armed with American guns and tanks, fighting comparatively better? All this shows that it is absolutely untrue that Chinese troops cannot win battles. Chinese troops have been fighting very gal-

lantly and staunchly. This is a great achievement of more than seven years of resistance of the Chinese nation. The cause of the successive defeats on the Chinese regular front is certainly not incapability of the people and troops. It is the errors, selfishness and incompetence of the Kuomintang Government and its commanders. Thus we advocate winning foreign aid, but such aid must be based on rebirth of our own efforts before it can produce results and can be powerful. We also advocate more supplies from our Allies; but such supplies, if they are to help us drive back and counter-attack the enemy, must be used to equip troops that are able to fight and can fight effectively. Otherwise, the more supplies given, the greater will be the losses, and the more will be the strength held back. Finally, not only victory cannot be won, but, on the contrary, the danger of civil war will be increased. On this point the public opinion of our American Allies seems to be the same. American papers are now openly pointing out that the visits to China by Wallace, Nelson and Hurley were made to solve this problem. These papers also said that "given food and equipment the Chinese people will be able to shoulder the fighting task as efficiently as any other nation."

This pretense is now not only exposed in foreign countries but in China it has led to irreparable loss. The reason that the Honan battle so

quickly and tragically ended in defeat was just because the troops under Tang En-po and Hu Chung-nan devoted all their attention to opposing the people and the Communist Party. Thus, when the enemy came these troops were panic stricken and were routed after brief engagements. This proves that anti-people and anti-Communist attitudes can absolutely not co-exist with the war of resistance. In particular, secret understandings with the Japanese and puppets and the anti-Communist and anti-Allies attitudes cannot co-exist with the war of resistance. Take, for example, the case of the North Honan battle of last year. Liu Chin and Chen Hsiao-chiang were previously instructed by Chiang Ting-wen that they could have an understanding with the Japanese to oppose the Communist Party, so that even when the Japanese attacked them they still hoped to use anti-Communist activities as a buffer. As a result, Generals Pang Ping-Hsuen and Sun Tien-ying went over to the Japanese, and Chen Hsiao-chiang, rather than receive help from the Eighth Route Army to fight against the Japanese. They preferred openly going over to the Japanese camp to fight against the Communists.

Take the recent case of the Hengyang battle. The generals holding Hengyang knew perfectly well that Generals Pang Ping-hsung, Sun Tien-ying and Chen Hsiao-chiang were not only not indicted by the Na-

tional Government but were supported by the Kuomintang authorities. Although Allied countries had continuously reinforced Hengyang through air transport, the authorities still complained of insufficient foreign help. Thus, when Hengyang fell into Japanese hands it was impossible to blame solely generals like Fang Hsien-chueh for failing to fight to the end. For had not their superiors long ago hinted to them that their way out was to capitulate to the Japs? A Chinese proverb says, "What the superior favors, the subordinate will favor still more." If their superiors could secretly have understandings with the Japanese and puppets, why can't they openly capitulate? If they can speculate on both camps now, they can take up their old role in the future. To resist the enemy is a crime, while to capitulate to the enemy is a credit—this is the real content of the military defeatism.

Politically the Kuomintang authorities cling like death to one-party despotism and personal dictatorship, and do not allow the existence of multiple parties or a people's democracy. Thus, the 637,000 square kilometers of Chinese territory we have liberated in places behind the Japanese lines, the ninety million people we have liberated, and various local governments of all classes, elected by the people are called "traitor regions" and "puppet governments" and are absolutely refused recogni-

tion
area
wit
ous
Cou
and
by
from
Chi
tion
the
men
sive
the
mas
dem
in t
rule
it o
Ku
thei
and
Prin
we
erge
Th
figh
pup
to-th
duct
tere
Japa
gion
dem
ryin
obey
ders
trol
thei
trol

tion, while in Chungking-controlled areas there is only one-party rule with no popular elections. The various ranks of the People's Political Council from county to province, and the entire country are appointed by the Government. All officials, from heads of villages (heads of Pao Chia) to the chairman of the National Government, are appointed by the Kuomintang. These appointments are furthermore made exclusively by a small ruling clique in the Kuomintang, with the wide masses of Kuomintang members and democratic leaders having no share in them. Thus, to call this party rule is not so appropriate as calling it oligarchic rule. Moreover, the Kuomintang authorities have set their minds on carrying out fascism and refuse to put the Three People's Principles into practice. So when we sincerely keep our promises, energetically realize the revolutionary Three People's Principles, persist in fighting against the Japanese and puppets, carry out the policy of "one-to-three-ratio system," develop production and effect reduction of interest and rent in places behind the Japanese lines and the Border Region, the Kuomintang authorities demagogically call these actions "carrying out bolshevization" and "disobeying the Government and its orders." While in the Chungking-controlled areas they rob the people of their freedom, bureaucratically control the so-called self-government,

control public opinion, trample culture, practice monopoly in industry and commerce, levy extortionist taxes and duties, set loose the Kuomintang Gestapo to trample rights and allow bureaucratic capitalists to undermine the people's industrial enterprises, thus bringing about the most serious political and economic crisis of today. The revolutionary Three People's Principles are not even allowed to be propagated in the Kuomintang, and advocacy of unity and friendly relations with the Communist Party is prohibited. What else can this be but fascism? If such an erroneous policy of defeatism and fascism is not changed and is still allowed to be pursued in this reactionary manner, then all kinds of crises will continue to increase and become more serious. We stand on the side of the Chinese people and see before us the task of the liberation of the Chinese nation. But on its bright and victorious path there stands the obstacle of this crisis and we feel our hearts are rending.

THE COMMUNIST PROGRAM

In order to save China from the present crisis, to cooperate with our Allies in the war and really prepare for the counter-offensive, we Communists of China advocate that the National Government should immediately call together representatives of the entire country to hold an emergency National Council, should abolish one-party dictatorship and set up a coalition government changing

from the old and creating a new impression in the world. We suggest that the following concrete steps should be taken in carrying this out:

1. These representatives should be elected by the various anti-Japanese parties, various anti-Japanese armies (Central Army of the Kuomintang, local troops and Communist-led armies fighting behind the Japanese lines), various local governments (on the one hand, the provincial governments in the Chungking-controlled areas and, on the other, the democratically elected governments in the liberated areas behind the Japanese lines), various people's organizations (organizations in Chungking-controlled areas and in liberated areas behind the Japanese lines which are national in character and representative of every class and stratum of the people). The number of representatives should be based on the proportion of the real strength in various places. It is unnecessary that the number of representatives should be very great, in order to meet the pressing needs of the situation and facilitate their being called.

2. The National Government should call this national emergency meeting in the nearest future, so as not to delay and plunge the Chungking areas into irredeemable disaster.

3. This meeting should take Dr. Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary Three People's Principles as its basis and should endorse such a program which meets the requirements of the

situation and can save China from her crisis, so as to change thoroughly the erroneous military, political, economic and cultural policies pursued by the Kuomintang Government.

4. On the basis of a commonly recognized program establish a coalition government of all parties and groups to replace the present one-party dictatorship. This government will absorb all leading persons in the entire country who persist in the war of resistance, in democracy and in unity, and will dismiss defeatists and fascists in order to guarantee the realization of a real democratic government.

5. This coalition government should have the right to reorganize the High Command, and representatives of all principal armies into the High Command, and establish a united High Command in order to guarantee victory in the war of resistance.

6. After the establishment of a coalition government steps should immediately be taken to prepare for a National Congress, really universally elected by the people, which should be convened in the shortest possible time in order that the constitutional government be put into practice.

Only such a national emergency meeting and coalition government can be the real starting point of democracy for entire China. Only such a united High Command can obey the orders of the government,

work
lied c
attack
lies

If c
of pu
even
a new
ventio
gress
wartim
rule a
false
not r
Was
to se
the la
nasty
crisis
now
self-d
matte
harm
ter.

Ag
party
all th
sued
chan
mint
repre
ment
gover
not a
partic
churc
Kuom
king
Conf
tang

work together smoothly with the Allied countries, drive back the enemy attack and coordinate with our Allies in the counter-offensive.

If one-party rule and falsification of public opinion still persists, then even should the Kuomintang make a new decision to advance the convention of the so-called national congress and to set up a constitution in wartime, it would still be one-party rule and not the people's rule, still false constitutional government and not real constitutional government. Was not such a farce of preparing to set up a constitution played in the last decade of the Manchu dynasty? What did it do to avert the crisis of that time? If it is repeated now the Kuomintang will end in self-destruction, which is a minor matter, and the nation will be harmed, which is an important matter.

Again, if the real content of one-party dictatorship is not changed, if all the erroneous policies now pursued by the Government are not changed, then even though the Kuomintang is willing to invite various representatives to join the government, that will still be a one-party government with invited guests and not a coalition government of all the parties and groups. After the Manchurian incident of 1931, did not the Kuomintang Government in Nanking convene a National Calamity Conference and invite non-Kuomintang people to join the Government?

As a result, what good did this do to the capitulation policy of that time? If the representatives of the principal armies are not allowed to join the High Command, or if the High Command does not obey the commonly recognized program and the coalition government, but still expels people not belonging to its own clique and prepares civil war, then even if a national meeting is called and a coalition government is formed, it would still be a puppet institution with no power or authority and could do nothing. In the early days of the Chinese Republic Hsiung Hai-ling formed the so-called cabinet of first class personages, and after the May Fourth movement of 1919 Dr. Hu Shih advocated a government of good men. Since, however, the militarists did not obey, politics and military affairs were out of control of the Government, what could they do therefore to reform the military dictatorship? At the time of the Northern Expedition, the Headquarters of the National Revolutionary Army did not obey the orders of the National Government formed by the cooperation of the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party. As a result the military dictatorship was created and the revolution sent to the scaffold.

From this we can see that the unity based on democracy, advocated by us, is real unity and thorough unity. But if we are unified under one-party dictatorship, under military

dictatorship, this would be false unity. If other parties and groups are excluded and other armies swallowed up, those who refuse to obey will rise to resist, those defeated will be dispersed. Thus, calamity and chaos will come together and civil wars will recur again and again. Where then would there be unity? Is not the history of the past thirty-three years enough for us?

Similarly, the unification of military orders and administrative decrees which we support must be military orders beneficial to the war of resistance and not "military orders" of defeatism. The administrative decrees must be consistent with the revolutionary Three People's Principles and not with fascism. During the seven years of the war of resistance, we have penetrated far behind the enemy lines. Despite complete isolation from outside aid, despite repeated Japanese and puppet mopping-up attacks with their burning and slaughtering, despite the blockade and attacks by the Kuomintang troops, we have stood firm and carried on the war of resistance until today. Not only have the three-fold attacks from the Japanese and puppets and diehards failed to annihilate us, as the Kuomintang authorities expected, but we have been able to exist, and moreover develop and be victorious. Can this be said to be accidental? No, this is certainly no accident! This is because the military orders we have obeyed are

beneficial to the war of resistance and because the administrative decrees we support are democratic. What we have opposed and refused to obey are "military orders" of defeatism and "administrative decrees" of fascism. When we want to fight the enemy, can fight the enemy, and also know how to fight the enemy, we can never be annihilated but instead will continue to be victorious. When we want to rely on the people, belong to the people, and work for the people, we will certainly exist and moreover continue to develop. It is because of this that our battlefield behind the enemy lines, in contradistinction to the regular front is gaining continuous victories.

We see that within the six months preceding September, China's regular front has lost over one hundred thousand square kilometers of territory. During this period the battlefield behind the enemy lines has wrested fifty thousand square kilometers from the hands of the Japanese. The regular front has thrown away over forty million people while the battlefield behind the enemy lines has liberated over four million people. The regular front has lost 102 cities, while the battlefield behind the enemy lines has expanded by ten thousand regular troops. Such comparative facts alone are already sufficient to show the meritorious achievements of our troops behind the enemy lines—the Eighth Route Army and New Fourth Army and the anti-Japanese

troops
also sh
mintan
have b
tion.
deman
comm
Honor
shoul
of the
Eighth
Fourth
Anti-J
done
battlef
But m
and cr
the ru
Govern
ed to
have a
several
nese tr
elected
areas.
If we
aboliti
helpin
really
ance a
But ca
people
enemy
thems
knows
be do
THE
JAP
TH
Let

troops of the people. These facts also show how irresponsible the Kuomintang troops on the regular front have been to the country and the nation. In justice we should not only demand punishment of the chief commanding officer responsible for Honan and Hunan defeats, but we should also request the rewarding of the commanding officers of the Eighth Route Army and New Fourth Army and the South China Anti-Japanese Brigade who have done meritorious service on the battlefield behind the enemy lines. But meritorious service unrewarded and crime unpunished have become the rule. According to Kuomintang Government proposals recently handed to us, the Kuomintang authorities have also demanded that we abolish several hundred thousand anti-Japanese troops and all the democratically elected governments in the liberated areas. This is really beyond reason. If we accepted their demands for abolition, it would be equivalent to helping the enemy. It would then be really "destroying the war of resistance and endangering the country!" But can the anti-Japanese troops and people's governments behind the enemy lines be ordered to liquidate themselves in this way? Everybody knows definitely that this should not be done and cannot be done.

THE RECORD OF THE ANTI-JAPANESE FORCES BEHIND THE ENEMY LINES

Let us see what is the actual ex-

tent of the victories in the liberated areas behind the enemy lines. Up to September of this year, the summary of reports from fifteen anti-Japanese bases in North, Central and South China shows that in the liberated areas behind the enemy lines ninety million people altogether have been freed. This is forty-three per cent of the total population (207,800,000) in the occupied territory. The territory recovered in these areas is something over 837 thousand square kilometers, or sixty-six per cent of the total area (over 1,263,000 square kilometers) behind the enemy lines. The county towns won back in these areas at present total twenty-eight. Our anti-Japanese forces behind the enemy lines consist of 570,000 regular troops (including the Eighth Route Army, New Fourth Army and the South China Anti-Japanese Brigade); approximately 2,200,000 members of the people's volunteer corps and guerrilla troops, and several millions of local self-defense corps. Within these liberated areas there are altogether 591 democratically elected county governments, eighty-five prefectures and twelve democratically elected border region governments and administrative offices. These figures do not include the Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region.

According to figures compiled before the Honan campaign in March 1944, our troops behind the enemy lines were attacking and holding back sixty-four and one-half per cent

of the whole Japanese forces (thirty-four and one-half divisions approximating 560,000 men), and ninety-five per cent of the whole puppet forces (780,000 men) which altogether constitute eighty-four per cent of the total Japanese and puppet forces. At present, although the enemy has reinforced three railways—Hunan-Kweilin, Canton-Hankow and Peiping-Hankow—to deepen their attack and hold back forty-nine point five per cent, almost half of the total Japanese forces invading China (estimated on the basis of thirty-three and a half divisions whose locality is clear and excluding six divisions whose locality is unclear). The state of puppet troops remains unchanged, and so altogether we are still opposing seventy-six per cent of the enemy forces. Our troops behind the enemy lines constantly besiege or raid thirty-eight big cities above one hundred thousand population, which is eighty-five per cent of the forty-five big cities occupied by the Japanese. Over 9,600 kilometers, or ninety-six per cent of the approximate ten thousand kilometers of Japanese-occupied railway lines, are constantly damaged by our troops behind the enemy lines or have our troops operating in vicinity. Our troops in the enemy's rear completely control eight hundred kilometers of coast; and there are six thousand five hundred kilometers of coast in areas where our troops are regularly operating. In summary, then, 570,000

anti-Japanese regular troops developed by the people behind the enemy lines during more than seven years, together with 2,200,000 people's volunteer corps already nearly equal the present number of Kuomintang troops. The people, in these areas, have established during that period 591 local county governments, which form eighty-two per cent of the 721 counties lost by the Kuomintang Governments. Such meritorious anti-Japanese troops and broadly established people's governments have already become the banner of liberation and the guide to action of the whole Chinese people. Without these forces China would be subjugated. Anyone who thinks of "abolishing" these forces destroys the will of the Chinese people to resist the enemy, and thus is ready to sacrifice all China.

The Kuomintang Government not only fails to recognize several hundred thousands of regular troops, several millions of people's volunteer corps, and various popularly elected governments in the liberated areas behind the enemy lines, but up to this time, its troops have been continuously blockading and attacking them in an attempt to annihilate them. Even now when the regular front is facing a most acute crisis, the troops which the Kuomintang Government employs to surround the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region and to attack the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies still amount

to fit
Army
ing 7
Chi
attach
cease
civil
requ
tion
fectiv
gethe
the K
ary a
nist
stren
votec
Fu
troop
these
lines
or h
from
Kuom
120
tank
war.
unif
fodd
mun
supp
reple
ern
med
the
fens
by th
in S
nort
troo
velo

to fifty-six divisions of the Central Army and other local units numbering 775,000 strong (those in South China have not been included). The attacks and disturbances have never ceased and, therefore, the danger of civil war still exists. We resolutely request the people of the entire nation and Allied countries to check effectively this danger of civil war together with us, and to demand that the Kuomintang abolish all reactionary activities opposing the Communist Party and the people, so that the strength of the entire country be devoted to the anti-Japanese war.

Furthermore, our anti-Japanese troops fighting so hard and gallantly these seven years behind the Japanese lines, have never received any light or heavy armaments or equipment from the High Command of the Kuomintang Government, except 120 light machine-guns and 6 anti-tank guns at the beginning of the war. Since 1940, even ammunition, uniforms and blankets, grain and fodder, war expenses as well as communication instruments and medical supplies have never been supplied or replenished by the Kuomintang Government. Indeed, even 101 cases of medical supplies donated to us by the British and American China Defense League have been confiscated by the Kuomintang High Command in Sanyuan about fifty kilometers north of Sian. Thus, the reason our troops have been able to exist, develop and win victories, is solely our

reliance on the support of the broad masses of the Chinese people, and the success of rebirth through self-efforts. For the purpose of more effectively draining the enemy's resources and diverting the enemy's attack today, offering more powerful cooperation to the Allied counter-offensive tomorrow, we have adequate right to demand from the National Government the armaments and materials due us, to equip and supply our units. We also have adequate right to request our Allies to supply the greater part of their armaments going to Chinese troops, to the Eighth Route and New Fourth Armies and all other anti-Japanese guerrillas behind the Japanese lines, according to the proportion of Japanese and puppet troops they are opposing. Our British and American Allies should know that without the part played by Chinese troops fighting behind the Japanese lines, it is not only impossible to launch a counter-offensive on the China front, but it is also impossible to check the enemy's advance today. We can say for certain that taking into consideration the strength of the army and people behind the Japanese lines, their achievements and strategic position, we shall certainly be able to attain still higher achievements if we have, in addition, Allied equipment.

Since the Quebec Conference our British and American Allies are paying more attention to the China

front. In the People's Political Council just adjourned in Chungking, Chairman Chiang Kai-shek indicated that he would continue to solve the Kuomintang-Communist problem by political means, while the People's Political Council decided to send five of its members to come to visit Yen-an. Besides extending our welcome to these People's Political Council members, we wish to take the opportunity of the Double Tenth National Day to reiterate the policy we advocate as mentioned above.

We consider that the only correct proposal for saving China from the present crisis and meeting the needs of the situation is the reorganization of the Government and High Command, establishment of a coalition government and united High Command of all parties and groups, and renunciation of defeatist "military orders" and fascist "government orders."

We continue to demand that the Kuomintang Government recognize all anti-Japanese troops and elected governments in places behind the Japanese lines, and we resolutely op-

pose the abolition of these troops and governments.

The twelve written proposals put forward by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on June 4 and the eight points forwarded by Comrade Lin Tzu-han orally, should still be the basis of negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party.

We continue to invite and welcome the Kuomintang representatives Mr. Chang Chih-chung and Mr. Wang Shih-chieh to come to visit and negotiate in Yen-an. We consider that this problem can be solved step by step, but it must be solved without violation of the main principles of armed resistance, democracy and unity.

The situation is too pressing. We earnestly hope that the Kuomintang authorities, the patriots of the entire country and the people of the entire nation will rise up and turn the tide of the present situation. This will be fortunate for the war of resistance! This will be fortunate for the country!

A
CH
MA

THE
Mar
"Ass
stitu
detai
most
mint
garcl
and
polic
men
and
Rout
and
area
Japa
ble
serio
nom
contr
Ch
merc
spok
tiona
of th
foll
part
a de
2) t
nego

• 7
Mar

A REFUTATION OF CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MARCH 1st SPEECH*

THE SPEECH of Chiang Kai-shek on March 1, 1945, at a meeting of the "Association for Promotion of Constitutional Government," reflects in detail the standpoint and plan of the most reactionary clique in the Kuomintang. This clique persists in oligarchic dictatorship and in its fascist and defeatist political and military policies; opposes a coalition government, democracy and the people; and plots to swallow up the Eighth Route Army and New Fourth Army and to abolish the Chinese liberated areas. This reactionary clique abets Japanese aggression and is responsible for bringing about the present serious military, political and economic crisis in the Kuomintang-controlled areas.

Chiang, in making this speech, merely once again plays the part of spokesman for this extremely reactionary clique. The important points of the speech can be summed up as follows: 1) the persistence in one-party rule and resolute rejection of a democratic coalition government; 2) the false interpretation of the negotiations between the Kuomin-

tang and the Chinese Communist Party and slander of the latter; and 3) the resorting to the futile trick of the alleged "returning the reins of government to the people" and the "convening of a National Congress," in order to preserve the clique's fascist dictatorship.

With regard to the first point, Chiang said that "the recent demand of the Communist Party is that the Central Government should abolish one-party rule at once and hand over State power to a Coalition Government of all parties and groups, whereas the standpoint of our Government is to prepare to admit all other political parties (including the Communist Party) and able non-partisan people into the Government. But before the convening of the National Congress, the Government cannot violate the Program for National Reconstruction, put an end to the period of political tutelage, and hand over political responsibility and the right of final decision to all parties and groups, thereby creating an irresponsibility situation which is in disharmony both with theory and facts." This is the clearcut indication of Chiang's persistence in maintaining oligarchic dictatorship and rejecting Coalition Government.

At any rate, this open rejection of Chiang's is much better than the indefinite statements of Wang Shih-chieh, representative of the Kuomintang in the negotiations. This open rejection at least enables others to see that his standpoint is clearcut and definite.

* *The New China News Agency*, Yenan, March 2, 1945.

Besides the above-stated program for National Reconstruction, Chiang advanced another reason for his rejection of Coalition Government. For instance, he said, "if the State power and responsibility are handed over to all parties and groups, the Central Government will be swayed by every wind, which will certainly result in defeat in the armed resistance and in terrible chaos in the country." "For conditions in our country are different from others. Before the convention of the National Congress China has no responsible organization which can represent the people and one with which the Government can consult the people's opinion." "The foundation of the National Government is paid for with innumerable lives, bloodshed and sacrifices of revolutionary heroes, army and people in the war of resistance . . . it has responsibilities which cannot be given up . . . and national affairs cannot be trifled with," etc.

To clear-minded people all these are just low-grade pretexts of despots and ordinarily are not worth refutation. But since Chiang has talked so virtuously as if he were speaking the truth, we cannot keep silent.

BETRAYERS OF SUN YAT-SEN'S WILL

We must first of all ask: "What clause of law has stipulated the so-called inviolability of the program for National Reconstruction?" The program for National Reconstruction

is only a kind of draft of National Reconstruction proposed by Dr. Sun Yat-sen in his early days. It is no sacred inviolable gospel. Dr. Sun in his later days personally revised this program.

In the thirteenth year of the Chinese Republic (1924) Dr. Sun proposed the convention of the National Congress with representatives of all parties and groups, military and all circles to settle national affairs. Just before his death Dr. Sun insistently instructed in his last will: "my latest proposal is to call the National Congress . . . we must within the shortest period, promote its realization. This is my bequest." Today, twenty years after his death, his unfaithful children and grandchildren who have betrayed his will—the Kuomintang reactionary group and its leader Chiang Kai-shek—are still wearing the so-called program for National Reconstruction which has been revised by Dr. Sun, to maintain their personal dictatorship, using it as their protective charm.

According to Dr. Sun's will, would not the calling of a conference of all parties and groups, the formation of a coalition government to secure victory over the Japanese invaders, and then the holding of free elections without fear or restrictions throughout the country under the coalition government for representatives to convene the National Congress be just what would meet the exigencies of today? May I ask how the formation of a coalition government will

lead to defeat in the war of resistance and to chaos in the country? During the past eighteen years under the personal dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek without a coalition government has China not suffered defeat in the war of resistance and is there not chaos in the country? Without digging up the distant past, let us take the facts since the Honan campaign of last year. Within a few months the enemy put through his continental communication line, while hundreds of thousands of troops fled at the enemy's approach like chaff in the wind. One hundred million of our countrymen in Honan, Hupoh, Hunan, Kwangsi, Kiangsi, and Kwangtung have fallen under Japanese rule. Is this defeat in the war of resistance or shall we call it a victory for the war of resistance? With secret police overrunning the land, corruption rampant, commerce and industry driven to bankruptcy, and people seething with complaints in the Kuomintang-controlled areas, is this then not chaos or shall we instead declare that everything is normal in the country? The Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese Democratic Federation, the democratic group within the Kuomintang, together with many non-partisan people, have proposed the immediate abolition of one-party dictatorship and the organization of a democratic provisional coalition Central Government—with full backing of the whole nation. Is this not the reflection of the popular will desirous to

overcome the fearful phenomenon of such defeat and chaos in the country as has resulted from the personal dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek? The Chinese people can no longer bear that the personal dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek continue its existence for even one second. But the Chinese people are generous. If a coalition government is formed, it is possible that Chiang Kai-shek may still be permitted to occupy a seat in the Government, correct his former mistakes, atone for his crimes and be judged by his future actions. But the personal dictatorship which has led China into such deep crisis during the past eighteen years, and particularly in the past eight years of war of resistance, must immediately end. This is the already determined will of the Chinese people.

A BOUGHT NATIONAL CONGRESS

No less absurd is the so-called argument that prior to the convention of the National Congress there is no responsible organization that can represent the people of China and with which the Government can consult. Why is it that for eighteen years there has only been the personal dictatorship without any representative organ of the people? Whose responsibility is this? Our dictator strips the people of all rights of freedom. Today he is not even willing to call a conference of all parties and groups. He is, however, willing to call a bought National Congress in

November of this year, after eight years of postponement. Only because the bought National Congress will be subservient, is he willing to "consult" it, otherwise why should he be unwilling to "consult" the easily convened conference of parties and groups? "My regime has been gained through shedding of blood," he says. This is not an argument, but simple gangster talk. Regarding the country as personal property and national affairs as a toy is just the viewpoint of a dictator. Looking over Chiang's various "grounds" for rejecting a coalition government, we find that they are simply a set of sophistries. But the real reason is that Chiang and the most reactionary group within the Kuomintang want to hold on for the selfish interests of a single person and a single group without caring for the interests of the people and the nation. Only this point is true. All the rest is humbug.

But most deserving of notice is that within the short period of a few months the demand for abolishing one-party dictatorship and establishing a democratic coalition government has electrified the whole country and countries abroad and become the demand of the whole people. Hence, Chiang Kai-shek has no alternative other than that of coming out to express his direct refusal.

CHIANG'S DOUBLE-TALK

Chiang's scheme has failed to

shove the responsibility for the failure of the Kuomintang-Communist negotiations upon the shoulders of the Communist Party. Chiang is trying his best to emphasize how "magnanimous" he is and how he has done all he could "for the benefit of the Communist Party." But let us test these claims in the light of the facts.

Chiang said: "The government will set up a wartime administrative council under the Executive Yuan to become the policy-deciding organ of that Yuan, and members of the Communist and other parties will be allowed to join this council." But, as Chou En-lai said, this wartime administrative council is only a side-show which "has no political responsibilities and no power for final decision." It is an ornament decorating dictatorship rule. If the Communist or other parties join it, it amounts to helping the fascists and defeatists to deceive the people and hinder victory in the war of resistance.

Chiang said that "members of all parties and groups and non-partisan people are allowed to join"; but at the same time he also said, "when constitutional government is instituted all parties and groups will be in legally equal position." Here Chiang is slapping his own face. According to his statement prior to the convention of Chiang's "National Congress," any party besides the Kuomintang has no legal status; yet Chiang wants all parties and groups to join this wartime administrative

coun
illeg
tha
they
som
who
state
unan
tile
nist
crati
in th
Ch
prep
mitte
troop
thes
the
sent
woul
ficer.
the
man
appo
the
Chia
If on
one
comm
trol
shek
the
ferin
comm
to be
repla
gaine
shoul
comm
Rout
Arm

council while they are still on an illegal basis, saying at the same time that "there really is no reason why they should not accept." Except someone as shameless as Chiang, who else could have made such a statement? Can it be said that in unanimously rejecting Chiang's futile proposal the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Democratic Federation were even slightly in the wrong?

Chiang said: "the government is prepared to form a three-man committee to reorganize the Communist troops into the National Army. Of these three men one would represent the government, one would represent the Communist Party and one would be an American Army officer." Chiang also said that "under the control of the Supreme Command an American officer can be appointed to command directly with the Communist troops." Here, Chiang is speaking like a lunatic. If one is not to talk stark nonsense, one needs to say instead: A people's committee should be formed to control and reorganize Chiang Kai-shek's troops which are oppressing the people and are constantly suffering defeat. Being incapable to command, Chiang Kai-shek ought to be sacked and investigated and replaced by a Chinese officer who has gained merit in armed resistance and should be appointed by a people's committee. Besides, the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army should be highly rewarded

because these two armies have been fighting gallantly behind the enemy lines opposing the majority of Japanese and puppets, have recovered large areas of territory, and have liberated large numbers of the population. Only this can be called fair and just. We are unwilling to call on foreigners to oppress those who differ from us. We merely propose that the Chinese National Regulations of awarding merit and punishing guilt be carried out. This will certainly gain the unanimous approval of the Chinese people.

Chiang said that during the negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party "the experience we gained is that as soon as one demand is accepted another new demand is brought forward." There seems to be no end to Chiang's asinine chatter. Of all the proposals raised by the Communist Party through General Lin Piao who went to Chungking in 1943, Chairman Lin Tzuhan in 1944, General Chou En-lai with General Hurley in November, 1944 and again in January of this year, has a single one been "accepted" by Chiang? Even demands for measures which can be most easily carried out, such as the release of political prisoners, recognition of the legal status of all parties, abolition of secret police, repeal of laws and decrees oppressing the people, lifting of the blockade and recognition of the liberated areas, etc., did you ever "accept" any of them?

CRAWLING INTO A BLIND ALLEY

With regard to the so-called "returning the reins of government to the people" and the "convening of a National Congress on November 12 of this year when constitutional government will be realized," Chiang is travelling on the road to political death. Faced with the present unprecedented crisis, Dictator Chiang Kai-shek and the most reactionary despots inside the Kuomintang do not try to find a way out in obeying the will of the people, abolishing dictatorship rule, and immediately setting up a coalition government, but instead want to find a democratic cloak to hide their counter-revolutionary fascist bodies. This then is the real essence of the so-called "returning the reins of government to the people" and the "convening of a National Congress."

Now at the end of his tether, our dictator is crawling into a political blind alley. He has gone back to Yuan Shih-kai's Hunghsien Parliament and Tsao Kun's slave parliament. Well, on behalf of the Chinese people we Communists advise Chiang not to dig his own grave. With this advice we have done our utmost to help you. If you persist in crawling into that blind alley, do so. We must warn you that if you get into that blind alley don't imagine that someone will come to your aid, for no one then can save you. Before Yuan Shih-kai became emperor,

people sought to dissuade him. But he did not listen and after eighty-three days on the throne he died of disappointment and a broken heart, leaving only an unimportant episode in the history of China. If anyone wants to catch up with him there is still time to follow his footsteps.

DEFINING "RATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS"

Summed up, Chiang's speech clearly exposes the standpoint and the designs of the most reactionary clique of the Kuomintang. These are in direct contradiction to the opinion freely expressed by the people of the entire nation and overseas Chinese. By now the Kuomintang-Communist negotiations have ceased to be a discussion of some pending problems between the two parties but concern the urgent political problem on which depends the very life of the people and nation. The demands brought forward by the Communist Party in the negotiations are not only those of the ninety million people in the liberated areas, but of the people in the Japanese-occupied territory and in the Kuomintang-controlled areas, as well as of overseas Chinese. The declaration of the Chinese Democratic Federation, the circular telegram of overseas Chinese, and many other documents testify to this. Even inside the Kuomintang there are many patriotic members who share the view expressed in the Communist Party's

proposals. It is unfortunate for all of China, and at the same time also for the Kuomintang, that the negotiations have now come to no result, due to the obstinate rejection of these demands by the most reactionary clique in the Kuomintang. Chiang said that "the government will still look for rational arrangements," which seems to show that there is still a chance to find a remedy. If this is so, the Communist Party will not refuse to negotiate. But the so-called "rational arrangements" really need no looking for. They are the immediate abolition of this discredited one-party dictatorship and the formation of a provisional democratic coalition government that will have full prestige. This government will lead the war of resistance,

strive for victory, and prepare to convene after the war the National Congress which is to be elected with complete freedom. This Congress will draft a Constitution and organize a democratic government. We hope Chiang will not resort to any further tricks. Either you will act according to these principles or follow your own way. Our standpoint is firm and clearcut. Any honeyed words or phrases, deceit or threats, acts of ruffians and crooks who want to rope in foreign forces to oppress our countrymen, using might to annihilate those who do not agree, and all such base and mean measures—let base creatures freely indulge in them. They are mistaken if they think any good will come of it.

BOOK REVIEWS

MAN UNDER SOCIALISM

Reviewed by RALPH BOWMAN

THE SOVIET SPIRIT. By Harry F. Ward. International Publishers. New York, 1945, 160 pp., \$1.75.

Doctor Ward's book on the Soviet Union is a notable endeavor to examine the effect of the socialist society upon the mind, the behavior and the ideology of a people living under socialism. It is a timely, popular and fascinating study. Properly enough, it begins with the pertinent question of why it was that the statesmen, journalists, military experts and even many honest anti-fascists underestimated the vast, enduring, fighting power of the Soviet Union. The book is primarily an answer to this question and to the subsequent naive assumption of the "miracle" of Soviet resistance and the purported mysterious resurgence and sudden "transformation" of the Soviet Union into a first class military and world power.

Doctor Ward proceeds to prove that there was no miracle or sudden transformation in the land of socialism. The Soviet "miracle" propaganda indeed was little more than an ef-

fort to reconcile the magnificent performance of the Red Army and the Soviet people with the almost universally false and distorted conceptions of the Soviet Union which had been deliberately built up by its enemies.

Fortunately for our civilization the initial errors and underestimation were short-lived and were quickly shattered by the mighty deeds of the Red Army. Stalingrad marked the turning point in the war because it broke the backbone of the Nazi Army and simultaneously exploded the widespread myth of Soviet weakness and instability. And now that European fascism is defeated through the joint efforts of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, it becomes necessary to bridge the gap between that dangerous and cynical underestimation of the Soviet Power and the alleged miracle of its performance. Now it becomes especially essential to understand the material foundation, the socialist nature, and the historical course of this great nation that so "unexpectedly" enabled the democratic peoples to survive at the stupendous cost of 20 million Soviet lives.

* * *

In writing this book Dr. Ward

must be
difficult
grasp
ideas
velope
with a
and tr
and un
It is d
munity
hood
people
limited
and w
its lea
interes
Perh
unders
Ward
the ea
Our e
imple
mocr
imple
when
lived u
when
some
a utop
realize
a reve
domes
countr
democ
surviv
tion a
cratic
inspira
for g
proph
forgot

must have been aware of the initial difficulty of the average mind to grasp fundamentally new social ideas. The American nation has developed in a capitalist civilization with a deep-rooted capitalist ideology and traditions. Socialism is a new and unprecedented system of society. It is difficult to conceive of a community where the means of livelihood are common property of the people, where democracy is not limited by opposite poles of poverty and wealth, and the government and its leaders really represent the vital interests of the entire community.

Perhaps it is on account of this understandable difficulty that Dr. Ward compares the Soviet spirit to the early spirit of our democracy. Our early history contains rich examples of the militant spirit of democracy, in fact, the first living example of a democratic way of life, when the balance of the world still lived under feudal-monarchist forms, when the wise men of Europe, and some here, said that democracy was a utopian idea which could never be realized in this world. It required a revolutionary war and a mighty domestic political struggle before our country proceeded on the path of democratic development. America survived to grow into a mighty nation and world power, and its democratic forms and ideals served as the inspiration of the progressive peoples for generations after those who prophesied our extinction had been forgotten.

And now a new, socialist civilization has emerged upon the world scene with dramatic force and apparent suddenness. The peoples of Europe greet it with joy as their liberator from fascism. In our own country the old voices of reaction, which did so much to distort and slander the young socialist republic over the past quarter of a century, grow louder and bolder as the danger of fascist aggression recedes. Now that the realization of the Yalta perspective of a stable and peaceful world becomes the order of the day, the forces of imperialist reaction again hasten to spread suspicions and lies designed to confuse us and to divide us from our indispensable Soviet Ally in the face of this greatest of tasks.

It is in the light of our imperative task today of exterminating the material and ideological foundations of fascism forever from the earth that Dr. Ward's book is of inestimable value. *The Soviet Spirit* makes its major contribution in tracing the roots of Soviet military prowess to its people, to their socialist training and outlook, and to the magnificent organization of their war economy. In the course of this narrative of unparalleled accomplishments we are given the first comprehensive picture of what the author calls the spirit of the Soviet people, but what we may also call the ideology arising from the socialist mode of production.

The new generation of Soviet youth are the massed examples of the

new type of human beings developed under socialism. Dr. Ward examines this new manifestation of the socialist spirit in every phase of Soviet life, from kindergarten to school to factory and farm, in government departments, in new constructions, in Soviet literature, on the war fronts, and in individual acts of heroism that take on mass proportions. Reading his book, one cannot help feeling a deep sense of pride and enduring faith for all humankind; for here is a living example, on a national scale, that opens up vistas to the future. Neither can one avoid an involuntary comparison of the opposite pole of human development manifested in the mass degradation and brutalization of an entire nation under fascism and its predatory war. Mingled with the feeling of pride is the sense of gratitude that this Soviet generation of what Dr. Ward terms the "socialized individual" has played so decisive a role in the military defeat of fascism's dread designs.

* * *

One of the most fascinating aspects of this book is to be found in the examination of the amazing record of production of war material in the Soviet Union. This is a tale that holds vast promise to the newly liberated democratic nations. In part this war was a contest of production of complicated war equipment such as tanks, planes, and artillery, of unprecedented magnitude. American

war production helped to turn the scales of victory to democracy. But American production began late, only a little before the decisive turning point at Stalingrad. Dr. Ward describes the Soviet marvel of production by tracing the problem all the way to the early days of the Revolution under Lenin's leadership. Lenin understood the tremendous potentiality of the creative impulse of the people and taught his young socialist republic how to release, encourage, and direct this impulse for the common good of the entire society. The Soviet war production record is the story of the transformation of backward Czarist Russia, predominantly agricultural, into the largest and most modern industrial power on the Continent over a brief span of 15 years. In part, this epic achievement is due to a program of import of machinery from abroad, in part to an intensified program of building heavy industries as the foundation for the socialist economy; but the unprecedented historic achievement lay in the human factor. The building of the material base of the economy proceeded simultaneously with the creation of a vast complex of planners, engineers, designers, technicians, managers, scientists, mechanics, and millions of skilled workers. Within a span of 15 years the Soviet economy surpassed the industrial nations of Europe in possession of technical traditions and training of over a century. These in suffi-

cient
ment
milita
social
ment
fancie
Russi
peopl
share
was t
omy,
the p
Stalin
becau
with
social
posse
the la
ple.
sense
trial
achie
sciou
Dr. V
evolu
forma
man
stage
Th
so ab
ism.
of pe
cialist
above
amica
when
were
cist in
the la
by a
unity

ciently known phenomenal achievements are of significance equal to the military performance of the young socialist republic. These achievements are not to be explained by any fancied racial or national trait of the Russian people. All the nations and peoples comprising the Soviet Union shared in the accomplishments. This was the product of the socialist economy, of the socialist consciousness of the people, and of its superb Leninist-Stalinist leadership. It was possible because the men and women charged with the responsibility of building socialism and defending the nation possessed a deep and abiding faith in the latent creative powers of the people. In the fullest and broadest sense, the creation of this vast industrial complex was a democratic achievement of the united and conscious efforts of the entire people. Dr. Ward traces the growth and the evolution of this marvelous transformation of the country and its human element through all major stages of development.

The Soviet spirit, as Dr. Ward has so ably shown, is the spirit of socialism. It was reared in an atmosphere of peaceful construction of the socialist economy of abundance. It is above all a spirit of peace and amicable international relations. But when its great constructive labors were violently interrupted by the fascist invasion, a mighty anger swept the land, and its people galvanized by a matchless moral and political unity in a supreme resolve to exter-

minate the warmakers root and branch from the face of the earth.

* * *

To the oft-repeated question as to what is the Soviet outlook for the future in terms of its foreign policy, one need only examine the peaceful record of Soviet history, the peace-loving and constructive spirit of its people, and to consider the world relations of the Soviet State in terms of its socialist democratic essence. One would do well to take to heart the remarks in Dr. Ward's concluding chapter:

The fact that Soviet democracy is built up on the democratic principles of freedom and equality, the kindred fact that the Soviet view of the future looks for the unending development of these principles, makes postwar collaboration between the Soviet people and the Western democracies both imperative and practicable. . . . We have been fighting together, as we now need to work together, for the future of mankind, for the right and opportunity of the last and least peoples of the world to have all the development that the resources of the earth and the combined efforts of all nations make possible. That extension of democracy is what fascist reaction seeks to halt everywhere on the earth.

That worldwide reaction should still seek its objective by political and economic maneuvers after the Axis is defeated is inevitable. . . . The collaboration of all the democratic forces in the world is just as necessary to build the road into the future as it was to stop the fascist blitzkriegs that tried to destroy the approaches to that road.

VITAL DOCUMENTS

V-E DAY

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN'S PROCLAMATION ON THE END OF THE WAR IN EUROPE; WASHINGTON, MAY 8, 1945

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A PROCLAMATION

The Allied armies, through sacrifice and devotion and with God's help, have won from Germany a final and unconditional surrender. The Western World has been freed of the evil forces which for five years and longer have imprisoned the bodies and broken the lives of millions upon millions of free-born men. They have violated their churches, destroyed their homes, corrupted their children and murdered their loved ones. Our armies of liberation have restored freedom to these suffering peoples, whose spirit and will the oppressors could never enslave.

Much remains to be done. The victory won in the West must now be won in the East. The whole world must be cleansed of the evil from which half the world has been freed. United, the peace-loving nations have demonstrated in the West that their arms are stronger by far than the might of dictators or the tyranny of military cliques that once called us soft and weak. The power of our peoples to defend themselves against

all enemies will be proved in the Pacific as it has been proved in Europe.

For the triumph of spirit and of arms which we have won, and for its promise to peoples everywhere who join us in the love of freedom, it is fitting that we, as a nation, give thanks to Almighty God, who has strengthened us and given us the victory.

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby appoint Sunday, May 13, 1945, to be a day of prayer.

I call upon the people of the United States, whatever their faith, to unite in offering joyful thanks to God for the victory we have won and to pray that He will support us to the end of our present struggle and guide us into the way of peace.

I also call upon my countrymen to dedicate this day of prayer to the memory of those who have given their lives to make possible our victory.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this eighth day of May, in the Year of Our Lord 1945, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 169th.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

PREM

Com
women
German
has be
Red A
has ac
has de
render

On 1
itulat
8, in t
Russia
presen
preme
the fin
into fo
signed

Know
German
agrees
no rea
ever, si
in fulfil
began
render

That
paper.
German
group
Czech
but I h
in bring

We
daring
rout of
great v
man in

The
made i
independ
innume
that ou
of the
rear at

PREMIER JOSEPH STALIN'S VICTORY SPEECH, MOSCOW, MAY 9, 1945

Comrades, my countrymen and women: The great day of victory over Germany has come. Fascist Germany has been brought to her knees by the Red Army and the troops of our Allies, has acknowledged herself beaten and has declared her unconditional surrender.

On May 7 the preliminary act of capitulation was signed in Reims. On May 8, in the presence of the staff of the Russian High Command and in the presence of representatives of the Supreme Command of the Allied Forces, the final act of capitulation, which came into force at 2400 hours May 8, was signed in Berlin.

Knowing the wolflike actions of the Germans, who consider treaties and agreements as so much paper, we have no reason to believe their word. However, since this morning German troops, in fulfillment of the act of capitulation, began laying down their arms and surrendering to our troops.

That is no longer an empty scrap of paper. That is the real capitulation of Germany's armed forces. It is true, one group of German troops in the area of Czechoslovakia still avoids capitulation, but I hope the Red Army will succeed in bringing it to its senses.

We now have all the ground for declaring that the historic day of the final rout of Germany has come—the day of great victory of our people over German imperialism.

The great sacrifices that we have made in the name of the liberty and independence of our motherland, the innumerable exertions and sufferings that our people had to bear in the course of the war, the strenuous work in the rear and the front that they have

brought to the altar of the fatherland, have not been in vain. They have been crowned by complete victory over the enemy.

The centuries-old struggle of the Slav peoples for their existence and their independence has been concluded by victory over the German invaders and over German tyranny. From now on, over Europe will fly the banner dear to us—the banner of victory of the peoples and of peace among nations.

Three years ago Hitler publicly declared that his plans included the carving up of the Soviet Union and depriving it of the Caucasus, the Ukraine, White Russia and the Baltic States and other districts. Hitler said openly that "we shall destroy Russia so that she will never be able to rise again."

That was three years ago. But Hitler's insane ideas were not destined to be fulfilled. In the course of the war they were blown into dust. In actual fact, the opposite happened to that which the Hitlerites threatened. Germany is completely destroyed. German troops are capitulating and the Soviet Union triumphs in victory, although it does not intend either to dismember or to annihilate Germany.

Comrades: The great patriotic war has ended in our complete victory. The period of war in Europe has ended. The period of peaceful development has begun.

Glory to our heroic Red Army, which has defended the independence of our motherland and achieved victory over the enemy!

Glory to our victorious people!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in battle against the enemy and gave their lives for the freedom and happiness of our motherland!

PRIME MINISTER WINSTON CHURCHILL'S ADDRESS,
LONDON, MAY 8, 1945

Yesterday at 2:41 A.M. at General Eisenhower's headquarters General Jodl, the representative of the German High Command and of Grand Admiral Doenitz, the designated head of the German State, signed the act of unconditional surrender of all German land, sea and air forces to the Allied Expeditionary Force and simultaneously to the Soviet High Command.

General Bedell Smith, Chief of Staff, of the United States Army, and General Francois Sevez signed the document on behalf of the Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force and General Susloparov signed on behalf of the Russian High Command.

Today this agreement will be ratified and confirmed at Berlin where Air Chief Marshal Tedder, Deputy Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force, and General de Latre Tassigny will sign on behalf of General Eisenhower and General Zhukov on behalf of the Soviet High Command.

The German representatives will be Field Marshal Keitel, Chief of the High Command, and the Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy and Air Forces.

Hostilities will end officially at one minute after midnight tonight, Tuesday, the 8th of May.

But in the interest of saving lives, the cease fire began yesterday to be sounded all along the front and our dear Channel Islands are also to be freed today.

The Germans are still in places resisting the Russian troops, but should they continue to do so after midnight they will, of course, deprive themselves of the protection of the laws of war and will be attacked from all quarters by the Allied troops.

It is not surprising that on such long fronts and in the existing disorder of the enemy, the commands of the German High Command could not in every case have been obeyed immediately. This does not, in our opinion, with the military advice at our disposal, constitute any reason for withholding from the nation the facts communicated to us by General Eisenhower of the unconditional surrender already signed at Reims nor could it prevent us from celebrating today and tomorrow, Wednesday, as Victory in Europe Day. Today, perhaps, we shall think mostly of ourselves. Tomorrow we shall pay a particular tribute to our heroic Russian comrades whose prowess in the field has been one of the grand contributions to the general victory.

The German war is therefore at an end.

After years of intense preparations, Germany hurled herself on Poland at the beginning of September, 1939, and in pursuance of our guarantee to Poland, and in common with the French Republic, Great Britain, the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations declared war upon this foul aggression.

After gallant France had been struck down, we from this island and from our united empire maintained the struggle single-handed for a whole year until we were joined by the military might of Soviet Russia and later by the overwhelming power and resources of the United States of America.

Finally, almost the whole world was combined against the evil doers who are now prostrate before us. Our gratitude to our splendid allies goes forth from all our hearts in the island and throughout the British Empire.

We may allow ourselves a brief pe-

riod of
for a
lie ab
Ja
greed,
ries sh
ain, th

The
in the
its glo
cial p
tions r
to com
perform

Tho
come i
flowing
and a
Your a
on the
ply ha

Ever
conflict
enemy
have t
difficul

ers as
defeat
fighting
you ha
privatic
obstacle
could t
pause u
up wit
from t
coming

Full
tained.

riod of rejoicing, but let us not forget for a moment the toils and efforts that lie ahead.

Japan, with all her treachery and greed, remains unsubdued. The injuries she has inflicted against Great Britain, the United States and other coun-

tries and her detestable cruelties call for justice and retribution.

We must now devote all our strength and resources to the completion of our task both at home and abroad.

Advance Britain! Long live the cause of freedom! God save the King.

GENERAL DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER'S ORDER OF THE DAY, REIMS, MAY 8, 1945

The crusade on which we embarked in the early summer of 1944 has reached its glorious conclusion. It is my special privilege, in the name of all nations represented in this theatre of war, to commend each of you for the valiant performance of duty.

Though these words are feeble, they come from the bottom of a heart overflowing with pride in your loyal service and admiration for you as warriors. Your accomplishments at sea, in the air, on the ground and in the field of supply have astonished the world.

Even before the final week of the conflict you had put 5,000,000 of the enemy permanently out of the war. You have taken in stride military tasks so difficult as to be classed by many doubters as impossible. You have confused, defeated and destroyed your savagely fighting foe. On the road to victory you have endured every discomfort and privation and have surmounted every obstacle ingenuity and desperation could throw in your path. You did not pause until our front was firmly joined up with the great Red Army coming from the east and other Allied forces coming from the south.

Full victory in Europe has been attained. Working and fighting together

in single and indestructible partnership you have achieved a perfection in the unification of air, ground and naval power that will stand as a model in our time.

The route you have traveled through hundreds of miles is marked by the graves of former comrades. From them have been exacted the ultimate sacrifice. The blood of many nations—American, British, Canadian, French, Polish and others—has helped to gain the victory. Each of the fallen died as a member of a team to which you belong, bound together by a common love of liberty and a refusal to submit to enslavement. No monument of stone, no memorial of whatever magnitude could so well express our respect and veneration for their sacrifice as would the perpetuation of the spirit of comradeship in which they died.

As we celebrate victory in Europe let us remind ourselves that our common problems of the immediate and distant future can be best solved in the same conceptions of cooperation and devotion to the cause of human freedom as have made this Expeditionary Force such a mighty engine of righteous destruction. Let us have no part in the profitless quarrels in which other

men will inevitably engage as to what country and what service won the European war.

Every man and every woman of every nation here represented has served according to his or her ability and efforts

and each has contributed to the outcome. This we shall remember and in doing so we shall be revering each honored grave and be sending comfort to the loved ones of comrades who could not live to see this day.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

SPEECH OF V. M. MOLOTOV, PEOPLE'S COMMISSAR OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE U.S.S.R.

(At the session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco on April 26, 1945)

Mr, Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

On instructions of the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics I would like, in making this first statement on behalf of the Soviet delegation, to express to the government of the United States of America and to Secretary of State Mr. Stettinius personally, my government's deep gratitude of the tremendous amount of preparatory work carried out prior to this Conference and for the perfect organization of the United Nations Conference. At the same time I seize this opportunity to express the Soviet delegation's most sincere gratitude to the Honorable Mayor of the City of San Francisco, Mr. Roger Lapham, for the cordial hospitality extended to the delegation in this city.

The Soviet Government attaches great importance to the International Conference in San Francisco. The end of the war has drawn near—at least in Europe. The rout of Hitler-Germany,

the principal aggressor in this war, has become a fact. The time has come to take care of the postwar period—of the future.

This Conference is called upon to consider the problem of setting up an organization to protect the general peace and security of nations after the war. Hence the responsibility resting upon this Conference is very great indeed.

Today as on many other occasions we must remember once again the great name of President Franklin Roosevelt. His services in the struggle for the achievement of a lasting peace and in the preparation of this historic Conference have been widely acknowledged by all peace-loving nations.

The Second World War by far surpassed the First World War in the scope of military operations, in the size of armies involved, in casualties, in immeasurable destruction, and in the unusually severe consequences for the

life of
which
no cri
ination
pave t
of Ger
of chi
extern
turity;
peacef
liking
tion o
in cul
many
the di
tire na
losses
Germa
pared
piratic
but F
ideolog
in its
ing d
This
illitera
Germa
foreign
Lon
neighb
pared
at a r
well k
scrupu
accom
when
made
the So
ing ac
which
in blo
cism r
the go
for th
after t

life of many peoples. Hitler-Germany which unleashed this war shrank from no crimes in trying to impose her domination of Europe in the attempt to pave the day for the world domination of German imperialism. Mass murders of children, women and old men; the extermination of nations in their entirety; the wholesale destruction of peaceful citizens who were not to the liking of fascists; the barbaric destruction of culture and of men prominent in cultural fields; the destruction of many thousands of towns and villages; the dislocation of economic life of entire nations and the other incalculable losses cannot be forgotten. In the past German fascism not only openly prepared its armies and armaments for a piratic attack on peaceful countries, but Hitlerism cynically adapted the ideology of many millions of people in its country to the purpose of achieving domination over foreign nations. This purpose was also served by the illiterate misanthropic theories of "the German master race" in whose service foreign nations were supposed to be.

Long before directly attacking its neighbors Hitlerism had openly prepared a criminal war which it unloosed at a moment of its own choice. It is well known that Hitlerism found unscrupulous henchmen and sanguinary accomplices. It is also well known that when German fascism, which had made an easy tour of Europe, invaded the Soviet Union, it faced an unflinching adversary. The country of Soviets which has saved European civilization in bloody battles against German fascism now, with good reason, reminds the governments of their responsibility for the future of peace-loving nations after the termination of this war. This

is all the more necessary because before this war the warning voice of the Soviet Republics was not heard with due attention.

This is no time to explain at length why this happened. It cannot be proved that there was no desire to prevent war. It has been fully proved, however, that the governments which once claimed a leading part in Europe manifested their inability, if not their reluctance, to prevent this war, with consequences with which it will not be so easy to cope.

The Conference is called upon to lay the foundations for the future security of nations. This is a great problem which has thus far been impossible to solve successfully. Anybody knows that the League of Nations in no way coped with this problem. It betrayed the hopes of those who believed in it. It is obvious that no one wishes to restore a League of Nations which had no rights or power, which did not interfere with any aggressor preparing for war against peace-loving nations and which sometimes even lulled the nations' vigilance with regard to impending aggression. The prestige of the League of Nations was especially undermined whenever unceremonious attempts were made to turn it into a tool of various reactionary forces and privileged powers. If the sad lessons of the League of Nations have to be mentioned now, it is only so that past errors may be avoided—errors which must not be committed again under the guise of new profuse promises. It is impossible, however, to count indefinitely on the patience of nations if the governments again manifest their inability to set up an international organization to safeguard the peaceful life of people, their families

and young generations against the horrors and hardships of new predatory imperialist wars.

The Soviet Government is a sincere and firm champion of the establishment of a strong international organization of security. Whatever may depend upon it and its efforts in the common cause of the creation of such a postwar organization for the peace and security of nations, will readily be done by the Soviet Government. We will fully cooperate in the solution of this great problem with all the other governments which are genuinely devoted to this noble cause. In spite of all obstacles, we are confident that this historic goal will be achieved by the joint effort of peace-loving nations.

The work which was carried out at Dumbarton Oaks last year and which is well known to all of us, is an important contribution to this cause. Representatives of the United States of America, Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union outlined such principles of an international security organization as will constitute an important basis for an international organization of a new type. Quite recently at the suggestion of the great President Franklin Roosevelt, the Crimea Conference adopted important supplements to this draft. As a result, this Conference has a sound basis for successful work.

Naturally, the new organization of international security will be built up on the foundation laid in this war by the United Nations.

It is well known that a great coalition of democratic powers came into being in Europe in the strenuous struggle against the common enemy. The formation of the Anglo-Soviet-Ameri-

can Coalition ensured the rout of German fascism and its henchmen. The other nations of Europe led by this Coalition have been fighting for their liberation. The Coalition of great powers with their inflexible will to defend their national rights and to promote the liberation of all nations which fell victim to sanguinary aggression is consummating the task of defeating the enemy of all the United Nations. This coalition has been able to accomplish its mission because it was conscious of its historic responsibility and because it possessed immense manpower and material resources which were invariably used in the struggle against the enemy. But we must always bear in mind that prestige is easily wasted, if certain elementary things such as the lessons of the League of Nations, or the lessons of this war in which the democratic nations rallied against an imperialistic power which considered itself master of Europe and which intended to impose its will well nigh on the whole world, are forgotten.

This Coalition was forged in the fire of struggle and rendered a great service to the cause of the United Nations. It must be admitted that the presence in this Coalition of such a country as the Soviet Union where relations between great and small nations are based on equality and true democracy is of extremely great importance. On the other hand, one can hardly overestimate the active part played in this Coalition by the United States of America, which had remained aloof from the problems of an international organization but which is now devoting to this cause its initiative and its enormous international prestige. This Coalition would have been impossible with-

out Great Britain, which holds an important place in the international association of democratic countries. China in Asia and France in Europe are the great nations which strengthen this Coalition as a powerful world factor in the postwar period.

If the leading democratic countries show their ability to act in harmony in the post-war period as well, that will mean that the interests of peace and security of nations have at last received protection and have been provided with a sound basis. But that is not all. The point at issue is whether other peace-loving nations are willing to rally around these leading powers to create an effective international security organization, and in the interests of the future peace and security of nations. This must be settled at this Conference.

An international organization must be created having certain powers to safeguard the interests of the general peace. This organization must have the necessary means for military protection of the security of nations. Only if conditions are created such as will guarantee that no violation of the peace or the threat of such violation shall go unpunished and that the adoption of necessary punitive measures is not too late, will the security organization be able to shoulder its responsibility for the cause of peace. Thus the point at issue is the creation of an effective organization to protect the general peace and security of nations, for which all the sincere partisans of the peaceful development of nations have long been yearning, but which has always had many irreconcilable enemies in the camp of the most aggressive imperialists.

After the innumerable sacrifices made in this war and after the suffering and hardships of these past years, the urge of nations for the establishment of such an organization has become particularly strong. The opponents of the creation of such an international organization have not laid down their arms. They are carrying on their subversive activities even now, though in most cases they are doing it in a veiled and camouflaged form. For this purpose they frequently use the most ostensibly democratic watchwords and arguments, including the professed protection of the interests of small nations or of the principles of justice and of the equality of nations. But in the long run it does not matter what reasons or pretexts have been used to sabotage the establishment of an effective security organization of nations. If even this time no such effective organization is created to protect the postwar peace, this will be another indication of inability to cope with this great problem by using the available forces. But that will not prove that the necessity for such an organization has not yet arisen and that such an organization will not ultimately be set up.

We must not minimize the difficulties of creating an international security organization. With our eyes closed we cannot find the right road. We must warn of these difficulties in order to overcome them and in order to find at last a safe road to march ahead toward this noble objective by avoiding illusions. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I should like to assure this Conference at this time that in our country the people are brought up in a spirit of faith in, and devotion to, the cause of setting up a solid or-

ganization of international security. I should also like to assure this Conference that the Soviet people will readily lend their ear to the voices, wishes and suggestions of all sincere friends of this great cause among the nations of the world.

You know that there are millions of people in the Soviet Union who know how to defend their Motherland to the last by means of arms. At the same time the people of our Soviet country are especially devoted with all their hearts to the cause of the establishment of general peace and are willing to support as best they can the efforts of other nations to create a reliable

peace and security organization of nations. You ought to know that as far as safeguarding the peace and security of nations is concerned, the Soviet Union can be relied upon. This great cause is resolutely backed by our peace-loving people, by the Soviet Government and the Red Army, and by our great Marshal Stalin. It is a most important task of the delegation of the Soviet Government to express these sentiments and thoughts of the Soviet people.

I shall conclude my statement by expressing a fervent wish that our joint work at this Conference may be crowned with success.

SOVIET-POLISH RELATIONS

THE TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AND POST-WAR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS CONCLUDED APRIL 21, 1945

The President of the National Council of Poland of the Polish Republic and the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, animated by unshaken will to carry on jointly the war against the German aggressors until complete and final victory, wishing to make permanent the basic change in the history of Polish-Soviet relations toward friendly allied cooperation which has been formed between Poland and the U.S.S.R. in the course of the joint war against German imperialism, confident that a further strengthening of relations of good neighborhood and friendship between Poland and adjoining

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics corresponds to the vital interests of Polish and Soviet peoples, confident that the maintenance of friendship and close cooperation between Polish and Soviet peoples will serve the successful economic development of both countries in the time of war as well as after the war; aiming to support with all means the cause of peace and security of the nations after the war, have decided to conclude the present treaty and have appointed as their authorized representatives for the National Council of Poland of the Polish Republic, Edward B. Osobka-Morawski, President of the Council of Ministers and Minister of

Foreign
for t
Coun
ist P
Stalin
Peopl
Soviet
excha
to be
who h
lution

The
contin
in cor
until f
high c
selves
and o
being

Hig
that th
perous
viet pe
strengt
friends
the ene
ly coop
in acco
mutual
dence a
interfer
the oth

The
pledge
present
use in
disposal
threat

Foreign Affairs of the Polish Republic; for the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, chairman of the Council of the Peoples' Commissars of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who have exchanged their credentials, found them to be in due form and full order and who have agreed to the following resolutions:

ARTICLE 1

The high contracting parties will continue the struggle against Germany in common with the United Nations until final victory. In this struggle the high contracting parties pledge themselves to render to each other military and other assistance with all means being at their disposal.

ARTICLE 2

High contracting parties confident that the interests of security and prosperous development of Polish and Soviet peoples demand maintenance and strengthening of permanent and firm friendship in wartime as well as after the end of war will consolidate friendly cooperation between both countries in accordance with the principles of mutual respect towards their independence and sovereignty as well as non-interference into the inner affairs of the other state.

ARTICLE 3

The high contracting parties also pledge themselves after the end of the present war against the Germans to use in common all the means at their disposal for the elimination of every threat of repeated aggression on the

part of Germany or any other country which would ally itself with Germany directly or in any other form. In order to achieve this purpose, the high contracting parties will participate in the spirit of most sincere cooperation in all international activities aiming to insure peace and security to the peoples and will contribute their full share for the achievement of these high aims. The high contracting parties will effectuate the present treaty in conformity with international principles, in settlement of which both negotiating parties participated.

ARTICLE 4

Should one of the high contracting parties be drawn in the post-war period into military operations against Germany, in event of Germany renewing her aggressive policy, or against any other country which would ally itself with Germany in such a war directly or in any other way, the other high contracting party will immediately render the high contracting party drawn into such military operations military and other assistance and support with all the means at its disposal.

ARTICLE 5

The high contracting parties pledge themselves not to conclude without mutual agreement an armistice or peace with either the Hitlerite government or any other regime in Germany which would threaten or could threaten independence, territorial integrity or security of either of the high contracting parties.

ARTICLE 6

Each of the high contracting parties pledges itself neither to conclude any

alliance nor to join in a coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

ARTICLE 7

The high contracting parties will cooperate in the spirit of friendship also after the end of the present war for the purpose of further development and strengthening of economic and cultural ties between both countries and will help each other in the economic reconstruction of both countries.

ARTICLE 8

The present treaty becomes valid immediately after its signature and is subject to ratification in the shortest possible time. The exchange of ratification documents will take place in Warsaw as soon as possible. The present treaty remains valid for the next twenty years from the time of its signature. If none of the high contracting parties twelve months before the end of the twenty-year period will present a statement

about its desire to denounce the treaty, this treaty will remain in force for a period of the next five years and thereafter for subsequent periods of five years until such time as one of the high contracting parties gives notice in writing twelve months before the termination of any such five-year period of its intention of terminating the treaty.

In witness whereof the authorized representatives signed this treaty and appended their seals thereto.

Done in Moscow on April 21, 1945 in two copies each, in Polish and Russian, both texts having equality validity.

By the authority of the President of the National Council of Poland of the Polish Republic.

EDWARD OSUBKA-MORAWSKI

By the authority of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

JOSEPH STALIN

PREMIER JOSEPH STALIN'S STATEMENT ON THE POLISH-SOVIET TREATY (MOSCOW, APRIL 22, 1945)

I think the treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and postwar cooperation between the Soviet Union and Poland which we have just signed has great historical significance. Its significance lies first of all in the fact that it marks a fundamental change in relations between the Soviet Union and Poland toward friendship and an alliance which has been formed in the course of the present war of liberation

against Germany and which is now being formally strengthened by this treaty.

It is well-known that relations between our countries for the past five centuries were marked by mutual estrangement, unfriendliness and often by open conflict. Such relations weakened both our countries and strengthened German imperialism.

The significance of the present treaty

lies
the
buy
place
allie
Unio
Du
is, d
Germ
territ
ward
again
take
no fr
our c
did n
allian
prefer
many
course
land
annul
possib
policy
gates
The
lies in
the ol
Germ
substit
and f
her eas
torical
we hav
the Sov
ship, r
collabo
It is
the pe
await v
this tre
is a ple
new de

lies in the fact that it puts an end to the old relations between our countries, burying them and erecting in their place a real basis for a friendly and allied relationship between the Soviet Union and Poland.

During the last 25 to 30 years, that is, during the last two World Wars, Germany succeeded in using Polish territory as a corridor for invasion eastward and a springboard for an attack against the Soviet Union. This could take place only because there was then no friendly allied relationship between our countries. The old rulers of Poland did not want to have a relationship of alliance with the Soviet Union. They preferred to play up the game of Germany against the Soviet Union, and, of course, they overplayed themselves. Poland was occupied, her independence annulled and German troops gained the possibility, as a result of this pernicious policy, of finding themselves at the gates of Moscow.

The significance of the present treaty lies in the fact that it puts an end to the old pernicious policy of playing up Germany against the Soviet Union and substitutes for it a policy of alliance and friendship between Poland and her eastern neighbors. Such is the historical significance of the treaty which we have just signed between Poland and the Soviet Union, the treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and postwar collaboration.

It is, therefore, not surprising that the peoples of our countries should await with impatience the signing of this treaty. They feel that this treaty is a pledge for the independence of the new democratic Poland, a pledge of

her might and her welfare. But this is not all. The present treaty still has great international significance.

While there was no alliance between our countries, Germany had the possibility of using the lack of a united front between us, could play Poland against the Soviet Union and vice versa and then beat them singly. This has fundamentally changed with the alliance between our countries. It is no longer possible to play one against the other. There is now a united front between our two countries, from the Baltic to the Carpathians against the common foe—against German imperialism.

Now it can be said with certainty that German aggression is held in the east. There is no doubt that this barrier from the east is complemented by a barrier from the west, that is, with an alliance of our countries with our Allies in the west. Then it can be confidently said that German aggression will be bridled and will not find it easy to break loose.

It is, therefore, not surprising that freedom-loving nations, and above all Slav nations, await the conclusion of this treaty with impatience since they are convinced that this treaty means a strengthening of the united front of the United Nations against the common foe in Europe. For this reason I do not doubt that our Allies in the west will welcome this agreement.

Let free and independent Poland flourish! Let her eastern neighbor, our Soviet Union, live and flourish! Long live the alliance and friendship between our countries!

PREMIER JOSEPH STALIN'S LETTER ON THE POLISH ISSUE (MAY 19, 1945)

(In reply to a letter from Ralph Parker, Moscow correspondent of The Times of London.)

I have somewhat delayed my answer but this is understandable if one keeps in mind how busy I am.

1. The arrest of the sixteen Poles in Poland with the well-known Diversionist Gen. Okulicki at their head has no connection with the question of reconstruction of the Polish Provisional Government. These gentlemen were arrested in accordance with a law similar to the British Defense of the Realm Act. The arrest was carried out by Soviet military authorities in accordance with an agreement concluded between the Polish Provisional Government and the Soviet military command.

2. It is untrue that the arrested Poles were invited for negotiations with the Soviet authorities. The Soviet authorities do not and will not conduct negotiations with those who break the law on the protection of the Red Army rear.

3. As far as the question of the reorganization of the Polish Provisional Government itself is concerned, it can only be solved on the basis of the Cri-

mea decisions because no deviations from these decisions can be permitted.

4. I think the Polish question can be solved by agreement between the Allies only if the following elementary conditions are observed.

a. If in the reconstruction of the Polish Provisional Government the latter is recognized as the basic core of the future Polish Government of national unity, similar to the case of Yugoslavia, where the National Liberation Committee was recognized as the main core of the United Yugoslav Government.

b. If as a result of the reconstruction a government is created in Poland which will pursue a policy of friendship with the Soviet Union and not the policy of the "cordon sanitaire" against the Soviet Union.

c. If the question of the reconstruction of the Polish Government is resolved together with the Poles who at present have ties with the Polish people, and not without them.

Yours respectfully,
STALIN.

Colle

Why

The

Orga

Germ

Fascis

Capit

Jewish

The A

Docum

The C

The B

Writers

Choir

Irish R

S

NEW PUBLICATIONS ON OUR TABLE

- Collected Works, Volume XXIII, 1918-1919.* V. I. Lenin. (International Publishers) New York, 1945. 540 pp. \$2.75.
- Why America is Interested in The Chinese Communists.* Earl Browder. (New Century Publishers) New York, 1945. 16 pp. 5¢
- The Treatment of Defeated Germany.* V. J. Jerome. (New Century Publishers) New York, 1945. 108 pp. Paper edition 35¢; cloth \$1.25.
- Organized Labor Faces the New World.* William Z. Foster. (New Century Publishers) New York, 1945. 24 pp. 5¢
- Germany: Economic and Labor Conditions Under Fascism.* Jurgen Kuczynski. (International Publishers) New York, 1945. 234 pp. \$2.00.
- Fascist Spain: America's Enemy.* David McKelvy White. (Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade) New York, 1945. 24 pp. 10¢
- Capitalism and Progress.* Anna Rochester. (International Publishers) 1945. 106 pp. 40¢
- Jewish Youth at War: Letters from American Soldiers.* Edited by Isaac E. Rontch. (Marstin Press) New York, 1945. 304 pp. \$3.00.
- The Arctic in Fact and Fable.* Vilhjalmur Stefansson. (Foreign Policy Association, Headline Series No. 51) New York, 1945. 96 pp. 25¢
- Documents on World Security.* Compiled by the New York Times. 1945. 54 pp. 10¢
- The Crimea Decisions and Your Future.* Tim Buck. (Labor-Progressive Party) Toronto. 18 pp. 5¢
- The Bretton Woods Proposals.* (U. S. Treasury) Washington, February 15, 1945. 14 pp.
- Writers' War Board. Third Annual Report.* New York, January, 1945. 38 pp.
- Choir and Tempest: Epic-Symphonic Poem.* Esther Freemont. Preface to a New Poetry by Samuels Friedman. (Great Concord Publishers) New York, 1945. 150 pp. \$1.50 paper edition; \$2.00 cloth.
- Irish Review. An Organ of Democratic Opinion.* Dublin. No. 1 (New Series). April, 1945.

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

EARL BROWDER'S new book, *American Marxists and the War: Ten Years of Struggle for a Foreign Policy*, will be issued this month by International Publishers. * * * WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, a Vice-President of the Communist Political Association, is the author of the newly published pamphlet, *Organized Labor Faces the New World* (New Century Publishers). * * * FOSTER, a Vice-President of the Communist Political Association, is represented in the July issue with an article, "Main Features of the Nation's Veteran Problem." * * * GENERAL CHOU EN-LAI is a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of China and until recently Envoy of the Yen-an Government to the China Central Government at Chungking. * * * BETTY GANNETT is a member of the National Organization-Education Department of the C.P.A. * * * A. B. MAGIL, Acting Editor of *New Masses*, is co-author of *The Peril of Fascism*. * * * ADAM LAPIN, formerly Washington correspondent of the *Daily Worker*, is now a member of its Editorial Board.

WILLIAM SENTNER, whose article on the Missouri Valley Authority appeared in the May issue of *Political Affairs*, was erroneously described as a member of the National Committee of the C.P.A.

HUGO GELLERT, one of America's most distinguished artists, has contributed the frontispiece and the drawings to this issue of *Political Affairs*.

We urge readers who expect to be away on vacation and who wish to receive *Political Affairs* at their resort addresses to notify us accordingly at least two weeks in advance.

the
ued
Z.
cia-
zed
* * *

cia-
s of
EN-
the
the
ng-
onal
. B.
eril
rre-
orial

lley
was
ttee

hed
this

who
tify