

# The Communist

20¢

JUNE

1943

## LEWIS AND THE DEFEATIST CONSPIRACY

EARL BROWDER

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

## VICTORY IN AFRICA

EUGENE DENNIS

•

## LESSONS OF THE PARTY BUILDING CAMPAIGN

JOHN WILLIAMSON

•

## THE CRISIS IN FASCIST UPPER CIRCLES IN ITALY

M. ERCOLI

•

## THE PROVOCATION OF THE POLISH REACTIONARIES

HANS BERGER

•

## "ONE WORLD"—WENDELL WILLKIE'S CHALLENGING BOOK

JOSEPH NORTH

"In this great conflict against the Axis, there are fundamental philosophic issues at stake. Indeed, all our ethical values are involved in the outcome. Dr. Selsam's book is a notable contribution to the understanding, the philosophic understanding, of both ourselves and our allies. It is the most complete and careful treatment of socialism and ethics that has been written by anyone at any time."—CORLISS LAMONT.

## **SOCIALISM AND ETHICS**

*By Dr. Howard Selsam*

What is ethics? From what do men derive their judgments of right and wrong, good and evil? Is ethics concerned primarily with individual virtue or with economic, social and political institutions? How can capitalism and socialism be morally evaluated—democracy and fascism? Are there eternal moral questions? What is the true relation of the individual to society? What is freedom, what is progress? What is the role of the working class in the determination and achievement of freedom and progress? How should one morally evaluate national unity in the war of the United Nations against the Axis?

In this new book, just published, the author of **What Is Philosophy?** examines capitalist society in its historical development and in its present form and shows how and why Marxian socialism conforms with and embraces the highest moral ideals of the ages.

**Socialism and Ethics** is a fundamental contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory in a field long neglected. It is a book that belongs in every Marxist library.

**224 Pages. Price \$1.90**



**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

# THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER




---

## C O N T E N T S

The Strike Wave Conspiracy . . . . .	<i>Earl Browder</i> . . . . .	483
The Victory in Africa . . . . .	<i>Eugene Dennis</i> . . . . .	495
The Crisis in Fascist Upper Circles in Italy	<i>M. Ercoli</i> . . . . .	505
The Provocation of the Polish Reactionaries	<i>Hans Berger</i> . . . . .	513
The Strike of the Coal Miners . . . . .	<i>William Z. Foster</i> . . . . .	527
Lessons of the Party Building Campaign and the Next Tasks . . . . .	<i>John Williamson</i> . . . . .	539
A Year of American Slav Unity . . . . .	<i>A. Landy</i> . . . . .	552
On the 73rd Anniversary of Lenin's Birth	<i>L. Yudin</i> . . . . .	562
"One World"—Wendell Willkie's Challenging Book . . . . .	<i>Joseph North</i> . . . . .	564
Historic Documents . . . . .		572

---

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

## **NEW AND FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS**

- Policy for Victory . . . . . \$ .15**  
By Earl Browder
- Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity . . . . .05**  
By William Z. Foster
- Behind the Polish-Soviet Break . . . . .03**  
By Alter Brody  
With an introduction by Corliss Lamont
- Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings . . .25**  
With an introduction by Dr. Philip Foner
- The Heritage of Jefferson . . . . .10**  
by Claude G. Bowers, Earl Browder and Francis Franklin
- Karl Marx: His Life and Work . . . . .15**  
Reminiscences by Paul Lafargue and Wilhelm Liebknecht
- Battle for America—1776-1861-1941 . . . . .15**  
By A. B. Magil
- Is Communism a Menace? . . . . .10**  
Earl Browder-George Sokolsky Debate



**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

---

# THE STRIKE WAVE CONSPIRACY\*

BY EARL BROWDER

**T**HE present moment is characterized by the turn in the war in which the ultimate defeat of the Axis has been written in large letters for the whole world to see. The brilliant completion of the North African campaign with the occupation of Bizerte and Tunis by the British, American and French soldiers, and the rapid mopping up afterwards which netted 175,000 Axis prisoners, are a sign of the times.

The North African campaign, so well completed, and the rising tide of British and American air raids on Nazi munitions and communication centers, have merged with the victories of the Red Army on the Eastern Front—victories on a scale unprecedented in military history—to create the preconditions for breaking the backbone of Hitlerism in 1943. The decisive phase of the war has arrived; the road to victory lies straight ahead and needs only the immediate and full development of coalition warfare, unmoved by military or political diversions, to crush Hitler in the iron ring of a two-front war.

Hitler and his associates are fully

aware of this and are frantically trying to avert disaster by mobilizing all their resources and calling up their reserves. Hitler has already mobilized all of his fighting forces in Germany and is now combing the war factories for able-bodied men, replacing them with slave labor from the occupied countries. At the same time he has called upon his fifth column in the United States to go into action. The military record over many months has gone steadily and inexorably against Hitler, but he has still been able to register surprising strength on the diplomatic and fifth-column front, especially in this country.

## *The Alter-Ehrlich Conspiracy*

The first open break in the United Nations was registered in the provocations of the Polish government-in-exile which joined Berlin's propaganda against the Soviet Union, compelling the Soviet Government to suspend diplomatic relations with the Sikorski government. A *New York Herald Tribune* correspondent in London cabled to his paper a day or two after the break in diplomatic relations the opinion expressed in conservative circles in London, that

---

\* This article is based on a speech delivered at Manhattan Center, New York, May 14, 1943.

the Sikorski government would never have dared to join in Goebels' provocation about the missing Polish officers had it not been for the fact that they had been encouraged to expect United States support in such a position by the success that had attended the campaign in the American labor movement against the Soviet Union on the basis of the Ehrlich-Alter case.

It is true that a very small proportion of the American labor movement responded to this provocation on the Ehrlich-Alter case. However, I believe we have all made a serious error in underestimating the importance of this issue. We saw it too much as an isolated incident which would soon be over and forgotten, leaving the mass of the workers untouched and unaffected. We failed to see that it was a part of the whole pattern of Nazi conquest through the division of its enemies.

It is time we put an end to that underestimation because, although a very small section of the American working class in any way responded to that campaign, the campaign was carried out by men who hold powerful and strategic positions in the American labor movement and who compromised in their provocation important and honest leaders who did not know what they were being inveigled into. In this way the conspirators transmitted to a large section of the American population and the working class an attitude of suspicion and uneasiness toward our Soviet ally, precisely at the moment when that would do the most harm to the united war effort

to strike Hitler this year and finish him.

These conspirators had powerful press organs in their hands for this purpose. They not only had the collaboration of a large section of the capitalist daily press. Through the presence of members of this anti-Soviet conspiracy in strategic positions in the labor press, they were able to make powerful trade union organs the bearers of this poisonous propaganda.

Thus in the months of March and April, the *United Auto Workers News*, the organ of the great automotive union, which happens to be edited by a former associate of the Social-Democratic *New Leader* in New York, carried not one single line to expose the crimes of the Nazis, but every single issue has thundered against the supposed crimes of our ally, Soviet Russia. Another former associate of the *New Leader* is the editor of the *C.I.O. News* of the State of Michigan. And there we find the same thing repeated: and it is no accident that this concentration has been right at the heart of the war industry in Detroit. They have dinned it into the ears of the workers that the great David Dubinsky of New York vouches for Alter and Ehrlich and says that those two men in the Soviet Union could no more have been guilty of appealing to the Red Army to desert to the Nazis, than David Dubinsky himself. But they did not tell the workers that David Dubinsky, on a public platform in New York only last week declared his solidarity with the sentiments expressed by N. Chanin, in the maga-

zine *Friend* in January, 1942, that "the final shot will come from Free America—and from this last shot the Stalin regime will be shot to pieces," or that earlier David Dubinsky had defended another advocate of desertion from the Red Army, a Ukrainian associate and protégé of Dubinsky's who published a pamphlet in the City of Detroit in the Ukrainian language, addressed to Ukrainians and Russians and presumably transmitted through the international channels of the organization centering around the *New Leader* to Soviet territory.

After stating that he is hostile to the Soviet Government, this man wrote in the pamphlet:

"Consciousness of national duty justifies desertion from the army of a hostile government. All dissatisfied elements will take advantage of this, their right, in order not to risk their lives."

This is addressed to the Red Army, and is an appeal to them to desert, not to fight the Germans. The circulation of this began about the time Alter and Ehrlich were arrested and charged with doing the same thing in the Soviet Union.

Dubinsky defended this man in the United States. He later defended Alter and Ehrlich. How can anyone doubt that Ehrlich and Alter said the same thing in the Soviet Union that their friends and protectors were saying in the United States?

Why did these men have the "courage" to be so bold in the Soviet Union? The answer is found in their own predictions at the same time that the Red Army and Soviet

Government would crumble under Hitler's assaults.

These men were speculating on the victory of Hitler over the Soviet Union, and today we see them beginning to speculate on the defeat of the United States. They still believe in Hitler's victory. They are still speculating on it and they are ready to go to great lengths to prevent Hitler from being defeated.

#### *Another Diversion*

That is the significance of the whipping up and the careful cultivation of the strike movement among the American workers at this moment, which, if it materialized, would prevent the opening of the second front this year. The same people who launched the first campaign in Berlin's propaganda to break the unity of the United Nations and prepared the grounds for the present move, are now engaged in an effort to involve American labor in a broad strike wave against the government of the United States. There can be no doubt that if this movement continues to grow, it will confront the whole labor movement, as well as the entire nation and its allies with a major crisis, a political and economic diversion directed against the development of the joint Anglo-Soviet-American war to a decisive and victorious conclusion.

It is indicative of the character of this strike movement that its basic premise is the contention that labor is not itself interested in winning this war, and that only the government and the employers have a special interest in victory. But as I

stated in a recent speech on the mine strike and its lessons:

“. . . this is a false and vicious argument. The war is first of all labor's war. There is not the slightest hope for the existence of free labor, or organized labor, anywhere in the world today except at the price of destroying Hitler and his Axis. The working class furnishes the main body of men who must fight this war on the battlefields. Labor's sweat and sacrifice alone produce and can produce the weapons of victory. Labor first and most of all will pay the terrible price of defeat in slavery. Labor first and most of all is interested in victory, which alone can preserve free labor.” (*The Worker*, May 16, 1943.)

The second premise which the promoters of the strike movement attempt to convince the workers to accept is that all efforts to redress their grievances have failed because of the no-strike policy and that a few threats of strike, little strikes, or a big general strike would get immediate results. These people do not want labor to cooperate with the Administration or with management for victory; they do not want increased income for the workers based on increased production for the war; they do not want to solve the wage problem at all. They want only to break the back of the Roosevelt Administration by means of a deliberately planned strike movement which would open the way to a negotiated peace with Hitler instead of his unconditional surrender, and bring the war to an end without victory for the United States and the United Nations.

If you cannot find a settlement for these grievances without striking, it means you cannot conduct the war, because you cannot strike and have a war at the same time. If you think these grievances are more important than the war, then your place is with John L. Lewis and Matthew Woll and such people as Walter Reuther, and all the advocates of a negotiated peace. If you think that victory is above everything else, then you will have to go along with a no-strike policy no matter what you think of these grievances. If you not only place victory above everything else but understand that we can settle many of these grievances, even though we won't get 100 per cent satisfaction, you will not only go on with the no-strike movement but you will also continue to work with the government for the settlement of these questions and will help stop all this nonsense of withdrawing labor's representatives from the government bodies.

Is it true that we have an Administration which is indifferent or hostile to labor and its grievances? Is it true that this Administration has to be bludgeoned into doing anything? While reserving the right to indulge in the sharpest kind of constructive criticism of the Administration necessary in the interest of victory, it must be said that, with all its weaknesses, the Roosevelt Administration has organized and conducted a great war with fewer burdens placed upon the working class and fewer rights taken away from the working class than has ever happened in any capitalist country in the world before.



### *How To Get Tough*

We have had a long period in the United States in which the present labor movement grew up and the strike was the principal weapon in defense of labor's economic interests. When we talked about getting tough, we usually meant getting prepared for a strike movement, and out of that has grown a habit that if you don't talk about strike you are getting soft. I am not giving up the fight for the improvement of all the conditions necessary for waging this war. I am going to do some tough fighting for improving the policies, and adjusting the conditions of labor and wages in the course of this war. But would I be able to get tough if I joined the strike movement?

The worst section of the employers, those least anxious for the unconditional surrender of Hitler and the destruction of fascism, are the very ones who want the strike movement. Is it getting tough when you give these employers what they want? Or do we want to strike against employers that are ready to collaborate in the settlement of questions? Those who are not ready to settle problems are the ones who want us to strike the most. How can we call it getting tough when we play into their hands? That is not getting tough; that is getting soft and where it hurts the most, in the head.

To get tough means holding a disciplined labor movement together, studying and understanding its problems, formulating a way in which these problems can be solved,

and then pressing the solution upon the government and the employers, with the united power of labor—the political power of organized labor. That is the solution to this question.

As to the specific answers to these problems—they are all given by the C.I.O. and Philip Murray has repeated them time and again. We would be much tougher, and further along in the solution of these questions if we united around Philip Murray instead of helping the Lewises and Reuthers by sitting back and letting Murray fight out these questions without sufficient support from us.

A little story, told to me in Milwaukee, will illustrate the extent to which wage questions can be solved by cooperation with the government. This story concerns three small factories working in war production, similar in size, doing the same type of work, under the same general working conditions, wages and hours. We'll call them Factory A, B and C. Each one had a separate business agent; each one worked out its own wage demands; the union in each case endorsed them and left it up to the business agent to file the claims with the War Labor Board. They negotiated with the bosses first, of course. In each case the bosses were quite willing to give them what they wanted. The negotiations were very short and sweet and agreement was reached, and it was left up to the business agents in each case to file their application with the War Labor Board. Each one made out his application in the terms he thought best according to his education and experiences; the

applications all went to the War Labor Board; everybody thought they were all going to win or lose together because the justice of the case was quite clear and the same in each factory.

The decisions came back: Factory A, application denied; Factory B, application denied; Factory C, application granted. Immediately the workers were up in arms. "What's this discrimination? Our case is the same, about the same things. The justice of our cause is the same. The War Labor Board turns down two of us and accepts the other one." And a whole strike sentiment developed on the basis of the discrimination. Then they began to examine the applications, and what did they find? Application in Factory A said the workers were entitled to this increase because of the higher cost of living and in general because they needed it and they wanted it. The same thing in Factory B. Factory C, however, had applied for approval of this agreement on the grounds that the factory had within the last period increased its production so much that this wage increase was not even as much as the increase in production, and that the cost per unit in production, therefore, would be even lower under this new rate than it was previously. That is, Factory C claimed its wage increase on the grounds of production increases that had already been achieved. That was the sound basis to argue under the rules of the government, and therefore it was endorsed. Factories A and B had increased their production just as much as Factory C, but under the influence of the

Reuther line of thought, they refused to put that argument in their application, and therefore they didn't get their increases.

That is what's happening throughout the automobile industry today. Production is increasing. In most places, it is increasing steadily from week to week. In some departments of some plants, production increase has been as high as 80 per cent. Workers are still getting the same wages they were before. Walter Reuther, opposed to an incentive wage based on increased production, convinced them it was wrong to take such an increase, and the employers agreed that as long as the workers don't want it, they're not going to force them to take it. In the whole automobile industry, the workers have increased their production 20 per cent in the last six months at a minimum estimate. If their wages were hitched to their production, they would have a 20 per cent increase, something that even Reuther doesn't tell them to go out and fight for. If they had the incentive wage, they would already have that wage increased.

If you get functioning labor-management committees and really get things moving, production will shoot up, and that will hasten the winning of the war and it will bring large increases in wages to the workers. This is the answer to the main question before the labor movement of how to combine the economic interests of the workers with the production interests for the war, the interests of victory, and only with this policy is it possible to fuse them and prevent the demagogues from

placing one in opposition to the other.

Many workers have been told the incentive wage policy is nothing more than a speed-up plan. That is one of Walter Reuther's pet propaganda devices. Of course there is a certain element of speed-up in increased production—a minor element. The main element in increased production is better organization of the work, better coordination of the workers and the departments, better planning, and better execution. There is a certain element of speed-up in war production, and the labor movement has accepted as policy that the workers are going to work harder for the war effort than they ever worked for a private employer. If you are against that, you are against the war, that's all. Let us face it. Do we think we're going to win this war without any kind of burdens, without any sacrifices? We certainly are not. And the problems are going to get worse. Do you think we're going to solve these problems with a slogan of "equality of sacrifice"? We know very well that the bourgeoisie never has agreed to any equality of sacrifice and never will. The point is this is our war. If we don't determine to win it, it isn't going to be won. That is the only question and that is the only answer.

### *The Forces Behind the Strike Threat*

The deliberate nature of the strike movement can be seen from the forces behind it. Just this after-

noon I received a copy of the Social-Democratic *New Leader* dated Saturday, May 15. A double line, full-page headline reads: "Carey, Reuther Lead Union Drive for New Roosevelt Labor Policy." Here we have it right out of the horse's mouth, except that there is one lie in that headline. It should have said, "Drive for New *Anti-Roosevelt* Labor Policy." Carey and Reuther are supposed to be the new leaders of the American labor movement, according to the sponsors of Ehrlich and Alter.

And what is the characteristic of Carey and Reuther today? They are working in such a way as to give aid and comfort to John L. Lewis to spread the strike movement throughout the labor world, to discredit and to overthrow the responsible leadership of organized labor. Carey, it should be remembered, made his first appearance in the strike movement at the Alter-Ehrlich meeting with Dubinsky in New York; his second role was to begin to make speeches everywhere possible in which he lists all of the shortcomings of the Roosevelt Administration, contributing nothing whatsoever to bringing about a solution of them; his third role is now to appear with Reuther in support of Lewis' effort to upset the Roosevelt Administration.

Who else agrees with the *New Leader*? Norman Thomas and the *Call*, the Trotskyites and *The Militant*. This Trotskyite sheet declares: "Mine Leaders Predict Walk-Out"; "Union Members Are Prepared to Fight as Truce Nears End"; and in a modest place, "Earl Browder,

Strikebreaker." Hard words don't break any bones, and as regards the fomenting of the strike movement that threatens America at this present time, I consider it the greatest honor to be a breaker of this movement.

After I made my speech on the mine strike and its lessons in St. Louis on May 7, there gathered in the same city the Regional Conference of the United Auto Workers Union; and to that conference came Walter Reuther. He came to St. Louis fresh from the conference of the Auto Workers in Detroit, the heart of the union, where he had organized a move against the chief leaders of his union, had voted down all their proposals, preventing the denunciation of Lewis and his strike movement and instead engineering a message of cheer to Lewis, and where he endorsed the withdrawal of the union's representatives from the War Labor Board, and had endorsed the withdrawal of the no-strike policy. With these victories behind him, Reuther came to St. Louis on May 9, and the newspapermen asked him to read my speech and comment upon it. As a result, he went into the conference in St. Louis, made a speech against John L. Lewis, said John L. Lewis was manipulating the grievances of the miners for his own personal ends, and then joined the conference in a unanimous reaffirmation of the no-strike policy.

Some people think that Walter Reuther has already seen the error of his ways. I want to warn the Auto Workers and the whole labor

movement that the difference between Walter Reuther and John L. Lewis is not so great as it appears. Lewis comes out in the open and Walter Reuther has a hypocritical mask on his face. He squirms around and tries to prevent anything from being on his record that could hold him to responsibility. But every active worker in the Automobile Workers Union knows that Walter Reuther is aiming to take control of the Auto Union and evidently is counting on the help of John L. Lewis as well as his Social-Democratic colleagues. He has encouraged his followers throughout the country to defend John L. Lewis and uses the example of Lewis to bring the airplane and tank workers of this country out on strike as quickly as possible.

It should be noted that even in his maneuvers Walter Reuther does not abandon even slightly the central point of his fight as a "new leader." That which he carefully maintains is his fight against the incentive wage. Why is this so important to Reuther that he does not even maneuver with this issue but stands pat 100 per cent against the incentive wage? The reason is that it is by their fight against the incentive wage that they have prevented the airplane and automotive workers from getting wage increases that would have made them immune to the strike moods. They fight against the incentive wage because that fight closes the door to the solution of the grievances of the mass of the workers, and with a closed door against any solution of the biggest wage problem of this

great body of workers you can keep them stirred up, you can get them excited over all the current issues of the day, you can get them desperate in feeling the only way out is strike. That is why Walter Reuther is fighting against the incentive wage in the airplane and automotive industry.

Walter Reuther knows just as well as anyone that the only way to raise the general level of earnings of the workers of his industry is either to break down the declared and established policies of the Roosevelt Administration and force a complete general readjustment of the economic policies of the government on a level of higher wages and higher prices, or adopt the incentive wage which would keep prices as they are and wage rates as they are but wage earnings increasing even beyond the demands that are now made by any of the unions. It is one way or the other—either accept the incentive wage or shatter the Roosevelt Administration's policies in the hope that out of it some wage increases might come even at the cost of a general release of prices.

Roosevelt is committed to the present policies and the breakdown of those policies in the face of the hostile Congress would mean a breakdown of the war effort. Even should the movement for strikes in an effort to force a breakdown of the Roosevelt economic policies not succeed immediately, it would destroy the effective power of leadership of the Roosevelt Administration in the war effort and prevent the opening of the Second Front,

and could bring about a general national crisis.

Walter Reuther knows all of that just as well as anybody else; he is not a stupid man; he is a very clever and very able man. If there is any clear objective result to the policy that he is pursuing, it is time the workers understand that Walt Reuther intends that result to come.

### *A Revealing Banquet*

For a direct formulation of these intentions, we can cite the words of Victor Reuther, Walter Reuther's brother and his collaborator, as well as the words of several of his associates delivered at a banquet on April 25. As far as we know, Walter Reuther has never broken with his brother Victor, or with his brother-in-crime, Norman Thomas, who uttered similar words and expressed similar sentiments as Victor at this banquet, which was held significantly enough in the city of Detroit. At this banquet Norman Thomas said, and Victor Reuther agreed, that "the winning of the war has been exalted too much. . . . The size of the Army is one of the greatest wastes of manpower with no reasonable justification for it. . . . Roosevelt is writing his speeches while Churchill interprets them and the youth of America have to die."

At the same banquet in Detroit, Matthew Smith, head of the Mechanics Educational Society of America, a company union, was one of the featured speakers. Here is the tenor of his remarks: The war was offensive to me when it was

started. . . . A matter of expediency should not allow any Socialist to support any war at all. . . . There is no excuse to be in the war any longer than such time as the other side is ready to quit, we haven't a lot to lose on either side of the war.

Drawing the practical conclusion of action from these general sentiments, Matt Smith said: "The M.E.S.A. has never accepted the no-strike clause. It is ready to drop it at the drop of a hat, and without even waiting for that." Walter Reuther is a little ashamed of his union; he's not so ready to drop the clause at the drop of a hat—he's got to get his union to drop the hat to drop the no-strike policy.

Matthew Smith said further: "We have the right to deliver ultimatums and take advantage of the shortage of labor now."

Victor Reuther, who is also an official of the U.A.W., of which his brother is one of the Vice Presidents, spoke next. If he said anything that was directly contrary to the wishes of his brother Walter, it would be something that has never happened before in their careers and what Victor Reuther said fits in exactly with what Walter Reuther is doing.

And Victor Reuther, Assistant Director of War Policy Division of the U.A.W., C.I.O., said at the Norman Thomas banquet: "I agree with many things that Matthew Smith has said; I used to make many of such speeches, years ago. I wish Matt Smith a great deal of success in his ideas." Victor Reuther elaborated on that. He attacked the whole idea of cooperation with the government on war policy for vic-

tory. He said that such policy is leading the labor movement into a blind alley. "Where does the union meet itself?" he declared. "I don't mind fighting McNutt, but some of our people are responsible for opening the door to such as the hold-the-line order. You cannot serve two masters." And then he made a conclusion of policy. He said: "I would rather see the C.I.O. washed up in a fight than to see it die slowly as a result of cooperation with the government. . . . The C.I.O. must fight the hold-the-line policy with whatever it takes to break that policy. . . . If the hold-the-line order is not withdrawn, the only thing to do is to announce to the government that we are withdrawing our no-strike pledge." With regard to labor participation in War Labor agencies, Victor Reuther said: "Maybe we ought to pull out and have the unions advance programs." That was the general recommendation for the labor movement of an action that the U.A.W. had already taken on the motion of Walter Reuther.

Tucker Smith, head of the Retail Clerks Union of Detroit, C.I.O., and old-time associate of Norman Thomas and former head of Brookwood College in New York State, also spoke. Pointing to a uniformed soldier in the audience, he said: "I don't like to see Socialists wearing the uniforms of a capitalist government. . . . It is unpleasant for me to support this war and I have to do it solely on the ground that it is a different kind of a war."

The same Tucker Smith referred to Victor Reuther's opinion that cooperation with the government's

war program leads to disaster, and said:

"Those of us in the C.I.O. who believe this, should take some steps to see that the leadership makes a break with this good fellow policy."

The "good fellows" who have to be changed or kicked out of the leadership of the labor movement he specified were first of all, Phil Murray and R. J. Thomas. And his friends, the *New Leader* in New York announced today, "Carey, Reuther Lead Union Drive for New Roosevelt Labor Policy."

#### *An Unmistakable Conspiracy*

It is clear by now that we are not dealing with misguided or short-sighted men who are just swept away by the pressure of a mass resentment of the labor movement because of an accumulation of grievances. We are dealing with a well-developed, organized conspiracy against the war, to prevent the solution of the grievances of labor and then to manipulate those grievances in order to whip up strike sentiment and a strike movement among the workers of this country, all directed toward one specific purpose—to create a crisis in the United States that will prevent the opening of the second front in Europe which will crack Hitler in 1943.

If you look over the speeches and the newspapers which represent the leadership and the development of this strike movement in the United States, you will find one feature common to all of them: Every

leader of this strike movement is hostile to the Soviet Union, wants to see the Soviet Union defeated, and most of them joined in the campaign against the Soviet Union on the Alter-Ehrlich case. It is not an accident that David Dubinsky himself, although he heads a union in an industry that has no significance for the war directly at all, went out of his way to help create strike atmosphere in the American labor movement by calling his dressmakers out on strike absolutely unnecessarily, not so many weeks ago in New York. The settlement of that strike had already been worked out before the strike was ever called. The only purpose of that strike was to spread the idea throughout America that the way to get settlements was to strike.

There are a large number of anti-labor employers in industry after industry who, on little grievances, are encouraging the workers to strike. And when they strike, they will settle the little grievances; if they won't strike, they don't settle anything. These employers want to help create the atmosphere of strike movements in the United States. The reactionary directors of the coal operators collaborated with John L. Lewis for preparing and provoking the mine strike. And if you read the reactionary columnists in the big newspapers in this country, you will find that they all have been repeating for weeks now with the most curious unanimity, that John L. Lewis is the outstanding leader of organized labor, congratulating him on

his achievements, and then ending up their columns with the conclusion that this means, of course, that we're going to have the anti-labor Smith Bill adopted by Congress very soon and everything will be hunky-dory.

Every one of these people who talk strike agrees not to mention any of the problems of the war. They are all agreed, in the words of Norman Thomas, that too much has been made about this question of victory; victory is not the important thing any more. Every one of them is agreed that it is more important to satisfy the immediate, particular demand or desire that is raised for discussion than any consideration about the conduct of the war. Every one of them is agreed that Lewis' friends are of course correct when they laugh at Phil Murray and say, "Phil Murray, he's a good fellow, but he's no leader." Every one of them is agreed that, "Roosevelt, of course we don't speak directly against him, but his policies, they have to be broken down." Every one of them is agreed that it is not worthwhile to talk about the crimes of Hitler; "after all, that's just war propaganda and you know from the last

war how things are exaggerated. Don't get excited about the wholesale enslavement of the working class of a dozen nations." Every one of them is agreed that we must get very excited, however, about Ehrlich and Alter, and every one of them sprang into action at the moment when the word went out from Berlin, "We're in a tight spot, boys. Go to it."

As long as this strike issue is before the country and the labor movement, I am going to avoid criticism of the Administration's labor policy. As for labor, it is clear that one of its first obligations is to clean its own house of defeatists and place itself solidly behind this war and take leadership in the conduct of the war. Because, after all, this is truly the nation's war and consequently labor's war. It is true that there are important parts of all other classes besides labor who want to win this war, just as much as labor does. But it is true that it is labor which is the most unanimous and the most trustworthy in the conduct of this war to victory.

This is labor's war. The no-strike policy is labor's policy, and labor is going to enforce that policy throughout the United States.



---

# THE VICTORY IN AFRICA

BY EUGENE DENNIS

**T**HE triumph of American and British arms in Tunisia, aided by French troops, has brought the Allied campaign in Africa to a victorious conclusion. The Italo-German coalition has suffered a serious defeat. The United Nations have won an important victory.

The immediate and direct military factors which determined the final outcome of the Anglo-American operations in Tunisia—the crowning climax of the African campaign—were the brilliant tactics of the Allied Command, under General Eisenhower; the unified strategy and coordinated blows of the combined British-American and the British Eighth Armies; the close and concerted action of the Allied air forces, troops and naval units; the preponderant air superiority of the Allies; the successful naval and air blockade which prevented Hitler from sending necessary reinforcements and supplies to Tunisia; and not least of all the courage and skill of the American, British and French soldiers, the first of whom acquired their fighting experience as “green” troops in combat against the seasoned veterans of Rommel and Messe.

Moreover, to a considerable ex-

tent, the Allied victory in Africa was facilitated by the fighting collaboration of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition which has grown during the past months. The epic struggle of the Red Army at Stalingrad, unmatched in history, just as the entire Soviet winter offensive, was a decisive factor in disrupting Rommel’s offensive in Egypt. It enabled the British Eighth Army to regroup its forces and go over to the offensive. This also made it impossible for Hitler to transfer the Luftwaffe or a single division from the Soviet-German front to Africa (in fact, due to the absence of a Second Front in Europe, Hitler was able to shift thirty divisions from western Europe to the Eastern front precisely during the Soviet winter offensive). All this, too, had a profound effect in enhancing the morale of the Anglo-American forces and in lowering the morale in the camp of the Axis, including among both the Nazi and Italian troops in Africa.

In this connection there can be no doubt but that the powerful British and American air attacks over Europe during this period, as well as the heroic struggle of the Yugoslav Partisans, also played a role in helping frustrate Hitler’s

plan to reinforce the Axis troops in Tunisia. Hitler had intended to continue to prolong resistance to the Allies in Africa, beyond the six months already obtained, thereby seeking to delay still further the opening of a Second Front in Europe. But these plans were wrecked, and not least of all, by the great striking power of America and Britain and by the common blows of the American-Soviet-British coalition.

\* \* \*

As a consequence of the African fighting, as well as due to the great Soviet winter offensive which facilitated its outcome, the German-Italian coalition has been further undermined and its disintegration accelerated. The Nazis and fascists have lost their African bases and armies. Hitler's plans to break through to the Near East and to effect a juncture with his Japanese partners in India—plans which were defeated by the Red Army at Stalingrad—now have been doubly shattered.

The Italian empire and Mussolini's dream of converting the Mediterranean into an Italian lake have gone up in the smoke of the Italo-German debacle in Libya, Tripolitania and Tunisia. Italy is on the verge of being knocked out of the war. The anti-Hitler forces and the national-liberation struggles in France, Spain and the Balkans have been directly encouraged and strengthened.

Above all, the victorious completion of the Anglo-American military operations in North Africa and

the increased and extensive Allied air raids on the key war centers of Germany and Italy, coupled with the decisive turn of the war on the Soviet-German front—have enhanced the strategic initiative which is now in the hands of the anti-Hitler coalition. *These have created additional prerequisites for, and have brought closer, the organization of a Second Front in Europe from the south as well as the west, near to the vital centers of Hitler Germany.*

There has now been established in Africa, especially at strategic points in the North, a series of important bases for conducting offensive operations in Southern and Southwestern Europe. Africa now constitutes a protected and well-equipped springboard for invading the European continent, second only in importance to England, from which an invasion of Europe is long awaited and over-due.

With the domination of the Mediterranean which the victory in Tunisia ensures, the Allies have safer and more effective communications. They have a shorter supply route to invasion points on the European continent, to the Near and Middle East, to extend aid to the Soviet Union via Iran, as well as to reinforce India and expedite the struggle against Japan in Burma and the Far East.

Moreover, now in Africa there exists a tested and skillful Allied army which is equipped and trained for offensive combat in Europe. And in addition to the American and British forces there has arisen the beginning of an anti-Hitler

French army in North Africa which, if united with the de Gaulle forces and the Fighting French National Committee, could add great force, weight and inspiration to the forces of Allied invasion.

And outstanding, of course, is the fact that the growth of American-Soviet-British *fighting collaboration* has now created further preconditions for launching new and powerful blows jointly from the East and the West. In other words, additional prerequisites have been created by the events in Africa, as well as on the Eastern Front, for combining the military efforts of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and Great Britain into united and coordinated blows against Nazi Germany which can jointly lead to the speedy defeat and collapse of Hitler and Hitler's Axis.

\* \* \*

In analyzing the significance of the African victory and the prospects which exist for immediately extending the Allied offensive to the continent of Europe, it is also necessary to bear in mind certain costly political-military lessons of the North African operations. Among these note should be taken of the following miscalculations and mistakes, all of which need to be avoided in the next phase of our offensive operations:

First, it is well to remember that the decision to invade North Africa which was made in July, 1942, thereby modifying the Roosevelt-Molotov - Churchill agreement reached in June, 1942, regarding the urgency of creating a sec-

ond front in Europe in 1942, was influenced by a mistaken Anglo-American military analysis of the situation on the Soviet-German front. At that time leading circles in London and Washington misjudged the character of the temporary advances of the Nazis in the summer fighting in 1942. Evidently they believed that the Nazis might capture Stalingrad and break through to the Caucasus and reach the Near East. Evidently they considered that the Nazis might succeed in "stabilizing" the Eastern Front in such a way as to enable them to divert sufficient forces from the East so as to cope with Allied landings in the West, as well as to reinforce Rommel in Egypt.

Certainly the defeat of the Nazis at Stalingrad and the subsequent Soviet winter offensive proved how unjustified and erroneous were such calculations. They clearly indicated that had Britain and America invaded Western Europe in November last, in coordination with the Red Army's winter offensive, not only the Afrika Korps would be smashed but that the Hitlerite armies in Europe would be, at least, on the verge of final catastrophe. They show, too, that if we had not waited to invade the continent until the completion of the North African campaign, the Nazis and their satellites would also be confronted now with imminent disaster and annihilation.

It is useful to mention this, not to minimize the important results of the African campaign, but so as to help ensure that the favorable situation which now exists for

hastening the defeat of Hitler Germany, as well as of fascist Italy, shall be speedily realized. For now, after Tunisia, after the recent mighty Allied and Soviet air raids, after the Soviet offensive in the Kuban area, voices are again being raised, such as Edwin James of the *New York Times*, counseling that a major Anglo-American land operation in Western Europe should once more be postponed, ostensibly until the outcome of the momentous summer fighting on the Soviet-German front has been decided. These are the voices of cautious calculation, of criminal procrastination, and of defeatism, which, if successful, would have us lose in 1943 the opportunity which we lost in 1942, namely, to defeat Hitler and smash his war machine.

Secondly, it was contended that, while the creation of a second front might be feasible in 1942, it would place too heavy a strain on Allied shipping and supplies, especially in view of the growing U-boat menace. But the African operations proved that ships and convoys were and are available. Moreover, the African campaign has shown the best way to cope with the U-boat menace. And this is, to supplement the production and use of destroyers, corvettes and naval patrols by liquidating the hornets' nests of the U-boats, such as were done at Bizerte and Tunis, through the medium of combined air raids and land assaults, particularly the latter.

Thirdly, it was claimed that obscure and questionable political intrigues and deals with Vichy and

Vichy elements in North Africa would facilitate an easy conquest of North Africa. But as the whole world knows, these political intrigues and policies delayed and jeopardized military operations in North Africa, as well as resulting in harmful political repercussions in the United Nations, particularly within Africa and France.

It is no secret that the policy of Darlanism pursued by our State Department delayed the final victory in Tunisia. It helped prevent an all-out assault on Bizerte and Tunis in November-December, 1942. It held back the most rapid and complete coordination of American and British forces in North Africa, which was not fully secured until the final phases of the campaign. It obstructed the unification of the anti-Hitler French forces and delayed the formation of a formidable French army on African soil. It still operates to becloud the Allied victory in North Africa proper, to retard the democratization of Algiers and Morocco, the complete liberation of all anti-fascist prisoners, and injures the fullest mobilization and complete unity of all anti-Hitlerites in France.

It is essential to comment on this because now, for instance, as we prepare to invade Italy, Greece, France, Yugoslavia, etc., it is high time that we learn a simple truth of this people's war of national liberation. Whatever deals and commitments it may be expedient or necessary to make with certain upper circles in these countries—and some such deals can and should be consummated in the interests of de-

stroying Hitlerism — the Allies should rely upon offensive military action and upon mobilizing the popular anti-fascist forces.

This, for example, is the case in respect to Italy. For to withdraw Italy from the Axis coalition, from Hitler's war, it will be necessary to invade Italy and to activate and depend upon the staunch anti-fascists. It will be necessary to depend, in the first place, upon the working people, upon those who will sacrifice and struggle consistently against the Hitlerite enslavers. It will not depend primarily or so much upon those who have worked in collaboration and collusion with Mussolini and Hitler, and who now, under the duress of the war, in view of the turn of the war in favor of a United Nations victory, seek to scuttle the sinking ship of fascism.

Fourthly, it was said that a major landing in Europe would be easier in 1943 than in 1942. But, as all can see, the delay in attacking in the west from England and in extending the African offensive to Europe has enabled Hitler further to fortify the continent. The longer the decisive second front is delayed the costlier will be the undertaking.

The defeat of Hitler will not come automatically or by easy stages. The theory of "stages," of "stepping stones," of conquering Europe "piecemeal," is false and deceptive. It delays and jeopardizes victory. Hitler-Germany will be defeated, will be destroyed, by concerted blows at its heart, at its vital centers. Whereas the defeat of the Nazis will be postponed and victory endangered by blows which are

confined to its periphery, to its outposts, and which are disconnected in time from the key blows of the Red Army that are leveled on the decisive Eastern front of the war.

\* \* \*

At this writing, Roosevelt and Churchill are meeting in conference with their chiefs of staff. It can be expected, on the basis of established governmental policy and all current indications, that the main orientation and direction of the forthcoming Anglo-American blows will continue to be directed chiefly against Hitler Germany. Steps may be taken to reinforce the attacks against Japanese militarism in the Pacific and the Far East, but this subordinate to the extension of the Anglo-American offensive from Africa and from our "advanced fighting base" in England to the continent of Europe. As the President stated on May 13 in reply to Premier Stalin's congratulations on the Allied victory in Tunisia, ". . . now that we have the initiative, it is reasonable to expect further successes on both the Eastern and Western fronts and further supplies, including air."

There is, however, much speculation concerning the next military objectives. Some people talk of the certainty of the imminence of a major and decisive Allied attack during the next few months in Western Europe. This is possible, though it is not yet assured. Nonetheless, all visible indications would seem to point rather to the extension of the Allied offensive in its next phase during the key summer

months, primarily into the European Mediterranean area. That is, there are substantial grounds for giving credence to the estimates of competent American military observers that the approaching Anglo-American invasion of Europe which draws nigh may start in Sicily, Sardinia, Crete and Greece, though these may also be accompanied by a simultaneous blow in Norway or a diversion in Northwestern Europe. And, of course, there is ample evidence that still heavier and more damaging blows against the main war industry centers of the German-Italo coalition, and against possible invasion points in occupied Europe, will be speedily and systematically stepped up and delivered on a larger scale by the air forces of our country and Britain.

In other words, what does appear probable at this moment is that the next Allied land operations in the West during the summer fighting most likely will be blows struck at the periphery of the European continent, chiefly in southern and southeastern Europe; at least it is still unclear precisely how soon major and decisive blows may be delivered at the heart of Hitler's Axis in Western Europe.

Be this at it may, it cannot be overlooked that in certain powerful circles in Washington and London there are still views, influenced by the defeatists and cautious calculators, that "time works for our side"; that the decisive Anglo-American blow should be delivered in 1944 or 1945, instead of this year; that Nazi Germany should be

weakened still further by blows of the Soviet Union before we attack "Festung Europa"; that since the defensive and offensive powers of the Red Army are growing it may be advantageous for us to accumulate further strength and new reserves, simultaneously consolidating our positions and influence, for instance, in Africa, southern Europe, the Balkans and the Middle East; that now "we should concentrate less" on defeating the Hitlerites, the center of the Axis, and should devote "more attention to the Far East."

Obviously, such false and dangerous views are not in harmony with but run counter to the main orientation and the direction of the major military strategy of the Roosevelt Administration and the Churchill Government. Such views and influences, as mentioned above, those calculated, among other things, to again postpone decisive action in western Europe, should and can be overcome. These can and may be altered by the progress of the Red Army on the decisive Eastern Front; by the course of the mounting national-liberation struggles in Europe; by the speed and force with which each new front on the periphery of Europe is developed; and not least of all, by the clarity, unity and vigor of the people's movement for strengthening national unity around our Commander-in-Chief, for combating the defeatists, for developing the impending Anglo-American invasion of Europe into a major military operation directed against the key centers of Hitler's Axis, in the West as well as the

South, in coordination with the Soviet offensive from the East.

\* \* \*

Now more than ever the mass movement of labor and the people for the second front should be reinforced. Stern, difficult and stubborn military and political struggles lie ahead. The African campaign is only a step on the road to victory. Crucial battles are approaching on the decisive Eastern Front where the Nazis continue to concentrate their maximum forces and striking power. Important Anglo-American operations are in the making. If the existing prerequisites for speeding the defeat of the Hitlerites are to be realized, then the blows against Hitler from the East and West must now be fully synchronized and concentrated against the vital centers of Nazi Germany.

To carry out the military decisions already arrived at by the President and Prime Minister Churchill necessitates the maximum mobilization of labor and the people. And to ensure the most rapid extension of the Anglo-American offensive to the heart as well as the periphery of Europe demands greater and not less political activity of the masses to help implement and influence the Administration's war policies, and to sustain the President's hand against both the defeatists and the counselors of cautious calculation.

The military decisions of the government and the High Command can be advanced or retarded, as was shown by the outcome of the June 11 and the Casablanca decisions. Not

least of all, these will be affected by the success of the mass political struggles waged by labor, in alliance with all other anti-fascists and win-the-war forces, against the defeatists and appeasers within the country.

The defeatists are now desperately at work to revise and circumvent the decisions of Washington and London to extend our offensive operations to the European continent. So far they have not succeeded in determining the main direction of our military blows. But they have been successful in delaying action, in creating countless difficulties. They have succeeded up to now in limiting the extension, force and tempo of our military action.

Today, seeking to provoke and exploit anti-Soviet and anti-British bogeys and prejudices, as well as the timid philosophy of the cautious calculators, they counsel postponing decisive blows till 1944 or later. They are vigorously advocating a suicidal and traitorous revision of our war strategy, and echoing Berlin, as well as Bullitt's "carrot and the club" thesis, call for concentrating our main blows against Japan, so as to try and disrupt the unity of the anti-Hitler coalition, so as to avert defeat for both the Nazis and their Japanese partners. They pose the extension of material aid to the Soviet Union as standing in opposition to the task of organizing the second front. They assiduously campaign for a "negotiated peace" with Hitler's slave-order and strive to undermine our Commander-in-Chief and the national war effort at home.

Therefore, now more than ever, the popular movement for the second front now must become one of help guaranteeing the earliest and *complete fulfillment* of the military decisions of our government; one of organizing the most active public support in behalf of, and for *implementing* the policy of our Commander-in-Chief for carrying forward and extending immediately the fight against Hitler Germany to the continent of Europe. This movement should be crystallized into mobilizing full support for the opening of the new Anglo-American fronts now planned or being undertaken, and for the most energetic, resolute and successful prosecution of these new military enterprises. This movement should profit by the lessons of our African campaign, should seek to avoid the mistakes and miscalculations which were made there both in the political and military spheres. It should strive to organize support for *combining* the conduct of aggressive military operations against Italy, the Balkans or northern Europe *with the launching of a decisive, all-out offensive in western Europe, in conjunction with the summer campaign of the Red Army*, simultaneously reinforcing the struggle against Japanese militarism.

Moreover, the people's movement for the second front requires that a more serious and stubborn political struggle should now be waged against all and sundry exponents of a "negotiated peace" with Hitler's Axis, against the Ehrlich-Alter conspirators, against the opponents of

international labor unity, and against all anti-Soviet baiters and Anglophobes. New efforts are being made to disrupt the unity of the United Nations, especially of its leading coalition of America, the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Franco's latest bid for a "compromise peace" and for a new coalition to combat the "menace of communism" is a straw in the wind. The defeatist conspiracy organized by and around John L. Lewis to try and obstruct war production and create internal disunity as a means of impeding the national war effort, of undermining the Commander-in-Chief and of enhancing the position of the Hoovers and du Ponts further dramatizes the seriousness of the situation. It confirms the urgency for continuing and reinforcing the mass movement supporting the immediate invasion of Europe.

The strengthening of the popular movement, headed by the working class, for the second front likewise requires that greater attention shall be given to the achievement of new goals on the production front. It necessitates a marked rise in war production to meet the requirements of our expanding military operations and of those of our Allies. It makes necessary the assurance of uninterrupted production, the defeat of the Lewis-Woll-Reuther strike provocations, the continuance of labor's no-strike policy, real progress toward achieving over-all economic stabilization and a centralized war economy, and the forging of more effective labor



and national unity around our Commander-in-Chief in furtherance of our nation's war objectives.

It is therefore clear that the success of our new military efforts in Europe, the task of establishing now, this summer, the cardinal second front, the further development and consolidation of the American-Soviet-British coalition, as well as the strengthening of national unity for victory—require that the mass movement for the second front in Europe from the west as well as the south, should be intensified and broadened, that the people, especially labor, should intervene more actively and firmly in the political life of the nation, backing up and implementing the anti-Hitler and victory orientation and decisions of our government and nation.

For it should be remembered, as Stalin emphasized on May First, while—

“. . . the Germano-Italian fascist camp is undergoing a severe crisis and is facing catastrophe. . . . This does not yet mean, of course, that the catastrophe of Hitler Germany has already arrived. Not at all. Hitler Germany and her army are shaken and undergoing a crisis; but they are not yet smashed. It would be naive to think that the catastrophe will come automatically and spontaneously. Two or three more powerful blows from the west and east, such as that inflicted upon the Hitler army in the last five or six months, are necessary for the catastrophe of Hitler Germany to become real.”

\* \* \*

Joseph Stalin, in the same historic Order of the Day on May First, stated that in conjunction with the Soviet winter campaign, the victorious actions of the Anglo-American troops in Africa, and the growing blows of the Anglo-American air force in Europe, it was possible “for the first time in this war” that “the blow delivered by the Red Army in the East was merged with the blow delivered by the troops of our allies in the west into a united, common blow. . . .”

This signifies that a new and most important development has already taken place in the war, in the strengthening of the fighting alliance of the leading anti-Hitler coalition, in the developing coalition warfare now taking place between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain. As Stalin pointed out—“All these facts taken together have shaken the Hitler war machine to its foundations, changed the course of the world war and created the necessary prerequisites for victory over Hitler Germany. . . .”

But this does not yet mean that victory is won, or that the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain have already forged a unified strategy and fully coordinated military action. Heavy battles still must be fought. Hitler's Axis, Hitlerism, must still be destroyed.

The relations among the members of the anti-Hitler coalition have undoubtedly improved. It would seem that a general *understanding*, though not yet complete agreement, exists among the coalition regarding military strategy.

Clearly, there is not yet full

agreement, otherwise the second front against the vital centers of Hitler Germany would now, or long since, have been opened as a major, all-out offensive. Otherwise American relations with Mannerheim-Finland and Franco-Spain would have been radically changed. However, this is not yet the case.

What we have witnessed in the recent period—in the combined struggles of the Red Army, the Anglo-American armies in Africa, and the mounting air raids in Europe—is the *beginning* of coalition warfare but not yet full, coordinated coalition war. What we see, important as it is, is the striking of a united, common blow—but not yet the attainment of a single, completely unified strategy embracing the timing, scale and force of the *major blows, resources and the total war efforts of all members of the anti-Hitler coalition, directed in coordination against the core and center of the Axis—Nazi Germany.*

A common, unified strategy must still be obtained. The complete coordination of Anglo-Soviet-American military action must yet be realized. The conditions for realizing this are improving. This is evidenced by the actions and preparations now being organized to ex-

tend American and British offensive operations to the continent of Europe, in important operations which may and should take place simultaneously with the crucial summer campaign and fighting of the valiant Red Army on the decisive Soviet-German Front. This is seen by the character and widening scope of the Anglo-American air raids over Europe. This is testified to by the recent augmenting of Lend-Lease aid to the Soviet Union. This is also evidenced by the clarification of the political atmosphere arising from the suspension of Soviet relations with the pro-fascist Polish government-in-exile.

However, it is still essential and urgent that everything should be done, that all patriots, that all anti-Hitlerites, should continue to press resolutely and vigorously for a completely unified fighting strategy, for ensuring the maximum and timely concerted military action of our country and its Soviet and British Allies. This is vital today in view of the new and decisive battles approaching on the Eastern front. This is imperative for using the existing prerequisites to deliver the decisive blow against the Hitlerites this year, for winning victory. This is the way to prepare for a just and durable peace.

---

## THE CRISIS IN FASCIST UPPER CIRCLES IN ITALY\*

BY M. ERCOLI

**L**AST February news of the re-organization of the Italian Government spread through Italy and the whole world. With the exception of several obscure minor officials the only minister to retain his post was Mussolini. The rest were dismissed. At the same time the Chief of the General Staff of the Italian Army, Marshal Caballero, was also removed.

This time Mussolini considered it necessary to get rid, in the first place, of those people who were more or less closely connected with various groups of public opinion who critically estimated the situation in the country. The Minister of Finance, Taon de Revel, unquestionably personified the fascist plutocrat. A big industrialist and financier, he was sponsor of the very same financial policy which in less than three years had boosted the country's national debt to more than three times Italy's annual revenue. This policy enabled the fascist state to finance war by appropriating billions in small savings.

Considerable industrial and financial circles are beginning to understand that there is a limit to this

policy, beyond which bankruptcy begins. These circles regard with alarm the destruction of Italy's economic and trading positions in the whole world and in Europe: Some of these positions were abolished with one blow three years ago, and others were seized by voracious German imperialism, pursuing its expansion in keeping with the "New Order" in Europe. That is why these circles in Italy looked to the future with the greatest apprehension.

A trusted man and direct representative of these circles could no longer be Mussolini's trusted man and consequently his Minister.

Grandi and Bottai—the former was Minister of Justice and the latter Minister of Public Education—were unquestionably representatives of the Fascist Party second only in importance to Mussolini. But Grandi has on his "conscience" the fact that at another period critical for the fascist movement he headed all those in the Fascist Party who mistrusted Mussolini. As regards Bottai, just as luck would have it, before the present crisis he deemed it necessary to begin a campaign for personal responsibility of everyone, including also the fascist rulers, for his own actions, and to

---

\* Written before the latest Allied victories in Tunisia.—Ed.

campaign for "restoration of freedom of criticism." It is obvious that this campaign was not very much to the liking of Mussolini, directly responsible as he is for all political and military disasters which have befallen the country since the beginning of the war.

The dismissed Riccardi and Ricci, ex-Ministers of Economy and Corporations respectively, could be regarded as typical representatives and leaders of an apparatus consisting partly of profiteers and demagogues, and partly of corrupt bureaucrats placed by fascism over the country's productive forces in order to subordinate them to itself.

But the most characteristic figures of present-day Italy are Foreign Minister Ciano and Chief of General Staff Caballero. General Caballero, better known as a shareholder in heavy industry and exchange-profitier, was appointed to his military post solely because he was Mussolini's evil genius in the organization of the military disaster in Greece and Albania in 1940-41. An obedient servant of the German General Staff, he supplied Hitler with the whole Italian Army for the Soviet-German front.

Ciano signed the "Steel Pact." Moreover he is Mussolini's son-in-law. Having given his daughter in marriage with Ciano, Mussolini gained access to narrow circles of magnates in heavy industry and shipbuilding.

\* \* \*

Wherein lies the explanation of the fact that Mussolini could not trust even these people and was

compelled to get rid of them? The only acceptable explanation is that these people are backed by influential circles of the big Italian monopolist bourgeoisie. Together with Mussolini these circles were permeated with an expansionist and belligerent spirit. They represented the only category which derived concrete advantages in the form of thousands of millions of super-profits from the war waged by Italy in the interests of the German imperialists.

But Italy's heavy industry is also having a hard time at present. Its crisis is due partly to lack of raw materials which Germany no longer can or wants to supply, partly to the impossibility of replacing equipment. It is beginning to feel devastating blows as a result of the first serious Anglo-American air raids.

The opposition circles in the Italian bourgeoisie see that all of Italy's colonies have been lost and that, following all of Mussolini's defeats, conquests are out of the question. Those who began this war, calculating on conquering and plundering the East and West, have only brought the hurricane of war to the territory of Italy proper.

The popular masses justly consider the groups of imperialist plutocracy mainly responsible for the catastrophe. Feeling the approach of the storm, they too are beginning to look for a way to salvation. And Mussolini is increasingly feeling the waning enthusiasm for the policy of the country's servile submission to Hitler Germany.

Surrounded, if not as yet by open

opposition, then at least by distrust which has penetrated considerable sections of Italian public opinion, Mussolini was thus compelled to oust all his Ministers. He replaced them by his own person. He personally took over all politically important Ministries and placed at the head of other Ministries formerly unknown bureaucrats.

Such is Mussolini's new government. At a time when every day finds the people growing more and more weary of war and its consequences, at a time when the ruling classes are themselves beginning to doubt the expediency of continuing a policy which may lead Italy to catastrophe and doom, Mussolini's new government is a government of violence, of bureaucracy and fascist militia, systematically enforced to plunge a "stubborn" nation completely into the abyss.

After two and a half years of war, Mussolini can credit himself with so many defeats and disasters that even in the upper circles of fascist society a vacuum is beginning to form around him. Defeat and liquidation of the army which the Italian Government, on Hitler's orders, sent to fight on the Soviet-German front have added a new disgrace to the long list of Mussolini's vile deeds and constitute one of the main reasons which led to the reorganization of the government.

\* \* \*

Beginning February, 1943, the Italian Army in Russia ceased to exist. Mussolini was able to add to

his army's death roll another 175,000 killed, wounded and prisoners. He refrained from communicating news of these losses to the Italian people. But news leaked through from the barracks, camps and hospitals and became widely known among the people. A cry of indignation against Mussolini's vile adventure was ready to burst everywhere. The people were bent on learning the truth at any cost and Mussolini was again obliged to break his silence.

In a new communiqué published after the "return" of the Italian army home, Mussolini stated that in January and February alone Italian troops on the Soviet-German front had lost more than 100,000 men. In another communiqué he admitted that six Generals, twenty-three Colonels and a militia consul were killed on the Soviet-German front. However, he continues to maintain silence about December, that is, the month when the Italians were subjected to the most deadly attack.

"The defeat sustained by Italy on the Soviet-German Front," stated Colonel Luigi Longo, Commander of the Third Regiment of Motorized Infantry of the Division Celere, taken prisoner by the Red Army, "is incomparably more terrible than the defeat suffered by the Italian army at Caporetto in 1917."

This estimate is correct. Actually the Italian Army received crushing blows after it had sustained a number of major military defeats. In other words the fascist regime has revealed its utter incapability

to conduct any serious military campaign.

The Italian people do not approve of the predatory adventures of fascism, they do not intend to sacrifice their lives for them. The outstanding testimony, not only of the soldiers, but even the higher officers taken prisoner on the Soviet-German front is exactly this state of profound indifference and hostility to all Mussolini's delicious dreams about Empire.

"I know nothing about war aims. I didn't in the least understand what I must fight for," stated Colonel Mario Bianchi of the 28th Infantry Regiment. "There wasn't the slightest cause for war between the Soviet Union and Italy," said Colonel Giovanni Goldini of the 37th Infantry Regiment, while Major Ettore Contelli Bonanno of the Torini Division said, "This is not a People's War, it's a war of the fascist clique."

On December 31, 1942, 4,000 Italians, taken prisoner, gathered in the rear of the Soviet-German front. To the question, "Who among you considers the war against Russia profitable for Italy," not a single hand was lifted in assent. The most widespread conviction among these soldiers, which they voice as soon as the fascist discipline which ties them down disappears, is that Mussolini sent them to the Soviet Union as "sold cannon-fodder"—an expression widespread among the Italian army and people.

The same Colonel Longo told that during the Red Army's offensive a German officer put a revolver to his temple and German soldiers threat-

ened to machine-gun Italian soldiers.

There is a deep gulf between Mussolini's promise to win empire and today's reality when German officers and soldiers are driving Italian hirelings and slaves to certain death in the interests of German imperialism.

Such is the lesson learned by the soldiers and officers of the Italian Army in the Soviet Union.

Muffled and partly, as yet, unconscious, but growing indignation at the fascist policy as a whole, humiliation at the sight of how Mussolini sold out Italian soldiers to the Germans, profound mockery of national feeling by shameful German slavery—such are the elements which have rendered the rout of the Italian army on the Soviet-German front politically and morally more grave than the defeat at Caporetto.

\* \* \*

Today the war has acquired a quite concrete and direct meaning for many millions of Italians: It is threatening them with the constant menace of death in their own city, in their own home. Beginning November 1, major raids have been made on the big industrial centers in North Milan and Turin. Every time the front in Africa rolled several hundred of kilometers to the West it was accompanied by a corresponding extension of the zone of Italy which has become a theater of military operations. This zone includes, among others, Sicily, Sardinia, and all of Southern Italy,

that is, the poorest part of the country and moreover a section always known for its separatist tendencies. For more than fifty years after the political unification of the Italian Kingdom the Rome Government regarded these districts as territories to be exploited and plundered in the interests of the welfare and profits of the reactionary and plutocratic clique. Italy's imperialist bourgeoisie invested hundreds of millions in senseless colonial campaigns; Mussolini and his gang of blackshirt sharks squandered tens of millions for building highways in Ethiopia and preparations for war to conquer Africa. In the meantime Sicily, Sardinia and the South of Italy continued a pitiful existence without highways and railways, without dwellings, schools or port facilities. Today the cities and ports of Sardinia, Sicily and the south are crumbling to heaps of debris and the population looks with horror to the future.

With the completion of the Tunisian adventure Italy may soon become the arena of military operations, not only as regards air raids on her territory, but in the fullest sense of this word. Thus a new problem is arising before the Italian people, that of facing war at home.

It is doubtful whether Italy politically will be able to withstand this blow as an integral state. Not in vain do Italian soldiers, taken prisoner on the Soviet-German front, tell about the movement among the petty and middle bourgeoisie in Sicily demanding separation of Sicily from fascist Italy. Mussolini replied to this movement

with mass arrests and executions, but terror will not bring him any results. The population of Sicily, Sardinia and Southern Italy, which has never been fascist, on whom fascism has been forced with the aid of punitive expeditions from the continent, and who now regard fascism as the direct cause of their ruin, will welcome British and American troops should they land in Italy.

But the same problem, and in the same form, is also facing the whole of Italy, that is, not only the working class and the working people as a whole, not only the anti-fascists but all the citizens to any extent conscious of Italy's national interests.

The countries of the anti-Hitler coalition have never advanced and never will advance any demand contrary to the interests and dignity of Italy. They are merely pursuing the rout of German imperialism, the destruction of Hitlerite tyranny and the restoration of the freedom and independence of all the nations of Europe. All this is directly in accord with the interests of the Italian people and the Italian state.

If, despite the inevitable prospect of the war being shifted to the territory of Italy proper, the prospect of the devastation of the country and new disastrous defeats for its army, Italy still continues the war, it is due to two reasons. Firstly, Germany compels Italy to continue to fight on to disaster and death. The second reason is that Mussolini and his clique are clinging tooth and nail to power in Italy. And the main reason is that the forces which

must overthrow Mussolini and his gang have not yet matured.

For Germany, Italy's withdrawal from the war today would mean the collapse of her position in the Balkans and the immediate necessity to fortify Southern Germany's frontiers. Naturally, Hitler is bent on preventing this at all costs.

The only way to salvation for Italy and the Italians is to overthrow the power of Mussolini and his entire gang of fascist dignitaries. These people have shown thousands of times over and over again that they represent a caste of the most ungifted, corrupt, irresponsible rulers ever known in Italian history. In war and in international relations they brought about only the defeat and humiliation of Italy. They are ending their career of ill-starred conquerors, as the boot-blacks of German imperialism.

\* \* \*

As regards Italy's internal situation, it is hard to find another country with greater disorder and graver chaos. Only a fascist government would be able to bring a country to such a state, with its policy which condemns people to death from bombs, forces masses of people to go to Germany to work for the Germans and compels people to live on a hunger ration of 150 grams of bread daily, a policy which systematically and stubbornly is defending the interests of the plutocrats of war industry, who feathered themselves a nest in the state apparatus and in the leadership of

fascist organizations. A staggering state debt, inflation, and the disappearance of foodstuffs and articles of consumption from the markets, triumphs of the black market—all these are facts against which the government, according to its own admission, is powerless to do anything.

To preserve this regime and rule of the country, it is by no means worth while to go to certain disaster. This truth is dawning on many representatives of the ruling classes, who preferred to leave Mussolini alone with his squadristas at the head of the government; it is being realized more and more by a wide section of the population, beginning with groups affiliated to fascist organizations. This is attested by the struggle against "defeatism" in the fascist organizations, from which "defeatists" are being expelled in tens of thousands.

From October, 1942, to February 28, 1943, the membership of the Fascist Party declined by 2,000,000, and the membership of the youth organizations by 5,000,000. (According to available information, 1,000,000 members of these organizations are in the army.) The masses of people are turning their backs on Mussolini and fascism. Nevertheless, this clear manifestation of disgust with the fascist regime, like the sabotage pursued by the peasants with regard to the requisition of agricultural produce, like the flight of workers from the factories, acquiring a mass character, despite the militarization of all workers and threats of imprisonment remains as yet at a stage of passive opposition



and passive resistance to the policy of war and catastrophe pursued by Mussolini.

With such means as passive resistance, the expression of "defeatist" viewpoints, it is impossible to overthrow Mussolini's despotic government, impossible to break the chains of German slavery, to put an end to war, to save Italy from doom.

Following the reorganization of his government, Mussolini began without any scruples to make preparations for the use of all arms to suppress open rebellion by the people. To the leadership of his organizations he appointed the most hated jailers and murderers of the early period of fascism, speeding up the formation of his battalions specially trained for civil war. It is clear the moment is coming when the popular masses—workers, soldiers and peasants—must in an organized way, under the leadership of the bravest anti-fascists, begin at the cost of any sacrifices an open struggle for the overthrow of Mussolini.

Among the officers in the army and navy, the Catholic bourgeoisie, monarchist circles, industrialists and intelligentsia and even among the fascist cadres, there is a growing number of those who realize the necessity for Italy to break with Germany before it is too late, the necessity to save the country from devastation, to put an end to the war. But these opposition elements will begin to act only under the impact of a broad and strong mass movement.

The objective conditions for

creating a broad front of the national forces resolved on bringing the country out of the war by overthrowing Mussolini exist. But such a front will be created only when strikes break out and big street demonstrations of workers occur, when in the city, countryside and army rebellion breaks out against the fascist government, when group after group of dauntless anti-fascists throughout the country develop the struggle by every means to smash the war machine and the state apparatus of Mussolini.

Therefore a decisive struggle for rooting out every manifestation of passivity and inertness, especially in the ranks of the working class and among the anti-fascists, remains the principal task of those who today really want to play in Italy the role of vanguard of the whole nation, of the whole country in battle against the shameful fascist tyranny.

An example which must be followed has been set by the Turin anti-fascists, who, defying death sentences (three were executed immediately following the trial), organized in the first half of March of this year a strike of 30,000 workers of the Fiat plant, under the slogan, "Long Live Peace!" An example was set by the brave men who in the center of Naples blew up the biggest German munitions dump in the city. An example was set by groups of the National Front in Trieste, Venice and Giulia, who concluded an agreement with the guerrillas of Croatia and Slovenia on mutual aid and struggle with all means against Mussolini's militia.

These are facts which testify to the pressure in Italy of groups who are beginning to understand and fulfill their duty as fighters against fascism, but their action still is of a sporadic and inadequately broad character. It is up to the Italian people today to save Italy. It depends on the people's ability to adopt rapidly a decision on the ability to conduct a bold struggle for overthrowing the shameful yoke of tyranny weighing it down for over twenty years, and to regain the right to join the family of free peoples.

No agitational and organizational efforts, no sacrifices are too great today when it is a question of helping the triumph of this cause. This is what must be understood today by every Italian, every worker, every anti-fascist, every patriot worthy of this name.

The Italian people must deliver to the hated fascist regime and to Mussolini a blow that will drive it into the grave for good. That is why it is in the interest of the people to give every support to the blow being prepared against fascist Italy from without.

---

## THE PROVOCATION OF THE POLISH REACTIONARIES

BY HANS BERGER

NUMEROUS individuals and the newspapers have indulged in more or less would-be ingenious speculations as to the reason that the Soviet Union has broken off relations with the so-called Polish National Government in London. The grounds offered by the Soviet Union for this break did not suffice them. Some—not the least among them, of course, the *New York Times*—even went so far as to ascribe to the Soviet Union the motive of alleged opposition to an independent and free Poland. Stalin's letter to the Moscow correspondent of the *New York Times* clearly and succinctly reasserted the position of the Soviet Union with reference to the reconstruction of an independent Poland. To Mr. Ralph Parker's question:

"Does the Government of the U.S.S.R. desire to see a strong and independent Poland after the defeat of Hitler's Germany?"

Stalin replied:

"Unquestionably it does."

To the further question:

"On what fundaments is it your opinion that the relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. should be based after the war?"

Stalin replied:

"Upon the fundament of solid good neighborly relations and mutual respect, or, should the Polish people so desire, upon the fundament of an alliance providing for mutual assistance against the Germans as the chief enemies of the Soviet Union and Poland."

Thus Stalin reaffirmed, in this letter, the declaration he had made at the conclusion of the pact with General Sikorski in December, 1941, now developing it, and thereby expressly emphasizing the fact that the break in relations with the so-called Polish Government-in-Exile in London in no wise affected the attitude of the Soviet Union in regard to the question of the reconstitution of a strong and independent Poland. This position is in no way a surprise to anyone familiar with the Leninist-Stalinist principles of Soviet policy in regard to the question of nationalities.

The *New York Times* is pleased to note that Stalin, in this letter,

does not touch on the boundary question. We find this quite obvious, since for the Soviet Union there can exist but one boundary question, namely, that of the destruction and expulsion of the German invaders. This boundary question the Soviet Union discusses with its foes by means of artillery, infantry, and cavalry. But, one might perhaps argue, we have not recognized the Western border of the Soviet Union. This is certainly regrettable, but it in no way alters the situation. We recognized the Soviet Union only in 1933; yet it endured and developed. And it is to be hoped that in the best interests of the growth of our friendship with the Soviet Union we make amends for our neglect and recognize the Soviet Union as a whole, that is, as it was constituted prior to Hitler's invasion; for our ally is the *entire* Soviet Union, which adheres to and will remain our friend if we do not disturb this growing relationship with methods used in the past for that purpose.

It requires no Atlantic Charter or recognition to determine the frontiers of the United States. We are not a "geographical concept" but a sovereign state, whose frontiers are marked on a map—frontiers which we are defending with all the means at our command against the German and Japanese imperialists. Nor is the Soviet Union, with which we are allied, a "geographical concept," as the Nazis are finding out to their grief. Therefore the sovereign Soviet Union does not require, any more than we do, an Atlantic Charter or

recognition in order to establish the geographical boundaries of its land. Consequently, for the peoples of the Soviet Union and their elected government there is no boundary question to be discussed with friends.

Hence, it was not because of a change in attitude toward the question of a future free and independent Poland, or because of any "boundary question," that the Soviet Union suspended relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile. It did this because the Polish government, in its propaganda, intrigues, and overt acts against the Soviet Union, had made common cause with the Nazis, and thereby robbed the pact of any valid basis.

In July, 1941, the Soviet Union concluded a pact with General Sikorski, as the representative of the Polish Government-in-Exile, a pact of war against Hitler-Germany. According to this pact, all questions of boundaries were to be left to the future. The Soviet Union undertook to provide the Polish government with facilities for organizing upon Soviet soil a Polish army for struggle against Hitler. The Soviet Union concluded this pact with the Polish Government-in-Exile although it knew that in that government there was a coalition of arch-reactionary landed proprietors and reactionary army officers who had formerly carried on a systematic policy of hostility toward the Soviet Union, while manifesting at the same time marked pro-German and pro-Nazi tendencies. In the very conclusion of this pact even with such a government, the Soviet Union explicitly stressed its wish

to see, after the victory over Hitler, an "independent and strong Poland" reconstituted.

Had the Polish Government-in-Exile under the leadership of General Sikorski loyally lived up to the Polish-Soviet Pact, had it desisted from falling back into the old tradition of its policy of anti-Soviet hostility, had it exerted itself to maintain friendly relations with that land upon whose fighting strength above all others depended the emancipation of Poland also, there would have been obviated any need for a breach in its relations with the Soviet Union.

But the arch-reactionary Polish circles, represented by the Government-in-Exile, just like the Prussian junkers, or the Japanese samurai, are unteachable. Very soon after the conclusion of the pact they began, in England as well as in the United States, a bitter incitement against the Soviet Union and against General Sikorski, whom they reproached with being "too conciliatory" toward the Soviet Union. Both in the United States and in England as well as in other countries, they allied themselves with every anti-Soviet force—with the America Firsters, with fascist-minded Slovaks, with Ukrainian White Guards friendly toward the Nazis, with all that hated the Soviet Union and wished to see her downfall. The former lecturer at the University of Cracow, Mr. Oscar Lange, at present professor at the University of Chicago, described, in the *New York Herald Tribune* of April 29, the activities of the Polish reactionaries as follows:

"The very signing of the Polish-Soviet agreement in July, 1941, was accompanied by a crisis in the Polish Government-in-Exile. The opponents of the agreement, the leaders of which were mostly members of the former 'colonel's regime' and adherents of Colonel Beck's policy, or members of the definitely fascist 'nationalist camp,' had started an embittered opposition against General Sikorski's foreign policy. This opposition organized its center in the United States and is led by Colonel Matuszewski. It has been doing much damage to the morale of Americans of Polish descent, among whom it is building up strong emotions against our Soviet, Czechoslovak and British allies. . . .

"In the spring of 1942 strong anti-Soviet sentiments were expressed in the National Council. A resolution stressing the claim to pre-war eastern frontiers was passed in December, 1942. Another resolution was passed in February, 1943. In none of these resolutions was there any mention of the Ukrainian and White Ruthenian populations which form the majority in the disputed territories.

"At the same time a constant anti-Soviet campaign was being carried on in the Polish emigré press by the official diplomatic and information services. Among incidents in this campaign there are such facts as furnishing the *Chicago Tribune* with anti-Russian material, and the activities of the American Friends of Poland, an organization acting under the auspices of the Polish Embassy and counting among its members this country's foremost isolationist leaders. Colonel Langhorn is chairman, Mr. Cudahy, General Wood, Mr. Robert Hall McCormick, Miss

Lucy Martin belong to it. This collaboration of Polish diplomacy with persons who have been *outstanding advocates of a negotiated peace with Germany* is unanimously interpreted as an anti-Soviet policy. The activities of the press, of the information services, and of the diplomatic representatives of the *Government-in-Exile* have thwarted General Sikorski's personal efforts. Having signed an agreement and an alliance with the Soviet Government, General Sikorski *proved unable to 'deliver the goods.'* He has been consistently sabotaged by his own government, by the National Council, and by all government agencies." (Italics mine.—H.B.)

\* \* \*

To this description by an outstanding Pole, of anti-Soviet intrigue by the Polish reactionaries and their friends, much could be added; for instance, the regrettable fact that the Divine Service and their priestly robe were abused by certain reactionary Catholic priests, in order to wage a campaign of hate against the Soviet Union, and break the Eighth Commandment by bringing false witness against an ally.

This slander-campaign, carried on over many months by the Polish reactionaries, led on December 8, 1942, to the open violation of the pact entered into with the Soviet Union. In contravention of the agreement, the Polish government on that day, Sikorski agreeing thereto, made public a declaration in which it specifically raised its claims to the Eastern frontier, claiming as its basis the Riga Treaty of March, 1921.

What was the Riga Treaty? That treaty was imposed upon the young Soviet Union by force of arms. Four to five million White Russians, eight million Ukrainians, and two million Jews, as also a part of Southeastern Lithuania, were forcibly brought under Polish rule. The Ukrainians and White Russians were brutally oppressed and exploited by the Polish large-landed proprietors. Pogroms against the population of these regions constituted the policy of the half-fascist Polish dictatorship. Misery was their daily bread. Even the extremely anti-Soviet British Foreign Minister, Lord Curzon, had proposed at the Versailles Peace Conference a line of demarcation corresponding to the line established by the Soviet Union before the fascist invasion. *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* characterizes this phase as follows:

"The Polish gentry and Wrangel, as Lenin put it, were the two hands with which international imperialism attempted to strangle Soviet Russia. The plan of the Poles was to seize the Soviet Ukraine west of the Dnieper, to occupy Soviet Byelorussia, to restore the power of the Polish magnates in these regions, to extend the frontiers of the Polish State so that they stretch 'from sea to sea,' from Danzig to Odessa, and, in return for his aid, to help Wrangel smash the Red Army and restore the power of the landlords and capitalists in Soviet Russia. . . . The Soviet government made vain attempts to enter into negotiations with Poland with the object of preserving peace and averting war. Pilsudski refused to

discuss peace. He wanted war. He calculated that the Red Army, fatigued by its battles with Kolchak and Denikin, would not be able to withstand the attack of the Polish forces." (P. 24).

The outcome of this attack against the Soviet Union by the Polish reactionaries, whose army was being led by von Weygand and those French officers who later contributed so systematically to the destruction of France, was the Treaty of Riga. And on this treaty the clique of Polish reactionaries in London, that government without land or people, elected by no one, has dared to base its claims! It is as though Hitler, in order to justify legally his conquest in the Soviet Union, were to fall back on the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. It is as though the Polish gentry in London were to justify their claims to the parts of Czechoslovakia they stole at the time of the Munich Pact on the basis of that very pact. Little interest indeed has this clique of large landowners and big capitalists in self-determination for the Ukrainians, White Russians, and Jews in the very regions they have themselves despoiled!

The developments in Poland followed along lines other than those of national self-determination and democracy. The reactionary Polish overlords established their brutal anti-democratic, anti-labor, anti-Semitic and anti-Russian regime over the Polish people and especially over the subject peoples. Their fascist policy at home corresponded to their policy of adventure abroad. The reactionary govern-

ment of "colonels" under Beck strengthened German fascism, performed labors of love for the Hitlerite executioners after Munich, pursued a consistent policy of opposition to collective security and of hostility toward the Soviet Union and thereby helped to prevent that development which ultimately would have provided the only way of saving Poland. In 1939, the Beck Government, whose circles even today dominate the so-called Polish government in London, played an ominous role in sabotaging the conclusion of a pact of security between the Soviet Union, France and England. In his address on August 31, 1939, to the Supreme Soviet on the ratification of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, Foreign Commissar Molotov described the role of Poland:

"In these negotiations one came up sharp against the fact that Poland, which was to receive the common guarantees of England, France, and the U.S.S.R., *rejected the military aid of the Soviet Union*. Attempts to obviate these objections on the part of Poland failed. . . . One realizes that the negotiations involving Britain, France, and the Soviet Union could not come to any fruitful conclusion in view of such an attitude on the part of the Polish government and of her principal allies on the question of military aid by the Soviet Union in case of an aggression. Thereafter it became clear to us that the British-French-Soviet negotiations were doomed to miscarry." (Italics mine —H.B.)

It is essential to recall these past

events because there is still being circulated among Polish reactionary circles and their American helpmates the calumny that the Soviet Union made a pact with Hitler for the dismemberment of Poland. Such a pact never existed, and the Red Army marched into its formerly ravished territories, since there no longer was a Polish government and the resistance of Poland had collapsed. Doubtless the Beck crowd, who even today exert their unholy influence in London, would have preferred to see the occupation of these territories by the German fascists rather than their liberation by the Red Army. But the Soviet Union, foreseeing the developments with regard to Hitler-Germany, discharged its responsibility toward the Ukrainian and White Russian brothers of the Soviet people in these territories. In his radio address of September 17, 1939, Molotov described the situation as follows:

"The events evoked by the Polish-German war have exposed the *instability and the notorious political incapacity of the Polish state. The Polish government circles have gone into bankruptcy.* All this occurred in a very short time. Hardly two weeks have gone by and Poland has already lost all its industrial areas, and the greater part of its large cities and cultural centers. Also Warsaw, as capital of the Polish state, is no more. *No one knows the whereabouts of the Polish government. The people of Poland have been left in the lurch by their wretched rulers.* The Polish government and the Polish state have in fact ceased to exist.

By force of such a situation, the treaties entered into previously between the Soviet Union and Poland have lost their validity. In Poland there has arisen a situation that requires particular concern on the part of the Soviet Union over the security of her state. *Poland has become a field susceptible to all sorts of accidents and surprises which may engender danger to the security of the Soviet Union.* . . . Nor can it be expected of the Soviet Union that it will view with equanimity the fate of its Ukrainian and White Russian blood relations, who reside in Poland and have hitherto found themselves there as nationals deprived of all rights, but who at present, however, are abandoned to the whims of chance. The Soviet Union deems it her sacred duty to extend her hand in help to her Ukrainian brethren, her White Russian brethren now living in Poland. . . . No one could imagine that the Polish state could ever reveal such utter helplessness, and could disintegrate so rapidly as it has done throughout all of Poland. However, since this disintegration is nevertheless a fact, while *the statesmen of Poland are completely bankrupt and are incapable of changing the situation of Poland,* our Red Army must therefore . . . in full duty bound, perform its duty of honor." (Italics mine.—H.B.)

The Red Army was acclaimed by the population of the territories it occupied, as defenders and liberators. In a plebiscite, the people declared themselves almost unanimously in favor of the Soviet Union. These areas are today an inseparable part of the Soviet Ukrainian, Soviet White Russian, and Soviet Lithuanian Republics of the



U.S.S.R. The Red Army, which is fighting equally for the liberation of these areas, will not allow anyone, after their liberation, no—not even Polish counts who had their landed estates there—to seize an inch of this, as of any other part of Soviet soil. And the allies of the Soviet Union, whose army and people have brought the most sacrifices and fought the decisive battles of this war, are duty bound to stand by the Soviet Union's defense of every inch of its soil.

\* \* \*

The Polish reactionaries in London, while conducting their campaign against the Soviet Union, undertook another step that clearly exposed the wretchedness of their position. They allowed the Polish army set up on Soviet soil to march—but not against the common oppressor, against the Hitler armies, but in another direction, toward Teheran in Iran. This event took place at the moment when the Red Army was engaged at Stalingrad in the epic life-and-death struggle, not only for the Soviet Union, but also for Poland and all other nations.

Soviet Vice-Commissar for Foreign Affairs Vyshinsky, in a statement to the representatives of the foreign press at Moscow on May 6, made known to the world how that Polish army was systematically used as an instrument for anti-Soviet propaganda and intrigues, how members of the Polish Government's diplomatic staff in the Soviet Union were using the so-called Po-

lish Refugee Aid for systematic espionage activity.

The Polish Lieutenant-Colonel Zygmund Berling, former chief of staff of the 5th Division of the Polish Army in the Soviet Union, describes from his experiences, in the ninth issue of the periodical *Wolna Polska* (Free Poland), published by the Union of Polish Patriots in the Soviet Union, the kind of an army the Polish reactionaries in the Soviet Union were striving to build. The leaders of this army hoped for the defeat of the Soviet Union, and trained the Polish soldiers and officers, not for struggle against Hitler, but for struggle against the Soviet Union, against Jews, against the Ukrainians and White Russians, against democracy and progress. They exerted themselves to set up a fascist, counter-revolutionary Polish army. The Polish Lieutenant-Colonel, who refused to flee to Teheran and stayed behind in the Soviet Union, wrote:

"Taking advantage of the hospitality, confidence and friendship of the Soviet Union, deceiving democratic world opinion, misleading their own soldiers, a handful of army and civilian politicians spared no efforts to create on the territory of the Soviet Union an army along their own lines—a fascist, hostile-to-democracy, Polish armed force, far from any thought of struggle against the Germans and instead directed it—ideologically at least—against the Soviet Union.

"Those who have been closely following the Polish press in America and England have noticed that *from the very beginning of the ex-*

*istence of the Polish army in the U.S.S.R. its command has pursued a program outlined by reaction.*

"Relations inside the army, the attitude toward the U.S.S.R., and, finally, what is all-important—the attitude toward the struggle at the front, all of which culminated in the flight to the Near East—such is the exact program of the Matuszewskis, Bieleckis and their ilk: The formation of an army not for struggle against Germany, but for the political intrigues of cliques.

"It is high time to show the world that the Polish people in the U.S.S.R. by no means want to remain aloof from the struggle against Hitler. *The Poles in the U.S.S.R. are eager to fight at the front together with the Red Army, together with all democratic peoples in the anti-fascist coalition.*" (Italics mine—H.B.)

The decisive hostile act against the Soviet Union which led to the suspension of relations was the Polish government's teamwork with the Nazi propaganda machine in connection with the Goebbels-inspired tale about the alleged murder of ten thousand Polish officers by the Russians, and, following the nod of Goebbels, its calling upon the International Red Cross to investigate this Nazi fairy tale.

The prejudices of Dorothy Thompson, as is well known, certainly do not incline her favorably toward the Soviet Union. Still, in her analysis of the Nazi myth, in the *New York Post* of April 30, she tore to shreds this horror story. She wrote:

"The territory has been for two

years—since July, 1941—in German hands. They have had every opportunity to plant any kind of atrocity story they want.

"But the story they tell is simply incredible. They claim, just now, to have found the common grave of these officers, through stories told them by Russian peasants, who for two years have kept silence.

"The officers, dressed in their uniforms, with their medals, and with identification papers, letters, and diaries in their pockets are said to have been found in a common grave, atop which grew three-year-old trees. This fixes the date of the slaughter before the German occupation.

"The bodies were, of course, not embalmed, and have been decomposing for three years in the Smolensk climate, where the ground freezes to a depth of eight or ten feet in winter, then thaws, becomes mud, freezes again, and hardens and blazes with heat in summer.

"Yet these bodies are in such a state that Nazis could even identify bayonet wounds in the legs as 'Russian' by the width of the blade cuts.

"Their papers were legible. Everything was identifiable. And on the basis of this the whole of Poland is being set ablaze with wrath against Russian assassins, who, according to the Nazis, were Jews and O.G.P.U. men. . . .

"This fancy tale looks to me more like German thoroughness than like Russian ruthlessness. It reminds me of the case of Van der Lubbe, in the Reichstag fire, caught red-handed, with a Communist Party card in his pocket."

On April 26 the Soviet Government published its note declaring its relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile to be severed.

*Pravda*, in its issue of April 28, in commenting on the Note, stated:

"The note of the Soviet Government on its decision to sever relations with the Polish Government, published April 26, exposes the treacherous behavior of the Polish Government toward the Soviet Union in connection with the vile campaign of slander in the matter of the murder of Polish officers in the Smolensk area.

"On April 16 the Ministry of National Defense and on the next day the Polish Government itself published communiqués containing the same slanderous fabrications which the German fascist scoundrels indulged in day after day.

"These communiqués contained also the application of the Polish Government to the International Red Cross requesting the latter to send its representatives to the scene for an 'investigation,' although it was quite obvious that on territory occupied by Hitlerites and in conditions of German fascist terror the International Red Cross cannot conduct any truly objective investigation, that its participation in this investigation farce must inevitably result only in gross deceit and falsification. This was exactly what the experienced Hitlerite assassins reckoned upon when they immediately took advantage of the appeal of the Polish Government to the International Red Cross.

"Thus, complete unanimity was proved to exist between the Polish and Hitlerite governments — this fact, as well as the simultaneous opening of a campaign hostile to the Soviet Union, and the very nature of this campaign left no doubt, as the Soviet Government pointed out in its note of April 25, as to the existence of contact and accord in

this matter between the Hitlerites and their Polish accomplices.

"Hitler found *obliging collaborators among those who, as a matter of their conscience and honor, ought to come out as accusers of the Hitlerite bandits. It transpired that pro-fascist Polish elements were found not only on territory of Poland occupied by Hitlerites but within the Polish Government itself.*" (Italics mine.—H.B.)

The well-known French journalist Pertinax revealed in the *New York Times* of April 28 some of the threads spun between the pro-fascist elements in London via Beck in Rumania, to the Nazis. He wrote:

"A journalist who was the press agent of Colonel Josef Beck, exponent of Poland's pro-German policy, is actually in charge of the review *Free Poland*. As the Russians see it, Premier Wladyslaw Sikorski, a broadminded leader, has long ceased to control his own government. The Beck faction is in the ascendancy even within his national committee. There are to be found the men responsible for the appeal to the International Red Cross in Geneva that infuriated the Russians.

"Colonel Beck is reported to be living in Bucharest and is in constant touch with his henchmen, who are at work everywhere. Six months ago he was said to have offered to Adolf Hitler to constitute a Polish government of his own, but that suggestion was turned down by Hitler. *Such is the group of men that prevented General Sikorski from going to Moscow last December and perhaps from reaching an agreement with the Kremlin.*" (Italics mine.—H.B.)

\* \* \*

What object did the Polish reactionaries in London have in their concerted campaign with the Nazis against the Soviet Union? They wanted to incite the peoples and the governments in England and America against the Soviet Union. They wanted to divert the oppressed Polish masses from their struggles against Hitler Germany to support his war against the Soviet Union. They wished to arouse a feeling of opposition against the Second Front. By means of its participation in the new Reichstag-Fire campaign against the Soviet Union the Polish Government-in-Exile hoped to be able to get the English and United States governments to bring demands upon the Soviet Union that it obligate itself, after the war with Hitler, to deliver its Western areas over to Poland.

The Polish reactionaries dread a victory ending in a powerful Russia, with a strong Red Army, and an unbreakable friendship among the Soviet Union, England and the United States, as well as with the people of Poland. The reactionary Polish imperialists are not interested in a victory over Hitler and in the liberation of the Polish nation, unless such a victory harmonizes with their narrow interests as restorationist large landed proprietors or big capitalists in territories that are Soviet. In their struggle for their reactionary imperialist interests, they are ready to cast their lot with death or the devil, also with Hitler, even if the shattering of the unity of the United Nations is

the price to be paid. The policy they pursue is merely the continuation of that policy that led to the enslavement of Poland, the policy that the Vichy-men, the appeasers and defeatists, the quislings of all lands have followed and are following.

Johannes Steel, in the *New York Post* of April 29, quotes English papers which voice indignation over the unbelievable attitude of the reactionary Polish circle in London to the issue of the Second Front. Every true Polish patriot longs for the day of the invasion of Europe that will decisively hasten the liberation of the Polish nation. What are the Polish colonels, however, doing in London? Steel writes:

*"The London Statesman and Nation* some time ago called attention to the fact that while the Polish people are suffering all the horrors of the German occupation, *certain Polish writers in London even expressed the view that there is really no hurry about the liberation of Poland because such quick liberation could come only as a result of a Russian victory.*

"The Polish newspaper *Mysl Polska*, published in London, stated quite openly as early as last September that a quick opening of a second front would not be in the Polish national interest. It is not likely that these typical comments on the part of the Polish editorial writers in London and New York represent the feeling of the Polish people, suffering at home under the heel of the oppressor. The truth is—as the *Statesman and Nation* put it so well—that these people in London represent nothing but narrow class interests and greedy mu-

sical-comedy Polish imperialism and that the welfare and salvation of the Polish people by means of a quick Russian victory is something that does not gladden but terrifies them." (Italics mine—H.B.)

Without doubt, there existed quite a series of factors that encouraged the Polish reactionaries in the United States and England to carry on their provocation against the Soviet Union, and that culminated in the open concerted play with the Nazis. Unfortunately, the British and we have too long tolerated on our shores the intrigues and propaganda of the Polish reactionaries in their provocation against the Soviet Russian Ally. This even reached a point where outstanding individuals in the win-the-war camp, on the grounds of the deserts meted out to the provocateurs and spies Alter and Ehrlich by Soviet justice, participated in the anti-Soviet campaign engineered by a reactionary Social-Democratic clique, and thereby lent aid to the Polish Government-in-Exile to further its struggle against the Soviet Union.

The pretext that officially nothing can be done against such campaigns aimed at misleading masses of people in regard to our Soviet ally, because we are a democracy, is not valid. We are fighting to preserve our democracy. Our war is not only against the enemy on the battlefields; it is and must be also against all who in any way hold back the combined fighting strength of the United Nations from the speediest possible blows for victory. Our fight, therefore, on the home front must be unmerciful against

the fifth columnists and defeatists—in this instance, against the Polish pro-fascists and their friends of all varieties, whom we have all too long allowed to use our country as a stamping ground against our valiant Soviet ally. Well might our own and the British governments have employed the means at hand to hit back at the Polish provocation against our ally upon British and American soil.

Yet the Polish reactionaries and their abettors were allowed to do as they pleased, to carry on undisturbed their work of disunity, of treason to the cause of the United Nations. Even when they openly took over the Goebbels propaganda in the struggle against the Soviet Union, neither from the British nor our own government did there come one word of immediate, clear protest at the assumption of the Nazi cynicism by the so-called Polish Government in London.

No wonder that the Polish reactionaries felt encouraged; no wonder that they looked back to their repeated role in the history of imperialism as gendarmes against the Soviet Union, failing to understand that "those good old days" are gone. No wonder they still imagined it to be their "historic task" once more to build tomorrow a cordon sanitaire about the Soviet Union. Mr. Hull made a dour remark in answer to a question put to him by a reporter concerning the contention of the *Daily Worker* that Polish reactionaries were receiving encouragement from certain circles in the United States. But Mr. Walter Lippmann, in the *New*

*York Herald Tribune*, asserts essentially what the *Daily Worker* has asserted. And it is to be admitted that this eminent bourgeois publicist has access to far better information than the Communist newspaper has. In his column of April 29 he wrote:

"It has been evident for some time that Polish-Russian relations were drifting to a crisis out of which they would either become irreparably bad or much better. It was impossible to avert this crisis by the well intentioned display of abstract principles. In fact, the effect has been quite the opposite—to mislead the Polish government into taking risks it could not afford to take and to provoke the Russian government into forcing a showdown. We would have done better to have taken the unequivocal position that the boundary must be settled between Poland and Russia, *that we are committed under the Atlantic Charter to the resurrection of an independent Poland, but not to the restoration of a particular frontier, and that the fate of Poland, the war against Germany, the common action of the Allies in Europe and in Asia must not be hazarded upon a disputed province.*

"A line like that would have raised among the Polish leaders *no false hopes, and encouraged no imprudent defiances and challenges. Among the Russians it would have aroused no deep and old suspicions. . . .*" (Italics mine.—H.B.)

Further, however, how can the Polish reactionaries feel otherwise than encouraged in their anti-Sovietism when they see other "representatives" without land, people or influence—the so-called rep-

resentatives of Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania—continue to be recognized as speaking for these republics—which are an organic part of the U.S.S.R.?

How can they feel otherwise than encouraged when they observe the policy we still pursue with regard to Hitler's Finnish ally? How can they feel otherwise than encouraged when they see how our State Department discovers General Giraud as the "leader" of the French nation while it snubs the French National Committee under the leadership of de Gaulle, although this committee is based on the confidence and support of the French masses? How can they feel otherwise than encouraged when they read the compliments our ambassador pays to the Spanish fascists who send their "Blue Divisions" to fight against the Soviet Union and are peddling "negotiated peace" pleas in behalf of Hitler?

Nor was the reply of the British and American governments to the provocation by the Polish reactionaries of a kind to discourage them from continuing with their attempt to make common cause with the Nazis against the Soviet Union and to drive a wedge into the unity of the United Nations. Far better had it been had the British and our own governments declared outright that they would have nothing to do with people resorting to Nazi propaganda as a weapon against the Soviet ally; had they added that our two countries were fighting this war in an unbreakable coalition with the Soviet Union, also for the liberation and the reconstruction of an inde-

pendent, strong, and democratic Poland. Such a step, coming in conjunction with the firm answer of the Soviet Government, would have crushed utterly any effectiveness of the Nazi lie. Such a move would have demonstrated to all peoples that the hopes of the Nazis and of their confederates to drive a wedge into the unity of the United Nations were in vain.

But such a logical step was taken neither by us nor by the British Government. Official and semi-official spokesmen did criticize the Polish Government for having been "taken in" by Nazi propaganda; but at the same time they bewailed the Soviet Government's suspension of relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile, and spoke of the Goebbels "trap" into which "both governments" had fallen.

These attempts to shield the Polish reactionaries—whose perfidy could not be openly defended—went so far that O.W.I. chief Elmer Davis presumed to offer the Soviet Union admonitions and counsel in regard to the "proper attitude" to adopt toward the Polish issue. Quite naturally, Mr. Davis has been following the activities of the Polish reactionaries, their press, and their propaganda. Admonitions and counsel could indeed have been useful had they been offered by him as timely warnings to the Polish reactionaries, especially at the moment when the Polish Government in London caught the ball from Goebbels, and when he could have risked a word in defense of our Soviet ally when the Polish-German campaign

of vilification was being launched.

Trap? Nobody fell into a trap. The Polish reactionaries, working in collusion with the Hitlerites, know very well what they were trying to bring about. And the Soviet Union, by its firm action of repelling the trap-setters, taught the world anew how to deal with collaborationists of the Nazis in the camp of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union explicitly declared that the suspension of relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile did not constitute a break with the Polish nation. The essence of this is also contained in Stalin's letter to the *New York Times* representative in Moscow. Every day the Soviet Union gives proof of the high esteem in which she holds the heroic struggle of the Polish people against the German fascist oppressor. Despite the agitation of the Polish reactionaries in London, and also in our own country, the Polish nation knows that it has in the Soviet Union the staunchest friend in the terrible war for its existence.

\* \* \*

The Polish nation has no doubt learned from its terrible experience that it must adopt a different policy from the one pursued by the former rulers of Poland, a policy that has cast it into a limitless national catastrophe. There can be no doubt as to the realization on the part of the Polish people that only in closest unity with the peoples of the Soviet Union is it possible to regain and maintain Poland's independ-

ence. The Polish patriots who have stayed on in the Soviet Union represent, without doubt, the true attitude of the Polish masses, in Poland and all over the world, in their championship of friendship for the Soviet Union, and in their active participation at the side of the Red Army, in the war against Hitler Germany. The recent creation of the Kosciusko Division on Soviet soil will inspire every freedom-loving Pole and every friend of the Polish people.

Whatever confusion may have been engendered by the concerted agitation of the Nazis with the Polish reactionaries, that agitation has failed in its objective. The unity of struggle of the Soviet Union, Brit-

ain and the United States is growing more and more effective. With the tremendous Allied victory in North Africa, following upon the great winter offensive of the Soviet Union, the full emerging of the coalition forces, through the opening of the Second Front, is imminent. The dog barks, but the caravan moves on, as the glorious Polish revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg was fond of saying. Goebbels and his Polish helpmates may have triumphed for a split second with the trick they tried to play; but the moment of this cheap triumph flew by fast. For the hour of the destruction of the Nazis moves nearer and nearer. That hour will also proclaim the liberation of the Polish people.



---

# THE STRIKE OF THE COAL MINERS

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

## *The Course of the Strike*

ON MAY 1 the United States, deep in its battle for survival against the attack of the Axis powers, found itself confronting a national strike of coal miners. According to U. S. official figures, 480,110 mine workers were pulled out on strike throughout the entire Appalachian region, including some 80,000 anthracite miners. The strike was practically solid, only isolated local unions here and there remaining at work in the strike area.

The strike constituted a grave and immediate menace to the national war effort. Stocks of soft coal above ground were relatively small, and the threat of a widespread shutdown of war industries loomed in the near future. It was estimated that the steel mills in the Pittsburgh area would begin drastically to cut production after three or four days. Other basic industries were in a similar predicament. The government called upon the railroads, the largest single users of coal in the United States, to institute important coal economies immediately. The whole war production program of the government was in jeopardy.

Reactionaries, while covertly provoking and welcoming the strike as a blow at the Roosevelt war administration, were quick to seize upon it as a pretext to intensify their union-smashing campaign. In various state legislatures anti-strike legislation was quickly introduced. The Senate also rushed through the Connally Bill to prohibit strikes in plants under United States control, while in the House, the Connally Bill has been amended in committee to include the infamous Smith Bill and is scheduled to be voted on very shortly. As for the fascist radio and newspaper propagandists in Berlin, Rome and Tokyo, they shouted in glee that the strike proved there was no national unity in the United States, that the workers were against the war, and that the American war effort was about to collapse. Naturally, our own war allies, as indicated in the British and Soviet press, were astounded and dismayed by the strike. The *London Daily Telegraph* expressed a widely-held opinion when it said:

"The war seems very far away from the American coal fields."

Labor and American public opinion in general sympathized with the

economic complaints of the miners, but sharply condemned the strike. Almost universally, union leaders supported the demands of the miners, but there was mounting condemnation of the anti-war strike as a means for winning them. C.I.O. President Philip Murray, in a speech at Los Angeles, emphatically stated that the organized workers under his leadership would honor the no-strike-in-wartime pledges given by the labor movement after Pearl Harbor. A. F. of L. President William Green assured the government that the Progressive Miners in Illinois would not strike. R. J. Thomas, President of the United Auto Workers, while endorsing the miners' demands, openly repudiated their strike, declaring that "there is no doubt in my mind that this is a political strike—a strike against President Roosevelt. During the period of Lewis' so-called 15-day truce the C.I.O. National Executive Board strongly reaffirmed its no-strike pledge and condemned Lewis' unpatriotic strike action. In the same period the A. F. of L. Executive Council held a meeting and likewise renewed its no-strike pledge, although Mr. Green weakened the Council's stand by stating later that each affiliated A. F. of L. union would decide for itself as to whether or not it should strike. This reflects the influence of Woll, Hutcheson, and Lewis' friends within the A. F. of L. top leadership.

The Communist Party spoke out sharply against the strike as an insidious blow by Lewis against the nation's war effort. It pointed out that with the nation at war and

with labor's destiny bound up with the nation's victory, to tie up the industries by strikes means to hit the vital interests of labor itself. The *Daily Worker* of May 2 said: "The entire labor movement, vitally concerned in this crisis, must give full support to the Commander-in-Chief in his move to ensure the coal supply. It must join him in calling on the miners to go back to work, to repudiate Lewis and submit their case to the War Labor Board. It must urge the government to secure the enforcement of its proposals for a full year's employment, to roll back prices, and to grant the miners an impartial hearing on their other demands."

The strike was not formally called, but was developed by Lewis upon the failure of the U.M.W.A. and the coal operators to agree upon a new contract. The mines were tied up on the basis of "no contract, no work." The miners' demands, presented to the Appalachian bituminous coal operators prior to the expiration of their agreement on March 31, included a \$2-per-day wage increase and the incorporation of 60,000 mine bosses and office workers under the union agreement. The operators refused all the union's demands. Whereupon John L. Lewis, claiming that the National War Labor Board had prejudged the miners' case because allegedly it was committed to the Little Steel Formula, refused to submit the miners' case to that body. After much haggling, a month's extension of negotiation time was grudgingly agreed upon by Lewis. Meanwhile, the anthracite miners, whose agreement

expired on April 30, had come to a deadlock with their employers over the \$2-per-day increase. Thus there was a complete breakdown of negotiations in both the soft and hard coal fields, with the deadline for a general automatic stoppage set for May 1. Mr. John Steelman, on behalf of Secretary of Labor Perkins, proposed to settle the dispute by the establishment of a guaranteed yearly wage for the miners. The U.M.W.A. accepted this, but the mine operators rejected it, just as Lewis had several months before when Secretary Ickes had originally proposed the 6-day work week. As a device to avoid responsibility for calling the strike, Lewis announced that the miners never worked without a union agreement and that therefore, unless an agreement was duly arrived at, they would not "trespass" on the companies' properties after April 31. Large numbers of the men in the pits, however, under the instigation of Lewis officials, began striking, so that by the time May 1 arrived, when the general walkout began, at least 100,000 were already out on strike.

The Federal Government went into action on May 2. President Roosevelt, having previously pleaded in vain with the miners not to strike, seized the mines in the name of the government, hoisted the American flag over them and, in the following words, ordered Solid Fuels Administrator Harold L. Ickes to see to it that they were operated:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to take im-

mediate possession, so far as may be necessary or advisable, of any and all mines producing coal in which a strike has occurred or is threatened."

The President, while speaking in a friendly tone to the miners and acknowledging they had economic grievances which had to be attended to, nevertheless minced no words in calling the walkout a strike against the government. He said, "No matter how sincere his motives, no matter how legitimate he may believe his grievances to be—any idle miner, directly and individually, is obstructing our war effort." The President also stated that the mines would be operated, even if it took soldiers to guarantee it. He put the question of the war and the nation's safety first, and on this basis called for an immediate return to work the next day, May 3.

In the meantime, asserting that he had come to a satisfactory understanding with Mr. Ickes (which the latter afterwards denied), Lewis declared a 15-day "truce" and ordered the miners to return to work on Tuesday, May 4. The bulk of the workers, however, visibly influenced by the President's radio speech, went back on Monday, the 3rd, not waiting for Lewis' Tuesday date. By May 4 all the mines were operating again. After which, Mr. Ickes announced the establishment of the 6-day week (time-and-one-half for Saturday) in the mining industry. And there, at this writing, the situation stands, with the War Labor Board considering the miners' demands.

*Economic Factors in the Strike*

It is clear that John L. Lewis did all he could to provoke this sensational wartime strike; but it is also obvious that, despite his autocratic control of the miners, he never could have succeeded in pulling out the men so completely, in the face of the war situation and President Roosevelt's plea not to strike, if the miners had not had very substantial economic grievances. These grievances are akin to those of tens of millions of other American workers. They may be summed up in a few words—relatively stationary wages in a situation of rapidly rising living costs.

The basic cause of the present widespread discontent among the workers, of which the miners' strike has been the sharpest expression, is the fact that the anti-Administration bloc of appeasers, defeatists, profiteers, union-busters and poll-taxers in Congress, backed by powerful outside forces such as the N.A.M., the Hearst-Howard-Patterson newspapers, etc., have been able, so far, to defeat the effective application of President Roosevelt's 7-point program of economic stabilization. This program, presented to Congress a year ago by the President, proposed to control the major economic factors making for inflation. It included (1) the maximum taxation of profits, and the limitation of executives' salaries to \$25,000 yearly; (2) the placing of ceilings upon all items affecting the cost of living; (3) the stabilization of farm prices on a parity basis; (4) the stabilization of

wages at levels assuring the health and efficiency of the workers; (5) the rationing of foodstuffs and other necessities of the people; (6) the cessation of installment buying, the payment of debts, and the increase of savings; and (7) the maximum general sale of war bonds.

With the exception of points 5 and 6, this economic program has been torpedoed by the defeatist opposition. The \$25,000 salary directive by the President was canceled by Congressional action, and there is an orgy of profiteering going on throughout the country; the net profits of corporations, after all taxes have been paid, having increased from \$4,200,000,000 in 1939 to \$7,600,000,000 in 1942. Price ceilings are "more honored in the breach than in the observance"; farm prices are being systematically jacked up by the phony Farm Bloc; the profiteering defeatists are now trying desperately to jam the Ruml plan through Congress; would "forgive" the profit-swollen corporations their 1942 taxes; the rationing system, still sketchy in character, was introduced only after shameless profiteering in necessary foodstuffs; while anything like direct profits limitations, as the 6 per cent limit suggested a year ago by Secretary Morgenthau, is strictly out. The line of the Congressional oppositionists is to give capital a relatively free hand, while nailing labor down tight. Hence their vast enthusiasm and pressure for measures to freeze labor's wages and freeze war workers to their jobs. Likewise they are engaging in violent attacks upon the legal status

of labor organizations, in Congress and the various state legislatures.

The general result of the opposition bloc's Congressional policy, forced upon the Administration, of economically soaking labor and facilitating widespread profiteering, is that we have developed a lopsided economy. The general characteristics of this are that the country is fast heading into inflation and that the living standards of the masses are in decided decline. It is estimated by government reports that living costs in April were 24 per cent above pre-war levels. They are still rising, but the President has now pledged a "roll back" in prices, and has taken certain steps to effect this. The A. F. of L. claims that the increase, as over January 1, 1941, amounts to 33 per cent. As against this rapid increase in living costs, under the Little Steel Formula of the National War Labor Board, which was figured upon the basis of the price levels of January 1, 1941, the workers were allowed wage increases amounting only to 15 per cent, which was manifestly far below the actual rise in living costs, and which also did not take into account the added financial drains upon the workers caused by increased taxes, war fund contributions, bond purchases, etc. Additional income from longer work hours did not offset this opening scissors between living costs and wages.

The coal miners were among the worst sufferers in the increasingly unfavorable economic situation of the workers as a whole. To begin with, they were working at wage levels substantially below those in

various war industries. And then, the rise in living costs was particularly swift in mining communities. According to the U.M.W.A. statements, widely printed as advertisements throughout the press of America, the overall price increase of foodstuffs in the mining areas had run up to 124.6 per cent, and food, to the miners with their relatively large families, amounts to from 60 to 70 per cent of their total living costs. Obviously, the wages of the miners, did not balance off the steep rise in the miners' general living rates. The inevitable consequence was a spreading poverty and a growing discontent among the miners, factors which were utilized by Lewis to provoke the recent national strike.

#### *Political Factors in the Strike*

Despite their already difficult and steadily worsening economic situation, however, it is extremely unlikely that the miners would have walked out were it not for direct strike provocation by John L. Lewis. The coal miners are patriotic citizens; they realize the menace of Hitlerism; about 80,000 of their sons and brothers are already in the armed services; and they ardently want to win the war. So much so, that if left to their own devices, they naturally would have proceeded to every means of patient negotiation and adjustment, rather than to strike. The plain fact of the situation was that John L. Lewis, taking advantage of the miners' legitimate economic grievances and the slowness of certain government agencies in adjusting them, literally rushed the workers into the strike

for his own reactionary political reasons.

The central political objective behind Lewis' carefully built-up strike, was the same as that of the defeatist Congressional bloc: namely, to obstruct our nation's war effort. The obstructionist activities of the Wheelers, Tafts, Fishes and Vandenberg in Congress and Mr. Lewis' disruptive strike policy in the industries definitely complement each other. They are two phases of the same thing: opposition to the war policy of the Government. The Lewis-Hoover line is one that would lead, not to the unconditional surrender of the Axis powers, but to a "negotiated peace" with the fascist aggressors, and hence, to the defeat of the United Nations.

The political offensive of the appeasers and defeatists within our country for a negotiated peace with the fascists is now being pressed with renewed vigor. Hitler, with the prospects of military victory fast fading, is now moving everything for a "peace" that would give him a breathing spell in which to get ready for a new attempt at world conquest. General Franco, who recently lyingly stated that the war had come to a stalemate and that there must be a "negotiated peace," is a mouthpiece of Hitler. The line of the Hoover-Taft-Wheeler bloc in Congress and of John L. Lewis fits right in with this general slave-peace strategy of Hitler.

Lewis' record and his present activity admit of no other conclusion than that he is playing Hitler's negotiated-peace game. Through his

daughter he was a roundabout affiliate of the notorious America First Committee. He was also formerly a member of the Republican National Committee and is now an intimate crony of the big-shot Republican defeatists. Ever since the United States became involved in the war his house organ, the *Mine Workers Journal*, has waged unceasing attacks upon the Roosevelt Administration and upon our British and Soviet allies. Lewis himself has given only lip-service to our war cause and his influence has kept the war activities of the U.M.W.A. down to the barest minimum that he could get away with. In the vital matter of increasing coal production, his agents started out with widespread propaganda to the effect that there was no production problem in the mining industry. His union administration has sabotaged the formation of labor-management committees, it opposes an incentive wage in the coal industry, and it has not yet enunciated a real program for increased coal production. The measures that have been adopted to step up coal output, such as the establishment of the six-day week, have been virtually forced upon Lewis by Solid Fuels Coordinator Ickes and the Roosevelt Administration.

Lewis wanted and plotted the coal strike for the same general defeatist purpose that the opposition bloc in Congress is trying to hamstring the war activities of the Roosevelt Administration. Hitler could hope for nothing better than the paralysis of American industry by strikes. The big thing Lewis

wanted to accomplish by the strike was to break down the no-strike pledge of organized labor and to throw the industries into a series of stoppages, the general effect of which could be none other than to cripple and reduce war production. To this end, as preparations for a broad strike movement, Lewis shouted that the President's seven-point economic program, to which he never gave an iota of support, had failed. He demanded that the Government abandon all efforts at economic stabilization, declaring that inflation is inevitable in war. He proposed, in substance, that the workers "get theirs" by an anti-war strike policy. Such a line, if it were to prevail, could, of course, only destroy national unity and create internal turmoil. Lewis backed up his general defeatist policy by pulling his stooge representatives out of the War Labor Board, by refusing to recognize that board on the ground that it was prejudiced, by by-passing an appeal to President Roosevelt to adjust the situation, and by hastening into the strike full steam ahead.

As for the actual launching of the strike, Lewis, who rules the U.M.W.A. like a czar, proceeded with characteristic ruthlessness. He very reluctantly granted a 30-day stay in the bituminous districts and agreed to none whatever in the anthracite regions. No democratic, rank-and-file "folderol" for him. As the strike crisis date approached, Lewis' horde of field men circulated the "no contract, no work," and "no trespass" slogans among the miners, simply telling them that the

mines would all shut down if no agreement were reached. There were very few, if any, rank and file meetings called. It is not surprising, therefore, that the opposition to the strike, whatever there was of it, was stifled and submerged. The great body of the miners, full of economic grievances, animated by a powerful sentiment of union solidarity, believing the strike was pretty much only a demonstration, stayed out of the mines, although with many misgivings and hopes for a speedy settlement.

#### *Lewis Attempts to Wreck President Roosevelt's Leadership*

One of the major political objectives of Lewis in the strike, and part of his central plan of obstructing the national war effort, was and is to try and weaken the war leadership of President Roosevelt. The defeatist oppositionists in Congress and in the copperhead press are furthering their virulent hatred of the President, leaving no stone unturned in order to try and weaken his prestige and leadership. But none of these elements hates Roosevelt more violently or seeks his undoing more persistently than does John L. Lewis. This common hatred of Roosevelt by Lewis and the Congressional opposition shows their identity of general defeatist political purpose.

By provoking the coal strike, Lewis figured he had a heads-I-win-tails-you-lose proposition to defeat President Roosevelt now and for the 1944 elections. If the Government were forced to give the miners any concessions,

then Lewis, through his elaborate publicity machine, would vigorously claim full credit, and, on the other hand, if the President, as Commander-in-Chief, used troops to bring about the resumption of coal production, then, Lewis figured, Roosevelt would hopelessly discredit himself as a political figure among his mian political support, the millions of organized trade unionists. Whichever way the situation went, Lewis calculated he could not lose. As for the economic welfare of the miners and the national interest of our country in the war, these, of course, were non-essential details in Lewis' grandiose schemes of defeatist politics.

An especially sinister feature of the strike, and one which dovetailed directly into Lewis' attempt to destroy the President politically, was the intransigent attitude adopted by the coal operators in both the bituminous and anthracite fields. They were not a bit anxious to help the Government prevent the walkout. On the contrary, their whole line of policy led straight to the strike, even as did that of Lewis. The fact that they were willing to deal with the W.L.B. and did so, did not alter their general strategy, which was made to order for Lewis. They rejected the miners' demands point blank, all of them, including the yearly annual wage which was urged by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins as a way out of the impasse. More than that, they even refused, as a condition for a 30-day postponement of the walkout of the soft-coal miners, to make the agreement, finally arrived at, retroactive

to April 1. They had to be compelled by the Government to accept this elementary consideration. This hard-boiled stand of the coal operators distinctly showed on their part an anti-Administration attitude.

#### *Lewis' Attempt to Ensnare Labor in the Defeatist Opposition*

The third political objective of Lewis in the coal strike, and also a central feature of his anti-war line, was, by means of the walkout, to lay the basis for bringing organized labor into a head-on collision with the Roosevelt Government and to make it the pawn of the defeatist bloc in Congress. In doing this, Lewis also hoped to grab off the leadership of our disunited labor movement. He knew full well that there was a broad spirit of economic discontent among the millions of workers and he timed his strike in an effort to crystallize this unrest around his leadership by a show of seeming militancy. Thereby he hoped, at the cost of our country in the war, to drive a wedge between labor and the Roosevelt Administration and to advance his own ambitions to be the number-one man in the American trade union movement.

The grave danger of this demagogic move by Lewis in seeking to appear as the bold champion of the economic grievances of the workers and attempting to lead hig sections of labor into the camp of the defeatists, is greatly enhanced by his strong backing from various reactionary groups. He is the darling labor leader of the defeatist Re-



publicans, even while they are utilizing his anti-war activities as an excuse for enacting legislation hostile to labor. The smelly Hearst press has also come out praising Mr. Lewis' "militancy in behalf of the workers." But, even more dangerous, in top A. F. of L. circles, Mr. Lewis has natural affiliates among such notorious and powerful reactionaries as Matthew Woll, W. L. Hutcheson and David Dubinsky. This group gave Lewis strong encouragement in the strike and is obviously working closer and closer with him. Even in the C.I.O. there is a sort of sneaking pro-Lewis sentiment, typified by Walter Reuther and James Carey. This C.I.O. pro-Lewis element does not endorse Lewis openly, but extends a greater or lesser support to his general defeatist line. The Trotskyites, Norman Thomas Socialists and similar ilk also find Lewis' activities to be grist to their mill and are giving him their backing.

#### *The Responsibility of the Government*

Lewis was undoubtedly repulsed in his bold attack upon the Government's war policy. Also it is doubtful if he succeeded in alienating any considerable trade union support from the Roosevelt Administration. Although he managed to get the miners out of the mines, he never could have held them out for any length of time. Reports from the coal fields showed that the miners looked upon the strike partly as a protest against their bad economic conditions and partly as a duty in carrying out trade union

discipline. They neither wanted nor would have tolerated any serious interruption of war production. Universally they hoped and looked for a quick settlement and an early return to the mines. Nowhere among them was there any mass desire for a long drawn-out struggle such as the miners have experienced in past strikes and as Lewis would have liked to see this time. As a result of President Roosevelt's radio speech and the seizure of the mines by the Government, about half of the men had already streamed back to work on Monday without waiting for Lewis' deadline of 24 hours later. Lewis just managed to save his face by his so-called 15-day "truce," which neither the President in his radio speech, nor Mr. Ickes in subsequent speeches, acknowledged. Had Lewis tried to hold the miners out of the mines for any length of time, the strike would have disintegrated. Actually, in a negative sort of way, the coal strike showed that the workers basically favor the no-strike policy. No one knows this better than Mr. Lewis.

Although the Government gave Lewis' strike policy a setback, nevertheless its victory is a contingent one. To make it real the Administration must follow it up with real measures to alleviate the bad economic situation that is now disturbing the workers. In his radio speech on that fateful Sunday night, President Roosevelt acknowledged that the miners have legitimate economic complaints, and he might well have included the workers in general. In the days following the strike, the

President further practically assured the miners and other workers of wage concessions through the War Labor Board by modification of the Little Steel formula. He also promised to roll back prices. On the latter question he said specifically to the miners:

"Wherever we find that prices of essentials have risen too high they will be brought down. Wherever we find that price ceilings are being violated the violators will be punished."

It is therefore distinctly up to the Government now to carry out these policies and promises, despite all defeatist opposition in Congress, if Lewisism and the economic discontent it feeds upon are to be liquidated. The miners must be guaranteed concessions along the line of wage adjustments, of the portal-to-portal demands,\* or the guaranteed yearly wage. The six-day week, promulgated by Mr. Ickes immediately after assuming control of the mines, is not adequate, and in very many instances it was already in effect before the strike.

As for the workers in other industries, their economic conditions, too, must be eased, or else we may have a sudden spread of resentment that will be a fertile field for Lewisism. It is dangerous to assume, as Congressional reactionaries are doing, that drastic anti-strike legislation will take care of the situation. What is necessary is that the President's hold-the-line

\* According to statements of the U.M.W.A. in the capitalist press, the miners often spend as much as four hours daily underground, going to and from their work places, for which they are not paid a cent.

order be fully carried out. This can be done if the President's seven-point program is enforced. Especially is it necessary that prices be "rolled back" to the levels of September, 1942, as the President has promised, that profits also be rolled back, that Roosevelt's new directives to the War Labor Board be applied resolutely, that a practical system of incentive wages agreeable to organized labor should be developed, and that job stabilization be carried out democratically, in concert with the unions and not in the face of their protests against bureaucratic abuses. The price chisellers in Congress must and can be defeated by appeals to the people and a liberal use of the veto power by the President. There must be no further concessions to the profiteers by Byrnes, Brown, Davis, Nelson and other war executives, who seem to be suffering from weakness of the knees. The workers, including the coal miners, are quite ready to endure every inconvenience or hardship in order to win the war, but they are not going to permit conscienceless profiteering at their expense. The Administration must check rising living costs, or be prepared to grant general wage increases, or to face serious working-class unrest.

#### *The Tasks Confronting Organized Labor*

After the brilliant Allied victories in North Africa it would appear that Great Britain and the United States are finally about to launch a second front somewhere in Europe. To make this great mili-

tary enterprise a success, and to bring victory in 1943, maximum production of war materials is an indispensability. And this uninterrupted, all-out production can be advanced in spite of the Lewises if, among other things, the Administration and the trade unions, resisting all defeatist pressure, will courageously strengthen and carry out the President's hold-the-line order.

The labor movement must realize that it has heavy responsibilities in applying the President's "hold-the-line" order. To break through the powerful defeatist opposition in Congress and elsewhere, the President's seven-point program must receive the hearty, vigorous support of the masses of the people. This means that the trade unions have to become far more active politically than they now are. The C.I.O. has shown the basic way that this activity should develop, through the formation of united labor action committees in all cities and Congressional Districts, through the unfolding of a national labor-consumer movement directed against the looming danger of inflation, and in militant support of the Government's "unconditional surrender" war policy.

This is a time when the labor movement must categorically reject all Lewisite policies which would make it a supporter, or half-supporter, of the defeatist bloc in Congress. It must support and strengthen the Roosevelt Administration. Especially it must renew and reinvigorate its no-strike pledge, both in word and in action, in the full understanding that this policy

is necessary, not alone to advance the nation's general interests in the war, but also to satisfy the specific grievances of the workers. Organized labor must clearly realize that Lewis' attempt to have labor repudiate its no-strike pledge is a blow aimed at our national war effort, an attempt to subjugate the trade unions to the line of his defeatist Republican friends: Hoover, Taft, Vandenberg, et al. Labor must understand, therefore, that the Lewis line of an anti-war strike policy cannot and does not protect the economic interests of the workers, but lays the trade unions wide open to violent attacks from the worst union-smashing reactionaries. And most important of all, it would jeopardize our national victory in the war.

Lewis' anti-war policy, in all its aspects, must be fought boldly and vigorously, and with it all the Wolls, Hutchesons, Dubinskys, Reuthers and Careys who are giving it open or covert support. Lewisism is now a grave danger confronting our labor movement, seeking, as it does, to misdirect labor's win-the-war policies, destroy its unity, and weaken generally its support of the war. The patriotic forces throughout the labor movement, the overwhelming mass of organized labor, must much more determinedly work together to destroy the influence of the copperheads now so busy inside and outside the ranks of the workers. As Earl Browder declared in St. Louis on May 8: "Every effort to break down the no-strike policy is a blow for Hitler and his Axis partners, is

treason to the people, is a betrayal of labor itself."

But Lewisism cannot be defeated merely by support in words of the no-strike pledge, however sincere. Ways must be found, by intensified political action, not only to back up and implement the Roosevelt Administration and its general war policies, but also to accomplish the no less necessary war task of protecting the economic standards of the workers. The workers have willingly agreed to lay aside the strike weapon for the duration of the war; therefore, in self-defense and as a condition of an effective national unity they must develop broad and active political action. Failure to do this would bring down disaster upon us.

While developing united labor action committees to fight against inflation and for a militant war policy, the trade unions must insist upon full representation in the President's Cabinet and in all war boards. This is necessary in order to give labor its rightful status as a full partner in the national war effort and to enable it properly to mobilize its vast following to help still more effectively to prosecute the war. A serious mistake made by organized labor in this war has been its failure to insist upon solid representation in the Government and to refuse to take "No" for an answer.

In this critical moment of our national history heavy political responsibilities rest upon the organ-

ized workers. The trade unions, 12,000,000 strong and with many millions of additional supporters and sympathizers, which are the very backbone of our national unity, of our people's war effort, must display more initiative and unity politically. The fight for the seven-point program is only the first and most urgent of these political tasks. Others closely related and no less vital press upon the workers. Roosevelt's "unconditional surrender" policy must be given day-to-day mass support. There is the great second front in Europe still to be established and then militantly supported; there is a rounded-out centralized war economy to be completed; there is national and international trade union unity to be established; there is a better working arrangement to be made between labor and farmer forces; there is the ruthless drive of the union-smashers to be defeated; there are the preparations to be made to smash reaction in the highly crucial 1944 elections; there are the vast problems of the post-war world to be faced after victory is won. All these fundamental tasks insist in a manner categorical and irresistible, that organized labor must unify its ranks and, in vigorous support of the war, develop its potentially vast and powerful political forces on a scale it has never heretofore reached. This is one of the most important lessons labor has to learn from the coal strike.

---

# LESSONS OF THE PARTY BUILDING CAMPAIGN AND THE NEXT TASKS

BY JOHN WILLIAMSON

**N**EARLY 15,000 American workers, busily engaged in war activities, with less time available than previously, but confronted daily with swiftly moving political events that require understanding and enlightened action, joined the Communist Party during the three-month Party Building Campaign. This indicates a development in the thinking of growing sections of American workers toward the Communist Party and a widening recognition of the party's constructive program and win-the-war policies.

The keynote on which the Party Building Campaign was launched was sounded by Comrade Earl Browder in a special message to each member, when he declared:

"We can do greater things than we have ever done before. We must be confident in our abilities, and bold and tireless in our work among the masses. We must constantly think and discuss with them, transmitting to them the political line of our party which brings us into step with the great march of history. In this great hour of world history, we are optimistic because we are not idle, because we are part of the forces that are going to win the war and that are going to ensure a better world after the war."

The Party Building Campaign was conducted in a period of big and crucial developments and struggles. It took place during the crucial struggle to realize the Casablanca decision for immediate invasion of the European continent—a period of struggle for strengthening the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, against the efforts of the appeasers and defeatists of all varieties striving to change the basic strategy of the war. On the domestic scene, the nation faced the menace of the Lewis-provoked miners' strike and the threat to disrupt war production, with the consequent danger of splitting up the camp of national unity and aiding the Axis. It was a period of struggle for a correct economic stabilization program to protect the conditions of the people and of labor through a strong and united trade union movement recognizing as its chief task the winning of the war. It was a period of growing movement for unity among the Negro people, together with the nationwide activities for repeal of the poll-tax laws.

The contributions of the Communists in all phases of these political debates and struggles for a correct war policy in support of the Roose-

velt Administration emphasize that party building as a win-the-war task is not a mere phrase but a vital undertaking. There is a direct relationship between the success of the Party Building Campaign and the widespread political activization of labor and the entire people.

#### *Main Facts of the Campaign Results*

The correctness of the National Committee decision to launch the campaign for 15,000 new members, despite the original skepticism of certain district leaderships, has been borne out in life by its over-fulfillment. While the objectives set by the districts totaled 13,000, the campaign finished with 15,000. Of the twenty-seven districts, eighteen overfulfilled their objectives. Especially outstanding among the large districts were Michigan and New Jersey, which recruited 885 (177 per cent of its quota) and 653 (163 per cent) respectively; while among the small districts, outstanding were Montana with 51 recruits (255 per cent), Louisiana with 98 (163 per cent), and Virginia with 73 (146 per cent).

In many important shops and in entire communities there is today a completely new party membership.

Especially significant is the composition of the new recruits, indicating a strengthened contact with decisive sections of the population. This can be seen from a comparison between the composition of the registered total membership on January 1 and that of the new recruits, as follows:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Per cent in Registration</i>	<i>Per cent in New Members</i>
Negro .....	10	31
Trade Union .....	51	54
Industrial Workers Basic Industrial	43	62
Workers .....	23	36
Women .....	43	38
Housewives among Women .....	43	44
Professional and White Collar .....	29	16

Of specific help in preparing the workers for the campaign were the previously conducted activities which resulted in the selling of a quarter of a million copies of Earl Browder's *Victory—and After*, and in the increase in circulation of the *Worker*. In many districts, from 30 to 50 per cent of the new members were subscribers to the *Worker*.

The campaign required full political mobilization of both leadership and membership. It was especially necessary to overcome misconceptions and hesitations within certain leading trade union party circles. In the main, this was achieved; thereby the solid foundations were laid for the successful organization of the campaign.

Early in the campaign the National Committee, realizing that certain skepticism still prevailed, selected the important Michigan District for special attention. With the able assistance of a National Committee delegation, headed by Comrades Hudson and Ford, the Michigan party set the pace for the entire party, achieving 60 per cent of

its goal in the first three weeks. The example of Detroit inspired and convinced the entire party of the great possibilities, and in the last half of the campaign every district got into stride with Michigan.

How did Detroit get such results? The workers in Detroit are essentially the same as elsewhere. Our position and influence among the trade unionists were no stronger than in many other large industrial districts. The party was no better organized than elsewhere, and in some respects was considerably weaker than in certain other districts. Finally, while it is true that we have an able leadership in Michigan, we also have able leadership in many other districts.

#### *What Made Possible the Michigan Achievement?*

Nevertheless, Michigan proved in the first month the possibilities of mass recruiting and continued to set the pace for the entire party. While the National Committee delegation, together with the state leadership, headed by Comrades Toohey and Little, made possible this achievement, the main lessons of Detroit's success are:

1. The entire party—membership and leadership—was won to a complete understanding that party recruiting is a win-the-war task, without which the successful mobilization and unity of labor and all the people's forces of national unity and victory would be weakened and thereby made less effective.

2. Recruiting was carried on precisely when the party was most active politically in helping to clar-

ify the masses on such issues as increased production, incentive pay, the Second Front, the struggle against Red-baiting (most notoriously instanced in the reactionary efforts to unseat Senator Stanley Nowak), as helpful to the Axis and harmful to the war effort; and, lastly, the movement for unity of all Slav forces—especially the Polish-Americans, the largest national group in Detroit—behind the Commander-in-Chief and the nation's war program.

3. The party reaped the organizational benefits of accumulated years of political propaganda and activity expressed in our contributions to the fight for unemployment relief and insurance (which had its most dramatic expression in the Ford Hunger March); the active participation of Communists during the long, bitter years of organizing the unorganized, starting with the Auto Workers Industrial Union (of the Trade Union Unity League) and the A. F. of L. Federal Locals, and culminating in the great C.I.O. United Automobile Workers' organizing drives in the General Motors and Ford Companies; the consistent struggle of the Communists for Negro rights, dramatized for the entire nation by the victory at the Sojourner Truth housing project as a result of the achievement of a substantial degree of unity of labor with the Negro people; the exposure of, and struggles against, fifth columnists—the Black Legion, Father Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith; the aid given in election campaigns to all win-the-war candidates and toward the defeat of

the reactionary, appeaser candidate, ex-Congressman Tenerovich.

4. The effective organization of the party branches stimulated a large section of the membership to pursue a bold and energetic policy in recruiting, especially following up systematically the subscribers to the *Worker*, as the first line of reserves for party recruiting.

As a result, the Detroit District has nearly doubled its membership in these twelve weeks, and realizes that it is only starting on the path that can quickly lead to a party of at least 5,000 in the State of Michigan—more than double the present membership.

#### *Lessons of the Campaign*

What are the main lessons of the campaign for the entire party?

First, that the recruitment of 15,000 new members into our party signifies a decided development in the thinking of large numbers of Americans, a development indicating growing awareness of the fact that we are in the midst of a world war involving the future of mankind and the very existence of the United States as an independent nation. It signifies a growing awareness that in this war labor must be in the center of the most intense political struggles for a correct policy of coalition warfare based on a strong fighting alliance of the U.S.A., the Soviet Union and Great Britain, aiming at the destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism through an immediate invasion of Europe and uninterrupted production to supply our armies.

It further signifies that ever

larger numbers of workers associate our program and our fighting policies and slogans with their own thinking as a result of the great impact of history on their lives. As they learn of our policies, whether through our own independent activities or through our collaboration with them and their organizations in every phase of war work behind the nation's war effort under our Commander-in-Chief, new tens of thousands of American workers recognize in the Communist policies the things they are most interested in, and join our ranks the more effectively and unitedly to fight for these policies and win for them the labor movement and the nation.

If this is true of the more advanced workers who are ready to join the Communist Party, it is true also of many times that number who, while not yet convinced of their need to join, nevertheless see in the Communist Party a constructive force in American life, one which should be officially and openly recognized as a democratic force in the nation and an integral part of the camp of national unity.

This growing political understanding of the masses is evidenced both by their position and growing clarity on the key win-the-war issues generally, but also in respect to their attitude toward our party and its fighting policies on behalf of our nation. It is evidenced by the repudiation of the attempted injection of the Ehrlich-Alter spy issue in many C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions and central bodies—a repudiation, not only of the anti-Sovietism involved, but also of the Red-



baiting which the anti-Sovieteers injected; in the action of the organizing committee of the Jewish National Congress to admit mass organizations whom the Jewish *Daily Forward* clique sought to bar on grounds of "Communism"; in the action of a number of colleges in selecting leaders of the campus Young Communist League as members of their official delegations to the American Student Assembly Conference, specifically as a repudiation of Red-baiting by a reactionary minority; in the growing number of Communists elected to trade union posts in various cities; in the votes for the Communist municipal candidates in California, especially in Oakland, where the Communist Party candidate received 12,000 votes—half of the total vote cast! It is further seen in the stated sale of a quarter million copies of *Victory—and After*, the favorable reviews of the book in the newspapers outside of New York City, and the packed Communist Party mass meetings addressed by Earl Browder in city after city.

Too many of our party organizations, it must be said, are still insufficiently aware of this development. From the Party Building Campaign we should draw the lesson of greater confidence in the appeal of our policies to the people, for initiating independent party campaigns and speaking out on all vital issues, locally and nationally. In our agitation we must display greater imagination and ingenuity. Systematic radio programs should gain the same recognition as the recent utilization of newspaper ad-

vertisements for publicizing the party's important statements of policy. Neither, however, should be considered a substitute for tireless political work, extended circulation of the *Daily Worker* and the *Worker* among the masses.

#### *The Relations Between the Party and the Trade Unions*

The second main lesson of the campaign for the entire party is the fuller contribution we can now make through strengthening our relations with the trade union and other mass movements. The increase in industrial workers, especially basic industrial workers and Negro workers, presents the party with great opportunities and also responsibilities. Thus, with the new recruits, we shall increase the party members in the automotive industry by nearly 100 per cent, in the steel industry by 50 per cent, and in the shipbuilding industry by 60 per cent.

We have the responsibility to see that the growth of our party, especially among trade unionists in all important industries, contributes to strengthening the unity of the trade unions, and to strengthening their leaderships, on a program such as outlined by President Murray of the C.I.O.

The relationship between our party and the trade union movement is a political one. It is our task to help the trade unions and the whole working class to achieve independence from those influences which interfere with labor's full participation in the national war effort, with the defense of labor's

interests, and the achievement of its aspirations for a better world. The sole obligation of Communist Party members as members within trade unions is to their fellow unionists, loyally to help them carry out the democratic decisions of their union. The party considers this so decisive that it includes in its Constitution the following provision:

"All Party members in mass organizations (trade unions, farm and fraternal organizations, etc.), shall cooperate to promote and strengthen the given organization and shall abide by the democratic decisions of these organizations." (Article VI, Section 8)

With this understanding of our attitude toward and relationship with the trade unions and other mass organizations, every Communist Party member can all the better serve his mass organization by studying and mastering the program and policies of the party, which are based upon the scientific teachings of Marxism-Leninism and express the fundamental and current interests of the working class in every field of its activity.

This understanding must be brought to the thousands of trade unionists who have recently joined our party. Precisely for the reasons outlined above and to avoid any misunderstanding with trade union leaders as to our purposes, the party years ago liquidated all fractions and shop papers. It must be made clear to all that whatever so-called "gain" the party could achieve through any other approach, would result in political losses to our basic

work of helping to build a strong, united and politically clear trade union movement as the backbone of the nation. Only where democracy is denied in a mass organization is it permissible for, and incumbent upon, the progressive and democratic forces to find forms of democratic activity.

With this understanding of the relationship between the Communist Party and the trade unions, the further growth and strengthening of our party will increasingly be looked upon by trade union and mass organization leaders as a contribution toward the strengthening of the labor movement and its policies.

#### *The Fight for the Party's Full Political Citizenship*

The third main lesson of the campaign is the need for furthering the fight for the full political citizenship of the Communist Party in the nation and among all workers' organizations, and for enlightening the masses on the main ideological assaults directed at the party.

While considerable progress has been achieved, we must recognize that as long as the full citizenship of the Communist Party is challenged by reactionaries, including some elements in the Administration such as Attorney General Biddle, the battle for democracy in our own country is not yet won.

Red-baiting and the "threat-of-Communism" hysteria are generally recognized as one of Hitler's most potent weapons, but not everyone recognizes that we cannot wage a successful war against fascism and

the Axis if we resort to the use of Hitler's main weapons in our own country. Comrade Earl Browder dealt clearly with this question when he declared:

"If the United States is so fearful of its own small proportion of Communists that it must have special laws against them, special committees of Congress to hunt them out of governmental service, and special segregation of them into labor service in the armed forces—then it will certainly be impossible for such a fearful United States to have a realistic relationship of alliance with the Communists of Europe and Asia who are much more powerful, and without whom it is impossible for the United States to have an alliance with the democratic forces of the world. When we fight for the full admission of American Communists as citizens of the country without discrimination, we are fighting for a correct world policy which is necessary for victory in the war." (*Policy for Victory*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1943, p. 67.)

This understanding of the problem and the elimination of all obstacles in the path of the full public acceptance of the Communist Party in the camp of national unity must be fought for. This is not the struggle or concern of the Communists alone. It is the concern and must become the struggle of all who cherish the Bill of Rights as a living charter and who stand for the victory of democracy over the Axis and the furtherance of our nation's true interests in war and in the peace to follow.

The charge of "foreign agent"

leveled against the Communist Party has been exploded in theory and practice; it is the stock-in-trade of that small clique of enemies of our nation like Dies and Hearst and their Social-Democratic helpers like Dubinsky, Chanin, Woll and Counts, for whom Communism, not fascism, is the main enemy and who campaign for the "liquidation" of the Communist Party.

A new thesis is being introduced in the crusade against the Communist Party, as expressed by people who are sincere in their desire for victory over the Axis and favor joint action of the United States and the Soviet Union. Typical of this point of view is Mrs. Roosevelt, who, in a recent speech, attacking the moral integrity of the Young Communist League, declared:

"You can work with anyone who has the courage to stand up and say what he believes, but you can never work with anyone who says one thing and does another or who stays silent and does not state his objectives."

This charge as applied to the Communists is false and cannot stand up against the facts. Who can accuse the Communist Party of not having "the courage to stand up and say what it believes"? Day in and day out, for 365 days a year, the Communist Party states its position publicly to the American people, through speeches, articles, pamphlets, radio talks, advertisements in the newspapers, and through every other means at our disposal. It is precisely because we stand up and say what we believe in the in-

terests of labor and our nation—many times ahead of all others—that we are criticized and attacked by reaction and its dupes. True, not every Communist in a factory, in a trade union or other mass organization can admit membership in the Communist Party. Those who protest against this as “unethical” are either blind or politically dishonest. Their concern for ethics should cause them to fight against a condition in which our statute books have laws and certain people in high places adopt policies prohibiting employment of Communists in war industries and in government agencies.

Such guardians of ethics cannot fail to know of discrimination against Communists and those termed “Communists” in the armed forces which is depriving our nation of the experiences of expert military men who have already fought against Hitler’s and Mussolini’s troops; they cannot fail to know of the witch-hunting of the Dies, Rapp-Coudert, and Kerr Committees, or of the banning of the Communist Party from the radio in a number of cities. Despite this, the Communist Party speaks out openly on all issues affecting our nation. Tens of thousands of its members, including trade union members and leaders, are known publicly as Communists. Let the misguided individuals join with us in a struggle to wipe out all those remnants of Hitler’s “secret weapon” and every Communist in every organization will proudly announce his party membership.

On two different occasions the United States Government—once

through President Roosevelt and once through Under-Secretary of State Welles—has declared its agreement with the policy of all-inclusive unity, from conservatives to Communists, on the basis of a win-the-war program and common struggle against Hitler. This policy should become the accepted practice, carrying with it the wiping out of all discriminatory laws and practices in relation to jobs, professional standing, service in the armed forces, restrictions and prohibitions against the Communist Party getting on the ballot, right to hold trade union posts, etc. This is a real problem before the nation. This is in reality part of the struggle for the extension of democracy and the winning of the war. Under such circumstances, the few Communists who are not able publicly to affirm their party affiliation will be able to function openly.

In furthering the movement for full political citizenship of the party, the party itself should function everywhere and at all times publicly in political life, assuming all its rights and responsibilities that fall upon it as the political party of the American working class. This means appearing at all hearings on public questions before City Councils, State Legislatures, or Congress, and actively participating in political symposiums and debates on all current political questions. The party should deal squarely with all ideological questions raised before the masses, and should meet and dispose of slanders and distortions, not only coming from the reactionaries and defeatists but also from forces

within the win-the-war camp. The party should see that its members constantly strive to understand and master the great lessons from the history of our country and its foremost leaders, such as Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, and from the history and theory of the great labor and revolutionary movements of our own and other countries, in order to strengthen and unite the labor movement and our nation on the common platform of uncompromising struggle till Hitler and the Axis armies and systems are utterly destroyed.

The thousands of new party members not only add to the organized strength of the Communist Party in initiating and waging this struggle, but, what is equally important, these 15,000 new members, through their numerous contacts, will be able to help mobilize great masses of non-Communists in this common struggle.

#### *Effects of the War on the Negro People*

The fourth lesson of the Party Building Campaign is the rapidly growing influence of the party among the Negro people and especially the Negro industrial workers, who make up a large percentage of the new Negro recruits. This is borne out by the fact that nationally 31 per cent of the recruits are Negroes as compared with 10 per cent in the Party Registration on January 1. Of still greater significance are the results in such districts as Michigan, New Jersey, Baltimore, where Negro

recruits number close to 50 per cent of the total recruits.

This development takes place, first of all, because of the effects of the war on the Negro people, and especially Negro labor. There is a growing consciousness of broad political issues, affecting the entire Negro people. There is growing clarity on the anti-Hitler character of the war and the role of the Negro people in this great war of national liberation. There is also increasing understanding among the Negroes of labor as an ally of the Negro people, expressed in the position of the trade unions toward the F.E.P.C. and the anti-poll tax struggle in Congress. Among the Negro people and its organizations there is a great desire for unity of all forces.

As this development unfolds itself, the Negro people finds the Communist Party an active participant in all of these struggles and movements. It appreciates the correctness of the long and consistent struggle of the Communist Party for full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people. With this understanding ever larger numbers of Negro workers see in our party the most politically clear and consistent representative and fighter for their own aspirations.

The party has a special responsibility toward the large numbers of Negro comrades joining its ranks. Thought and study should be given to the possible working out of specific forms of branch life and activity to take cognizance of accepted forms of organization to

which the Negro people are accustomed while fitting into such organizational forms the political content of the party program, policies and activities.

*Majority Mobilization Could Have Brought Still Greater Results*

The fifth lesson from the Party Building Campaign is the recognition that these recruiting achievements have been gained with but a minority of the party mobilized. Clearly, we can see the great possibilities for further party building, if the great majority of our members draw the lessons from this campaign. Precisely because of this and the growing appreciation by the branches of their responsibility to function as a political force, does the goal of 100,000 party members in 1943 become more realistic and attainable.

*Shortcomings of the Campaign*

Two outstanding weaknesses of the Party Building Campaign were the virtual absence of coal miners among the 15,000 recruits, and the small percentage of women shop-workers, precisely at a time when millions of women are entering industry.

The recent miners' strike provoked by John L. Lewis, and which could only result in disrupting war production precisely at a new and critical stage of the offensive against Hitler, dramatizes the urgency of the immediate strengthening of the party among the coal miners. Who would deny that the effective influence of a few thousand Communist coal miners would

have rendered impossible this strike of Lewis, disruptive to the cause of victory and sowing confusion in the labor movement?

Today we must face the fact that, with the increase in industrial workers, especially basic industrial workers, among the party members the number of coal miners in our party is at the lowest point in party history. Using 1939 as 100, we see the following trends:

	1942	1943
Illinois .....	30	27
West. Pennsylvania....	34	17
Anthracite .....	34	42
Ohio .....	50	30

The final remedy in this situation is a challenge to us. The fact that John L. Lewis can malign the patriotism of the coal miners before the nation and strive in their name to disrupt the labor movement demands that our previous decisions be reinforced and guaranteed with all the necessary leadership and organizational ability we possess.

How shall we account for this unsatisfactory status of our party strength among the coal miners? A partial examination indicates that among the older generation of coal miners our party is held in political esteem, but primarily on the basis of past performances in the coal fields. The new and younger coal miners know little of the Communists, except in a confused and distorted manner.

The reasons for this situation can be summarized as follows:

(a) Until recently the party was without a complete rounded-out program based upon the actual con-

ditions and problems of the coal miners and the mining communities. This is partly explainable by the fact that with the rapid development and unionizing of such mass production industries as the steel, automotive, rubber and metal-electrical industries, the concentration of our party activity was centered on these spheres, to the exclusion of our activity among the miners. An effective program for our work among the miners must connect increased coal production with betterment of the miners' conditions in relation to winning the war; proper planning of coal production in relation to the domestic and war needs of the nation with saving of transportation facilities through planning and supervision; economic rehabilitation of "worked out" mining areas such as in Illinois and Ohio; abolition of "provisional government" and institution of full democracy within the miners' organizations, etc.

(b) The miners by virtue of the location of the coal areas are isolated from the main stream of the labor movement, which has not taken energetic steps to bridge this gap and initiate joint activities.

(c) Too often we forget that the main center of the bituminous mining industry has been shifted from the old Northern fields to the area centered in West Virginia. While the old fields, especially in Pennsylvania, are of key importance for our work, a serious approach to a fundamental change in party activity among the coal miners will necessitate activity also in West Virginia.

(d) In recent years there has been little organized party activity in the way of propaganda, agitational tours or assignment of leadership to the mining areas. Precisely in this period we have applied no cadre policy among coal miners. One of the first signs of serious organized activity on our part should be intensive propaganda work, especially in the securing of several thousands of subscriptions to the *Worker*; assignment of our best propagandists and speakers to mining communities; training of selected mining cadres and systematic political guidance by all party committees.

The fact that in the splendid Party Building Campaign, with 62 per cent of the recruits industrial workers and 36 per cent basic industrial workers, fewer than a hundred coal miners were recruited is a challenge which the party must meet and solve.

The second main weakness of the Party Building Campaign is the small number of women shopworkers recruited. While 38 per cent of all the recruits were women, nearly half of these were housewives. Another 30 per cent were clerical and professional or other non-shop workers. The remaining 20 per cent, or 8 per cent of the total recruits, were women shopworkers. The seriousness of this can be seen especially in Michigan, the pace-setter in recruiting for the entire party, where, with larger numbers of women entering industry than elsewhere, only 3 per cent of the new party recruits are shop women. A correct political appre-

ciation of the great changes taking place among the women of America, as they enter war industry by the hundreds of thousands, should cause us to understand the urgency of recruiting shop women into our party and to recognize that thereby our party will the more effectively be able to contribute to maximum war production and the necessary strengthening of the trade union movement through the integration and activation of women in its ranks. These women shop-workers, once members of the Communist Party and understanding the policies of our party, will become an important force in all aspects of the war effort and in strengthening the labor movement.

#### *Integrating and Activizing the New Members*

Discussing the success of the Party Building Campaign and drawing the main lessons for the entire party would be of little value if we today did not recognize quite frankly that equally important but more difficult than recruiting the new members is their political integration and activation—the task of making them feel “at home” in their own party.

These 15,000 new members took the first step in joining the party because they agree in general with our political program. The new member took the step we asked him to—he joined the party because he agrees with its principles and activities as he understands them. He is now waiting to see what will happen. Will the party give him what he wants and expects from it? Will he learn how the party functions

and how he as a member can best contribute? The party is now being judged by the new member as to its ability to live up to his expectation in politically activizing him and making him a more qualified trade unionist and consequently a better American.

The keeping of every new member is a challenge to each branch, section and state committee. The effort politically to integrate and activate the new members should assume a campaign character, with the same consciousness, determination, pride and competition that characterized the Party Building Campaign.

While the state and section organizations should plan, guide and check this entire campaign, the real solution of the problem lies in the branch. To the extent that branch activity, life, education and functioning are established according to previous National Committee recommendations, the branch will be more ready for its present-day big responsibility.

In line with our emphasis on establishing a closer political relationship with the members—new and old—instead of a mechanical organization relationship, and our decision of the last Plenum that regular attendance at every branch meeting is not a condition of membership, we should consider three types of branch meetings:

1. The regular weekly or bi-weekly meeting of the branch, where all political and organizational campaigns are discussed, organized and checked. While open to every member, it will invariably be the most



active members in community or shop affairs—numbering approximately 30 per cent to 40 per cent.

2. Once a month an open branch meeting for propaganda purposes where contacts and friends and Y.C.L. members should be systematically brought.

3. The instituting of a new type of branch meeting every three months to be known as the branch quarterly meeting. Every single member should be convinced of the necessity to attend that meeting. It should be well prepared by the branch executive. The branch executive should present a review of its activities for the last three months, evaluating its work and outlining tasks for the next period. This report should include a review of the activities of the membership of the branch. There should be presented to this quarterly meeting a financial and dues report of the branch. Then there should be a well prepared political report on the issues of the moment. At such quarterly report the agenda should provide for discussion and proposals for any replacement of any member of the branch leadership who has not met his or her party responsibilities. (This is not to replace regular annual elections of branch officers.) The purpose of such a quarterly meeting is to guarantee that every single member, no matter what or where his mass activity may be, will attend a branch meeting once a quarter and participate democratically in its affairs.

While the key to the problem of the new members lies in the branch

—insofar as activity, political relation, education, etc.—a necessary technique in helping the branch is a membership committee apparatus. *Every branch and section should have a functioning membership committee that visits every new (and old) member, knows their problems, helps acquaint them with party procedure, suggests reading material and educational activities, sees they have their membership books and know about their dues, and generally helps them feel at home in the party.*

It is well to enlist the comrade who recruited the new member to keep regular contact with his or her recruits for the first three months and to consider it a challenge to see that every recruit becomes a permanent member.

To demonstrate real understanding that party recruiting is an urgent win-the-war task, we should strive to equip every member—especially the new member—with the minimum basic political education, through regular reading of the *Daily Worker* and *The Communist*, consistent with time available. For it is precisely political understanding and conviction that are the specific contribution of the Communists to the trade unions, labor-management committees, civilian defense activity or community mass movements, and that distinguish them from others, but also enable them to unite and strengthen all movements of labor and the people in the common effort to speed victory over Nazism, and fascism, and their Japanese partners.

---

## A YEAR OF AMERICAN SLAV UNITY

BY A. LANDY

ONE of the significant developments in the organized effort to forge American national unity for victory over Hitlerism has been the movement for all-Slav unity in the United States which began in July, 1941, and finally resulted in the establishment of the first American Slav Congress on April 25-26, 1942, in the city of Detroit. This Congress, which was attended by close to 3,000 delegates, represented nearly all organized Slavs in the country, the Poles being the only group whose chief national organizations did not officially participate. Of all the national groups, which constitute such a substantial part of the American nation, the dozen and more Slav groups, representing an estimated population of 15,000,000, have been among the most energetic in the creation of organized forms of united activity in support of the Administration's win-the-war program. The fact that their blood brothers in Europe have been in the vanguard of the struggle against Hitler, augmented by the knowledge that Hitler is attempting virtually to exterminate the Slav nations and peoples, made Americans of Slav extraction particularly conscious of the menace of Hitlerism to

the national existence of the United States itself.

The most powerful stimulus to American Slav unity, as part of our country's anti-Hitler national unity, was provided by Hitler's attack upon the Soviet Union. This attack not only showed that a common fate of enslavement and annihilation awaited all the Slav nations, as well as the rest of humanity, should Hitler be victorious, but it also produced a vast upsurge of hope and confidence that with the involvement of mighty Soviet Russia, the largest of the Slav nations, the seemingly invincible Nazi legions would finally be halted, the freedom and independence of all the conquered and tortured Slav nations would be restored; and with the United States clearly next on Hitler's list of aggression, our country would have a mighty anti-fascist ally, who, together with Great Britain and ourselves, would form an invincible coalition rallying all humanity for the ultimate defeat of the Hitler scourge. When Hitler's Japanese partner treacherously attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor as a prelude to a joint Axis declaration of war, American Slavs were more than ever convinced of

the necessity of united action and saw even more clearly the inseparability of all-Slav unity, American national unity and the fighting unity of the United Nations.

### *Program of the Congress*

These sources and sentiments out of which the desire for all-Slav unity arose, were reflected in the spirit, the deliberations and the decisions of the national organizing Congress in Detroit. Despite efforts of some of the top circles to hold it in check, the Congress established a clear-cut fighting line, adopting as its first resolution the call for the opening of a second front in Europe to assure the speedy destruction of Hitler in a two-front war, and calling upon American Slavs for all-out production of the weapons necessary for this. To this it added the demand for close friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union as the road to victory over Hitler, and insisted on the necessity of sharpest struggle against all appeasers and defeatists and all those who opposed the President's win-the-war policies.

The organization of the American Slav Congress was undoubtedly an unprecedented achievement which came as a surprise alike to those who believed that such unity could not happen and those who did not want it to happen. But even more significant is the fact that the unity achieved at this Congress has been maintained and extended during the course of the year, despite the great diversity of its component

parts and the efforts of its enemies to disrupt it. The dire predictions of those who thought and those who hoped that the day of its birth would also be the day of its death were not fulfilled. Two months after its organization, the American Slav Congress showed its vitality in a series of nationwide demonstrations on June 21-22 which the Congress had proclaimed as All-Slav Day, with 50,000 participants in Pittsburgh, 15,000 in Cleveland, 10,000 in Detroit, and thousands in other key Slav centers of the country. These were followed by various activities in the war effort, ranging from blood donations to participation in the election of win-the-war Congressmen; and even though these activities were not developed to the same extent in all centers, the work of the Congress has been going forward everywhere.

The importance of this movement has been established beyond all doubt. It has proved itself to be a force for national unity; it has enhanced the unity of the win-the-war forces in the separate Slav groups; wherever it has been established, it has stimulated the win-the-war activities of the entire community. Despite the fears of those who erroneously confused it with the Pan-Slavism of Tsarist days or those who deliberately opposed it because it would strengthen the anti-Hitler coalition of the United States, England and the Soviet Union and serve as a further bar to their anti-Soviet intrigues, the movement for Slav unity has grown and has been a definite contribution to our coun-

try's war effort and to the cause of United Nations unity.

### *Importance of Slav unity*

The Slav groups, four million of whom still speak the various Slav languages, are not only numerically important in the United States; a large part of America's war industry workers are said to be of Slav extraction. This Slav origin and the sentiments associated with it are a source of fighting morale and determination. Inspired by the immortal and matchless example of the Red Army, the Slav peoples have shown the world how to fight for freedom and national independence. Indeed, the unprecedented deeds of the Red Army, which have given England and the United States time to build up their military might, supported by the legendary heroism of the Yugoslav partisans, the irrepressible struggle of the Polish guerrillas, and the valor of the Czechoslovak units fighting on Soviet soil, have created the preconditions for the complete and irrevocable destruction of Hitler slavery by the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

This fighting origin of the sentiments for American Slav unity, the knowledge that the fate of each Slav nation depends upon the unity of all Slav nations, the pride in the magnificent contribution which the Soviet Union, supported by the other Slav fighters, is making toward the survival and independence of all nations, give American Slav unity the character of a powerful offensive weapon, the kind of weapon that is needed when com-

plete and unconditional victory is the goal.

The growth of the American Slav Congress during the past year, according to the press, was expressed in the organization of all-Slav committees in many new localities and in the greater participation of the separate Slav national groups.

Today there are Slav Congress movements in Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, New York, Newark, Hartford, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and on the West Coast.

At the original Congress, the Croats provided the largest number of delegates with a large block coming from the Serbs, the Slovenes, Carpatho-Russians, Czechs and Slovaks. Since then, the majority of Slovenians and Croats have united into Slovenian and Croatian Congresses of their own and these are now official members of the American Slav Congress.

The Czechoslovak organizations have likewise strengthened their role in the work of the American Slav Congress. If the Russians and Carpatho-Russians have not been so prominent in the work of the Congress, it is not because they are not in full accord with it. Indeed there are indications that in the future these two groups will play a more outstanding role in the movement for American Slav unity.

While the bulk of the Polish organizations did not participate in the Congress, adopting a non-committal attitude toward it, the Polish fascists fought the Congress, at first by staying away and then, after seeing its strength, by joining it in

such places as Chicago, Philadelphia, and Newark, in an effort to disrupt it from within. Whatever genuine participation there has been on the part of the Poles has come mainly from the Polish-American trade union circles as personified in Leo Krzycki, President of the American Slav Congress and a Vice-President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, or from progressive circles associated with them, such as those represented by Dr. T. W. Ossowski in Detroit and Blair F. Gunther in Pittsburgh. In Hartford and Milwaukee important blocs of Polish organizations are affiliated to the all-Slav movement. In the former, the central body of Polish organizations is active in the Congress.

#### *Lessons for the Future*

The beginning of the second year of American Slav unity opens at a new and perhaps most decisive stage of the war. The bulk of Hitler's armies are still on Soviet soil, engaged by the might of the Red Army, although the blows of England and the United States have at last begun to merge with those of our Soviet ally. Poland and Czechoslovakia are still occupied and enslaved by the Nazi barbarians. The blood of the Yugoslav partisans is flowing in the mountains and valleys as they beat back Hitler's fourth large-scale offensive. Mass executions and pillage by the fascist hordes are turning the Slav lands into vast cemeteries. But the tide has turned; coalition warfare against Hitler is becoming a reality. Amer-

ican boys and American arms have made their first major contribution to the destruction of Hitler's armies in North Africa, and are now indisputably in a position to close the iron ring around him from the West. It is plain, however, that we are on the eve of the most gigantic battles of the war. Every effort will be made by Hitler and his friends to prevent the closing of this iron ring. Frantic military exertions and adventures by Hitler will be accompanied by equally frantic diplomatic efforts to save the Nazis by means of negotiated peace. Clearly, the maintenance and extension of Slav unity are more urgent than ever.

On the eve of the Anglo-American invasion of Europe which will crush Hitler in a two-front war, the strengthening of Slav unity is an indispensable means of strengthening the unity of the United Nations, and of assuring the maximum, unpostponable mobilization of the fighting energies and reserves of millions of people in the occupied countries as well as in the United States. It is essential in order to eliminate serious obstacles to the most efficient functioning of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, such as the criminal contact with the enemy and the policy of no-resistance cultivated by the Polish and Yugoslav Governments-in-exile. For it should be evident that such policies, based on reactionary designs toward their own people and on hostility to the Soviet Union, facilitate Hitler's desperate attempt to fortify Europe against the impending Anglo-American invasion

and give him additional means to carry through his frantic maneuvers to stave off final defeat by dividing the United Nations among themselves and internally with the help of his anti-Soviet bogey. No observer of the movement for Slav unity in the United States can forget that the forces which have opposed this unity are the same forces, in and out of Congress and the State Department, that have tried to break national unity around the Commander-in-Chief, prevent the opening of the second front in Europe, disrupt the fighting alliance of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, and encourage the restoration and establishment of pro-fascist regimes throughout the world.

The experiences of the first year of American Slav unity will undoubtedly serve as a guide for its further development under the new conditions. Some of the significant facts revealed by a study of these experiences indicate:

1. American Slav unity was achieved and maintained, despite all of its weaknesses and contradictions, because of the collaboration of government, trade union and Left-progressive forces on the basis of all-inclusive anti-fascist unity, making it possible to give organized expression to the deep-rooted sentiment and desire of the American Slavs for anti-Hitler unity. It stands to reason that the strengthening of the national war effort on a scale demanded by the needs of victory, and consequently the further development of Slav unity, requires the continuation of this collaboration.

2. American Slav unity has thrived to the extent that it has fought for the program as adopted by the first organizing Congress in Detroit and resisted every effort to reduce it to a purely formal and barren character. It cannot thrive and contribute to the nation's war effort if it is kept on a purely cultural, non-political plane, or if its activities are restricted within the narrowest confines irrespective of the desire of the masses in this movement to speak out and act on the questions closest to their hearts as, for example, the immediate opening of the Second Front and firm friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union. It cannot contribute to national unity by the methods of those forces who, though friends of American Slav unity, have tried to meet the incessant pressure of its enemies by capitulating to this pressure, seeking for a way out finally in a surrender of Slav unity altogether. If American Slav unity is to be a vigorous part of national unity for victory, it must represent more than perfunctory participation in the war effort; it must develop greater organizational activity and initiative in relation to all questions affecting the outcome of the war.

3. American Slav unity is based on a combination of local committees and the participation of the separate Slav national groups. Without these local movements, the American Slav Congress would have gone out of existence soon after its foundation. This is clear from the impressive achievements of the Michigan Slav Congress in

Detroit which seems to have stimulated many other Slav centers to register similar successes.

The close interdependence between these local movements and the activity of the separate national groups is also shown by the work of such Slav committees as those in Detroit and Milwaukee. The effective work of the Detroit committee, for example, has resulted in activating the Ukrainians of that city, even though nationally this group is sharply divided. The Milwaukee committee has been able to do the same thing with the Polish organizations of that city, despite the aloofness of the chief Polish organizations nationally.

It is evident that the further strengthening of Slav unity as part of American national unity depends upon the growth of the local committees and their activation around the needs of the war. Judging from the experience of the Detroit Slav Congress as reflected in its organ, the *Michigan Slav*, this would require the correction of such serious shortcomings in their work as the insufficient involvement of labor, the haphazard development and pursuit of a program of activities, the poor utilization of the available forces for leadership, and the inadequate involvement of the basic organizations of the various Slav groups.

### *Three Main Groups*

It is clear, of course, that the situation in the separate Slav national groups will affect the further development of Slav unity in this country. An examination of

the three main groups, the Yugoslavs, Czechoslovaks and Poles, shows to what extent the central issues dominating these groups are essentially problems of American national policy, and not just American reflections of purely European questions.

Take the Yugoslavs. The central point of controversy here has been the Mikhailovich question. At the organizing Congress in Detroit, not only the Croatian and Slovenian organizations took part, but also the organizations of the third group constituting the Yugoslav population here, that is, the Serbs, including those organizations dominated by the fascists. Today, the bulk of the Serbian groups has withdrawn from the Congress. It is significant that the fascists dominating the chief Serb organizations are not only champions of Mikhailovich but also conduct propaganda for Neditch, Hitler's Serbian puppet.

Obviously, Anglo-American policy toward Mikhailovich has been used as a screen by these agents of Hitler in the United States, while confusing the anti-Hitler forces not only among the Serbs but among other Slav groups. The time has plainly come when continued support of Mikhailovich by Britain and the United States can only weaken the United Nations, and be at the expense of Anglo-American military needs and the lives of British and American boys.

Every student of the Yugoslav question knows that Mikhailovich has definitely collaborated with the Axis against the Partisan fighters of the United Nations; that he has

publicly attacked Britain and the United States, not to speak of the Soviet Union, although every effort has been made to conceal this fact; that his alleged declarations of loyalty to England and America have been manufactured by the reactionary Yugoslav Government-in-exile to cover up his treachery; and finally, that it has become increasingly difficult for both London and Washington to maintain the Mikhailovich myth.

It is true that Britain particularly has recently come around to a greater public recognition of the role of the partisans and has even brought pressure to bear on the Yugoslav Government-in-exile to modify its public declarations in relation to them as revealed by the last speeches of King Peter. But the toleration of Mikhailovich continues. The Anglo-American invasion of Europe will unquestionably reveal the utter untenability of this position and will force a drastic revision in policy.

Meanwhile the American Yugoslav groups have a great responsibility to intensify their efforts to bring the truth about Mikhailovich not only to the Slav movement for the sake of Slav unity in this country but to the entire nation for the sake of victory over Hitler. They have an urgent obligation to organize moral and material aid to the partisans and full mass support to the government's policy of American collaboration with the Soviet Union, a prime condition for the liberation of Yugoslavia and the victory of the United States and the United Nations.

The Czechoslovaks are today the most important single group in the American Slav Congress. The close and friendly relations of the Benes government with the Soviet Union and the neighborly relations of the Czechoslovaks with the other Slav groups enable the Czechoslovak-Americans to play a unifying role in the Slav community in the United States. The Czechoslovak units fighting side by side with the Red Army against the common enemy are a dramatic reminder to the Czechoslovak masses in America that Slav unity is the only guarantee of Czechoslovak liberation and independence.

Despite this favorable position, the Slovak question, which arises from the national aspirations of the European Slovaks within the Czechoslovak group, represents a serious source of disruption for American Slav unity. Slovakia today is headed by a Hitler puppet who seeks to exploit the national sentiments of the Slovak people for the destruction of the Czechoslovak state. His supporters in the United States have been active in the same direction.

The efforts of the American-Slovak League to win the Slovak masses in support of Tiso, Hitler's Slovak puppet, were followed a year ago by a new element of disunity in the person of Milan Hodza, formally a member of the Czechoslovak government-in-exile, who quickly found a place in the plans of the reactionary Berle-Bullitt schemers in Washington. Prominent Slovak leaders of the American Slav Congress were taken in by



Hodza's separatist propaganda and unfortunately have come to regard the leaders of the Czech group not only as enemies of Slovak national aspirations but also as enemies of American Slav unity. This breach is plainly not in the interests either of the Czechs or the Slovaks and must be bridged. The real enemies are to be found elsewhere, and it is these that must be exposed. Above all, the big task is to win the masses of Slovaks in the United States for active support of the government's win-the-war policies and the anti-Hitler struggle. The rapid development of the great perspectives for anti-fascist unity among the Czechoslovak masses in the United States will be a big factor in strengthening American national unity and all-Slav unity generally during the next crucial period.

The exposure by the Soviet Government of the Polish Government-in-exile as a government of contact with the Nazi enemy has already been seized upon by the reactionary forces among the Poles here as a further means of combating our government's war program and its policy of collaboration with the Soviet Union. They have selected no less a forum than the Congress of the United States, with Congressman Lesinski, defender of pro-Nazi elements, as their chief spokesman, and other Polish-American Congressmen being lined up by the Polish Embassy.

The supporters of the Polish Government-in-exile in the leadership of the main Polish-American

organizations who, in the past, refrained from open opposition to American Slav unity, as distinct from the Pilsudski-Matuszewski pro-fascist forces, have found a common ground with these elements in public attacks on the Soviet Union and will now take even fewer pains to maintain the semblance of neutrality toward the Slav Congress. It should be said, however, that the fact that the Polish-American masses are overwhelmingly progressive and supporters of the President's win-the-war policies has so far prevented the enemies of Slav unity from using the Soviet Union's severance of relations as a pretext for an open fight against the Congress. The meeting of the Chicago All-Slav Congress on April 28 after the break in Polish-Soviet relations, was attended by about twenty-five Polish delegates, the largest attendance of its kind in that city, who expressed full support for All-Slav unity.

The Polish labor and progressive forces in Detroit who represent the backbone of the Michigan Slav Congress have sharply condemned the action of the Polish government-in-exile in associating itself with Hitler's effort to divide the United Nations, and have reiterated their faith in Polish-Soviet friendship and the need of Polish armed forces fighting side by side with the Red Army as the only assurance of the liberation of Polish people and the restoration of a free, independent and strong Poland. A meeting of 100 leading Polish personalities in Detroit, addressed by

Professor Karpinski of the University of Michigan, resulted in the organization of a Victory First Committee which categorically repudiated the action of the fascist-dominated Polish government-in-exile. The statement of the Polish Professor Oscar Lange, from the University of Chicago, which appeared in the New York *Herald Tribune* a few days after the rupture of relations, sharply attacked the Sikorski Government and will undoubtedly exercise considerable influence in mobilizing the anti-Hitler forces in this country on the question.

Patriotic Polish-Americans and especially Polish-American labor and anti-fascist forces have a great responsibility to take the initiative in uniting their ranks to spread the truth about this issue, and to defeat the efforts of the appeasers and America First defeatists like Lesinski and Cudahy in the so-called Friends of Poland Committee to use the Polish question as a means of struggle against the Administration and disruption of Anglo-American-Soviet collaboration. They must see to it that the criminal acts of the Polish government-in-exile are not permitted to obscure the heroic struggles of the real Polish people as expressed in the activities of the Polish partisans and the formation of a Polish division on Soviet soil.

#### *Attack on All-Slav Unity Rebuffed*

It is evident that the course of all-Slav unity is not a smooth highway, free of obstacles or obstructions. Indeed, judging from press

reports, the very meeting of the National Committee of the American Slav Congress held in Chicago on March 27, which marked approximately one year of gratifying accomplishments, also revealed an effort to liquidate the entire Congress. Unfortunately some of its best friends served as unwitting instruments of this effort which had its origin in certain Washington circles; they yielded to the pressure of those who to this day have not given up their ambition to destroy the Slav Congress and thereby opened the way for the dissolution of the Congress in the name of organizing a broader United Nations Congress. All reports indicate that the deliberations and decisions of the Chicago meeting of the National Committee provided a vigorous rebuff to this effort. The fact that this seems to have been administered by means of friendly and fraternal discussion was evidence of the vitality of the Congress. Because this was a meeting of struggle for the maintenance of Slav unity, the leading forces of the American Slav Congress acquired a deeper understanding of its meaning. The Resolutions and Seven-Point Program of Action adopted unanimously at this meeting showed that the political basis for American Slav unity was being strengthened by the very development of the war.

Reaffirming its pledge "to our Commander-in-Chief to rally Americans of Slav extraction in unbreakable unity for the complete defeat and unconditional surrender of the Axis powers," and declaring that "the decisive moment of the

war against the German would-be conquerors has come," the main resolution adopted at the national committee meeting called for a quick invasion of Europe "with all the power that we have built up during the time granted us by the magnificent resistance of our Russian brothers." "At this decisive moment," the resolution declares, "we renew our call to American Slavs to uphold the hand of our President with firmness and courage, so that he may carry out the decisions of the Casablanca Conference for the swift invasion of Europe. . . ." Another resolution adopted a stirring reply of solidarity to the appeal of the All-Slav Congress in Moscow.

Unquestionably, our country's war effort has been stronger for the existence of the American Slav Congress. Its national committee has adopted a program for the energetic extension of its work in the next period which should make even greater contributions to the strengthening of American national unity, American-Soviet-British col-

laboration and world Slav unity for victory over Hitler. Judging by the results of the All-Slav Day on June 22 of last year, the decision of the National Committee of the Congress to recommend similar actions this June 22 should prove an effective means of helping to mobilize the full moral, political and material influence and resources of the American Slavs in support of the Casablanca decisions and the decisions of the latest Roosevelt-Churchill conference in Washington aimed at the unconditional surrender and the crushing defeat of the Italo-Nazi coalition in a two-front war which will provide the basis for the destruction of the entire Axis. There are many urgent tasks confronting the movement for Slav unity in the United States. The energetic execution of the plans adopted by the American Slav Congress will demonstrate that the Congress is capable of meeting these tasks and, in doing so, of advancing our country's war effort and the cause of the United Nations.

---

## ON THE 73<sup>RD</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF LENIN'S BIRTH

BY L. YUDIN

**F**OR every country, every war, particularly modern warfare, is a stern test of the stability of its political system and of the economic power and moral and spiritual strength of its people.

In summing up the past twenty-two months of war our people can proudly declare to the world that the Soviet system has stood all the tests. The Soviet state has proved that it is the most stable of all modern states. The unexampled heroism, courage and skill of the Red Army have evoked the admiration of the whole of progressive mankind. The Soviet people have displayed their full determination to fight the hated enemy until his utter destruction.

What are the courses of the military might and stability of the Soviet state? What guides the Soviet people in their determination to wage the war against the German imperialists until the complete rout of the hated invaders, no matter what the sacrifices?

The answers to these and similar questions are to be found in the very nature of the Soviet political system, founded by Lenin and Stalin; in the peculiarities of the war the Germans thrust upon us.

Lenin devoted all his life to the

liberation of the people. Prior to Lenin, history knew of no other man who played such a great role in the life of his country, in the life of his people.

It is now half a century that the history of Russia, that everything great that has been created by the Russian people and the other peoples of the U.S.S.R., is indissolubly associated with the name of Lenin.

Lenin was the organizer of the Bolshevik Party, the teacher of the people of the Soviet country, the leader of the October Revolution and the founder of the Soviet state. He created the Red Army and organized the victories of the civil war. He drew up a brilliant program of a socialist society.

Lenin strikingly and profoundly defined the vital strength of the Soviet system and the full readiness of the masses to defend Soviet power at any time and with all their strength.

Soviet power gave the people boundless possibilities for free and creative labor, cultural development and the independent administration of their state. And this united politically all the peoples of the Soviet country from the very first days of Soviet power and considerably multiplied their forces.

Lenin taught that the strength of the Soviet state lies in the universal and conscious support of this state. He had boundless faith in the strength of the masses, in their creative energy and ability to accomplish great historical deeds. He said that an inexhaustible source of self-sacrifice, of everything honest, progressive and aspiring to the new is latent in the popular masses.

In one of his speeches in 1920 Lenin said that in every war victory in the final outcome is conditioned by the morale of the masses who are shedding their blood on the battlefield. He said that conviction in the justness of the war, the consciousness of the need of sacrificing their lives for the well-being of their brothers, raise the spirit of soldiers and impel them to bear unprecedented hardships.

The war has been on for nearly two years now, and the heroism of the Soviet people and their will to victory are still further enhanced by every new trial. The production of war materials—planes, tanks, artillery, mortars and all types of arms and munitions, equipment and supplies for the Red Army—is mounting month after month.

Lenin pointed out that in the course of a war, no matter how strong an army is and no matter how stable its rear, a critical moment will inevitably set in in those states which are engaged in the war not in the interests of the people; a moment when the army becomes incapable of continuing the war, and when the rear is unable to keep its army supplied with all its needs.

On the other hand, the state wag-

ing a just war in the interests of its people finds universal support among the people. Such a state, such a country, such a people are capable of fighting until victory is scored.

The Soviet people are developing their creative forces to the full in the course of the war. The heroism of the Red Army, its courage and military skill, are growing.

Difficult and bloody clashes with the Hitlerite scoundrels still lie ahead for the Soviet people. Victory can be achieved at the price of great efforts and sacrifices; by straining all the vital forces of the Soviet state.

Realizing this, and steadily following Stalin's instructions, the Soviet patriots in the rear are daily increasing their output of war materials; the Soviet troops at the front are perfecting their military skill and daily wiping out increasing numbers of German soldiers and officers.

Our Red Army men and the whole Soviet people remember Stalin's words that the struggle against the German invaders is not yet over; that it is only just developing and flaring up. It would be silly to believe that the Germans will surrender even a single kilometer of Soviet soil without a fight.

The Soviet people know that the enemy is still strong, and therefore they do not underestimate the difficulties confronting them. The Soviet people repeat the words of the great Lenin: "Our Russia that has been liberated, that has won its Soviet Revolution—we will defend this Russia to our last drop of blood."

---

# “ONE WORLD”—WENDELL WILLKIE’S CHALLENGING BOOK

BY JOSEPH NORTH

**A**S THIS is being written, about a million Americans have bought copies of Wendell Willkie’s book *One World*. The trade reports that it is the fastest selling book in recent years. There is great significance in this: it is not only that the titular head of the Republican Party has written a fascinating book of the journey on his twentieth-century “magic carpet”—the four-engined Consolidated Bomber, “The Gulliver” which whisked him over 31,000 miles of land and sea in forty-nine days. It is far more than a fine job of reporting. It is a statement of policy: a political document of first-rate importance. *One World*, as the title implies, breathes the spirit of United Nations cooperation. Mr. Willkie seeks a course of action that will strengthen the base of the coalition—the success of which spells victory in the war and in the coming peace.

For years—and particularly since June 22, 1941, millions of Americans puzzled over a number of facts—or rather, distortions of fact. They realized that something was wrong with the information afforded them of certain world phenomena. The times were bringing vast changes, but the authorities in foreign affairs were not equal to the job. What, for example, was

happening in the Soviet Union? They wanted facts, but what they were told did not seem to hold water. Their suspicions were totally confirmed when reports poured in of the fighting on the Eastern front. They were inspired by those reports: it did not take long for their feelings to crystallize into deep admiration for the Red Army and the Soviet Union. Why, they began to ask, were we informed by radio and by the press that the Soviets would last three weeks after the Wehrmacht unleashed its blitz? Such a cosmic piece of misinformation can never be forgotten—nor forgiven. Too much was at stake: this “mistaken” appraisal of Soviet Russia’s strength greatly affected international relations and programs of action, which, in turn, affected the daily lives of men and their families. A re-evaluation of the Soviet Union began. Actually it started with Joseph E. Davies’ book *Mission To Moscow*. Small wonder that the movie of this book is “packing them in.” Small wonder, too, that this movie is drawing the concentrated fire of the defeatists and appeasers, of all professional anti-Sovieteers, of the unreconstructed Social-Democrats, and the mad-dog Trotskyites, as well as those liberals influenced by them. They fear the

fact that we have moved into a new era in our thinking about the Soviet Union and all our Allies.

Mr. Willkie's book accords with the popular realization that this is a just war, a truly patriotic war of national liberation—a realization which came about after Hitler's *panzerdivisionen* crossed the Soviet frontier. The book is welcomed because it answers questions—and poses solutions—that are in harmony with the growing popularity of the Soviet Union, and our other Allies. Americans saw the mighty Red Army smash the myth of Nazi invincibility. They came to understand that without the Soviets the Nazis would have overrun all Europe, Africa and Asia. They knew then that we in America would have been assaulted by the overwhelming might of the Axis. They know now that the Eastern Front made our great victory in Tunisia possible. They have come increasingly to demand answers to their questions about the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Furthermore, this just war is engendering a sense of community with all our sister nations. Sympathy for the lands and peoples of the United Nations, and the desire to know them, grow, despite the frantic counter-propaganda of those in America who echo the Goebbels line. Mr. Willkie touches the agreement of the majority in our land when he writes that the "net impression" of his journey "was not one of distance from other peoples but of closeness to them." The world had "become small and interdependent." The voyage of his four-engined bomber brought him

complete realization that "there are no distant points in the world any longer." When Mr. Willkie says "Our thinking in the future must be world-wide," he gets the approbation of all democratic Americans.

Herr Doktor Goebbels is not at all unaware of this change in attitude: his propaganda mills work furiously to revive old confusions, to stir up old prejudices. The airways are filled with libels on all the United Nations, and most particularly our Soviet ally. The success of such propaganda can well rob the United Nations of promised victory. It is particularly dangerous today, on the eve of great impending action upon the continent of Europe, when hundreds of millions throughout the world wait to hear that the Allied armies have landed in Europe. They wish to see the opening of the long-desired second front that will synchronize with the epic fighting on the Eastern front. That will spell total coalition warfare in the decisive theater of the war. At such a time the Goebbels lie, if not exposed and refuted, becomes a most deadly weapon in the Axis arsenal. Our defeatists, eager for weapons, know that very well.

For these reasons, Mr. Willkie has done a great patriotic service with his book. He accepted no mean responsibility when he climbed into "The Gulliver." He discharged his responsibility honorably. His report was a wise statement of policy; and it carries especial weight coming from the 1940 Presidential candidate, from a spokesman of capitalism, a hard-headed businessman who might have retained the

encrusted prejudices of so many of his class, and particularly of leading circles in his own party. His book, as Earl Browder has pointed out, ranks with the speech of Henry Wallace of May 8, 1942, and of Sumner Welles of May 30, 1942. Mr. Willkie is another powerful spokesman of that section of monopoly capital—the dominant section—that realizes this is a war in defense of our national sovereignty and therefore acts as a component in the national front for victory.

\* \* \*

What, in sum, does Mr. Willkie say? First of all, that this war cannot be won without genuine coalition warfare and common military council; that the Soviet Union and China must be recognized as being equal partners in the councils of the United Nations, the realization of which must be borne home on all people. That is his principal argument. And he concludes that, "generally speaking, nothing of importance can be won in peace which has not already been won in the war itself." The post-war world will be fashioned by the way we fight the war itself to victory.

In his thinking about the post-war world, he returns time and again to the idea that it depends totally upon the way the war is fought, *now*. That was apparent when he spoke up for the opening of the second front last year. It is apparent when he writes, "It is quite true that many details must be worked out at the peace table and at conferences succeeding the peace table—details which cannot be judiciously worked out under the

pressure of war. We—we and our Allies, of course—cannot, for instance, stop fighting the Japanese to make a detailed plan of what we intend to do about Burma when victory is won. Nor can we relent in our pressure against Hitler to decide the detailed future of Poland now."

To those in his class who look for "enormous" trade relations with China and the Far East he warns that their hopes may be an unrealized dream unless "joint military strategy with China" is worked out "*today*." "Can we hope to bring Russia, with its almost startling potentialities within the orbit of a future coordinated economic world, unless we have learned to work with her military strategists and her political leaders in common council." Today, now.

This, to our detriment, is not the viewpoint of all official circles: it certainly is not in the sinister "Berle corner" of our State Department. There are too many in Mr. Willkie's own party, and also among the Democrats, who share the responsibility for the secret finaglings of that "corner." The failure to declare war on Hitler's Finnish ally and the continued appeasement of the fascist Franco have created universal misgivings. Precisely such appeasement policies endanger the structure of coalition warfare. Our notoriously ambiguous foreign policy has done us much harm. In this regard, Mr. Willkie's now famous phrase—the reservoir of good-will for America—comes to mind. He warns that it has sprung too many a leak. There was the Darlan episode; this was followed



by the Peyrouton appointment. Mr. Willkie feels that the explanation of "temporary military expediency" did not sit well on most people's minds. They "felt they saw diplomacy once more, in devious ways, trading away the principles which we had proclaimed to the world." He warned that the "people of Russia and Great Britain and the conquered countries of Europe felt betrayed and baffled."

Today, as we gird ourselves to fight upon the European continent, this fact must be kept well in mind. For this is a war of liberation, Mr. Willkie stresses, concurring, he points out, with Joseph Stalin. His journey proved to him that all the peoples want the United Nations to win the war, but "they all want a chance at the end of the war to live in liberty and independence." And there are doubts, he continuously presses upon his readers, in "the readiness of the leading democracies of the world to stand up and be counted for freedom for others after the war is over. This doubt kills their enthusiasm in participation on our side."

This, he says, is true everywhere, particularly in Asia. "This is a continent where the record of Western democracies has been long and mixed, but where people—and remember there are a billion of them—are determined no longer to live under foreign control. . . . They are determined to work out their own destiny under governments selected by themselves."

He declares that this war must end "the empire of nations over other nations. No foot of Chinese

soil, for example, should be or can be ruled from now on except by the people who live on it. And we must say so now, not after the war."

"America," Mr. Willkie writes, "must choose one of three courses after this war; narrow nationalism, which inevitably means the ultimate loss of our own liberty; international imperialism, which means the sacrifice of some other nation's liberty; or the creation of a world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation. I am convinced that the American people will choose, by overwhelming majority, the last of these courses. To make this choice effective, we must win not only the war, but also the peace, and we must start winning it now."

When Mr. Willkie says that, he undertakes a historic responsibility. He has a big job to push through his own ideas in leading circles of his own party. For there are many in it—"Big Stick" imperialists—who differ violently with his concept. Harrison E. Spangler, chairman of Mr. Willkie's own Republican National Committee, has a totally different viewpoint. He summed it up when he said, "My job is to build up an army of voters in the United States to defeat the New Deal, and I don't think there are any voters in China, or Mongolia or Russia that I can get for the Republicans."

That reflects the caliber of one of Mr. Willkie's leading party figures; it reflects the thinking of important sections of topnotch G.O.P. circles. What Mr. Willkie writes collides completely with the daily campaigning of the Patterson-Mc-

Cormick Axis. It is completely at odds with that "elder statesman" of the G.O.P.—Herbert Hoover, who too, in collaboration with Hugh Gibson, wrote a book. In *Problems of a Lasting Peace*, Mr. Hoover openly favored "a compromise peace." Everything Mr. Hoover has written since his book was published certainly attests to no change of heart. On the contrary. He doggedly continues in one form or another to reaffirm his book's conclusions. His series of articles, carried by the Associated Press in January, 1943, echoed the Goebbels line, arguing against the decisive strategy of an early Second Front that was later enunciated at Casablanca. Don't invade Europe in 1943! With Cassandra-like gloom he seeks to overwhelm us all over again with Axis "invincibility." He says they have "six to seven million men behind their control of the whole European seaboard"—a wildly exaggerated figure that can gain endorsement only from the Berlin Propaganda Ministry. He pleads for a policy of drawn-out "attrition warfare" and proposes "solutions" that would drag the war on so that the defeatists and "Big Stick" imperialists would have ample time in which to carry through their intrigues.

This Hoover line of a dragged-out war of attrition received its condemnation in Winston Churchill's meaningful words before Congress on May 19:

"We have surmounted many serious dangers, but there is one grave danger which will go along with us until the end. That danger is the undue prolongation of the war."

In brief, Mr. Willkie has no mean task. He and his like-minded associates, in collaboration with labor and the Administration, are confronted with the decisive task of combating the defeatists and reactionaries, in order to carry the day in his party for his proposed "third choice." He must win out against those others in the G.O.P. leadership who favor the other two choices, "narrow nationalism," which equates to "the ultimate loss of our own liberty" and "international imperialism" — which means the "sacrifice of some other nation's liberty."

\* \* \*

Finally, and in context of current political discussions as the war moves to its climax, we come to the most fruitful part of Mr. Willkie's book—the section dealing with the American-Soviet understanding and cooperation, so vital to the victory drive of the United Nations. These are the most vivid chapters; the son of the western prairies who remembered the flatboard pavements of his childhood town in Indiana found much in common with the pioneering Soviet people. And he looked clear-eyed at what he saw. The Russians were vibrant with energy; they had enthusiasm; they had a dream; they were builders; they had already created a tremendous industrial machine. Their democratic spirit reminded him of his own midwestern folk. He saw war waged with every ounce of the people's energy. "I realized more clearly than ever before," he writes, "that in Russia, 'This is a People's War' had real meaning." He sees

that it is the Russian people "in the fullest sense who are resolved to destroy Hitlerism." He is stirred by what he saw. "The Russian people—not just their leaders—the Russian people, I was convinced, had chosen victory or death. They talked only of victory."

He was given carte blanche to go where he wanted, to see what he wished. He went to the Rzhev front where he was impressed by the 38-year-old commander there. When Mr. Willkie asked him how big a front he was defending, the Soviet general replied, offended: "Sir, I am not defending, I am attacking." Mr. Willkie looked at the collective farms, studied a typical one in considerable detail and discovered it was run much like 250,000 other collective farms in the Soviet Union. And he began to realize how the "collective farms constituted the very backbone of Russia's tough resistance." He spent a day in a Soviet aviation plant where the famous Stormoviks are built, saw some 30,000 workers "making a very presentable number of airplanes every day." He found that more than 35 per cent of the labor in the plant was being done by women; and discovered the meaning of the word Stakhanovite. He saw typical instances of the Russian workers' and leaders' self-sacrificing zeal and heroism. The plant he studied had been picked up bodily from its foundations in Moscow in October, 1941 "when the sound of Nazi cannonading could be heard in the Soviet capital." He admired the fact that it had been moved more than a thousand miles and set up again, "many of its

original workers tending their own machines throughout the transfer." And by December, two months later, "it was producing planes at its new location."

And he saw another thing of vast significance. "I found in Yakutsk evidence of one of the Soviet Union's greatest achievements and one which the best and most progressive Americans must applaud; its handling of the terrible problem of national and racial minorities." He was made acutely aware of this problem everywhere he traveled—in Syria, in Turkey, in Egypt, in China. "Everywhere I found polite but skeptical people, who meet my questions about their problems with polite but ironic questions about our own. The maladjustments of races in America came up frequently. . . ." This is highlighted by his own reflections upon the way we "handle" the Negro question in our country, and by the fact that we are "witnessing a crawling, insidious anti-Semitism in our own country." Is it any wonder he was moved to admiration when he witnessed how the many races and peoples in the Soviet Union live together harmoniously, in fullest equality and unity? As an honest observer there was for him much to admire.

Later he spoke with the leader of this great ally that is Soviet Russia, Joseph Stalin—and with his associates Molotov, Vyshinsky, Mikoyan and others.

In Moscow he had two long talks with Stalin. His reactions to the Soviet leader are similar to those previously recorded by Winston Churchill, Lord Beaverbrook and

Harry Hopkins. He too admires Stalin's "hard, tenacious driving mind." Stalin, he says, "asked searching questions, each of them loaded like a revolver, each of them designed to cut through to what he believed to be the heart of the matter that interested him." When Stalin asked Mr. Willkie of his trips through the various Soviet factories, "he wanted detailed reports, department by department, not general judgments as to their operating methods and efficiency."

He asked Stalin, "the great realist," questions about the battle of Stalingrad, then under seige. "He developed for me logically not only its geographical and military importance, but the moral effect on Russia, Germany and particularly the Middle East, of the successful or unsuccessful defense." The Soviet leader "made no predictions as to Russia's ability to hold it and he was quite definite in his assertion that neither love of homeland nor pure bravery could save it. Battles were won or lost primarily by numbers, skill and materiel."

Stalin afforded no comfort to those who are inclined to over-optimism. "He did not think we should count upon an early internal collapse in Germany." He said that the way to defeat Germany was "to destroy its army."

Mr. Willkie also discussed the post-war world with Stalin and other Soviet leaders. "Whenever the talk of these men ran to the peace, to what the world must be prepared to do after the war is over, they talked with statesmanship and real understanding." Addressing himself to those who "question the good

faith of Stalin" Mr. Willkie offers the following advice.

"Perhaps we can better measure the good faith of Stalin's statement in the light of the millions of Russians who have already died defending their fatherland and of the sixty millions who have become slaves of the Nazis; in those other millions of Russian men and women who are working feverishly sixty-six hours a week in factories and mines to forge and produce instruments of war for the fighters at the front; and in the effort that went into the almost miraculous movement of great factories, hundreds of miles, that they might operate, uninterrupted, beyond Nazi reach. For it is in the attitude of the people that we may find the best interpretation of Stalin's purpose."

For all these reasons, one can only differ with Mr. Willkie when, urging fullest understanding and cooperation with the Soviet Union, he refers to Communism as "leading to absolutism." It is unnecessary here to debate with this leading exponent of capitalism the relative merits of Communism and the system he espouses. It is necessary to point this out: the very mountain of facts he has recorded attests to the Soviet peoples' vigor, participation and boundless enthusiasm. His observations on the war effort in the socialist state led him to conclude that there, "This is a people's war" has real meaning." His own recorded observations refute the entire concept of absolutism in relation to the Soviet Union. Mr. Willkie, at this point, has lapsed into the pattern of prejudice typical of the very people whom he

is endeavoring to win away from pernicious anti-Sovietism.

Notwithstanding this, as well as certain minor shortcomings, the book deserves the wide acclaim it has received. For Mr. Willkie arrives at basically sound conclusions; conclusions, which, if advanced with the same zeal and energy that he displays in this book, will play a great part in helping win this war and the peace.

These are his conclusions:

"First, Russia is an effective society. It works. It has survival value. The record of Soviet resistance to Hitler has been proof enough of this to most of us, but I must admit in all frankness that I was not prepared to believe before I went to Russia what I now know about its strength as a going organization of men and women.

"Second, Russia is our ally in this war. The Russians, more sorely tested by Hitler's might than even the British, have met the test magnificently. Their hatred of racism and the Nazi system is real and deep and bitter. And this hatred makes them determined to eliminate Hitler and exterminate the Nazi blight from Europe and the world.

"Third, we must work with Russia after the war. At least it seems to me that there can be no continued peace until we learn to do so."

And what honest, patriotic American, desiring victory over the Axis, and effective post-war reconstruction, can differ with these conclusions?

Mr. Willkie finally addressed himself to those of his fellow capitalists in America who set their

anti-Soviet prejudices against the country's needs. Overcome your fear and distrust of Soviet Russia, he tells them. "Such fear is weakness. Russia is not going to eat us or seduce us." And he concludes with convincing eloquence that we must work and work well with the U.S.S.R. against our common enemy, Nazi Germany. "We need to learn to work with her in the world after the war. For Russia is a dynamic country, a vital new society, a force that cannot be bypassed in any future world. . . . So let me say once more: I believe it is possible for Russia and America, perhaps the most powerful countries in the world, to work together for economic welfare and the peace of the world. At least, knowing that there can be no enduring peace, no economic stability, unless the two work together, there is nothing I ever wanted more to believe."

These are words that all truly patriotic Americans hail—honest Americans of all parties and classes who seek victory and a just and enduring peace when the war is won. Soviet-American cooperation and friendship are the *guarantee of our national existence*. Because Wendell Willkie has said these things so well and with such compelling force, his book has received the applause it merits. For it coincides with the thinking and the hopes of the common men, the democratic peoples of all lands who wish to live together and work together in a world rid of fascism and imperialistic brigandage. It reflects, in global terms, the nation's order of the day.

---

## HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

### STALIN'S MAY DAY ORDER OF THE DAY

**C**OMRADES, Red Army men, sailors of the Red Fleet, commanders, political workers, guerrillas, guerrilla women, workers, workmen and workwomen, peasant men and women, intellectual workers, brothers and sisters temporarily fallen under the yoke of the German oppressors, in the name of the Soviet Government and of our Bolshevik Party I greet you and congratulate you on this day of the First of May.

The peoples of our country meet on the day of May 1 under the severe conditions of war. They entrusted their fate to the Red Army and were not mistaken in their hope.

The Soviet soldiers rose to a man to the defense of their country. And now, for almost two years, they have defended the honor and independence of the Soviet Union.

During the period of the winter campaign of the years 1942-43 the Red Army inflicted a severe defeat on the Hitlerite troops, destroyed a large quantity of the man power of the enemy, encircled two enemy armies at Stalingrad, captured more than 300,000 enemy officers and men and liberated from the German yoke hundreds of Soviet towns and thousands of villages.

The winter campaign has shown that the offensive power of the Red

Army has grown. Our troops not only dislodged the Germans from territory captured by them last summer but also occupied a number of towns and districts which were in the enemy's occupation for almost a year and a half.

The Germans found it beyond their power to prevent the offensive of the Red Army. Even for a counter-offensive on a narrow front sector in the area of Kharkov, the German command was compelled to throw in more than thirty divisions from Western Europe.

The Germans intended to encircle the Soviet troops in the area of Kharkov and stage a German Stalingrad for our troops.

However, the attempt of the Hitlerite command to avenge themselves for Stalingrad failed.

Simultaneous with this, the victorious troops of our Allies defeated the Italo-German forces in Libya and Tripolitania, cleared these areas of the enemy and now continue to rout them in Tunisia, while the gallant Anglo-American air force inflicts devastating blows on the war industrial centers of Germany and Italy, presaging the creation of a second front in Europe against the Italo-German fascists.

Thus the blows on the enemy from the east by the Red Army have, for the first time since the be-

ginning of the war, merged with the blow from the west by our Allies into one single, common blow.

\* \* \*

All these circumstances taken together have shaken the Hitlerites' war machine to its foundations, have changed the course of the war and created the preliminary conditions necessary for victory over Hitlerite Germany.

As a result, the enemy was forced to admit the serious worsening of his position and began to yell about the war crisis. It is true that the enemy is attempting to hide his critical situation behind the brass foil of total mobilization. But no brass foil can hide the fact that the fascist camp is, in fact, going through a serious crisis.

The crisis in the fascist camp finds expression primarily in the fact that the enemy was forced to abandon his original intentions for a blitzkrieg. The boastful chatter of blitzkrieg has been replaced by lamentations about unavoidable, prolonged war.

If the earlier German fascist command boasted of the tactics of blitzkrieg, these tactics now have been discarded and the German command boasts not that they have carried out or mean to carry out blitz offensive but that they managed skillfully to sneak away from the encircling blows of British troops in North Africa or from encirclement by Soviet troops in the area of Demyansk.

The fascist press sparkles with reports that the German armies succeeded in escaping from a rout

and in escaping from another Stalingrad on one or another sector of the eastern or Tunisian front.

Apparently the Hitlerite strategists have nothing else to boast about.

Secondly, the crisis in the fascist camp is expressed by the fact that the fascists are beginning to talk frequently of peace.

If we are to judge by reports from the foreign press, one may draw the conclusion that the Germans would like to conclude peace with Britain and the United States of America under conditions of their separation from the Soviet Union or, vice versa, they would like to make peace with the Soviet Union under condition of its separation from England and the United States of America.

The German imperialists have the impudence to measure the Allies by their own yardstick, presuming that one of them would fall into the trap.

It is clear that the German prattle about peace is not prompted by an easy life. This prattle only proves that they are going through a severe crisis.

But what sort of peace can be in question with the imperialist fascists who have flooded Europe with blood and covered her with galls? Is it not clear that only the complete rout of the Hitlerite armies and the unconditional surrender of Hitlerite Germany can bring Europe to peace? Is it not because they feel the approach of the coming catastrophe that the fascists talk of peace?

The German-Italian fascist camp is going through a severe crisis and

stands before catastrophe. That does not mean, of course, that the catastrophe of Hitlerite Germany has begun. No, it does not mean that.

Hitlerite Germany and her armies are shaken and undergoing a crisis but they are not yet defeated. It would be naive to suppose that the catastrophe would come of its own accord and as part of the present course of events.

Two or three more such powerful blows are necessary from the west and east as have been inflicted on the Hitlerite armies during the past five or six months in order that the catastrophe to Hitlerite Germany may become a fact.

Therefore, the peoples of our Soviet Union and the Red Army, as well as our Allies and their armies, still have to face a hard and severe struggle for complete victory over the Hitlerite monsters. This struggle will demand of them great sacrifices, enormous staying power and iron staunchness. They will have to mobilize all their power and potentialities in order to smash the enemy and thus lay the way for peace.

\* \* \*

Comrades, the Soviet people are showing wonderful solicitude for the Red Army. They are ready to give all their strength for the further increase of the military power. In less than four months the people of the Soviet Union have contributed to the fund of the Red Army over 7,000,000,000 rubles. Workers, peasants and intelligentsia are working without rest bravely and gallantly, bearing all the sufferings

caused by war and toiling in factories, on transports and on collective farms.

But the war against the German invaders demands that the Red Army should get ever more guns, tanks, planes, trench mortars, machine guns, tommy guns, ammunition and food. That means it is imperative that the workers, peasants and the whole Soviet intelligentsia should work for the front with double vigor.

It is imperative that all our people, all our enterprises on the home front should work with precision and accuracy like good clockwork.

Remember the legacy of the great Lenin. Since war has become unavoidable—everything for war!

Complacency and lack of energy should be punished according to military law.

In reply to the faith of its people, the Red Army must smash even more powerfully and still more mercilessly to exterminate the German invaders. They must ceaselessly drive them from the Soviet soil.

The Red Army has acquired a rich store of military experience during the war. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers have mastered their weapons to perfection. Numerous commanders have learned to handle their troops on the battlefield. But it would be unwise to rest at that. Soldiers must learn to master their weapons well, commanders must acquire mastery in the conduct of battle.

But even this is not enough. In military matters and more so in such a war as the modern war, one cannot stand still. To halt in military matters means to remain be-



hind. And those who remain behind, as is known, are beaten.

The main point now, therefore, is that the whole Red Army must, day in and day out, perfect its combat training; that all commanders and men of the Red Army must study the experience of war and must learn to fight in such a manner as is needed for the cause of victory.

Comrades, Red Army and Red Navy men, political workers, men and women guerrillas, I greet you and congratulate you on the occasion of May 1!

First, all Red Army men, infantrymen, trench mortarmen, tommy gunners, artillerymen, tankmen, pilots, sappers, signalmen and cavalrymen should tirelessly continue to perfect themselves in their fighting mastery, to execute precisely the orders of their commanders, the requirements of army regulations and instructions, and maintain organization and order.

Secondly, that commanders of all services and commanders of combined arms become experts in the leading of troops, skillfully organize interaction of all arms and direct them in battle. To study the enemy, improve reconnaissance—the eyes and ears of the Army—to remember that without this one cannot beat the enemy. To raise the efficiency of the work of troop headquarters, to the end that the headquarters of the Red Army units and formations will become exemplary organs of direction of troops. To raise the work of the Army rear establishments to the level of requirements presented by modern

warfare, to bear firmly in mind that on the full and timely supply of troops with ammunition, equipment and provisions depends the outcome of combat operations.

Thirdly, that the whole Red Army consolidate and develop the successes of the winter battles, that it shall not surrender a single inch of our soil to the enemy, that it shall be prepared for decisive battles with the German fascist invaders and that it shall display a stubbornness and staunchness in defense which are characteristic of the men of our Army. To display offensive resolution, correct interaction of troops, bold maneuver in the field of action, crowned by the encirclement and annihilation of the enemy.

Fourthly, that men and women guerrillas strike powerful blows at the enemy's rear, communications, military stores, headquarters and factories, destroy the enemy's telegraph and telephone lines, draw a wide strata of the Soviet population in the occupied area into an active liberation struggle and thus save Soviet citizens from being driven away into German slavery and from extermination by the Hitlerite beasts.

That they take merciless revenge on the German invaders for the blood and tears of our wives, children, mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters. That they help by all means the Red Army in its struggle with the Hitlerite enslavers.

Comrades! The enemy already has experienced several crushing blows from our troops.

A new blow is approaching when

the Red Army, together with the armies of our Allies, will break the backbone of the fascist beast.

*Long live our gallant Red Army!  
Long live our gallant Navy! Long live our courageous men and wom-*

*en guerrillas! Death to the German enemy!*

(Signed)

*Supreme Commander, Marshal  
of the Soviet Union,  
STALIN.*

#### STALIN HAILS ALLIED VICTORY IN TUNISIA

**I** CONGRATULATE you and the gallant British and American troops on the brilliant victory which

led to the liberation of Bizerte and Tunis from Hitlerite tyranny. I wish you further successes.

#### ROOSEVELT'S REPLY TO STALIN

**T**HANK you for your message of congratulation on the performance of our forces in liberating Tunisia.

Now that we have the initiative,

it is reasonable to expect further successes on both the Eastern and Western Fronts and further supplies, including air.

#### ROOSEVELT'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF CHIANG KAI-CHEK'S MESSAGE OF CONGRATULATION

For the Allied forces in the African theatre of war, I should like to express appreciation of your message of congratulation on the complete destruction of the enemies of liberty in Africa.

We hope in the near future to

take, together with your gallant army, the initiative in Asia and bring to an end the war which you have for many years carried on successfully in spite of all difficulties.

## **Forthcoming "International" Books**

---

### **THE PROBLEM OF INDIA**

*By R. PALME DUTT*

The long-awaited book by Britain's distinguished Marxist, generally regarded as the most authoritative and comprehensive study of India today. The author, for over twenty years the editor of the British **Labor Monthly**, has cabled a new introduction for the American edition, clarifying the problem of Hindu-Moslem unity in the light of India's struggle for national unity and independence in the interests of victory over the Axis.

**Price \$1.50**

### **LABOR AND THE WAR**

*Prepared by Labor Research Association*

A handbook on labor problems in connection with the war, containing a veritable arsenal of valuable information on production and conditions in the basic war industries, man-power problems, war economy, the various war boards and commissions, trade union organizations, labor relations and labor legislation, international labor unity, etc. Prepared as the sixth volume in the **Labor Fact Book** series, it is indexed for handy reference.

**Price \$1.25**

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

**New Half-Million Edition!**  
**Complete at Only 10 Cents!**

## **VICTORY—AND AFTER**

*By Earl Browder*

The hundreds of thousands who have read Earl Browder's great war program for the nation and have been inspired by it to greater efforts for victory, will hail the announcement of the publication of a new half-million "Victory-in-1943 Edition" of his book, **Victory—And After**, complete and at the price of only 10 cents a copy. This mass edition makes it possible to deliver a shattering blow against the conspiracy of defeatist and appeaser forces who are obstructing the opening of the Second Front and the smashing of Hitler in 1943.

Here is the most searching and realistic analysis of the road to victory. Here is a message that is vibrant with the will to win through over every obstacle to the utter defeat of the common enemy and the triumph of the United Nations. Here is a book that meets the vital needs of the present crucial moment of the war, for as the author states in his introduction to the new edition: "The book has stood the test of time and criticism and proved itself sound, as much today as it was when it was written."

**Victory—And After** is a book written for the American people. It has special significance for labor, which is the backbone of the nation's support behind Pres. Roosevelt's victory policies. That is why **Victory—And After** must become a powerful weapon in the hands of labor to push forward all other sectors of the population toward victory this year.

**128 Pages, Complete**

**"Ten Copies for a Dollar!"**



**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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