



THE
ROAD
TO
VICTORY

EARL BROWDER

PS
700

The Road to Victory

EARL BROWDER

NEW YORK

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

NOTE

This pamphlet was compiled from the writings and speeches of Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, dealing with the struggle against the Munich policy. The books from which this compilation was made were published between 1938 and 1940. For the reader who wishes to study more extensively the writings of Earl Browder, a full list of his books follows:

- The Way Out* (1941)
The Second Imperialist War (1940)
Fighting for Peace (1939)
The People's Front (1938)
What is Communism? (1936)
Communism in the United States (1935)

Published by

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.

P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY

September, 1941



209

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Contents

Foreword	7
I. Our Country Will Never Surrender to Hitlerism	11
II. The Munich Betrayal	13
III. America Must Answer the Nazi Pogroms	16
IV. Social and National Security	19
V. Think Fast, Think Deep, America	21
VI. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.—Good Neighbors	28
VII. How the Capitalist Powers All Helped Prepare the War	39

(continued)

11. The French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars
12. The British Empire
13. The Industrial Revolution
14. Social and Political Reform
15. The American Civil War
16. The American West and the Gilded Age
17. The American Civil War and Reconstruction

Foreword

"We are the best defenders of America, we the American workers and farmers, and the Communists in the very first ranks. We defend our country from its real enemies."

— (EARL BROWDER, JUNE 2, 1940.)

PRECISELY because Earl Browder is the foremost leader of the Communist Party and the best representative of the working class, he is also the most able and devoted champion of America and its social and national security. That is why his continued imprisonment constitutes not only a flagrant miscarriage of justice but a crime against the unity and welfare of the nation in this hour of emergency and peril as well.

From 1934 to 1939, Earl Browder tirelessly worked to awaken America to its danger, consistently pleaded the cause of collective security as the only path by which to preserve peace and defeat the fascist aggressors. When the Spanish Republic fought for its life against the hordes of Hitler and Mussolini, when China was invaded by Japan, it was the voice of Earl Browder, more than that of any other American, which rang out as the conscience of America. He called for aid to Spain and China, not alone in the interests of these people, but for the safety and security of the United States. When the Chamberlains and Daladiers, with the consent and approval of Roosevelt, carried through their infamous Munich conspiracy and betrayal, it was Earl Browder who castigated the appeasers and with deep insight foresaw the catastrophe that would follow in its wake.

While associating the national interests of the country in the first place with the interests of the broad masses of the toiling population, Browder also warned the ruling circles of this

country that they, too, had a stake in the fight against Hitler.

He recognized that Hitler menaced all social classes of the American people, the workers and farmers as well as the capitalists.

At a time when Lindbergh, the darling of Hitler and Goering, was touring Europe and preaching Soviet "weakness"; at a time when Chamberlain and Daladier were bargaining with Hitler for a war against the East, Earl Browder repeatedly emphasized that American friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union were the only sound pillar of foreign policy upon which American security could rest.

"The Soviet Union and the United States have common problems, common interests and common enemies," declared Browder. "Today as never before, the fate of the world depends upon the role that will be played by these two great powers in the world; more than ever this depends upon the collaboration of these two powers for their common aims." (Dec. 3, 1938.)

There were those who falsely accused the Communists and Browder of ulterior motives, of being primarily concerned with the interests of the Soviet Union. But the Communist Party and Earl Browder knew that the interests of the people of America coincided with those of the Soviet Union; that the defense of one was the defense of the other. How well has that been proven by the tragic events of recent years! Today, even the Republican *Herald Tribune* is forced to admit, belatedly it is true, that the Soviet front against Hitler is our first line of defense. If this had only been realized in time, if America's foreign policy had but been geared to that understanding, then Munich would have been impossible and the present world war with its blood, sweat and sacrifice prevented.

In September, 1939, the imperialist war burst forth despite all the efforts of the Soviet Union and the people of the world to prevent it. Once again, under the new conditions, Earl Browder and the Communist Party took account of the national interests of the United States.

Branding the war as an imperialist struggle, the logical con-

sequence and continuation of the policies of Munich, the Communists fought against American involvement. They did this not because they underestimated the menace of Nazism but because they believed it the best possible way to defend the best interests of America and the American people. For even with the world aflame, there still remained two great world powers as non-belligerents—two powers who between them represented a preponderance of world economic and military might. These two powers were the United States and the Soviet Union.

As long as the mighty Soviet Union remained outside of the war, so long was it possible for the United States to defend its security without entering the conflict. Had the United States understood this, had friendship and collaboration been developed between these two great states, then it would have been possible to exert a mighty influence to bring a halt to the war and peace to the world.

But the American Government refused to recognize the Soviet Union as a true friend and potential ally. It refused to see the strength of the Soviet Union. It refused to admit that the Soviet Union was a true neutral and as such a powerful bulwark against Nazi fascism. It encouraged a campaign of slander; one which proved beneficial only to Hitler and to his friends. Side by side with the rejection of Soviet friendship, appeasement policies were continued, policies which only resulted in weakening the security of the United States.

Since Browder's imprisonment the world situation has become radically altered for the worse. The only other world power with which the United States could have united for the maintenance of peace is now the victim of unprovoked aggression. A Hitler victory over the Soviet Union would lower the last barriers to the Nazi victory over Britain and to the completion of the military and economic encirclement of the United States. The United States is now directly menaced by Hitler, who has left no doubt as to his drive for world conquest.

In this connection it is worth while to recall what Earl Browder said as early as 1938 about the Nazi military menace

to the United States. Answering the argument of the appearers that "our country cannot be invaded," Browder replied:

"First, it is true only for the immediate period and the present world relation of forces, but this will be changed substantially if the fascist governments succeed in subjugating Western Europe and China; and second, it is true only for continental United States and does not apply to the Philippines, Hawaii and the Pacific Islands, or Alaska." (May 4, 1938.)

What does this mean today? The world relationship of forces has substantially changed since 1938. Western Europe with the exception of Britain is subjugated. China is still fighting for her very life. Japan is now astride Indo-China and preparing to pounce upon Singapore, the Dutch East Indies and Manila.

What was true therefore for the immediate period of 1938 is no longer true for 1941. America is menaced economically and militarily by Nazi Germany, its Japanese partner, and its Vichy and Franco vassal states. America's vital national interests can today only be defended and secured by the *military* destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism. This is the necessary conclusion to draw from the new world situation and from the teachings of Earl Browder.

America must gird its loins for the all-out effort to defeat German fascism. As President Roosevelt put it the other day: We have a war to win. In order to win this war, in order to defend the interests of the United States and its people, national unity is necessary—a unity of *all* classes menaced by the threat of a Hitler victory over the world. And in this fight America needs the clear mind, the great talents, the honesty, courage and devotion of Earl Browder.

—GIL GREEN.

I. Our Country Will Never Surrender to Hitlerism

(Nov. 1, 1938.)

I HAVE just returned from a visit to Europe. There I saw country after country falling into the ferocious clutches of fascism, as a result of retreat and surrender of their trusted leaders. And these peoples were unable to halt these retreats and surrenders, because they had allowed themselves to be divided.

We have been told that peace was brought to a distracted world by the Pact of Munich. But that bandit agreement of Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Daladier destroyed the Czechoslovak republic, the last remnant of democracy in Central Europe. That pact delivered the largest part of Europe under control of Hitler the warmaker, and enormously multiplied his ability to make war. It destroyed the last structure of peace in Europe.

They call this "peace"! But this is not peace! What is going on is war, war on three continents, uninterrupted war. It began as civil war against the German people, and subjected them to a regime so horrible as to shock the whole world. The war was carried into Spain, as a war of invasion. It marched into Austria, wiping out that state overnight. It has destroyed Czechoslovakia. It has invaded Africa, and destroyed the Ethiopian people. It has involved half of Asia, and brought death to millions of Chinese men, women and children.

This is war, brutal, relentless, catastrophic. But the extension of this war, the triumph of the warmakers, is handed to the world as the achievement of "peace"! Falsehood can descend to no lower depths than this!

Examine for a moment the results of the Munich Pact, in

the few short weeks that have elapsed. Japanese armies, contemptuous now of all restraining influences, have extended their invasion to South China, occupied Canton, control all Chinese ports, captured Hankow, and announce themselves masters of China, threatening all who dare give aid to China as called for by the League of Nations. The Munich Powers announced a project for "peace" in Spain according to the Czechoslovakian example. Hitler begins openly to dictate not only the policies but also the personnel of the British and French governments. Mussolini insultingly warns the United States that the fate of China awaits us. And in Berlin the plans for conquest of Latin America, long prepared, are put in motion, with the assurance of at least the neutrality of the British Navy, if not its collaboration. Americans who have been saying "Thank God for the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," thinking of these waters as barriers to fascist aggression, suddenly wake up to find them transformed into broad highways.

The democracy of the United States is faced with the necessary choice either to surrender or fight. To surrender is simple: "peace" of the Munich type can always be purchased so long as people are ready to pay the price, and then Hitler will solve all other problems for us. To fight, and to win through to victory, is hard and difficult, and requires the close alliance and unity of all forces that can be rallied in America and throughout the world.

The situation calls for the unity of all progressive and democratic forces in the United States, to guarantee that, come what may, our country will never surrender to Hitlerism. We of the Communist Party, for our part, support such unity as the first law of political life, to which everything else must be subordinated.

II. The Munich Betrayal

(Nov. 14, 1938.)

THE fascist brigands of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis are rushing the capitalist world toward destruction. The ruling circles of the British and French bourgeoisie, abandoning all pretense of resistance, entered into alliance with fascism in the infamous Munich Pact. In the United States, the reactionary camp whose spokesman is Herbert Hoover has joined hands with the Munich gang.

Among all the nations of the world, only the Soviet Union stood firm and unwavering in the midst of the chaos, confusion and disintegration of the capitalist world. It alone stood firmly by its pledges and obligations on the side of world order and peace. And within the other nations, only the Communist Parties, steeled in the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, stood in monolithic opposition to the betrayal of Munich, while all others wavered, split, surrendered or even went over to the fascist side.

The Munich Pact was treacherous betrayal of the republic of Czechoslovakia. But it was also far more than that. It opened the floodgates of reaction over Europe. It placed the fascist noose around the neck of the French people. It strengthened the arrogant Japanese aggression in the Far East. It threatens new blows against the heroic Spanish people. It restored the shaking power of Hitler and Mussolini over their own enslaved peoples. It delivered a shattering blow at the remaining fabric of world peace. It threatens the encirclement of the United States, while it works to undermine our remaining democracy from within.

The Munich betrayal was presented to the world as a great achievement of peace. But the unanswerable stamp of false-

hood was engraved upon this unprecedented cynicism by the immediate decision of all governments to multiply their armaments as the first consequence of Munich.

Was it inevitable that the world should suffer from the plagues unloosed upon it by the Pact of Munich? No, it was not inevitable!

Was the democratic and peace-loving world confronted at Munich by overwhelming forces, before which it had no choice but to surrender? No, that is a brazen and cynical lie!

Was it possible to save Czechoslovakia and also to preserve peace? Yes, it was clearly and demonstrably possible!

Hitler Germany was unprepared for war. It lacked raw materials, food, finances. Its fortifications were incomplete. Its army was without sufficient trained men. Its very General Staff was in revolt against the idea of war at this time. The German people were stirring with revolt which threatened, in event of war, to overthrow the whole fascist regime.

Against Hitler was concentrated an overwhelming preponderance of forces—military, economic and moral—which absolutely guaranteed his quick defeat. In the face of these forces, firmly united, Hitler would have had no choice but to retreat.

No one knew this fact better than Chamberlain and Daladier and the circles for whom they acted. They did not surrender because they were afraid of a victory for Hitler. They were above all afraid of a defeat for Hitler. They joined forces with Hitler precisely in order to guarantee his victory. They wanted above all to preserve Hitler, as a policeman against their own as well as against the German people. They preferred to betray peace and democracy, rather than preserve it in cooperation with the Soviet Union. They betrayed the national interests of their own lands, rather than protect these interests in an international peace front that included the Soviet Union.

Hitler was bold, not because he was strong, but because he had received in advance the assurance that Chamberlain and Daladier would break up and betray the front of the democratic peoples. All the fantastic negotiations, with the military and naval mobilizations, were but elaborate stage-settings, in

order to present the greatest treason of history as an achievement of peace!

So monstrous was this treason that neither Chamberlain nor Daladier dared to ask even their own Cabinets for their agreement until after Czechoslovakia had already surrendered under their threats. While the Cabinets were still officially on record in support of Czechoslovakia. Chamberlain and Daladier sent emissaries to rouse President Benes from his bed at 2 A.M. with an ultimatum, either he must surrender to Hitler within a few hours or else both England and France would also join Hitler and assist him in subjugating Czechoslovakia. President Benes sent a hurried telegram to his Ambassador in Paris, asking if this was really the decision of the French government, suspecting the truth that it really was not. He did not receive any answer to his inquiry, for the simple reason that M. Daladier and M. Bonnet had held up all telegrams from Prague, cutting Benes off from all communication with even his own Ambassadors until he would surrender. After Benes surrendered, then the French Cabinet was allowed to vote on the question, and meekly endorsed the murder when confronted with the corpse.

Today everyone understands that the Munich Pact enormously worsened the conditions for world peace. But not everyone yet realizes that it brought the threat of fascism and war with tenfold imminence to the United States. Czechoslovakia was the front line defense also of our country. When it was betrayed, America's peace was also betrayed.

III. America Must Answer the Nazi Pogroms

(Nov. 16, 1938.)

ALL the world is filled with horror at the events of the last few days in Hitler's realm. The Dark Ages from which is drawn this social plague furnish no parallel to the mad fury of anti-Semitic pogroms deliberately unloosed and organized over Germany. A spontaneous cry of outraged protest has come from the people of the United States. It is intolerable that such wholesale offense against human decency can be perpetrated anywhere. Human dignity cannot exist anywhere in the world, in face of these crimes, except through unequivocal and emphatic condemnation expressed not only in words but also in deeds. Every American who clings to our best traditions must have felt a thrill of gratification that Washington responded by a deed, more eloquent than any words, in the withdrawal from Berlin of the American Ambassador.

The horrible events now going on in Nazi Germany are but a part of the fruits of the Munich Pact. That agreement for the enthronement of organized banditry over Europe opened the floodgates of reaction over the world.

Every person who fails to raise his voice against the Nazi pogroms by that fact becomes a partner in crime with Hitler. And every person who accepts or condones the Munich Pact undertakes the same responsibility.

The broadest united front of all the forces of decency and progress must be formed to impress upon the Nazi butchers, in the only language they can understand, that the world is united against them, determined to halt once and for all the spread of their poison over the face of the earth. Humanity can no longer live in the stifling atmosphere produced by a Hitler.

In the hot indignation that sweeps over America against the crimes in Germany, let us not overlook the growing and alarming signs of the growth of Hitlerism within the United States itself. Anti-Semitism is the infallible sign of desperate reactionary forces at work, threatening civilization, wherever it appears and under whatever forms.

It is being spread wholesale in the United States today. It seeps through our social structure in whispers and innuendoes. It is openly expressed in meetings, in the press, on the radio. It played a vicious role in the election campaign just concluded. It is subsidized with millions of dollars by some of our economic royalists. It has a sanctified spokesman in the radio priest Father Coughlin. It is preparing for America some shameful pages similar to those now disgracing Germany, if it is not scotched in its infancy by an awakened and outraged people.

For the attention of our Catholic brothers and fellow citizens, who still tolerate the anti-Semitic and fascist ravings of Father Coughlin, we point out the lesson of Germany, that anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism are Siamese twins that always go together. Pogroms against the Jews in Germany are accompanied by the sacking of Catholic sanctuaries and the murder of Catholic leaders. The same close connection between the two obscurantist cults is clearly visible in the United States, where it is also closely linked up with a revival of the hateful anti-Negro cult, remnant of the slavery we abolished long ago under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. And Hitler has shown us that what begins as a "crusade against Communism" always and inevitably ends up as a smashing of the labor movement, the destruction of democracy, the crushing of religious freedom for Catholics and Protestants alike, and culminates in such historic crimes as those now going on against the Jews in Germany.

All these reactionary and divisive propagandas, anti-social and criminal, are being wielded in our own country by those dark forces which would drag America onto the road of fascism. All of America that would save our country from the fate of Hitlerism must unite to drive these criminal cults out

of public life, and to clear them out of even the darkest corners.

Do not allow confused and false leaders to lead you to place the blame for the current atrocities upon the German people. The great and cultured nation that produced Goethe, Heine, Marx, Humboldt and a thousand other brilliant figures who gave their full contribution to lifting humanity to newer heights—that nation is not responsible for the miserable typhus-lice of the Hitlers, the Goebbels and the Goerings, who have infected Germany and threaten the whole world with such dire sickness. The German people were betrayed into the hands of fascism by the false and traitorous representatives of monopoly capital all over the world. During last September the German people were preparing to rise up and crush these lice upon their body, but they were thrust down again by the brutal hands of Chamberlain and Daladier, who rushed to Munich to press into the hands of Hitler the weapons for re-establishing his power over Germany and spreading it to new regions of the world.

The shameful pogroms against the Jews in Germany have finally awakened the sleeping conscience of America. But, now that we are awake, let us see fully the whole situation of the world around us. The world is in deadly peril. We have contributed to that peril by our stupidity and complacency and inactivity. We have a unique opportunity. America holds half the wealth and potential power of all the world. Four-fifths of the rest of the world waits for our leadership. We have world destiny in our hands. We can decide whether the world shall slip down in chaos and destruction, or whether it will be organized for human progress and decency.

Let all decent Americans unite to solve this question in the high tradition transmitted to us by our great forebears Jefferson and Lincoln.

IV. Social and National Security

(Dec. 3, 1938.)

FASCISM, reaction and war are advancing against the whole world as the result of the Munich betrayal.

Against this menace there is a rising movement of the working class and of the peoples to oppose the Munich treason and its consequences.

In this world movement there stand out before the peace-loving peoples of all the world two centers of resistance to the fascist flood, two points from which leadership and inspiration can be given to the majority of mankind struggling for democracy and peace, two rallying grounds for the hard-pressed forces of progress and culture—the Soviet Union and the United States.

Today, as never before, the fate of the world depends upon the role that will be played by these two greatest powers in the world; more than ever, this *depends upon the collaboration of these two powers for their common aims.*

The Soviet Union and the United States have common problems, common interests and common enemies.

This is a central fact in the new world situation.

Upon this foundation it is necessary to find a *program of collaboration* which can effectively unite these two greatest world powers, a program based upon the full recognition of the national interests of all peoples, and uniting them in a *minimum international policy* required for their orderly protection, as these interests are understood today by the preponderance of opinion of the cooperating peoples.

This is the key to the struggle for world peace, and to prevent the spread of the already developing world war.

Can we realistically pose this cooperation as something that can be achieved?

The consequences of the Munich Pact force this question to the front, demanding an immediate answer. The answer cannot any longer be postponed.

So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the answer is easy to give with full assurance. The Soviet Union, firm and calm in a world of storms, confident in its own strength, has never wavered from its oft-expressed policy of full cooperation with all peoples and governments which, from whatever motives, oppose aggression and uphold orderly international relations. The Soviet Union is one government which has not a single record of breaking an agreement or violating an accepted responsibility.

If there were any persons who listened to the fascist-inspired whispers that the Soviet Union was itself likely to be swung to the side of the Munich Powers, their answer is to be found in the thorough housecleaning which swept all the spies, wreckers and diversionist agents of the fascist powers into the waste basket of history. If any listened to the fairy tales spread by Hitler's messenger boy, Lindbergh, that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted because it is weak, they can find their answer in the pathetic eagerness of the Japanese militarists to settle the Changkufeng "incident" last summer on the formula given by the Soviet Union, and in the obvious fact that Hitler (who loves nothing better than a weak enemy) moves in any and all directions rather than across the Soviet border, and even reserves his most unbridled insolences for the British and American peoples.

Yes, we can state with complete assurance: the Soviet Union is not only willing but is fully able, in every respect, to give that unwavering collaboration of a great power which is the supreme need of the United States as it rides into the storm of the world crisis.

Can the United States be depended upon for such collaboration for world peace? To this the answer is more difficult, because the United States is not yet united and of one mind. . . .

V. Think Deep, Think Fast, America

(April 28, 1939.)

WHY is the international situation dangerous? Because there are great military powers aggressively encroaching upon the rights and territories of others, including our own.

Who are these aggressive military powers? Everybody knows they are the governments of Germany, Italy and Japan.

Is it in the interest of the United States to stand entirely alone in this international situation, or is it to our interest to find as many friends as possible, and as powerful ones as possible? Clearly, the more friends we have, and the more powerful they are, the better will be our situation, the more will the danger be reduced.

Is the Soviet Union a friend or enemy of the United States? Clearly, it is not an enemy, and the United States may choose by its own policy whether it shall remain a very distant friend or whether it shall be drawn into ever closer cooperation.

This is truly the most important single question that the people of the United States must decide in the immediate future. Upon this decision will depend American policy in the general crisis out of which will be decided the fate of the world. And our country, it so happens, is the most powerful single country in the world, equal in economic strength to all the other capitalist countries combined.

The Communist Party declares boldly and without hesitation that it is in the national interest of our country to enter into the closest possible cooperation with the Soviet Union for the aims common to both countries: the maintenance of peace, the halting of aggression, the preservation of international order. We declare that anyone who opposes this is opposing the most important single measure in protection of American national interests.

What are the arguments made against this policy? Not one of them stands up under analysis. Let us examine them one by one.

First, there is the argument that we can have nothing to do with the Soviet Union because it is a socialist country, and wants the United States to become socialist also. Certainly the Soviet Union is the country of socialism, and its people would be happy to see America and other lands adopt the same system. But the Soviet Union does not, and never will, try to force any people against their will to take up the socialist way of life. The Soviet Union relies for its influence in this direction entirely upon the logic of its example, which by its extraordinary success in multiplying its national income ten times in ten years does give a powerful argument in this direction.

Neither does the Communist Party of the United States propose or desire to force the introduction of socialism, but relies entirely upon democratic persuasion and conviction to win the majority of the people to this idea. But even if the Communist Party, as some people still wrongly think, would try to enforce socialism if it could, the fact of the matter is that it couldn't if it wanted to; it is such an infinitesimal part of the population that the very idea is nonsense. The whole first objection, therefore, falls by the wayside; no matter how much one may be opposed to the socialist system, that is no argument whatever against cooperating with the Soviet Union to maintain peace, halt the aggressors and establish international order.

Second, there is the argument that the Soviet Union is not worthwhile as a friend because it is weak internally, it will collapse under the first blows, its army is no good, and so on. This argument flies in the face of every known fact about the Soviet Union. Never in history has there been an example of a government which became weak while it was making its people and country economically prosperous. And the Soviet Union is prosperous beyond the dreams of other lands. Every five years it is doubling its accumulated wealth and national income, which, because the increase is in geometrical ratio, means that its national income today is ten times as much as

in 1927 when it had recovered from the war and regained the pre-war level. It has come up from the position of the most backward of the great powers to first place in Europe, and second in the world only to the United States. Last summer, on the suggestion of Hitler, the Japanese tried out the fighting ability of the Red Army, at Changkufeng on the Siberian border, and received such a smashing lesson for their pains that it changed their whole outlook on the world. Hitler is driving in every direction from which he does not expect firm resistance, so it is highly significant that he is carefully keeping away from that dangerous Soviet border.

Third, there is the argument that the Soviet Union cannot be depended upon, that it may at any moment go over to Hitler and doublecross the rest of the world. But when has the Soviet Union ever in its history failed to keep an obligation?

It is true that the League of Nations betrayed Ethiopia, but that was only over the most energetic protests of the Soviet Union. It is true that France and Great Britain most foully betrayed Czechoslovakia, but the Soviet Union stood ready at all times to come to her defense when called upon according to treaty—Chamberlain and Daladier were the ones who prevented that call from ever being made. It is true that the Chinese people have been shamefully abandoned by most of the world to the mercies of the Japanese invaders, but the Soviet Union has never ceased to give them moral and material support up to the very limit of possibility. It is true that almost the whole world, including the United States, violated treaty obligations and international law to blockade the Spanish republic when it was invaded by Italians, Germans and Moors, in order to impose a fascist dictatorship over the Spanish people—but the Soviet Union was the brilliant exception, and never ceased to give the utmost possible moral and material help. It is true that most nations of the world are unable or unwilling to pay their financial obligations—but the Soviet Union has never defaulted on a single obligation, even the smallest. In fact, in every respect, it is the Soviet Union alone among all the great powers of the world that has

not in its record a single instance of failure to meet an obligation.

Let us put the question in the simplest possible terms, such as even a business man can understand. The United States must either come to terms with the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo war alliance, which means abandoning the Pacific and most of Latin America to those powers, not to speak of fascist domination within the United States, *or* it must organize resistance to the warmakers. If the United States tries to resist alone, the simple cost of the effort would bring about an economic and political collapse. If the United States takes up cooperation with other nations, she will find that if the Soviet Union is included in the cooperative arrangement it will cost less than half as much as it would without the Soviet Union, not to speak of the danger that any combination of powers without the Soviet Union would not be strong enough to overcome the tendency to split up.

It is already clear even to Neville Chamberlain, the champion of "appeasement," that if he talks about stopping Hitler without the help of the Soviet Union, no one in the world will believe that he means what he says. Nobody takes him seriously, least of all Hitler, except when he is making friendly signals to the Soviet Union—and even then the world has learned to wait and see whether these friendly gestures are to be followed up by any commitments for democratic action.

This is the situation, and these are the issues, that are the center of the most dangerous crisis the world has been in for a very long time, and in which the American people are trying to find their way.

It is in this light that we must learn to estimate the significance of some of the current political catchwords. One of these catchwords or slogans that deserves deep examination is the demand that the United States must fight against "dictatorships of both right and left." What is meant, practically, by those who use this catchword is that the United States must refuse to cooperate with the Soviet Union. Its consequence, therefore, for those who adopt it, is to oppose every step by President Roosevelt to align the United States with the peace

forces of the world to halt the aggressors. Which means, as a further step, to line up with the open apologists for the war-making powers in the practical issues of the day. We see this in Congress in the pronouncements of Senator Nye and of Representative Fish, to mention only two examples. We see it outside of Congress in the curious unity of views among Hoover, Norman Thomas, and the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, who fully agree, whatever other differences they may have, that President Roosevelt's measures against the aggressor governments are the main danger to the peace of America and of the world, a view fully shared by the axis powers.

President Roosevelt has expressed the majority sentiment of the American people, one which embraces an ever growing majority, in his utterances and actions against the aggressors. With this trend of American public opinion and sentiment we of the Communist Party fully associate ourselves. We consider that the President's leadership in this movement has been his greatest single contribution to American and world democracy.

We are not uncritical, however, in our estimate of the President's role. The United States has hesitated, and vacillated, and thereby failed lamentably to exert its full influence in the world. It has missed opportunities, the loss of which has terribly worsened the general situation. It has drawn back before responsibilities, and allowed Chamberlain to lead us by the nose, to the serious detriment of the world and harm to American interests. The most flagrant example of this is in relation to Spain.

Recently the American people were shocked at the information that the State Department in Washington had granted unconditional recognition to the puppet government of butcher Franco in Spain. Thus was completed the cycle of blunders and crimes that began with the shameful embargo against the Spanish republic two years ago, for which history will demand payment from America at a terrible rate of interest.

Of what use to rally the Latin American countries against Berlin in protest against the murderous attacks against the Jews, if we rush with indecent haste to send an ambassador to Hitler's puppet in Burgos, at a moment when he is slaughtering

ing hundreds of thousands of disarmed and defenseless prisoners, and putting additional hundreds of thousands into penal labor camps?

Of what use to rally the Latin American countries against the fascist penetration, through the Lima conference, when we rush American recognition to the chief instrument of fascist aggression in the Americas—the Franco government, which had just announced its “protectorate” over all Spanish-speaking peoples and especially former parts of the lost Spanish empire, on the model of Hitler’s “protectorate” over Czechoslovakia?

Of what use to spend new billions of dollars on naval and military expansion, caused by the fascist threat to the Americas, when we rush America’s confirmation of Franco’s power over the prostrate Spanish people, and thereby multiply overnight the influence of fascist Spain upon the Latin American countries?

Such things can only be estimated as criminal blunders, as harmful to America as to the world, conceding that the desire and main aim of the President’s policy run in the opposite direction. But they represent a victory within our government of persons and forces who represent, not the line of Roosevelt, but that of the Munich “appeasement” policy. When President Roosevelt allowed these forces to take charge, first in the embargo against the Spanish republic and now in the recognition of Franco, he canceled out a large part of his tremendous contribution to the protection of world democracy and international order against the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo war alliance. This bitter truth must be spoken out loud, for if many more such betrayals in the spirit of Munich are perpetrated, the budding hopes of world democracy for a new alignment to stop Hitler and the war axis will be nipped by the sharp frost of disillusionment and despair. President Roosevelt has a position of high moral and political authority before the peoples of America and the world, but if he is to maintain that position and wield it in the interests of international order and peace, he must keep himself clean of complicity in the systematic betrayals that are being organized by the Munich men, he must stop the trafficking and compromis-

ing with the axis powers, he must make a clean break with the bankrupt and discredited policy of Chamberlain and Bonnet.

Now, when it is officially announced that the war in Spain is over, it is a terrible sign of the condition of the world that there begins the most horrible mass slaughter, the massacre of hundreds of thousands of disarmed and defenseless men and women, whose only crime is that they fought for their democratically elected government. We must demand from Washington that it wipe out at least a part of the shame of recognizing Franco, by the strongest possible diplomatic protest against the massacres going on in Spain, and by the sending of American ships to transport to Latin American countries those Spaniards marked for death by the butcher Franco.

VI. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. — Good Neighbors

(July 5, 1939.)

THE main idea which I am defending in the field of foreign policy is that of ever closer collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, as the major factor in the organization of world peace, as the chief protection of the world against the flood of fascist barbarism, for the maintenance of an ordered civilization in a large part of the world.

It is impossible to dismiss this question as of secondary importance since the two countries in question are the strongest in the world, economically, militarily, and in a strategic geographical position. If the two strongest nations can work together, then the prospects for organization of world peace are bright; otherwise they are very dark.

What are the obstacles to such cooperation? Is there any conflict of interest between the United States and the Soviet Union, in any area of international relations, which shuts the door to such cooperation? It is our contention that there is no conflict of interest, that, on the contrary, the interests of the two countries are parallel, with many and growing areas of complete harmony.

In the Far East, the Pacific area, those parallel interests are so obvious and fundamental that even the Harding Republican administration, in 1920, dominated as it was by a fixed and obstinate hostility to the Soviet regime that was never relaxed for twelve years under Coolidge and Hoover, was yet forced by the inexorable logic of even the narrowest conception of American national interests to put pressure upon Japan, in the Washington Conference, to evacuate the Soviet

Far Eastern Maritime Provinces after the Red Army had cleared them out of the Baikal region.

How much more, then, are these common interests of emphatic importance, since Japanese militarism has run amok in China, has embarked upon such an ambitious adventure of conquest that it openly proclaims its intention of transforming all Eastern Asia into its closed preserve and reducing its hundreds of millions of population to instruments of an all-conquering military empire; while, through its association in the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo triangle, it has become an active force in Latin American life against the United States. The Soviet Union, by its active assistance to China, has made possible the marvelously heroic and successful resistance of the Chinese people against Japanese conquest. It is a matter worthy of deep thought on the part of all Americans that this role of the Soviet Union has been at the same time most profoundly favorable to the interests of the United States. The fundamental interests of China, the Soviet Union and the United States are in profound harmony; the cooperative protection and advancement of these common interests furnish the only possible foundation for the stable organization of peace in the Pacific.

Turn now to Europe. Less than a year ago, Chamberlain proclaimed "peace for our time" as the fruits of the Munich pact, which excluded the Soviet Union from the "European family of nations" while surrendering Czechoslovakia and Southeastern Europe to the mercies of the axis powers. But already the fiasco of Munich and its catastrophic consequences are openly acknowledged by the very participants in the Munich Conference. Last October it was only the Communists who were possessed of sufficient clarity and courage to denounce openly the Munich betrayal. Americans might then have been excused for their confusion on the question, since they are so largely non-Communist and even anti-Communist, and only the Communists told them the truth. But the awful consequences that flowed so immediately and catastrophically from Munich are so obvious that Americans can learn part of the truth from conservative, reactionary and anti-Communist sources, and therefore no longer have an excuse for refusing

to see the facts. Peace in Europe is impossible without the active collaboration of the Soviet Union, which now, as always, is ready and anxious to participate in the organization of peace. Even Neville Chamberlain is forced to acknowledge this fundamental fact, though he seems to cling most stubbornly to the disastrous policy of surrender to the axis powers.

Our American newspapers have interpreted the difficulties in negotiating the terms of the "peace front" between the Soviet Union, France and Great Britain as signs of Soviet reluctance to enter fully into such a front, and its wish to "drive a hard bargain" or even to come to an agreement with Hitler against the Western powers. Quite typically, even Norman Thomas has joined his voice to these stupid slanders, which are highly welcome in Berlin. Against such clouds of diplomatic poison gas, my own words would perhaps be ineffective. Allow me, therefore, to call as an expert witness the Hon. Winston Churchill, who needs no credentials from me. I select a few sentences and paragraphs from a recent article of his, syndicated among American conservative newspapers:

"It is astonishing [says Mr Churchill] how swiftly and decisively opinion in Great Britain and France has consolidated itself upon a triple alliance with Soviet Russia. The well-known objections have simply ceased to count with enormous numbers of people with whom abhorrence of Communism is still a first principle. But it should not be supposed that this change arises out of any desperate strait or panic fear. It is due to the realization of the very real harmony of interests which unites the foreign policy of the three countries. . . . Their common interest is peace."

Mr. Churchill's words contain a profound truth. The leaders of Britain and France could not see this last October, but the people have forced them to see it in the last month. The "common interest in peace," so disastrously threatened by the Munich "appeasement" and "non-intervention" policies, is an interest that is fully and completely shared by the United States. And if the tory leaders, with whom "abhorrence of Communism" is a fundamental principle of life, have learned

of that "common interest" with the Soviet Union, it should not be so hard for Americans, even the most conservative, to learn the same lesson.

What is the significance for America of the differences between London and Moscow on the terms of establishment of the peace front? Is it really true, as the newspapers say, that they reflect Moscow's desire to "drive a hard bargain"? Again I turn for the answer to the hard-boiled conservative, Churchill, who cannot be suspected of prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union. He says:

"Personally, not having changed my views about Communism or past history in any respect, I have from the beginning preferred the Russian proposals to either the British or French alternatives. They are simple, they are logical, and they conform to the main groupings of common interest."

If Winston Churchill can prefer the Moscow proposals to those of either Chamberlain or Daladier, what then becomes of the idea that Moscow is "driving a hard bargain"? Churchill differs from Chamberlain and Daladier in having been against Munich and the appeasement policy *before* its bitter fruits were borne, and in having driven to the heart of the question, without squirming about in a futile effort to eat the cake and have it too, à la Chamberlain.

Americans, even of the most conservative trend, should be more attracted to the Churchill approach than to that of Chamberlain, if they are guided in their views by American national interest and not by ideological ties with Hitler. For, clearly, Moscow is taking a stand very close to that which Washington would almost certainly take if our country should, in the course of development, face a similar problem of negotiating an agreement with a Chamberlain and a Daladier. Like the Soviet Union, the United States would be faced with statesmen who are being pushed, against their own will, by the overwhelming demands of their people—statesmen who, therefore, would not be directed in their proposals by the broad all-inclusive interests of peace, which are dominant for the Soviet Union and the United States, but only by their own

narrow and special interests and commitments. Like the Soviet Union, the United States would also have to appeal to the people over the heads of their governments, before it would be able to force such terms as would represent the general interests of all the peoples. Winston Churchill recognized this issue when he said:

“There is a real and honorable basis of equal and rightful interest existing in external affairs between the Soviets and the parliamentary democracies. It is this that has invested the triple peace design with vitality. Matters have now gone so far that it is inconceivable that any of the three governments could take the responsibility of depriving the hundreds of millions of working people involved of this joint security for their life and progress. Agreement is driven forward by irresistible forces overriding and shearing away serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws.”

That this is also the view of realistic French conservatives is shown by the words of Pertinax, prominent publicist of the “right wing,” who remarked, anent Chamberlain’s dilatory maneuvers:

“Last September, Chamberlain knew how to move more quickly when Hitler had to be placated. He still fails to understand . . . that the fate of the continent depends upon what they [the Soviet Union] will do or not do. . . . There is irony in the fact that Chamberlain, having started with outspoken antagonism to anything like cooperation with Russia, should now be compelled to bring it into existence undiluted and unguarded. Such is the ransom for Munich and for what followed Munich.”

I quote at length from these two typical spokesmen of British and French conservatism, because it is my firm conviction that their evolution accurately forecasts, in its general nature and direction, the future of American policy in the increasingly dangerous world situation. For the United States also, the realities of national interest are “irresistible forces” which before long will for us also be “overriding and shearing away

serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws," to repeat the words of Churchill.

Much will depend, of course, upon the outcome of the 1940 elections, as to whether the United States will pay the same heavy tribute as Britain paid at Munich, before the realities of national interest are frankly faced. If the Hoover Republicans or Garner Democrats dominate the next administration in Washington, then in all likelihood our country will repeat in all its gruesome details the tortuous course over which Chamberlain has dragged Britain. But the underlying realities will inevitably bring the same general conclusion; the United States will ultimately, despite all obstacles and prejudices, find itself in cooperation with the Soviet Union to salvage peace and civilization. The only question is whether we will march ahead consciously to that end, and thereby attain its full benefits, or whether, like Britain, we will go through the swampy bypaths of appeasement of the fascist axis, and risk the catastrophes inherent in such a policy.

Many persons are still disturbed by the propaganda, unloosed in full flood last September, to the effect that the Soviet Union is too weak to be an effective ally in a world peace front. The American Lindbergh played a prominent role in making this campaign effective; shortly after, he received a decoration from Hitler, sharing that distinction with another American, Henry Ford. This propaganda campaign played an important part in sustaining Chamberlain's appeasement policy, in making the Munich pact acceptable to the masses for a few months. Its fatal weakness lay in the demonstration, not long delayed, that Hitler did not believe it, though he was happy that it found credence in the Western democracies. Hitler has been distinguished by always striking at the point which he considered that of least resistance. And after Munich he made it clear that the axis was preparing its main blows against France, Britain and the United States, against the traditional parliamentary democracies, in which direction he saw not only panic and confused capitulation reigning, but also, and even more important, the greatest booty to be seized. Hitler's course is the most obvious proof that he has never believed,

since his own agents were exposed and eliminated in the Soviet Union, in the myth of Soviet weakness and instability; and no one doubts that Hitler is well informed of the inner conditions in every major country, including our own; it is common gossip that his answer to President Roosevelt was composed on the basis of authoritative advice from American enemies of the New Deal. No, if the Soviet Union were weak, we might assume that Hitler would know it.

It is strange indeed that the more fantastic and unreal the propaganda, the more widely it is accepted among American newspapers and their more credulous readers! Why did so many persons accept the myth of Soviet weakness? Basic facts were known and available in print, from the most authoritative sources, sufficient to explode immediately that myth for any thoughtful person. Why were these facts overlooked or forgotten so easily?

For example, all of our American newspaper editors undoubtedly have on their office shelves the Statistical Yearbook of the League of Nations. By a simple twist of the wrist, they could have opened that document, and seen in universally accepted statistical tables the picture of the economic progress of the Soviet Union during the past ten years, and compared it with the course of all other major nations in the world. And they would have seen that the Soviet Union since 1928 had multiplied its national income by about 1,000 per cent, or approximately ten times. Now, since what date in history has it ever been demonstrated that a nation, multiplying its economic production by ten times in ten years, could be described as weak? What regime in history has ever lost its hold upon the people by bringing economic prosperity to the land? If Hoover's administration had brought to America, instead of economic collapse, an enormous multiplication of the national income, can anyone doubt that the "great engineer," to resurrect an almost forgotten slogan, would now be rounding out his third term as the idolized leader of the American masses, instead of giving way in 1932 to the New Deal? All these questions, and their obvious answers, were implicit in the facts, available to every newspaper editor at least, at the mo-

ment when they were telling the American people that the Soviet Union was too weak and unstable to be relied upon in the organization of world peace. Is it stretching a point to indicate, on the basis of such evidence, that our American newspapers are more influenced by reactionary propaganda than they are by fundamental facts? And is it exaggeration to say that such propaganda, while it may serve the interests of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis, is in flagrant contradiction to the immediate and larger national interests of the U.S.?

If there still remains any doubt about the ability of the Soviet Union to fulfill its international obligations, in face of the military prowess of the axis powers, it is possible to take a glance at the latest defense budget of its government, adopted last month. That budget, representing about one-fourth of the national income, totaled in the neighborhood of \$8,000,000,000 in terms of American money, approaching in sum the total budget for all purposes of the United States government. Whatever judgment one might otherwise make, it is difficult indeed to interpret these figures as a sign of weakness. And for those who might be inclined to decry the diversion of such tremendous sums for military defense, it would be well to recall that the Soviet peoples have much to defend: one-sixth of the earth's surface, unexampled prosperity, and a 20 per cent rise in living standards this year alone, guaranteed in that same budget!

There can no longer be the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone who wishes to know and face the facts. The Soviet Union is second only to the United States among world powers economically, and is second to none in defensive power and strategical position, as well as in moral and political unity of the people.

The only question still to be decided is whether the American national interests can best be served by conscious collaboration with this second greatest world power, on the basis of recognized common interests, or by isolation from it and going alone or with only the less powerful and less reliable friendly nations.

The position which I am defending is that the American

national interests, the interests of the overwhelming majority of the American people, are best served by an active and conscious collaboration between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Such collaboration would quickly become the most effective conceivable organizing center for the stabilization of the world, which is so dangerously unstable at present. It would provide the most effective conceivable protection of American national interests in the Far East and in Latin America. It would be the most effective conceivable guarantee of world peace, which is an American national interest just as it is a national interest of the Soviet Union.

Congressman Dies, on behalf of the anti-New Deal Democrats and the Republicans, has been working overtime in the effort to create the appearance of a great Red Peril in the United States, directed from Moscow through the Communist Party of the United States, the party for which I speak. This Red scare is brought forth in the newspapers as one of the big reasons why cooperation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. is impossible or undesirable. I would be less than frank if I did not answer the issue thus raised.

Allow me to declare to you that which is a matter of public record before the Supreme Court of the United States and other official tribunals, that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. is composed of American citizens, makes its own decisions and stands entirely upon its own feet, and is subject to no orders from abroad, from Moscow or any other place, but only to its own conventions held publicly in the United States. We consider that our country has much to learn from the Soviet Union, as that land has learned much from America, and to substantiate this we point to the tenfold increase in the national income of the Soviet Union, which we believe could be emulated by our country to its own benefit. The preamble to our constitution, which is binding upon every member, contains our basic beliefs, with which all our daily activities are in harmony. Despite the possible disagreements which some may have with it, it is clearly within that circle of questions upon which American democracy has traditionally tolerated disagreement. Our preamble states:

"The Communist Party of the United States of America is a working class political party carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence; it upholds the achievements of democracy, the right of 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' and defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties; it is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation, and to preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions."

To make this general declaration even more specific, our party constitution directly repudiates the charges made against the Communists that we wish or intend to subvert American democracy, by another section which says:

"The Communist Party of the U.S.A. upholds the democratic achievements of the American people. It opposes with all its power any clique, group, circle, faction, or party which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken, or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy whereby the majority of the American people have obtained power to determine their own destiny in any degree. The Communist Party of the U.S.A., standing unqualifiedly for the right of the majority to direct the destinies of our country, will fight with all its strength against any and every effort, whether it comes from abroad or from within, to impose upon our people the arbitrary will of any selfish minority group or party or clique or conspiracy."

The purveyors of the Red scare will surely fail in their objective, as they have always failed in critical moments of American history. The reactionary Federalist Party used the Red scare against Thomas Jefferson, because he was the firm and understanding friend of the French Revolution, as well as the leader and organizer of American democracy. But Jefferson came to power, and directed the destinies of our country for a generation, while the Federalist Party degenerated to

treasonable negotiations with foreign powers against their own land, and vanished into shameful oblivion, together with their infamous Alien and Sedition Laws which reactionaries are trying to resurrect in the present Congress.

The same old Red scare was trotted out against Andrew Jackson, especially when he broke the political power of Anthony Biddle and the Bank of the United States, but Jackson's memory grows ever more green, while his enemies find no one so poor as to do them honor. Again, the Red scare was one of the principal weapons wielded against Abraham Lincoln, but that did not prevent him from performing his historical tasks and becoming immortal as the personification of the American democratic tradition. Now the same old trickery is trotted out for active duty against Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal policies, but history will write the same sort of finish to this as to former efforts to scare the American people away from the path of progress by the cry of "Red." Reality and the true issues facing the people have a way of emerging out of the fog of demagoguery and misrepresentation, especially in the days of a national and international crisis such as we are living through now.

So it is also with the Communist Party. The Red-baiters have spread innumerable falsehoods and slanders against us, which are immediately damaging and force us to spend much time and effort refuting them. But these falsehoods, because they are false, lose their effect, while what remains with the masses of the people forever is the fact that the Communist Party was identified with the cause of the people, and was attacked by those who prove they are the enemies of the people. In the long run we gain from these crude attempts to create a bogeyman out of the Communist Party.

In the present world crisis, all true defenders of democracy and peace must find the way to work together, to unite their forces against the threatening flood of reaction. This is true within our country and it is equally true between nations, on a world scale. The Communists pledge their full strength toward such unity for peace and progress.

VII. How the Capitalist Powers All Helped Prepare the War

(May 30, 1940.)

GREAT BRITAIN, France and the United States proclaimed themselves the most completely devoted friends of peace. Together with the smaller countries under their leadership, these powers were possessed, until the last two years, of ample positions and resources to guarantee against any disturbance of world peace. They had the League of Nations, dedicated to that purpose; and if the United States stood aloof from the League, this was more than compensated by the fact that the Soviet Union joined the League, and was most insistent that its proclaimed peace functions be realized. How could it come to pass, therefore, that in a few short years the overwhelming preponderance of power in the hands of these "friends of peace" could be dissipated so much that the rising militarism of Hitler could challenge them in this war with any hopes of success? Why could not the possessors of overwhelming power so use it as to organize peace? How could German imperialism, defeated, prostrate and helpless after the last war, stage such a spectacular comeback in such a short time?

The answer is to be found in two main factors: First, the contradictions and antagonisms among the victors in the last war flared up with new intensity when Germany was defeated, and among the leading powers themselves effectively prevented any common world policy; peace was not the first, but the last, consideration among them. Secondly, the fear of the working class, of the socialist revolution, and especially hatred of the Soviet Union which emerged from the last World War, was so deep and overwhelming within the bourgeoisie, the

ruling classes of the whole world, that it led them into fatal miscalculations, into policies which went bankrupt under the test of reality. Bourgeois society, as we look back at it since the World War, presents a most dismal picture of decay, not only economic decay, not only moral decay, but even more completely, if that is possible, intellectual decay. In the whole bourgeois world since the World War, there is not one example of an outstanding statesman, not to speak of a country, which pursued a consistent and long-sighted policy even for the preservation of the bourgeois world, which in their eyes is "the preservation of civilization."

France built her system of hegemony over Europe only to find Great Britain facing her full of jealousy and suspicion, determined to rebuild as quickly as possible a new "balance of power" to replace that destroyed by the World War. The post-war world was a chaos of rivalries, antagonisms, and contradictions.

The phase of "creeping war," which opened the new period of wars and revolutions, began when Japan struck at China in 1931 with the seizure of Manchuria. This was also a heavy blow against the United States, which confidently moved for international support in bringing Japan to heel. But the conference of the signatories of the Nine-Power Pact came to nothing, because Great Britain could not be committed to any action. The United States suspected Great Britain of wanting her to go to war with Japan then, with Britain standing on the sidelines to pick up the pieces, and was certain that the British had double-crossed her.

Hitler, who had come to power with the aid of British and German capital, marched into the demilitarized Rhineland, and announced its forthcoming fortification, but Britain, France and the League of Nations merely scolded for a moment and were silent. In fact, relations between Britain and France were quite strained, for the French with justice accused the British of encouraging the Rhineland coup, and of playing off both Hitler and Mussolini against them, in order to restore the old game of balance of power on the Continent, which French hegemony had abolished for a time to the dis-

comfiture of Britain. Then Mussolini struck in Ethiopia, and the British Tories, after winning an election on the issue of "collective security," promptly proceeded, in partnership with the French, to sell the Ethiopians down the river. Mussolini and Hitler launched the fascist rebellion of the Spanish Army, and sent their forces in to help strangle the Spanish Republic; Britain and France, supported by the United States, responded by the elaborate farce of the "non-intervention committee" which blockaded the Republic, and these "democracies" publicly rejoiced when Butcher Franco was finally enthroned in power.

Hitler marched into Austria and turned it into a German province, but Britain and France remained silent. Japan invaded China in a bloody, furious war of destruction and made a ferocious assault upon British interests (incidentally machine-gunning the British Ambassador to China), but the U.S.A., Britain and France only mumbled a few words of formal protest, and the U.S.A. continued to furnish Japan with the largest part of the raw materials and machinery required for her war.

Finally, in September, 1938, Chamberlain and Daladier flew to Munich, in order to lay at Hitler's feet the bound and helpless body of Czechoslovakia. *By the Munich Pact, however, the British and French ruling classes had built up Hitler's regime in Germany so far, had surrendered so many strategic points, had so thoroughly destroyed their own moral standing by open complicity with Hitler's crimes, that it was already an open question as to which side was the strongest and, therefore, according to the rules of imperialism, entitled to rule the world. The Frankenstein built up over several years had escaped from the control of its makers.*

It is interesting and instructive at this moment when German arms, having conquered Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg, are penetrating France so quickly that both London and Paris are threatened, to recall again the long line of events in which the British and French, usually with the acquiescence or assistance of the United States, themselves deliberately and of their own choice broke down and

dismantled their whole post-war system of defenses against such a development.

How can such a course be explained, except as inconceivable stupidity or deliberate suicide? Yet we know the men responsible for it are very clever men—indeed; perhaps their trouble was that they were too clever by far. These hard-bitten leaders of the bourgeoisie have no suicidal manias—they may plan death for tens of millions of the people, but never for themselves. How then is it possible to understand their course?

There is but one explanation. The British ruling class had collaborated with their German class brothers in bringing Hitler to power in Germany in order to crush the threatening German socialist revolution, to smash the German Bolsheviks. They were delighted with his performance, and encouraged German rearmament for the purpose of smashing the Soviet Union, which Hitler had long boasted was his chief aim. For this the British and French bourgeoisie were actually happy to see Hitler building an army and piling up armaments. For this they were ready to make most serious concessions to Hitler's axis partners, Japan and Italy, sacrificing China and Ethiopia. For this they gave Mussolini and Hitler a free hand in Spain, to test out those engines of destruction which should later be thrown against the Soviet Union. For this they agreed to allow Hitler to guarantee his "rear" through the fortification of the Rhineland. For this they sacrificed Austria and Czechoslovakia, with untold armaments and treasure. For this they dishonored and emasculated the League of Nations. For this they betrayed their own most solemn obligations and turned them into a mockery before all men. For this they delivered their own fate into the hands of Hitler.

The British and French bourgeoisie had adopted Hitler as their savior with a faith as blind and unquestioning as that of his most ignorant German dupe. Systematically they thereby taught Hitler to despise them, to consider them as fit only for browbeating, blackmail, and if need be, for subjugation. For a chemically-pure example of this fawning British attitude toward Hitler, one need only turn to the pages of the naive and

self-revealing book of Sir Nevile Henderson, British Ambassador to Berlin from 1937 up to September, 1939, in which he explains the "Failure of a Mission." Or to Lord Lloyd's booklet, *The British Case*, which is blessed with a preface by Lord Halifax, British Foreign Minister. There is only one "crime" which they are not prepared to forgive Hitler, and that one is his renunciation of the anti-Soviet war. Yes, they were entirely too clever, these great statesmen of British and French monopoly capital, and overreached themselves. In the doing of which they incidentally brought disaster to the peoples of the world, and now to their own lands.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union was talking quite a different language. Soviet defenses more than matched Hitler's armaments. Hitler's agents were ferreted out of their hiding places, and the country was cleansed of them, along with Japanese and British agents. The Spanish Republic was aided on a scale which, despite its desertion by all the so-called democracies, would have insured its victory had not Blum and Daladier sealed the French border, at crucial moments, to stop the transit of Soviet arms and munitions, and permitted German planes to pass over France into Spain. The Chinese Republic was enabled, by Soviet aid, to resist over years the Japanese *blitzkrieg* conducted with American materials. The Soviet Union never lost an opportunity to urge the implementation of international pledges of collective security. Communists all over the world helped build the anti-fascist People's Front, despite all the betrayals and sabotage from the Second International. Above all, the tremendous achievements of the socialist Soviet economy, multiplying its national income tenfold, and the new Stalinist Constitution of the Soviet Union, made the socialist one-sixth of the world an impregnable fortress. *Facing the vigilant great Soviet power to the East, and the rotten imperialisms to the West, Hitler disclosed after Munich that he was more inclined to finish up with his imperialist rivals, to revise his original schedule of world conquest, following his well-established tactics of hitting first at the softest and weakest points.*

The British bourgeoisie was thoroughly shaken and fright-

ened by Hitler's defiant attitude toward it after Munich, especially when in March, 1939, Hitler marched into Prague, and with the collaboration of fascist Poland wiped out the remnants of Czechoslovakia. But these British rulers, with the agreement of the French (and it now appears also of Roosevelt), committed the unbelievable stupidity of sticking tight to their original grand strategy. They changed nothing but some details of carrying it through. They still gambled everything, everything, upon bringing about a war between Germany and the Soviet Union. Hitler was raising his price; very well, he should get it and more. Not only was Poland to remain completely defenseless, as a pledge of British "good intentions" toward Hitler, but a "loan" of a billion dollars and a German-British alliance were dangled before Berlin, on the sole condition that all moves should be worked out jointly and not by Hitler's sole decision. To enhance the attractiveness of these offers, Hitler was to be threatened with the alternative of war. But the threat of war would have little weight, especially after Munich, unless it was a threat of war from both East and West. But war from the East was impossible without the Soviet Union and its Red Army to conduct it. No one, least of all Hitler, would take such a threat seriously, unless the weight of the Soviet Union was also behind it. Therefore, in May the British and French opened conversations with Moscow for that purpose. Those conversations dragged on into August.

The British-French negotiators convinced the Soviet Union that their proposals were not seriously directed to the establishment of a peace front, but, on the contrary, were designed only to foment a German-Soviet war under the worst possible conditions for the Soviet Union. The following incontestable facts were sufficient to establish this:

1. In contrast to Chamberlain's airplane flights to Berchtesgaden, Godesberg and Munich, to negotiate directly with Hitler, for the Moscow negotiations were sent only subordinate officials, practically clerks, and these without any defined powers at all, and even without any formal credentials.
2. Their proposals, in essence, were to the effect that in

case Britain could not come to terms with Hitler, then the Soviet Union should consider itself at war with Germany, but should have no voice in negotiating those terms, and no rights of action in the Baltic territories or Poland, even when at war with Germany.

3. Poland, Britain's vassal, meanwhile stood pat on the position described recently by General Haller, on the occasion of visiting Roosevelt, as one of confidence in Hitler and hostility toward the Soviet Union, an undefended frontier with Germany and no mobilization, but huge fortifications fully manned on the Soviet frontier.

4. The Baltic States, with British approval, absolutely refused to discuss any measures for their own and the Soviet Union's defenses in such a war with Germany, while Finland was receiving, in the very months of the negotiations, forty million dollars' worth of planes and munitions to supplement the Mannerheim Line less than twenty miles from Leningrad, a line built under British direction.

These basic factors proved beyond all doubt that the British and French rulers were merely engaging in a maneuver to bring pressure upon Hitler to return to his original line of march against the Soviet Union, and that they had not the slightest intention of negotiating a serious peace front that included the Soviet Union upon a basis of equality.

At the same time the Germans came to Moscow with the offer of a far-reaching pact of non-aggression, on the lines which the Soviet Union had always held out to all nations. Since the Soviet Union, if not itself attacked, had not the slightest reason to attack Germany, and since there was no prospect whatever for a real peace, this offer was entirely acceptable. It withdrew Eastern Europe from the immediate threat of becoming the main battleground of the impending imperialist world conflict. It helped dispel the cloud of illusion and falsification that enveloped the world, reveal the true relation of forces and issues, and give another opportunity to the peace forces of the world to halt the warmakers. It enabled the Soviet Union to perfect its Western defense lines, the weaknesses of which the capitalist world had been boast-

fully discussing for years. The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, signed on August 23, 1939, knocked into a pile of ruins the whole grand strategy of the camp of Chamberlain-Daladier-Second International built on the fixed idea of using Hitler Germany to destroy the Soviet Union.

With the desperation of gamblers playing a "sure thing system" at roulette, the British-French rulers with their Social-Democratic accomplices (and as we now know, the complicity of the Roosevelt Administration) had doubled and redoubled their stakes. They gambled away the independence of nations and their own honor. They staked the most precious interests of their own peoples. They played with the peace of the world, with the lives of tens of millions of helpless and unknowing people. They gambled—and they lost.

A storm of hysterical rage swept over the bourgeoisie and their hangers-on of the Second International (with its Trotskyite and Lovestoneite appendages), against the Soviet Union, for daring to sign a pact of non-aggression with Germany without their permission. This storm was by no means least violent in the United States, significantly enough, showing how deep in the conspiracy had been our American ruling class. The very men and parties which had most loudly praised the Munich Pact less than a year before—remember, *only* the Communists fought and voted against Munich—now led a most ferocious denunciation of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact as—of all things—"another Munich"! The very men and parties who had been publicly praying for the success of Chamberlain's efforts to secure an agreement with Hitler on how to divide up the world—these were the ones to denounce the Soviet-German agreement merely not to go to war with one another. The depths of this hysteria among the bourgeoisie and their "Socialist" lackeys is a measure of the completeness of the bankruptcy of imperialist policy thereby was so deep and overwhelming within the bourgeoisie, the lost.



HAVE YOU READ THESE PAMPHLETS?

BY EARL BROWDER

Communism and Culture, by Earl Browder . . . \$**.05**

A compilation of the writings of the General Secretary of the Communist Party on the role of the intellectual and cultural worker in the struggle against Hitlerism.

The Communist Party of the U.S.A.: Its History, Role and Organization, by Earl Browder . . . \$**.05**

A short study of the history, origins, organizational principles and programmatic aims of the Communist Party.

The Way Out, by Earl Browder . . . \$**.35**

An indispensable book for a correct understanding of the background of the present war, and the forces and contradictions which led to it.

ON THE WAR

The Red Army . . . \$**.10**

Profusely illustrated, this authoritative study of the history and growth of the Red Army will aid the reader to understand the epochal events unfolding today.

Turning Point for the World, by R. Palme Dutt . . . \$**.02**

A brilliant review of the policies which led to the outbreak of the World War II, and an evaluation of the tasks confronting the peoples in the fight against Hitler and Hitlerism.

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.