

## IV

### Social and National Security

NAZI pogroms against the Jews, and their violent assaults against the Catholics, have awakened the American people, more than anything else, to the world significance of the Munich conspiracy. The tremendous all-embracing sweep of the protest movement against the pogroms lit up the world scene for the people of the United States; in its light there stood out the need for a new evaluation of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. That last democracy of Central Europe is now seen to have been a front-line trench in the defense of world peace. Its betrayal is seen as the betrayal of peace and democracy all over the world, including the United States.

Against the background of Munich our people now begin to understand the new Japanese aggressions, and the insolent Japanese demand that the United States accept its closed door in the Far East. Chamberlain's boasted "peace pact" with Hitler is seen in its true light as the removal of the British fleet as an obstacle to Hitler's plans for conquest of Latin America. The Munich Pact, unloosing the floodgates of reaction over Europe, strengthening Japanese aggression in China, threatening Latin America with large-scale fascist penetration, moving through the Empire ties to bring Canada into its orbit, clearly envisages the encirclement of the United States by the new coalition of the fascist powers with the imperialist ruling circles of Britain and France.

Clearly the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis is now an enormously multiplied menace to democracy and peace, and especially to the United States, since Chamberlain has allied with it and

brought into the combination the new dictatorship which Daladier is proposing to establish over the French people.

Projects for a new "Munich" settlement for Spain now being hatched in Paris by Chamberlain and Halifax, in conjunction with Daladier and Bonnet, according to the dictates of Hitler and Mussolini, thus strike clearly against Latin America in the first place; they constitute a dagger at the heart of American security against the fascist madness flooding Europe, Africa and Asia.

The political face of the world has been transformed by the Munich Pact. Every problem and every international relationship must be re-examined in the light of the new situation.

The Munich surrender was not inevitable; both Czechoslovakia and peace could have been saved.

Before Munich both Hitler and Mussolini were tottering on the edge of the abyss. Fascist economy was strained to the breaking-point; the middle classes, being wiped out by the crisis, were moving toward common action with the oppressed working masses; the army itself was on the point of revolt; the very apparatus of fascist power was torn with increasing conflicts. All that was necessary to halt the fascist advance was a firm and unyielding front of the democratic powers of the West standing with the Soviet Union—that unshakable fortress against fascism in both Europe and Asia. Such a firm front, demonstrated as possible, would have guaranteed not only the halt of Hitler, but the quick destruction of fascism as a threat to world peace.

After Munich the fascists have their shaking powers again propped up. The front of the anti-fascist peoples has been broken through, fascism has won new positions from which to launch a wider offensive, and the fascist attacks are more insolent than ever: the fascist dictatorships have been strengthened against their own people, the fascist front has been united and

extended for a new series of aggressions that embrace all continents.

The direct lie was given to all protestations that the Munich Pact was an achievement for peace when, directly afterward, all governments announced vast expansions of their armed forces as their first response.

The full depths of the Munich treason were revealed when, with startling speed, it was followed by the most insolent, bestial, bloodthirsty, indecent assaults upon the rest of the world by all the most reactionary forces.

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 pro-

tection, as these interests are understood today by the preponderance of opinion of the co-operating 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 co-operation 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 co-operation 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 house-cleaning which swept all the spies, wreckers and diversionist agents of the fascist powers into the wastebasket 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. . . .

The progressive or liberal camp receives its supreme test on these questions; it is on this field that Herbert Hoover, championing the Munich Powers and proposing a "Chamberlain" policy for the United States, leads the reactionary camp in what they hope will be the crucial issue to break up the progressive majority of the people.

In order to defend even its own narrowed national interests, the United States must assume a leading role in organizing all the peace forces of the world. That is the key to the unfolding of a really democratic and progressive foreign policy for the United States. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo powers driving toward world conquest, with Chamberlain and Daladier already in their orbit, are obviously and swiftly moving to the encirclement of the United States and the conquest of Latin America. There can be no serious defense of the national interests of the United States that is not planned on a world scale, utilizing all present and potential allies, and organizing them for joint resistance to fascism and, immediately, help to Spain and China.

This leading thought for an active foreign policy is one of the first necessities of the platform for building the democratic front looking to the 1940 elections. . . .

We are an American Party, composed of American citizens. We view all our problems in the light of the national interests of the United States. The national interests are not the interests of the pro-fascist circles of monopoly capital, of imperi-

alism; they are the interests of the great majority of the people, the workers, the farmers and the toiling middle classes, whose labor and efforts and sacrifices have formed our nation and built it into the richest and technically most advanced in the world. Our national interests harmonize with those of all other peoples in the world, and clash only with fascist governments and those which capitulate or surrender to fascism. Therefore the national interests of Americans go in the direction of the internationalism of the most advanced thought of mankind.

In the current issue of *The Communist*\* is an article in which I discuss some aspects of this question of the relation of our nation to internationalism. For the sake of saving time, I ask you to consider this article a part of my report, and proceed to consideration of some practical problems.

As an immediate result of the Munich Pact, every important government in the world, including our own, has announced big expansions of the armed forces. Armaments constitute a central question of the day. What must be our attitude toward it?

Prior to the Munich Pact, we declared that a correct peace policy by the United States, which would organize the overwhelmingly preponderant peace forces of the world, could quickly halt and remove the menace of fascist aggression without the necessity of a big armaments program for our country. We opposed the Naval Bill on those grounds, and because it became a substitute for a correct peace policy, and an obstacle to the adoption of the correct policy. Now, the failure of the United States to adopt and follow energetically the policy we proposed has borne its fruits in the Munich Pact. Munich enormously increased the fascist menace and brought it to the American continents in an immediate sense.

This argument on armament that was valid before Munich

\* "Concerning American Revolutionary Traditions," *The Communist*, December, 1938.

loses its force afterward. Munich is an accomplished fact, with all its awful consequences. We can no longer dismiss the armaments question with the old answer. We cannot deny the possibility, even the probability, that only American arms can preserve the Americas from conquest by the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance. The Munich betrayal shattered not only the possibility that relatively unarmed United States, by material and moral aid, could organize the rest of the peace-loving world to halt the fascist offensive, but also destroyed at one blow the sheltered position of the Americas. The Atlantic Ocean is transformed from a barrier to a broad high-road for the aggressor powers. The Pacific may soon be the same.

An unarmed people stands today as helpless victims for fascist conquest.

A fascist world can be prevented only, in the words of the Manifesto of the Communist International on November 7, "*with the aid of such governments which are ready to use armed force in the defense of the liberty and independence of their peoples.*" Only on this basis "*it will be possible for a firm front of the peoples to arise which will compel the fascist aggressors to respect frontiers and keep the peace.*"

It will be necessary to clear away all remnants of the pacifist rubbish of opposing war by surrender to the war-makers. Because for so many years the revolutionary working class consistently opposed, and correctly so, all appropriations for armaments and military establishments of all sorts, we inevitably were associated with the pacifist elements in some common actions, the peace-at-any-price individuals and groups who have today become Hitler's best allies. Some of their ideas seeped into and poisoned small circles of the labor movement for a time. The time has come to clear away all remnants of this degenerate influence.

Norman Thomas, in common with the most reactionary ideologists in the country, propagates a most vicious form of

this pacifist degeneracy, when he argues that a democracy is incapable of defending itself against aggression, that faced with war it must choose between surrender to the fascists without or the fascists within, that in the very effort to defend itself democracy is transformed into fascism. This pacifist defeatism was made to order for the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance; if they could only persuade the rest of the world to agree with Norman Thomas, their job would be done.

Fortunately, the influence of Thomas and all his kind is rapidly melting away, instead of increasing, so there is still hope in the world. The fundamental instinct of democracy is toward peace, it abhors war, but when it must fight for its life it is more capable of sustained struggle than any reactionary dictatorship, struggle simultaneously against its enemies within and without, at home and abroad. That is the main lesson of our own nation's history, not to go further afield for historical examples. The War of Independence, 1776-1783, was not chosen by the American people, but when it was forced upon them, they founded the first great modern democracy as a result. Despite Norman Thomas' sneering remarks to discredit the United States in the War of 1812, and the national anthem that was born in it, that was another defensive war for the maintenance of democracy and national independence, without which American progress would have been stultified. American democracy did not choose the Civil War, but when it was forced by the slave-power, its outcome in victory for the North was a victory for freedom all over the world, while a surrender to the South would have been a crushing blow against progress here and everywhere. And, today, the Spanish and Chinese peoples are giving a remarkable demonstration of how democracy can expand and grow in the very fires of a just war for national independence. No, the arguments of Norman Thomas are a vicious falsification of the lessons of history, arguments

whose only practical conclusions are answers to the most fervent prayers of Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado.

Our first conclusion must be, therefore, that in the world situation after Munich we cannot adopt a negative position to the question of armaments.

Neither can we, however, meet the new situation with a simple affirmative. No matter how much the situation has changed, it still remains true—more true than ever—that armaments are no substitute for a positive peace policy, for a correct approach and active role in organizing the world against the war-makers and therefore for peace. The question is not, Are we for armaments, yes or no; it is the more complicated question, "Armaments, for what?" If it is for the defense of the liberty and independence of our own and other peoples, Yes, emphatically yes! But the people must learn to make its "Yes" a power for securing guarantees that the armaments will be for that purpose and for no other.

Armaments in themselves provide no safeguard against fascist conquest. Spain had arms and an army, but it was precisely this army which was seized from within by the agents of the fascist invaders, and turned into the executioner of the Spanish people. Let us not too quickly congratulate ourselves in the United States that the same thing "can't happen here." It is only a few weeks since the Secretary of War of our own country found it necessary to note as "treasonable" the public utterances of an army general who had just retired from active service and begun to talk publicly for the first time. It would be very interesting to know how many of the general's brother officers agree with his treasonable views. But we have no way to find out. And the thought makes us very uneasy of increasing the powers of these officers. It is necessary to find democratic guarantees for our armed forces, if they are to be relied upon in meeting the fascist menace. It is necessary to cleanse

the armed forces and governmental apparatus of all fascist agents and sympathizers.

To stand up against the advancing fascist alliance, to call it to a halt, is a much bigger and more dangerous job after Munich than it would have been before. Perhaps there are persons who will raise the question: Is it worth while? Could we not, by following Chamberlain's policy, come to an acceptable bargain with the fascist powers?

Of course the great mass of the people, the workers, farmers and middle classes, cannot and will not even ask such questions. For them the issue is settled that they will resist fascism to the last breath. But some sections of our upper classes *are* asking themselves these questions, and seriously leaning toward surrender to foreign fascism, while the most reactionary circles still dream of a native American fascism. Even these gentlemen, however, should begin to understand that if Hitler's hordes once get their foothold in rich America, their voracious appetites will grow with the eating and with little delay they will come to have less respect for an American bourgeois than they now show for a Jewish doctor in Germany. It will do no good for the American bourgeoisie to plead with Hitler that they are good "Aryans"; the Nazis long ago learned to provide Jewish pedigrees for anyone who either resists them or holds any property they want to take; they have impartially presented both President Roosevelt and myself with Jewish family trees, and what they can do for us they can do also for a Rockefeller or a Morgan or even a Ford. For by that time they will be world conquerors.

It is the purest humanitarianism, therefore, to point out even to the American bourgeoisie that self-interest does not lie in accommodation to Hitler; accommodation must be followed by surrender, and it is not pleasant to visualize what would happen to soft and flabby American millionaires when they are at the mercy of Hitler's gang of hardened cutthroats. But then, I'm

afraid that American upper-income groups have an invincible prejudice against accepting advice from the Communists, so there is very little we can do for them directly, except to do everything we can to guarantee that the United States will not go their road, but rather the democratic and anti-fascist road of the majority of the people.

When the United States has thoroughly made up its mind to stand out against the fascist alliance, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis and its Chamberlain-Daladier annex, then the question is, how to do a quick and thorough job of it. Do we want to do it alone, or do we want all the help we can get?

The simplest kind of common sense seems to require that the American people gather all the assistance possible. Most people will agree to that.

Who will be willing to stand with the United States?

Following the steps of thought of American spokesmen of the day, we turn first to the Americas. The Lima Conference that opens soon is openly discussed as the first step to organize the Americas against the fascist invasion. Good, so far as it goes, and every anti-fascist must wish the conference well. But we must warn that it will not go very far unless a few points of policy are thoroughly established: (1) that every trace of the old "Dollar Diplomacy," of the old "Yankee Imperialism," be washed out of the "Good Neighbor Policy" which Roosevelt has been developing; (2) that we do not forget that we need *unity of the American democracies*, while in many Latin-American countries the *democracies* are suppressed and their leaders in jail or exile, which is the main reason for Hitler's successes there; (3) that the United States diplomatic and consular staff in Latin America, which is the instrument for executing United States policy in practice, shall be cleansed of its fascist sympathizers, notorious perverts and simple incompetents. If these three points are considered and acted upon, the Lima Confer-

ence could be a serious beginning to organize the world against the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis.

Canada is a separate question. That nation is orientated mainly upon the United States in the biggest questions of world policy, but is still closely bound to the Empire, and therefore to Chamberlain, by economic interest and political tradition. And Chamberlain, profoundly uneasy at the repercussions of President Roosevelt's promise of protection to Canada, is hustling off the King and Queen for a hurried trip to Canada to revive the "Empire spirit" that began to droop after Munich. But geography is more potent than titles, and Canada is more American than Imperial, and it is not too optimistic to expect our northern neighbor to join the United States in the anti-fascist front—once we demonstrate that we are organizing it in earnest.

Once the Americas are lined up against "peaceful penetration," intrigues and conspiracies, the next question is: Can it be protected from armed aggression? Before Munich this was "music of the future," but after Munich it is an immediate question. If Hitler gets his African colonies and crushes the Spanish republic, he will have naval bases much closer to Latin America than is New York. If Japan keeps her hold on China, and gets the new capital Chamberlain has promised her, she is all set for the next move in the Pacific, seizure of the Philippines, Guam and Alaska, after which she will be ready for her share of Latin America. We have two oceans, but a one-ocean navy; military experts are very pessimistic about the possibility of keeping the Panama Canal open in case of war; and the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis has secured the neutrality if not the co-operation of the British navy so long as Chamberlain is in power. Clearly, defense of the Americas is a big job, and we need still more help to be sure of success. Where can we get it?

First of all, there is the Spanish republic, which, despite Chamberlain, is still alive and fighting heroically and effec-

tively. If the U. S. would simply live up to its treaty obligations to Spain, and to international law, lift the embargo and open our markets to the republic—then the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis would be halted by the destruction of their agent Franco, would lose its prospective Atlantic bases, and would lose its cultural and social leverage upon Latin America of a fascist Spain. Food for Spain from America's surplus will help solve a domestic problem, and an open market for Spain will save that land for the world front of the democracies.

Clearly, if the United States wants to protect the Americas, it must adopt this minimum aid to Spain.

If Chamberlain and Daladier remain in power, however, the U. S. still stands alone among the great powers, while its tasks grow heavier. We must, therefore, exert our influence to rouse the British and French people to break with the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis, and establish governments that will co-operate with us and not with the fascists. That means we must work with the Peace Coalition in Britain, the potential bloc of the anti-fascist Conservatives, the Liberals and the Labor Party, and pledge our help to them if they set up an anti-fascist government. That means we must work with the *Front Populaire* in France, the anti-Daladier Radicals, the Socialists, the Communists and the great French labor movement—which has just called Daladier to account in the glorious general strike—and promise them our help when they set up the new government of the People's Front.

If Japan is not halted in the Far East, however, she may still upset the applecart for the United States and turn the scales against us; she may go further and step over the line that divides the Far East from the Far West. But Japan cannot do this while the Chinese people are still fighting. And the Chinese people will fight much better if the United States cut off the supplies with which Japan is conducting her war of conquest. And the Chinese people will fight to victory and in-

dependence, if the U. S. would grant them big credits, which China could use to put our unemployed millions to work producing the things she needs for her battle.

Clearly, if the U. S. wants to protect the Americas, it must adopt this minimum aid to China.

But still, with all this, the U. S. will continue to stand alone among the great powers of the world. Is there no other power that can be called to assist the great task of halting fascist world conquest?

Yes, there is another great power. It is the Soviet Union, the greatest power in the world next to the United States.

The United States must face and answer the question: Do we want the Soviet Union on our side in the fight to prevent the current war from engulfing all nations?

Will the United States, and everything that it stands for in the world, be stronger or weaker if it has the co-operation of the Soviet Union, a co-operation based entirely upon clearly-defined *mutual interests*, the guarantee of mutual respect and the principles of international order?

Only a blind fool could deny that the United States would be stronger, that its role in the world would be much greater, that its national interests would be more secure, if it were working in collaboration with the great power of the Soviet Union.

I am not a spokesman for the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. is not, as the slanderous demagogue Martin Dies charges, "an agency of Moscow." But I am an American as well as a Communist and, with the whole American Party, I can and do claim the Soviet Union as the reliable friend of our nation and our people, and propose in the American national interest that we should seek the co-operation of the Soviet Union in the world crisis in which we find ourselves.

The Soviet Union speaks for herself. She does not need my voice to explain her position on world issues. But I, as an American, have the right and duty to point out to our fellow-

citizens of the United States that the Soviet Union has explicitly laid down the basis for such co-operation with our nation and our government.

*Izvestia*, official newspaper of the Soviet Union, recently declared:

At the moment when the greatest discord and confusion exist in the international arena, there is complete clarity between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, which is capable of serving as a basis for further deepening these relations in the interests of world peace. . . .

The United States must, of course, choose its own future foreign policy. Firmly and purposefully the Soviet Union continues to follow its chosen path of active defense of peace and a consistent struggle against aggression. Both countries may still meet each other on this path, and this would have a most beneficial influence on the international situation.

From this side of the United States, the "complete clarity" that exists between the two countries was attested when President Roosevelt sent a friendly message of greeting to President Kalinin on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of the founding of the Soviet government.

Two governments, the most powerful in the world, finding their relationship one of the most "complete clarity" and friendliness, are facing the world crisis of a universal fascist aggression while the other great powers are retreating or surrendering; both these great powers are fully determined to defend at all costs their own territories and those neighbors to whom they have accepted obligations; both these great powers are fully devoted to restoration of international order, the inviolability of national boundaries, and the sanctity of treaties.

It is clear that this situation demands the conscious co-operation of the two great powers for their common aims. It is demanded by the national interests of both, and by the interests of all oppressed and suffering humanity. It is demanded for the continued existence of civilization itself.



The same approach to the problem for all peoples of the world was expressed in the recent Manifesto of the Communist International, when it said:

Only through the medium of an alliance of peoples conducting a self-sacrificing struggle for the cause of peace is it possible to thwart the criminal plans of the war instigators. A defense cordon of armed peoples who have joined their forces with the great Soviet people will doom fascism to impotence and will hasten its defeat and inevitable ruin.

This foreign policy for the United States is only simple common sense. It is a policy which appeals to the needs and the instincts of the American people. It is a policy which needs only to be stated clearly before the masses of the people to obtain their universal endorsement.

This policy is in the direct line of the best traditions of American history. The United States stood in the forefront of world progress and democracy in 1776, despite all difficulties and hardships, with a heroism that formed our basic national character. The United States stood up against world reaction in the War of 1812, and confirmed her democracy and national independence. The United States led world progress in the Civil War of 1861-65, when it wiped out the slave-power and opened the continent for democratic development.

The spirit of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln has not departed from the American people. In that spirit we will take our place in the forefront of progress today, facing all the storms aroused by the evil spirits of reaction, and shoulder our responsibilities of organizing the world for peace and progress. And the Communist Party will be in the front ranks of the American people in this struggle.

From the report on "Social and National Security," delivered at a meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., held in New York, December 3, 4, and 5, 1938.