

John L.'s Goebbeloney

ROY HOWARD's man who interviewed John L. Lewis last week observed brightly that the latter's views seemed remarkably similar to those of Westbrook Pegler. And, the reporter should have added, to another prominent essayist named Joseph Goebbels. All these authorities contend, with significant unanimity, that the world is going to hell in a droszky. That was Lewis' dire contention in his interview: the CIO, Philip Murray and all, were dupes of the diabolically clever Communists. This is not the first time that strike-fomenting, FDR-hating Lewis has talked this way: why he chose to bring it up again this past week, with the eager collaboration of Roy Howard, merits full examination.

Did the timing (and Lewis is no novice at timing) have anything to do with Martin Dies' forthcoming smear of the CIO Political Action Committee? Was it related to David Dubinsky's hysterical diatribe last week when he urged his followers to stint neither time nor money to defeat the united American Labor Party slate in the March 28 New York primaries? "Everything is at stake," Dubinsky warned his lieutenants.

Hysteria earmarked the way the cabal of labor-splitters operated last week. What is worrying them? Can it be that they sense the truth rising from the grass-roots of American life—that the rank-and-file of the working-class, the people generally, are evaluating their political lot and are groping toward a mighty coalition behind their fighting Commander-in-Chief? Isn't that what Dubinsky really meant when he said "Everything is at stake?"—for unity around the President's policies tolls the knell of all those pie-card artists and labor despots who fear the extension of democracy more than they fear Himmler's Schutz-Staffel Korps. Isn't that the reason for the concerted fire, last week, on the CIO Political Action Committee? Isn't that why the old, creaky Red-baiting arguments were hauled out? They said "CIO," but didn't they really mean "FDR," and all that he stands for?

LEWIS and Dubinsky weren't the only actors on the stage last week. Philip Pearl, former Hearst man and currently AFL publicity director, gave his (read Hutcheson, Woll et al.) blessings to the Dies "investigation" of the Hillman committee. William Green, buckling under the pressure of the Hoover-lovers in his retinue, circularized the AFL unions to steer clear of any collaboration with the Hillman committee for united political action for '44. (To do this Green had to run counter to traditional AFL policy guaranteeing autonomy to affiliates.)

All these developments were duck soup for Dies: he lost no time inserting Lewis' lies into the *Congressional Record*; the Lewis interview "tells the story of how the Communists have dominated and controlled the CIO," he said. He incorporated, too, in the *Record*, statements by Alex Rose, Old Guard American Labor Party boss, and Philip Pearl's slanderous remarks.

This is evident: news adds up of increasing cooperation among the rank-and-file of all union setups behind the President. Four hundred trade union leaders representing all AFL and CIO locals and Railroad Brotherhood lodges in Cleveland heartily welcomed the call of Phil Hanna, Ohio Federation of Labor leader, for a fourth term for President Roosevelt and for organic unity of the organized labor movement, last week. This is but one example of the growing national trend. As this trend rises, the misleaders of labor rush to align themselves with the nation's most dangerous enemies—men like Dies, Hoover, Dewey.

PATRIOTS would be blind, indeed, to underestimate the menace of these desperate men: the pro-Teheran people in America are in for a fight and cannot shrink from it. Labor, in conjunction with its allies—the farmers, professionals, small business, the enlightened sections of big business, Negroes—must realize this: their side *can* lose—and if it does, it will be defeat by default. They can shape history their way—if they act, *immediately* and in *unison*. Anything less may spell catastrophe.

ond report of its postwar committee, urges a gradual and selective ending of controls. But certainly the purpose of such controls in the postwar period should not be to choke off civilian production, but to direct its orderly expansion with a minimum of friction and strain. The recent Atlantic City conference called by the NAM, at which in addition to business groups, there were represented the AFL, the CIO and several farm organizations, indicates that in the ranks of big business there is growing realization that the solution of postwar problems requires the cooperative efforts of all classes.

Aiding Jews' Rescue

THERE is more heat than light in the protests of the Egyptian premier and high officials of Iraq against the Palestine resolution before Congress, and in the reciprocal brickbats tossed at those two countries by certain American commentators. The resolution in question was introduced in the House by Representatives Wright and Compton and in the Senate by Senators Wagner and Taft. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has been holding hearings on it.

The House resolution on Palestine calls on the United States to "use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth." The resolution has been endorsed by the House majority and minority leaders, by Chairman Sol Bloom of the Foreign Affairs Committee, by the CIO and AFL, and by many other organizations. The considerations behind the War Department's opposition are not yet clear.

The immediate practical effect of the resolution would be to swing the moral and political weight of the United States behind the effort to abrogate the British White Paper which would bar all Jewish immigration into Palestine after March 31. As such the resolution would become a weapon in the struggle to rescue those Jews who manage to escape from Nazi persecution and can be given a haven in Palestine. This is an objective which the vast majority of the American people, Jews and non-Jews, Zionists and non-Zionists, support. It is unfortunate, however, that the resolution has been weakened by the introduction of the question of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, a point on which there is no agreement not only among Americans as a whole, but among the Jewish people themselves and even among Zionists. For there are some Zionists, like Dr. Judah Magnes, Henrietta Szold, and a section of Histadruth, the Jewish labor federation in Palestine, who oppose an exclusively Jewish Commonwealth and favor some

form of state that would express the unity of the Jewish and Arab populations.

The inclusion of this extraneous controversial question has given an opportunity to anti-unity elements in Jewish life like the American Council for Judaism (headed by the ex-America Firster, Lesing Rosenwald), certain leaders of the American Jewish Committee, and the reactionary Zionist Revisionists (New Zionist Organization of America), as well as to anti-Jewish elements in the Arab world, to sow dissension and obscure the positive core of the resolution: the opening of Palestine for free immigration. Despite this weakness, we support the resolution.

Anti-Fascist Editor

MANY persons, from all walks of American life, paid tribute to Miss Freda Kirchwey, who has just completed twenty-five years of association with the *Nation* of which she is the editor and publisher. We should like to add our tribute. Though we have had our differences, we have much in common: she has waged uncompromising battle against fascism; she strives for a better America and a better world. She has a deservedly prominent place in the ranks of patriotic Americans. As the editor of a journal which expresses the opinion of liberals, she has courageously accepted a responsibility which grows with the times.

That responsibility is, today, perhaps more onerous than at any time in the past. As Archibald MacLeish said at the banquet in her honor, liberals must cherish "a belief in the future of man." And the demarcation lines of man's future were laid down at a recent historic conference between three world figures—Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill—and man's destiny today depends on his answer to the question: "Are you for or against Teheran?" Although we know that Miss Kirchwey has expressed herself most affirmatively for the Teheran perspective, we have not found that affirmation consistent in the pages of her journal, nor in liberalism generally.

Too often the practical judgments of liberals appearing in the *Nation's* pages are determined by archaic yardsticks that pre-date Teheran, and sometimes, even Pearl Harbor. Too often we encounter the old shibboleths, a blind baiting of Communists as well as indiscriminate capitalist-baiting. Unity for a prosperous, peaceful America, as well as a prosperous, peaceful world, requires that old prejudices be cast off: and, unfortunately, we do not find that in the thinking of all too many liberals today. We hope that Miss Kirchwey, with her indubitable drive for a happy America, will be one of those who help diminish secondary differences for the sake of the primary goal: unity behind Teheran, which adds up to indefatigable support of the Commander-in-Chief and cooperation with all those—all—who agree with his win-the-war and win-the-peace policies.



Ted

"Why, Miss—it's only Pegler!"

New Blows

WITH an unseasonable and freakish thaw messing things up pretty badly on the northern wing of the Eastern Front, Soviet troops under Generals Govorov and Khozin are perforce compelled to reduce the amplitude of their maneuver and concentrate on the actual gnawing through of the German defenses of Narva, Pskov, and Vitebsk. The marshy and waterlogged areas between these fortresses do not lend themselves to long and fast marches under meteorological conditions prevailing right now.

However, neither "rain, nor storm, heat of day nor gloom of night" seems to be able to catch the Soviet High Command unawares. The Red Army, shifting the center of gravity of its attack once more, (at this writing, March 5) has broken through the German front in the direction of the Carpathians on a very wide front and to a depth of up to thirty miles.

Marshal Zhukov, the armor expert, is in supreme command of this operation. The first bulletin announced that five hundred communities had been liberated, including the town of Yampol, and that the Red Army was fighting on the approaches to Volochisk (thirty miles east of Tarnopol), which used to be the frontier station between Russia and Austria before the first world war. If you look at the map of this region, you will see that this is the most ambitious blow yet struck by the Red Army on the southern wing of the front. The battle line here has been running from southeast to northwest, roughly paralleling the Lvov-Odessa railroad for a length of five hundred miles, the distance between

the firing line and the railroad varying between twenty-five and 150 miles. This line was overhanging the entire German position in the south like a ceiling about to collapse.

Since the end of October, the Soviet High Command has been playing a real "fugue" on the keys of this colossal "keyboard." The notation of the successive blows looks something like this:

October 27, blow at Krivoi Rog (first blow); November 6, Kiev; December 9, Kirovograd (first blow); December 30, Kazatin; January 8, Kirovograd (second blow); January 10, Nemirov; February 5, Lutsk-Rovno; February 8, Nikopol; February 11, Shepetovka; February 28, Krivoi Rog (second blow); March 5, Yampol. This makes eleven distinct blows in eighteen weeks.

In this pattern we distinguish two basic characteristics of Soviet strategy: (1) The constant shifting of the center of gravity, and (2) the progressive increase of the scope of the plans, with a failure (such as the first blow at Krivoi Rog and the first blow at Kirovograd) followed immediately by an operation with "raised stakes" instead of "lowered stakes."

Any prognosticator of things to come on the Eastern Front will do well to bear these characteristics in mind.

Flirting with Hitler

THE Turkish government insists on remaining neutral for the ostensible reason that it has not received enough Allied equipment to run the risk of war. Now American and British supplies are being stopped, military talks have been suspended,

and both these steps mark a rougher and tougher attitude towards a neutral whose neutrality is of advantage to Hitler only. The Turks may consider their bargaining as an extremely shrewd piece of business but it will go down in the war record as one of the most miserable examples of opportunism ever practiced. In the early stages of the conflict Turkey's non-belligerence may have been of some value in that it barred Hitler from the Middle East. But after the enormous events on the Eastern Front, after the Stalingrad victory, Turkish neutrality protects the Nazi's Balkan flank and makes it possible for the Wehrmacht to keep a limited number of divisions in the area while concentrating the bulk of its forces against the Russians. Turkey's fate would have been sealed long ago and her independence lost had it not been for the tremendous Nazi defeats in the past two years.

For that reason alone her position is untenable and her international politics of the market place variety. Ankara is the center of Nazi diplomatic intrigue and it was only last month that the Soviet press reported a considerable influx of German "tourists" into the country. Small wonder then that immediately afterward, Turkish official circles began attempts at pitting Washington and London against Moscow. Whatever Turkey's reprehensible motives may be—such as, perhaps, hegemony over some kind of Balkan federation—her present policies delay Hitler's doom and certainly warrant a stiffer Allied front towards her.

Still True to the Axis

AT THIS writing, the Finnish government still plays the farce of delay in accepting the Soviet armistice terms while some German divisions prepare their evacuation through northern Norway and others entrench themselves more firmly in their old positions. As the *Times* of London puts it, Helsinki's rulers are more the faithful instruments of Nazi policy than of Finnish interests. This is a repetition of the treachery which took place in Italy last year when Badoglio's vacillation about signing terms with the Allies gave the Germans a chance to reinforce their lines and regroup their troops in the Balkans. But the stalling tactic will collapse in Finland as it did in Italy. The Finnish cry that they could not consider peace because they feared Soviet incursions on their independence is now, after publication of the Soviet armistice conditions, too transparent a hoax for even the friends of Mannerheim in this country to repeat very loudly. They still seek, however, to have the American government intercede on Finland's behalf. But again the State Department, through Mr. Stettinius, has made it clear that Finland must pursue negotiations, and British official circles have warned that the longer Helsinki temporizes with the Soviet offer the graver will be the consequences. Finland nevertheless still struts and pirouettes as though she were never a member of the Axis alliance, as though her bases were never used for devastating raids on Allied

shipping, as though her shelling of Leningrad was the foolery of small boys with pop guns. Her haggling at this juncture only accentuates the utter bankruptcy of her ruling clan, its Social-Democratic collaborators, and their imperviousness to the needs of the Finnish people.

Tojo Gets the Jitters

THE Island of Truk which American forces blasted two weeks ago is over 2,000 miles from Tokyo. Yet even blows dealt the enemy at this distance from his home base create what he himself describes as "a serious situation." The bold bombardment of Truk followed upon or coincided with victories in the Gilbert and Marshall Islands as well as in New Guinea and New Britain far to the south. Since the climax of Japan's advance after Pearl Harbor we have thrown the Mikado's forces back across a belt about 2,300 miles wide along a 5,000 mile front stretching southward from the Aleutians. While we have so far been hacking away at the outer fortress our armed forces from the south and from the east are approaching perilously close to the bastions which protect the heart of the Japanese Empire.

Gone is the cocksure smugness of the Japanese fascist leaders characteristic of 1942 and the early part of 1943. Today it is replaced by alarms sounded to the people at home and to those enslaved in the vast tentacles of the Japanese Empire. Premier Tojo warned a few days after the attack on Truk that "the decisive Battle of the Pacific has entered its actual phase at last." A more important sign of the effect of our victories, however, is the severe military and political shakeup which has taken place. Three cabinet officers were cashiered in order "to cope with the current serious situation." The most crucial post which changed hands was the ministry of finance; the others were agriculture and commerce, and transportation and communication. Two days later Field Marshal Sugiyama and Fleet Admiral Nagano, chiefs of staff of the army and navy respectively and top men in the determination of strategy, were fired. Tojo himself took over the army job and placed the navy minister, Shimada, in Nagano's position. Evidently the political belt had to be tightened, and as few can be entrusted with the task of carrying out the fascist war, the circle of individuals in the top leadership becomes smaller and smaller.

On the other side of the great squeeze that is being prepared against Japan the dramatic progress recorded by Nimitz and MacArthur from the east and south is lacking. The press reports current conversations at the White House on the problem of the slowness of the long-awaited Mountbatten drive to open a supply route to China from India and the Bay of Bengal. And within China itself, the base from



Appointment in Ankara.

which the final all-out attack must be launched, the counter strokes of reaction continue to impede national unity and the development of a powerful Chinese army. A grand strategy such as that being unfurled against the Japanese enemy requires the rapid consolidation of every sector.

Symbol of Victory

DR. ALBERTO GUANI, who heads the Inter-American Advisory Committee for Political Defense and is Vice-President of Uruguay, has addressed the opening meeting of the Confederation of Latin American Workers' emergency conference in Montevideo. Fifteen thousand people jammed the Municipal Theater to greet CTAL president Lombardo Toledano, labor delegates from most of the Latin American nations, and the delegate from the CIO. The appearance of Dr. Alberto Guani was symbolic of the increasingly realistic attitude being taken by the American governments. On behalf of all the democratic states of the hemisphere the advisory committee earlier this winter investigated the Bolivian coup, recommended non-recognition, and is now looking into the sordid affairs of the Argentine junta. It is the official embodiment of a democratic unity struggling to eliminate fascism and its fifth column from this side of the Atlantic.

Speaking as its chairman, Dr. Guani indicated that the advisory committee would work closely with the CTAL. Thus for the first time the American governments, including that of the United States, have openly declared their intention to cooperate with the largest organized body of democratic people in the hemisphere, the CTAL, and, through its Montevideo representative, the CIO. It is of the utmost importance that such an alliance be rapidly cemented.

The hemispheric struggle between the forces for victory in the war and those representing fascism is approaching its climax. The Nazi bridgehead in Argentina is doing everything possible to create a serious political and even military diversion in Latin America, the purpose of which will be to interfere with our invasion of the European continent and to rob the United Nations of unconditional victory. Our non-recognition of Bolivia was not decisive, it was merely a welcome indication of a stiffening policy on the part of the democracies. The blow must be struck directly at the Argentine heart of the fascist movement and simultaneously at Franco Spain, which remains Hitler's bridge across the Atlantic. We hope that Dr. Guani's speech of welcome to the CTAL and CIO delegates will mean just this, that all pro-war forces in the hemisphere, official and unofficial, will now combine in the common task of eliminating all traces of the enemy from our shores.

Crisis in Italy

EVERY reliable political report from Italy's liberated areas underscores a heightening crisis. Poverty tortures the countryside and work is as scarce as bread. And there are not a few Italians who say, "Yes, the Germans have gone, but what have the Allies brought?" We know what the Allies have brought. Under their banner there is a vast potential of freedom and self-development impossible under the Nazi flag. This is what we believe and what we want every Italian to believe. Yet what shall we say to Italians who confront us with excerpts from Mr. Churchill's recent speech in the Commons? They are bitter and angry and the cynical among them will turn the minds of others in the same direction.

Why isn't there an Italian army fighting side by side with us? Mr. Churchill pulls the wool over our eyes when he says there is. Two thousand Italians organized by the Badoglio regime do not make an army; they are not even a token force compared to the large manpower available. Why isn't there a large Italian contingent at Cassino? Is it because there is no equipment with which to arm several divisions of Italian troops? Hardly. Is it because Italians lack courage? How great Italian courage is can be found in every report of the operations of Italian guerrillas in the north, in the reports of the tremendous strike movements in the northern industrial areas, or in that indelible record of the Garibaldi Brigade that fought for the Republicans in Spain.

WHAT is it then? The answer is simple. It is Badoglio and the king whom Mr. Churchill has accepted as the symbols of the true Italy. The Italians, however, are equally as good authorities as Mr. Churchill about symbols of the true Italy and they forthrightly refuse to accept these two as leaders of an Italian renaissance. Mr. Churchill's defense of Badoglio and the king is so threadbare that he must trot out all the nonsense about "legitimacy" and his devotion to the monarchical principle. The latter is so much poppycock, for the monarchy as such is not at issue. It is Victor Emmanuel over whom the critical controversy takes place. If we remember rightly, Mr. Churchill's predecessors did not hesitate to oust a king several years ago without jeopardizing the British monarchy.

And as for legitimacy—this is one of those fine legal points that is utterly pointless. If legitimacy were the test of distinguishing friends from enemies then Hitler has a powerful argument in asking us to stop the war against him because we threaten his "legitimacy" established in a dozen *Ja* "elections." From another angle, if Mr. Churchill desires to make legitimacy the principle of Allied relationships how is it possible for him to extend *de facto* recognition to Tito's forces, which certainly are not "legitimate" according to the books on international law? But even if legitimacy were made a criterion, then Badoglio's government should be dispensed with immediately. It is no more legitimate than was Mussolini's government—a government legitimized by Victor Emmanuel, who shared the loot brought him by Mussolini and the Duke of Addis Ababa, Marshal Badoglio.

All this fancy legal talk in British official circles, including those in Washington, will not bring us one inch closer to a rapid victory on the peninsula—and that is our central concern. If we disregard the six-party coalition, whose legitimacy was established in the twenty years it fought fascism just as Tito's legitimacy was established in his battles against the Nazis, then we are preparing the way for the very explosion that must be avoided at all cost. Although the ten minute strike in Naples was not held, the plans for it were signs of dwindling patience—a patience stretched almost to the breaking point by AMG officials in the Badoglio apparatus and now by Churchill's slap in the face.

There is compelling need for a revision of policy in conformity with the Moscow declaration on Italy. The situation is far from hopeless and we prophesy that it will be changed for the better. But dealing with it immediately and courageously cannot be delayed. The chaos will be great if we merely sit on our hands and let things slide. Badoglio, according to reports, has offered to resign over the transfer of part of the Italian fleet to the Soviet Union. What an opportunity to call his bluff!