

Despite Mr. Trohan's warning and even with the knowledge that NEW MASSES' views on Colonel Lanza's journalistic outpourings will be subject to review by the McCormick-Patterson press, I called on Col. John T. Winterich, head of the War Department board that passes on articles submitted for publication by army officers.

Colonel Winterich did not consider the Lanza articles controversial, though he intimated that some people might logically feel they went too far. His office is primarily concerned with guarding military security and with preventing information of benefit to the enemy from leaking into the press. He felt that my inquiries might involve freedom of the press, though he acknowledged that there is such a thing as abusing this privilege and transcending the bounds of license. The War Department grants greater liberty of "speculation" to its retired personnel. The Department, the colonel told me, would be very glad to take under advisement any protest that challenged the Lanza articles. "Go ahead and write your article," Colonel Winterich advised, "send us a copy, and we will take it under consideration."

The McCormick-Patterson press has

made a practice of using the prestige and authority of army officers to dress up disruptive propaganda. If any doubt lingers as to the thinking of the men running these newspapers, I submit a selection from the writings of Frank C. Waldrop, editor of the *Times-Herald*, appearing on August 7: "Stalin always has been a tough baby," Waldrop declares in extra heavy type. "One observer has summed it up pretty well—that the Germans and Italians and other Europeans seeking to work diplomatic confidence games made fools of themselves trying to imitate the English, but that Stalin gets ahead by just being a 'dirty, old Oriental who sleeps in his underwear and doesn't care who knows it.'"

I don't know exactly what Mr. Waldrop is trying to prove. But certainly he is straining every energy to whip up a frenzy of hate against our powerful ally, the USSR. Certainly, by so doing, he and his employers are sowing suspicion that hampers the prosecution of the present war and that lays the basis of a future war which can well be disastrous to the best interests of the United States. Certainly Mr. Waldrop makes no bones about repeating propaganda initiated by Goebbels.

The War Department, by posing as a

"neutral" when it approves the writings of officers like Colonel Lanza, is open to the charge of failing to exercise proper vigilance in wartime. The Department cannot remain oblivious to interpretations bound to be made at home and abroad as a result of articles authored by army officers and approved by the War Department. Colonel Winterich intimated that he will be interested in any reaction he receives to Colonel Lanza's views.

As Colonel Lanza himself has warned in the *Field Artillery Journal*, "Nothing is more injurious in war than plans which do not rest on a broad basis of fact." I do not think Colonel Lanza could deny that his aphorism is just as true when amended to read: "Nothing is more injurious to the country at war than misrepresentations of and attacks against our nation's allies which do not rest on the broad basis of fact." Colonel Lanza in the service of the McCormick-Patterson axis has been guilty of rumor-mongering, distortion, provocation, and evil-intentioned gossiping. He forgets his obligations as a retired army officer to lend all support to the fight to preserve the United States from its mortal foes, and to eschew everything that provides aid and comfort to the enemy.



AROUND THE WORLD

THE CRISIS IN CHINA

THE internal situation in China has reached a dangerously critical stage. The crisis expresses itself not only in the possibility of civil war provoked by the appeaser elements in the Kuomintang, but also in the near collapse of National China's war economy and the consequent weakening of the military effort.

China has been heading toward this crisis for many months; persons in a position to follow Chinese developments—and these include the military and civilian leaders of our war program—have not been caught unawares. Whether they have been caught unprepared to take whatever remedial action is open to a friendly ally is another matter. But without doubt it is generally realized throughout the world that the cornerstone of the Chinese people's magnificent resistance to the Japanese invasion has been a growing national unity among the people themselves, occasionally given impetus, though not so consistently as might have been desired, by leaders of the National Government and particularly by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The symbol of this unity was the working arrangement forged between the Kuomintang and Communist Parties in 1937, which reached

its high point in 1938 but since has been violated several times by defeatists in Chungking. Today that working arrangement has reached its lowest point, if indeed it can be said to exist at all any more. The most heroic phases of China's military effort have occurred as a result of the partial acceptance by pro-war elements in the Kuomintang of the principle of a people's war. In the fall of 1938 Chiang Kai-shek revived world hopes of China's ultimate victory when he called for a reorganization of the armed forces, including the development of a gigantic guerrilla movement as well as preparations for a later counter-offensive by training a new army of many million men, with the most modern war equipment. Had this program been carried out in all its ramifications on the economic and political side a nation of irresistible force could have been welded and all partisan differences would have disappeared in the fight to drive the foe into the sea.

That the program was not carried out cannot be blamed entirely on China's Kuomintang leaders. Two of China's natural allies, the United States and Great Britain, failed her miserably at that time and, indeed, gave comfort and support to the Jap-

anese enemy. When they finally altered their Far Eastern policies and adopted an anti-fascist line it was too late to do China any immediate good. The military events after Pearl Harbor placed China in an even more difficult position than before, for the Japanese seizure of the entire Malayan Peninsula and her completion of the coastal blockade closed all avenues of American and British approach. This situation still prevails and will continue until a major campaign is launched to recapture Burma and Indo-China.

BUT in the recent period there have been more than military factors to harm China's internal situation. One need only list a few to appreciate the effect they have inevitably had in strengthening the influence of Chungking reactionaries and appeasers. Britain's failure to mobilize the Indian people for the war and to grant a provisional government to that nation; Churchill's conditions to the Atlantic Charter declaration, the refusal to see the empire liquidated; our own failure to apply the Atlantic Charter to Puerto Rico; Darlanism in North Africa; our continued dealing with the fascist Franco; Jim Crow

and race riots in the United States; the anti-Soviet plot of the American Social Democrats; the AFL's recent kick in the face at China over the immigration question; the continuance of Red-baiting; the long delay in opening a second front on the European continent; our refusal to grant China full equality in determining the strategy of the war. And the list could be made much longer. It is true that these are not the dominant policies of war-minded Great Britain and the United States; they represent the lags, the exceptions in our determination to pit our entire strength against fascism. But the point is that in relation to China's internal situation every one of them can be and is used by disruptive elements whether they are appeasers who want a negotiated peace, fascists who fear their own people more than they do the enemy, or reactionaries who see the war only as an opportunity to profiteer.

While China's allies must share the blame for the present dangerous crisis, it is evident that the most responsible foreign observers are now taking a very serious view of the influence of defeatist elements within China. During the last few weeks a number of articles have suddenly appeared that completely lift a veil which had been carefully drawn out of deep respect for a valiant ally and from a hope that China would soon clean its own house. Pearl Buck has written "A Warning About China" in *Life* magazine. An American missionary, Creighton Lacy, has posed the questions in his book *Is China a Democracy?* The well known Far Eastern expert, T. A. Bisson has stated the issues sharply in the *Far Eastern Survey* published by the research organization the Institute of Pacific Relations. Bisson's charges have been thoroughly documented by Y. Y. Hsu in the summer quarterly issue of *Amerasia*. And the Foreign Policy Association Far Eastern expert, Lawrence K. Rosinger, has published the first of a series of articles on the subject in that organization's weekly Bulletin. Of signal importance, because its publication indicates the seriousness with which the Soviet Union views the situation, is the appearance of a timely article by Vladimir Rogov in the Soviet trade union periodical, *The War and the Workingclass*, warning of the danger of appeaser forces in China. Excerpts from this article have appeared in leading American newspapers; the full text may be found in the August 12 issue of the *Daily Worker*.

POINTING out that the Japanese have renewed their efforts to capitalize on the divisions within China, Rogov writes: "These Japanese plans profit from the maneuvers of the Chinese 'appeasers,' who provoke conflicts and incidents up to armed clashes, do their utmost to undermine the military collaboration of Kuomintang circles with the Communist Party, and incite the persecution and rout of the Eighth and

Fourth Armies, which as units of China's united national army have inscribed many heroic pages in the history of the resistance of the Chinese people to the Japanese invaders." He further points out that China has failed to undertake large economic construction for the war because "the industrial and financial circles prefer to engage in profiteering rather than invest their capital in the armaments industry."

Speaking of the deterioration in national unity since the high point of 1938, Bisson writes: "A year or more before Pearl Harbor . . . two Chinas had definitely emerged. Each had its own government, its own military forces, its own territories. More significant, each had its own characteristic set of political and economic institutions. One is now generally called Kuomintang China; the other is called Communist China. However, these are only party labels. To be more descriptive, the one might be called *feudal* China; the other, *democratic* China. These terms express the actualities as they exist today, the real institutional distinctions between the two Chinas." Y. Y. Hsu's contribution, in the *Amerasia* article, is to subject the war accomplishment of these two parts of China to close scrutiny based upon original Chinese sources not previously known to the American public.

The alarming stage of the Chinese situation is evident not solely from the fact that a large number of responsible experts now find it necessary to make public these extremely serious charges against our ally. The most recent events fully substantiate the wisdom of bringing the situation out into the open. It is known, for instance, that new Kuomintang divisions, probably as many as five, equipped with the best war material available to Chinese troops, have

been dispatched to reinforce the already heavily manned blockade of the Border Region from which the Communist forces operate. No doubt if the appeasers have their way these troops will do more than strengthen the already notorious blockade, they will undertake military action against the Eighth and Fourth Armies. Chiang Kai-shek, moreover, is reliably reported to have issued an ultimatum to the Communist representatives in Chungking demanding a virtual dissolution of the Communist-led armies and a further territorial reduction of the Border Region. Acceptance of such demands would be tantamount to surrendering China's war effort, lock, stock and barrel, to the appeasers. Needless to say the ultimatum has been rejected.

WITH the information at hand one cannot predict what will happen. It is clear that the danger of civil war is great—nothing else explains the outspoken character of the Rogov articles and the wide publicity given it. It is also clear that the analysis of China's internal crisis made simultaneously in the Soviet Union and by so many outstanding authorities in the United States itself serves as a deterrent. The most hopeful factor in the Chinese scene, however, is the unquestioned strength of the Chinese people's desire for unity, for unconditional victory over the enemy, and for the avoidance of civil strife at home. That has been the factor which has accounted for China's heroic resistance thus far. It is the factor which today must be given every conceivable assistance so that again it may overcome the treacherous elements which so tragically remain in positions of authority.

F. V. F.



WORKERS OF ALL THE AMERICAS

A firsthand report on the CTAL convention, by Frederick V. Field. What Latin America's trade unionists want. Their stand in the fight to obliterate fascism. The role of the United States.

Havana.

THE episode of the box of cigars symbolized the recent Havana meeting of the Council of the Confederation of Latin American Workers (CTAL) so I shall tell you about that first. It occurred at the closing session, held in the historic former legislative hall now occupied by the Ministry of Education. In the center of the rostrum sat the Prime Minister of Cuba, Ramon Zaydin, who presided. At his right sat the Minister of Labor, Suarez Rivas, and Lazaro Pena, secretary-general of the Cuban Confederation of Workers, the great Cuban leader to whom our State Department in their incredible shortsightedness had recently refused to grant a visa to attend the annual convention of the National Maritime Union. On the Prime Minister's left sat Vicente Lombardo Toledano, president of the CTAL and an outstanding leader of the Latin American people.

The hall, not nearly large enough, was jammed with cheering spectators. On the floor of the chamber directly before the rostrum sat the CTAL delegates. I was there as a fraternal delegate representing the Council for Pan-American Democracy and I found myself sitting next to Alberto Sanchez, one of the vigorous leaders of the Puerto Rican trade union movement. Just beyond him, wearing mourning because of the recent death of her heroic mother, sat Lygia Prestes, sister of Luis Carlos Prestes, and just behind her was Prestes' little daughter whom he has never seen. Opposite us were Jacob Potofsky, chairman of the CIO Latin American Committee, and the delegates from Uruguay and Argentina.

A Cuban labor leader opened the meeting by reminding us that the work of the CTAL Council had enjoyed the fortunate setting of a strong, united labor movement working closely with President Batista's progressive unity government. Then a representative of each of the nations present addressed the session. Mr. Potofsky was the first. As he stepped back from the microphone (the entire four-and-a-half hour meeting was broadcast locally and short-waved to the rest of Latin America) the announcer stepped up to say: "In the name of the working people of Cuba the Prime Minister is now handing to Mr. Potofsky, the delegate from the CIO, a carved box of cigars which is being presented through him to President Franklin D. Roosevelt." An ovation followed. It was an ovation for the CIO and its representative at the Havana meeting, it was a vote of confidence in the Good Neighbor Policy, more

than all else it was a demonstration in honor of President Roosevelt's progressive leadership among the United Nations fighting to exterminate the Axis.

Fidel Velazquez, the secretary-general of the Confederation of Mexican Workers (CTM), followed and he too was presented with a box of cigars for President Avila Camacho, the leader of another great democracy. Then came Guillermo Rodriguez of the Confederation of Workers of Colombia, and the Prime Minister handed him a box of cigars for President Lopez. The dramatic moment came when Jose Maria Argana, the delegate from the General Confederation of Workers of Argentina, stepped to the platform.

ARGANA represented the authentic trade union movement of Argentina, which only a few days before had been outlawed by the fascist clique of General Ramirez. He came from the nation which under the guise of a "neutrality" policy had given aid and comfort to the fascist powers throughout the war. Argentina was the only country in the Western Hemisphere which had failed to throw its weight behind the United Nations, a nation ruled by a dictatorship which thwarted the democratic will of the vast majority of its people through a brutal fascist repression. Argana said: "Even though there may be in the Western Hemisphere a government which is neutral, there are no neutral people. The workers do not want to be neutral because we are democratic. . . ." As he stepped back from the microphone his statement was greeted with applause. A silence fell on the assembly. All eyes turned to the Prime Minister. Was there to be a box of cigars for Ramirez? Argana quickly sensed the situation. He came back to the mike and, as every person in the hall, realizing what was to happen, rose to cheer a courageous anti-fascist, Argana told us: "I know I am not going to receive a box of cigars for the President of Argentina, and I am aware of the reason. I want to assure you, *compañeros*, that the people of Argentina are not defeated, they are not slaves, and they never will be slaves. They are overwhelmingly anti-Nazi and anti-fascist!"

This was the great international confederation of Latin American trade unions giving direct expression to the democratic convictions of the people of the Americas. And here was a thoroughly sympathetic government completely identifying itself with the workers' convictions through their Prime Minister. It was not only the Presidents of the United States and Mexico and

Colombia that were honored as peoples' leaders in the war against fascism. Bernardo Ibanez received a box of cigars for President Rios of Chile, Enrique Rodriguez for President Amezaga of Uruguay, Victor Cordero for President Calderon Guardia of Costa Rica, and, most fittingly, Lazaro Pena for President Batista of Cuba. There were other delegates, however, who left the rostrum empty-handed. One of these was Jose Arze, the fighter for democracy and trade union rights, of Bolivia; another was the stooge which the dictator Trujillo had sent over as an observer for San Domingo. Paraguay and Ecuador could not be directly represented because of internal reaction in those countries; it was obvious that their Presidents did not rate cigars. And Brazil was not there because, despite Vargas' cooperation in the war, he still refuses to permit a genuine Brazilian trade union movement. My companion, Alberto Sanchez of Puerto Rico, did not get a box of cigars either, but for another reason—that Puerto Rico had not yet been granted the right of self-determination. Some one said to me as we were leaving the hall, "Let us hope that when we come together again next year our friend from Puerto Rico will be entitled to a box of cigars for the President of the Puerto Rican nation!"

THE session I have just described came at the close of a week of meetings at which delegates from a dozen Latin American nations had focused their attention on the all-important question of smashing fascism. The meetings had been inaugurated by a great gathering at the Cuban Confederation's newly acquired Labor Palace. This large building, purchased and outfitted with \$200,000 which had been raised among the people of Cuba, housed not only the office headquarters of the Confederation but one of the largest auditoriums in Havana. The auditorium was literally jammed to the rafters that night. A normal capacity of 6,000 or 7,000 had been stretched to nearly 10,000. Hundreds stood in the aisles and at the entrances from eight-thirty in the evening when the meeting started, until half-past one the next morning. The CTAL delegates sat on the speakers' stand. Our party—I had come with Lombardo Toledano, the president of the CTAL—arrived around ten o'clock. (To be late, I discovered, was practically a Cuban custom.)

Lombardo received a deafening ovation. An hour later another ovation greeted President Batista of Cuba, who came with members of his cabinet and the highest