

volume of fighting they have been called upon to do in the past two years (they lost one man killed every forty-three minutes). Quality and heroism in fighting do not make up for volume and a wide range of experience.

Clausewitz says in fact, that only actual battle experience can neutralize the effect of frictions. To a certain extent it is so, but not quite, for the study of the experience of other armies, who have done more fighting and have done it brilliantly, is of help.

Just look at the frictions enumerated above, aside from tank tactics and reconnaissance: booby traps have been mastered by the Red Army through special courses in detecting and neutralizing them, including exhibitions and demonstrations. Sniping has been developed in the Red Army to a remarkable degree, its importance having been recognized long before the war. Air attack against armored vehicles has received its answer in the development of the "Stormovik" plane. The saturation of all units with men with engineering training is old stuff in the Red Army.

To make a long story short, it would seem, for instance, that our service maga-

zines should follow the progressive example of the *Cavalry Journal*, which tries to propagate the experience of the Soviet cavalry, instead of permitting fossils like retired Colonel Lanza to spread their drivel, as the *Artillery Journal* has often done. The time to strike is near. Let us not doubt our strategy, but let us borrow, in all humility, the tactical experience of those who have fought for more than 900 days over 700,000 square miles of territory, millions against millions, losing a man every seventeen seconds. They know all about resolving frictions. Let us learn from them.

On all existing fronts the forces of the United Nations are on the offensive. Our own troops under MacArthur, daringly brushing aside the Japanese still left on the Huon Peninsula of New Guinea, have landed on New Britain and have secured a firm hold on the Arawe promontory. Cape Gloucester to the west is being heavily bombed. The preliminaries to the march on Rabaul have been played. Simultaneously, our air forces are hammering the Marshalls and we learn that our task-forces have been making "guinea-pig" runs to Truk in an attempt to knock the chip

off the Japanese high seas fleet. The enemy did not choose to pick up the chip.

In China the Japanese are being pressed hard in the "rice-bowl" and their fifth Changsha campaign has again come to an inglorious end.

In Italy small advances have been scored by both the Fifth and the Eighth.

Across the Adriatic Marshal Tito has brought the big German offensive to a virtual halt in most sectors.

The Red Army has opened a large scale offensive in the Nevel sector, killing 20,000 Germans in five days, liberating 500-odd inhabited points and cracking the German defenses on a fifty-mile front to a depth of twenty miles. The fact that this new front is now called the "first Baltic front" is of great importance. This means that there will be other active Baltic fronts. Probably two more—one front south and the other front north of Lake Ilmen (Staraya Russa and Novgorod)—will become "Baltic."

The new offensive seems to be aimed at two key points—Polotsk and Vitebsk, southwest and south of Nevel. The winter wolf-hunt is on.



WATCH ON THE POTOMAC

by BRUCE MINTON

THE ANTI-WILLKIE SMEAR

Washington.

JAPANESE business men have never hesitated to imitate, down to the minutest detail, the packaging of rival products put on the market by their foreign competitors. The object quite frankly was to rook the buying public by fooling them into accepting inferior merchandise because it looked like the real thing. C. Nelson Sparks, former mayor of Akron, Ohio, has resorted to the same trick in peddling his "expose" of Wendell Willkie. His *One Man—Wendell Willkie* apes the binding, type, and lay-out of the best-seller *One World*.

C. Nelson Sparks claims to tell the "inside story" of how Willkie won the nomination at the Philadelphia Republican convention in 1940. His diatribe is dressed up with a high-falutin dedication to the author's seventeen-year-old son, a naval aviation cadet, and to "all others in our armed forces," with the pious hope that these young men will never forget the Constitution, the fathers of the republic, and the author, C. Nelson Sparks.

Mr. Sparks assures the reader that he has no axe to grind, and that he has "no desire either to praise or to condemn." Thereupon, he indulges in every nasty inference permissible under the libel laws. Of course, Mr. Sparks hardly comes to the political arena with clean hands. For his

qualities as statesman, I refer the reader to Ruth McKenney's *Industrial Valley*. But just to give a rough idea of this jaunty, nattily dressed, loud-mouthed little man with his thin mean face topped by a mass of dirty white hair, it is only necessary to recall that Mr. Sparks suffered a torn ligament of his left arm during a political oration—from pounding on the rostrum. In 1932, Sparks "proved" that the Russian people—"those Communistic hordes"—are "cannibals." In 1933, he accused the unemployed in Akron of being Communistic foreigners. During the catastrophic days of the national bank holiday (Akron got it early and hung on to it late), Sparks absolved the bankers from any blame because, he said, they were merely reckless, and everyone in the twenties was reckless. By the middle of 1933, Sparks was taking the Coughlin position, warning of anarchy and mayhem unless the federal government distributed relief to the unemployed he had previously denounced. During the strike of rubber workers in 1936, Sparks got himself deputized and immediately set about organizing vigilante "law and order" groups. His activities were so blatant that even the ultra-conservative Akron *Beacon-Journal* denounced him editorially for his "stupid and dangerous" program. Later

Sparks turned up as campaign manager for Frank Gannett, Republican publisher from up-state New York, backer of the congressional farm bloc, and all-in-all a thoroughly reprehensible and undistinguished isolationist. The Gannett presidential boom, under Sparks' management, "was greeted with a national apathy that could be described as monumental."

This is by no means an adequate portrait of the ex-mayor, the friend of countless strong-arm and fascist-minded outfits. Now suddenly Sparks has found his way back into the spotlight: his scurrilous pamphlet has been hailed by none other than Jew-baiting Representative Rankin, and has aroused Senator Langer to demand a Senate investigation of "the conduct of the 1940 National Convention of the Republican Party with a view to ascertaining whether there were irregularities in the selection of the candidate of such party for the office of president [Willkie], and whether Harry Hopkins had a corrupt connection therewith."

SENATOR LANGER is a Republican maverick—with no compliment intended—a sedulous defeatist who can't get along with Gerald Nye, a follower of the Hearst-McCormick-Patterson "line" who refuses

to coordinate his activities with those of his political elders like Herbert Hoover, Robert Taft, Arthur Vandenberg, and Joseph Martin. The lanky, sharp-faced Langer likes to mouth the phrases of old Bob LaFollette's progressivism; he likes to pose as an enemy of Wall Street, a critic of the international bankers, an anti-imperialist, a simple spokesman of simple farmers. His demagoguery is all very well, except when he gets out of hand and embarrasses the Republican machine. He has just succeeded in putting the Republican Party leadership on the spot with his resolution aimed at "getting" Willkie. The resolution was referred to a sub-committee of the Senate's Committee on Privileges and Elections, naturally dominated by the Democrats. And what Democrats—Harley Kilgore of West Virginia, James Tunnell of Delaware, and Tom Stewart of Tennessee, with the Republicans represented by Styles Bridges of New Hampshire and Warren Austin of Vermont, both of whom have been friendly with Willkie in the past.

The danger to the Republican high command grows out of the likelihood that once the sub-committee starts investigating, it might not know when to stop. What if it gives attention to the America First money spent so freely at the Philadelphia convention? What if it shows interest in the financial support behind Tom Dewey (and even behind Frank Gannett, for that matter), and takes the trouble to delve into the activities of Senator Taft and Elder Statesman Herbert Hoover? The Republican elders would like nothing better than a thorough smear of Willkie, but what if the smear spreads to the party's high priests?

Langer spoke out of turn, without consulting his betters. The more responsible Republican worthies curse among themselves, and quietly "explore" ways to squelch the investigation before it gets going. Just as Republican big shots were gleefully rubbing their hands at the spectacle of southern Democrats like Harry Byrd, "Cotton Ed" Smith, and that vicious little screwball, John Rankin, threatening to split the Democratic Party, along comes Langer with his resolution presenting the Democrats with their greatest opportunity since 1912 to call public attention to Republican shenanigans. The keening in the Republican cloak rooms on both sides of the Capitol is heartrending.

BY UNDERWRITING Sparks' book, a compilation of every anti-Willkie slander that the Hearsts and McCormick-Patterson press has been able to improvise—Langer made the same sort of mistake, in the eyes of the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg general staff, as Alf Landon made a few weeks ago when he visited Washington. Everyone had forgotten Alf's existence, and evidently no one had tipped him off as to what he should say. So Landon charged out of oblivion to squeak that for his money he

wanted no part of the coalition foreign policy outlined at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran. He, Landon, still plunked for straight isolationism. But this frankness, which revealed exactly where the Republican leaders stood, crossed up the wise old owls like Hoover and Taft who, quite shrewdly have ruled that discussion of foreign policy is banned until after November 1944. Their contention is that foreign policy is not an election issue. Republican potentates plan to adopt the same platform on foreign policy in 1944 as the Democrats—in the hope that the voters will think the Republicans endorse coalition. Now Landon spills the beans by stubbornly insisting that "the principles of the Teheran conference are fine, but how are they going to be applied?"

Republican big shots give out that they are all for coalition. Yet they quite obviously fear Willkie. Why? Because they know very well Willkie has supported essentially the same policy of international collaboration as that enunciated by President Roosevelt and given substance at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran. After all, Willkie's *One World* is a brilliant statement of the necessity of coalition. It is all very well to pay lip-service to the idea for campaign purposes, say high-placed Republicans, but it is not all very well to put the idea into action.

Yet the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg bloc knows that the best way for the Republicans to lose the 1944 elections is to admit that they are thinking in imperialist terms, that they really want no part of any coalition, that they are rabidly anti-Soviet, anti-British, anti-Chinese, with about as much use for the Good Neighbor policy as they have for price control and rationing, subsidies, and social security. They are not foolish enough to wage the coming presidential election battle on principle—all they want is to win it. Langer and Landon talk too much. They endanger the Republican leaders with exposure.

IN THE past weeks, the Republicans have certainly not played smart politics—and they are uncomfortably aware of their mistakes. They went along with the Senate poll-taxers to kill the soldiers vote. The Republicans now wish they had it to do all over again—they are sadly aware that public reaction throughout the nation has been anything but favorable to their sabotage of the soldiers' vote. On top of this, Landon's awkward revelation that the Republicans have no use for the coalition policy of Moscow is hardly likely to win friends, even though the pontifical Hoover covered up by interpreting Landon's remarks to mean the exact opposite of what the Kansan said with such deliberation and exactness. To add still more grief to their bloody heads, Langer presents the Democrats with the opportunity of the century to investigate the 1940 Republican convention and to scratch

about for connections between Taft and the America Firsters, the role of the isolationists, and how much money the du Ponts and others poured into Philadelphia.

It is said that the recent political carelessness of top Republicans can be explained by their supreme assurance that they are sure of victory in 1944. I doubt this explanation. For one thing, they are not so positive. They have no great hopes of beating Franklin D. Roosevelt should he run again. Of course, if he doesn't, they feel the election is in the bag. The fate of the presidency is therefore up to Roosevelt, in the estimation of Republican wise guys, but the field is wide open for control of the House and Senate. That is the real stake. Only Willkie, by influencing rank-and-file Republicans to support candidates sincerely in favor of a coalition foreign policy, can wreck the plans of the reactionaries for the new Congress. This may seem an oversimplification, but Republican strategists think in these terms.

More, far more than anything else, isolationists, imperialists, bitter-enders, defeatists recognize how deep a set-back they suffered at the United Nations' conferences culminating in Teheran. Their strategy was to *prevent* a United Nations coalition. They failed utterly. Their remaining hope is to compensate for the grievous drubbing they got by impeding the coalition and smashing it. They must delay the second front, delay lend-lease shipments, spread defeatism at home by magnifying every divisive tendency, discourage the people and make them grow tired of the war. Above all, they must *get* Roosevelt by undermining the FEPC, the Food for Victory program, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. They must spread anti-Negro and anti-Semitic poison, provoke strikes by entering into alliances with John L. Lewis and William Hutcheson, deny subsidies and wreck price control and rationing—they must *get* Roosevelt by wrecking the home front, while pretending to be all out for the prosecution of the coalition war. But they must also at all costs prevent Willkie from winning the Republican nomination in 1944, for despite Willkie's anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt finagling, he does support international collaboration.

The Republicans are showing their hand. It is high time for Americans to get acquainted with the Republican royal family. It is especially important for rank-and-file Republicans to know the men who run the national machine, to recognize for what they are the handful of rapacious men still committed to the Manifest Destiny, to the isolationist imperialism of the elder Lodge, to the "business of America is business" doctrine of Coolidge, to the Hoover creed that all social security is an evil dole, and to the Liberty League-du Pont anti-union, Red-baiting, fascist-minded dictum of "Let the suckers pay."

CRISIS IN THE CLASSROOM

The danger of a breakdown in public education. Teacher shortages and closing schools. The search for a living wartime wage. What federal aid to education can accomplish.

IT WOULD be good to be able to report that our schools are doing all that must be done to prepare our boys and girls for their part in the armed services and on the home front. We might feel more secure about the future if we knew that the coming generation was growing up to be more literate than the present one and better schooled in the traditions and principles of democracy. True, teachers and supervisors in many localities are making valiant efforts to adjust the curriculum to wartime needs, to bring students into the war effort through the High School Victory Corps, to make the schools part of every civilian wartime activity. But the most glaring fact about the educational system today is that schools in many parts of the country—always pitifully inadequate—face a partial or complete wartime breakdown.

Ten thousand closed schools; 13,000 classrooms without teachers; overcrowding and curtailed curricula which have wiped out 30,000 classes; a teacher shortage so acute that 37,000 emergency certificates were issued in 1942-43 to people unqualified to teach even under the low requirements existing in many parts of the country—that is the picture of public education in this period of war emergency.

What strikes one most forcefully in the school situation is a veritable exodus of teachers into non-teaching jobs. And no wonder. In 1942-43, 360,000 teachers—forty out of every hundred—received less than \$1,200 per year, while 66,000, or eight out of every hundred, received less than \$600. Southern states had by far the greatest number of poorly paid teachers. Only the District of Columbia, and the states of Washington and California had no teachers receiving less than \$1,200 per year.

With the wartime rise in living costs it has become increasingly difficult to live on such salaries. At the same time opportunities have appeared for more gainful employment such as have not existed since the first World War. And the teachers are responding to these twin pressures. The armed services have taken 39,000 teachers, but jobs in industry and elsewhere have taken almost as many—37,000. There have been some slight wage increases in a number of states, but hardly enough to make any appreciable difference in teachers' living conditions. The teacher turnover in 1942-43 was twice as great as in normal times.

The most acute teacher shortage is found in the rural areas where salaries are lowest, and where the physical and intellec-

tual conditions are shockingly bad. A National Education Association survey based on conditions in 1937 found that fewer than half of our rural teachers enjoy central heating, a heated bedroom, or a telephone. Nearly half do not have an indoor toilet, a bathtub or shower, or even running water. One-third do not have electricity. Most of these teachers have no opportunity for cultural or professional growth. Many do not have access to libraries with more than a thousand volumes. Buying books, subscribing to magazines, taking trips to better endowed cultural centers is out of the question on an average annual salary of \$867 for white teachers and \$346 for Negro teachers. If salaries are slightly higher now than in 1937, one must remember that the victory tax has to be paid, and that the cost of living has risen steeply.

A SAMPLING of testimony presented before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor will show what is going on in all parts of the country. In Jefferson County, West Virginia, there was only one day between September and April 1943 when all teaching posts were filled. In Pulaski County, Arkansas, the white schools started with eighty-one new teachers out of a total of 152. In the course of the year there were 143 additional changes. In a rural school district in Missouri, on the Saturday before school was scheduled to open, the school board was still frantically

trying to get a teacher for the following Monday. Children in a high school near Harrisburg, Pa., have had their tenth science teacher in one term. In Maine appeals have been issued to retired teachers, students have been taken out of the normal school before completing their course; three high school girls are teaching in one city alone.

IN MANY places Boards of Education are drastically lowering eligibility requirements in order to obtain teachers. But the 47,000 emergency certificates issued last year to people unprepared to meet requirements for regular licenses were not enough to provide teachers for all the children. And the teacher supply is beginning to dry up at its source. Teacher training institutions throughout the country report a drop in registration of twenty to fifty percent.

Testifying at the April hearings, A. D. Holt, secretary of the Tennessee State Teachers' Association said, "We have had to go out and get anybody who could teach schools. We have 2,250 teachers in Tennessee on permits. That means they haven't got the qualifications to get a certificate. And, goodness knows, our certification requirements are low enough in Tennessee." In the words of Howard A. Dawson, secretary of the Legislative Commission of the National Education Association, "We have gone back a generation or two in many communities in the type of teaching that we have."



Soriano