

serve and extend those democratic liberties which they have won by their sweat and blood and vision. It is because millions want these things and are fighting for them that the monarchs of monopoly, racing recklessly toward bigger profits—and economic collapse—seek to outlaw the Communist Party, to shackle and eventually pulverize the trade unions.

Remember 1919? Under Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer a crusade against “Bolshevism” was organized which resulted in widespread violations of civil liberties. At the same time the big corporations launched an open shop drive which cut union membership virtually in half, smashed strikes and hammered down wages.

But 1919 is not 1947. The ex-

periences of the depression, the New Deal and the people's war against fascism have not been written on water. The 15,000,000-strong labor movement, divided though it is, cannot be bludgeoned into submission. The Negro people, knowing the Communists as those who have been most ready to stick their necks out in the battle for their rights, will not readily consign their future to Rankin and his ilk. Many of the Jewish people have not forgotten that six million of their brethren, tortured to death by the Nazi sadists, are testimony that anti-communism also has another face: anti-Semitism.

The architects of the anti-democratic drive thought they would isolate the Communists from even their

close friends and then proceed to chop up and annihilate every other sector of the labor and progressive movement. Instead, they have succeeded in bringing to the defense of the Communists even some who have been their opponents. Now it should be clear to everyone that Red-baiting in unions or other progressive organizations, bans on Communists and statements lumping communism and fascism only bring grist to the mill of those who would crucify democracy and betray America. Unity and struggle — this must be our banner today.

“Tyranny,” wrote Tom Paine, “like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.”

2. EMPIRE: WHY THEY CAN'T WIN

By JOHN STUART

SO BRAZEN were the distortions in President Truman's message, so immoral and dangerous his proposals, so revealing the omissions that we have at once a measure of the man and an outline of a disastrous policy. At the core what Truman said marks no new departure from the road he and the Republicans have been traveling these last two years. It is the final touch finishing the strategic portrait.

Just a year ago Mr. Truman sat and listened to Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri. He listened so well that twelve months later in Congress he gave a masterly duplication of Churchill's act. To be sure it had none of Churchill's pitch and rhetoric but in substance it was the same. The senior partner of an unholy alliance is now seemingly convinced. There is the token of how far Truman and his administration have squandered the political treasure accumulated by Roosevelt in years of killing work.

During the war Churchill was the great advocate of a military plunge into the “soft underbelly” of Europe. The objective was to contain the Balkans with Anglo-American bayonets against the outburst of inevitable change and progress. The design failed because Roosevelt would not underwrite an adventure which polished the

bright gems in His Majesty's crown but delayed Hitler's defeat. Churchill's triumph, however, has come now, for Truman has taken over his design, adding to it American imperialism's aching ambition to rule Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Asia. What could not be accomplished in recent months by diplomatic intervention is now to be accomplished with mercenaries at the beck and call of Washington's hired kings and feudal lords. At long last it should be clear to the most foggy-eyed that the politics begun with food now moves relentlessly to bullets.

If we will recall Churchill's speech we will see immediately the meaning of Truman's. It had the large objectives of instilling the belief that a war with the Soviet Union is inevitable; it intended to destroy the reservoir of good will for the Russians built on all fighting fronts in the war; it sought to revise all the commitments we have made at Yalta, Potsdam and Moscow; it sought to hamper the growth of democracy predicated on self-determination; it attempted to make it appear that every social upheaval within and without the British Empire represented a menace to the United States and an expansion of Soviet power; it tried to make communism the major

evil of our time; and, finally, it embarked on a program of buying or rallying the support of every political scoundrel and cynic around an Anglo-American bloc which in essence is a more refined and refurbished version of Hitler's *anti-Komintern*.

No one with any sense of the national interest—at the minimum, peace—could accept Churchill's policy. But Mr. Truman has. His has become the idea that every shift in the status quo is derived from Moscow. Yet he could not if he tried until doomsday present an iota of proof that Russia is behind the discontent in the Philippines, Puerto Rico, India or Southwest Africa. Every war, particularly one which reaches into the very vitals of a country, brings with it an aftermath of change. It has been true throughout history even when there was no Soviet Union. The close of this last war has merely hastened a thousand social processes which were latent in a dozen different countries for many decades. And if, as Truman insists, the status quo is not sacred, why in terms of policy and action does he fear the developments away from the archaic and the outworn? And why does he choose to ally the United States with two countries, Greece and Turkey, whose status quo is the embodiment of re-

