Mobilize for Peace

War is no longer coming. It is here. In Europe the conversation of statesmen has yielded to that of cannon. The day that seemed as though it would remain always a tomorrow has at last dawned—and become now a yesterday. It is hard to get used to this one awful and fundamental fact: War is here.

War is here and in our midst. Not simply as scare-headlines, tensed radio voices, and fantastic news-reel images. It is the transforming energy that has caused industry to speed forth panting like a greyhound after orders. It is the wild buoyancy of stock markets and the suddenly cæsarious demand for wheat and corn and cattle and all other products of our agricultural states. And already it greets the housewife across the counter to snatch its extra-penny toll from daily necessities. War is here hungrily in our midst.

We May Not Want War. But . . .

We may not want to go to war. But with a speed eclipsing that of trans-Atlantic clippers war has come to us. It has come with no thunder of shellfire, no mutilated bodies, no bloody horrors. Not at all. Rather, it is here with gold in hand and the whisper and swelling rumor of more to come. And to this first wanton beckoning we who hate war have responded with working magic, are astir with new life.

The warehouse wheat that could not feed our hungry, the storage cotton that could not clothe our ragged, the unused materials that could not house our slum-dwellers, the stagnant capital that could not employ our idle manpower—all these things, as though touched by wonder-working magic, are stirrings new life. They are on the move. And they are preparing to move beyond our borders.

Thus subtly, within a few days’ time, has our economy been transformed. The monopoly-frozen industrial structure that for 10 years has resisted the most urgent needs of our own people has melted before the first flaky breath of war-born markets. It is alertly responsive once again. Ready to serve. Not our needs but those created by destruction over-sea. The war-boom has begun. The war-drift has begun. We may not want to go to war. But we have embraced the war that has come to us.

. . . We Have Joined Up

Nor are we to be neutral in this conflict. By the time this editorial is in print the drive to amend the Neutrality Act will be in full swing. Congress will be in session for the express purpose of repealing the arms embargo clause. It is perfectly evident that the motives for reestablishing what the President has called “true neutrality” are far from neutral. For example: “Senator Austin of Vermont,” reports the N. Y. Times of Sept. 10, “endorses a return to the ‘ancient’ concept of neutrality. He wants all our power, both moral and economic, put behind France and Britain.” And for example: The President, reports the Times of Sept. 11, has moved to limit Congressional debate on neutrality revision lest it “have an adverse effect on the morale of the Allied powers.”

So it goes. Once again, with a swiftness putting the years 1914-17 to shame, America has hitched its wagon to the Allied star. Once again has the unholy alliance between world-saving crusaders and armaments-profiteers been consummated. We are rushing headlong down the old, old road to war even as we announce that we shall stay out. Let there be no mistake about this. We have joined in the war and actively taken sides in the war.

Not Our War

Meanwhile an overwhelming majority of the American people don’t want to go to war. Certainly not to this war. It isn’t our war. Sure, we hate Hitlerism. But the lily-white banners of France and Britain are splotched with the blood of Republican Spain, smeared with the mud of Munich. These standards offer no promise of a world-order for the achievement of which we should willingly lift a finger. Crush Hitler—and then what? To this question Chamberlain and Daladier have no answer.

If we want to keep American blood from being shed in this war, we must recognize why we have allowed ourselves to drift so dangerously close to it. The danger that we may be finally pushed over the edge comes from inside and not from outside our boundaries. It is a danger so familiar that we are unapt to associate it now with war.

Where the Danger Lurks

The danger? It lies in the millions and millions of Americans prevented from consuming enough to keep our capital, our factories, and themselves fully employed. For being these millions are those stagnant resources and energies so rapidly and easily set in motion by the demands of war.

If we would keep out of war we must first of all be in a position to control the flow of our goods and direct the energy of our labor. The reasons for this are two. First, we can keep out of war only if we can keep our economy from becoming geared to the war markets abroad. Second, the economic and social well-being of the American people demands that our production should be developed to its fullest to meet the needs of home consumption.

By gearing our production to the home market we can keep it from being geared to the war market. We must mobilize an economy for peace and for the reconstruction of our nation.

The Road to Peace

Mobilization for peace means the bilization of our resources for a new and greater and richer America. It means resolute forcing open of American markets for American goods. But this involves a final declaration of war against the enemies of the American people. A declaration of war against those financiers and monopolistic owners who too have chocked American enterprise in its grasp and who have held the full fruits of American industry beyond the eager grasp (Continued on page 4)
After the Nazi-Soviet Pact

The dramatic formulation of the Nazi-Soviet Pact at the height of the Polish crisis would have outranked Munich in international importance if it had not been immediately eclipsed by the outbreak of war. For this agreement between Berlin and Moscow signified far reaching changes in international relationships and issues. It also created chaos in left-wing opinion throughout the world. It climaxed the pre-war crisis and formed a decisive factor in the precipitation of war.

Soviet Isolated by Munich

In the light of careful, realistic analysis the Nazi-Soviet pact should have occasioned no surprise to any except the incorrigible romantics in international affairs. In particular it should have caused no surprise to the readers of this paper.

Since the beginning of the modern era powerful economic and political factors have encouraged manual collaboration between the governments of Germany and Russia. After Munich these factors again came to the forefront. Munich provided the immediate basis for the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The settlement of last year was the work of Chamberlain and Daladier, not only scuttled Soviet policy in Europe, and left it exposed to a completely hostile west. This situation was the work of Chamberlain and Daladier, and not the work of Chamberlain and Daladier, in Europe, encouraged Hitler to satisfy his aims by an attack upon the Soviet Union.

The probable effect of these moves was evident immediately after Munich. In the New Masses of October 15, 1938, it was stated: "The Munich accord means the collapse of Russian policy in Europe—based on cooperation with the capitalist democracies. It therefore leaves Russia isolated in western Europe. However, suggestions are already being made of the advisability of a reorientation of Russian policy away from an agreement with Germany. The possibilities of a German-Russian combination already developed by a long tradition, Fascist-Communist differences and a few years of near collision are resumed as the least unlikely that Russia will again rely on capitalist democratic governments in the future."

Collapse of "Peace Front" Negotiations

Developments after last March lent continuance to collective security. In the Soviet camp, the elimination of Litvinoff indicated that the pilot of collective security, the ship of state was taking a new course. The situation of the state of collective security in the world. Britain, France, and Russia were launched. Unanimity of opinion at home and the necessity of the European situation, Britain and France were compelled to seek an agreement. The British-French approach to Moscow was hearted, dilatory, and apathetic. The negotiations dragged and dragged. They were charac terised by marked unwillingness on either side to make any concessions for the sake of a understanding.

The New Masses of June 15, 1939, stated: "The effort to build a common front of the Fascist aggressors in Europe seems verging down." And we drew from a conclusion of the significance of the security work, because the contradictory interests of the ruling cliques controlling Britain and France prevent them from entering a firm anti-Fascist front. They are compelled to resist the rising power of the Axis, but they are unwilling to do so at the expense of a permanent split in the Soviet government itself.

Far-Reaching Consequences

Any analysis of the Pact must begin with an evaluation of its immediate consequences. These have obviously been far-reaching and revolutionary in scope. This Nazi-Soviet agreement put a definite end to any expectation of forming an effective front against Nazi aggression among the powers of Europe. It put an end to the phantasy of collective security for progressive and genuinely democratic aims.

Germany's Strategic Position Strengthened

This has been a factor of decisive importance in the war crisis. In the view of Berlin, London, and Paris, the hasty conclusion of the pact gave Hitler a brilliant victory in the war of diplomacy and nerves that preceded the armed conflict. It meant that in the view of the Nazi attack, Poland was isolated from any effective support by the great powers. It indicated that Germany's military position was practically a free hand in the Polish issue and this automatically doubled the threat to Poland. It was on the verge of yielding to Hitler, or if a new appeasement had been under way in London and Paris, the Nazi-Soviet pact would have opened the way to a new victory for Nazi aggression.

Under the circumstances, the Pact had a different but equally serious effect on the outcome of the crisis. It encouraged Hitler to precipitate the war. The Pact meant two things to Hitler. First, it provided the Russian passivity opened to the Nazis the opportunity for a quick cleanup of Poland while Britain and France were held helpless before the west wall. The German fear of a war on two fronts was thus allayed. Second, the Pact encouraged the Nazis in the hope that the dreaded British blockade could be counteracted by Russian raw materials for Germany, as well as those of southeastern Europe. These were considerations of the highest importance in the decision for war.

In short, the conclusion of the Nazi-Soviet Pact increased the likelihood of a new Munich, and when this was out of the question, it became an instrument to precipitate war. Its effect throughout has been to encourage the Nazis in their aggressive aims and acts. This harsh fact cannot be regarded sympathetically by the opponents of Nazism. But it will provide grounds for criticism of the Soviet Union only to those romantics who continue to believe that ideals, and not interests, are factors in international politics.

Anti-Comintern Powers Scatter

The Pact has had certain important "constructive" consequences. At once the myth of the anti-comintern alliance has been exploded. This has isolated Japan and caused the collapse of that "ally's" support for the Nazis. It is probable that it has also contributed to the cooling of Italian and Spanish attitudes toward the Nazi Reich. A more defensive Soviet position in Eastern Europe has been strengthened by the strengthening of the Soviet position in the far east with the possibility of greater aid to China.

Other equally far-reaching consequences are indicated at this time. If the pact has blown up the anti-comintern illusion, it has also dealt a severe blow at the comintern. The aims and activities that have been pursued by the Communist movement throughout the world during the past four years are clearly repudiated in this Nazi-Soviet agreement.

Bedlam on the Left

The agreement has of course created bedlam in the narrow realm of left-wing and liberal opinion. The Communists Blow Hot and Cold. Some of this sound and fury merits brief notice for the record. First, the Communists, who have been putting on the contortion act of the age to fit in this pact with all that has gone before. On July 5, Earl Browder stated: "There is about as much chance of such an agreement as of Earl Browder being elected president of the United States." Robert Dell, in the Nation of Sept. 2, 1939...
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Liberal Dismay

The "betrayed" liberals, on the other hand, are left with nothing but their righteous indignation. Robert Dell, in the Nation of Sept. 2,
says flatly: "The situation has been entirely changed by the Anglo-French and the Anglo-American agreements."

The Soviet leader who warned his government in the opening days of war by the absence of any assurance that the Soviet Union had ample reason to mistrust communism, its erstwhile friends, and its only blundering toward war. It is also evident that Hitler's rise to power. Its immediate interests and its long time aims. The implications of the Pact becomes clear and reason).

Under these circumstances what is the correct policy for the Soviet Union? On June 15 we quoted with approval the exhortation of the Soviet leader who said it is a tradition that "to be cautious and not to allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by war mongers who are accustomed to have others pull chestnuts out of the fire for them."

The Russian step is devastating. Such a change of front without notice sows mistrust of all regimes. It is difficult for those who have not been unfriendly to Moscow, to accept an anomie in international politics. Ideology? Parties of the Left? These have been dealt a blow from which they cannot quickly recover. If war comes, what have we gained for our friendship?

Issolation Strengthens Soviets

In the light of these developments what will be the situation on the eve of war? There is every reason to suppose that the British government knew that the British attitude was firm on this Polish question and that the Allies would not likely to back down. The Soviet government may in the light of the Grand Duchy of Finland and the situation on the eve of war? There is every reason to suppose that the British attitude was firm on this Polish question and that the Allies would not likely to back down. The Soviet government may in the light of the Grand Duchy of Finland.

The moral effect of the Pact was directed toward preventing Nazi expansion at every point in order to prevent the ultimate attack upon the Soviet Union. The result is a large, mutually advantageous trade exists here as it does not in many parts of the world.

This position implies no sudden change in foreign policy. The Soviet Union, and back to manoeuvers to build an "iron ring" around Germany and a "cor don sanitaire" around the Soviet Union. The economic and political factors promoting an alliance of capitalist and communist nations for the overthrow of Fascism, can be expected from the opening days of war. It is also evident that under present conditions British policy is only blundering toward war. It is also evident that when that war breaks out, the aims of Britain in it will be based on the calculating self-interest of Great financial and commercial empire— the same calculating self-interest that yesterday produced appeasement and today prevents the formation of hardening or hardening up. At bottom, the conflict between British financial capitalism and Soviet communism is the most deeply rooted in the whole complex of power conflicts. This has been a dubious factor in the British policy, with the Soviet Union as the base of an aggressive imperialist policy, for very different reasons.

British-Nazi Conflict

On the other hand, despite British efforts at conciliation, it has been inevitable that the third Reich should come speedily into direct conflict with the old empire. Nazism is the essence of aggressive imperialism. Because of this expansion has become a direct challenge to British economic and political security in Europe and throughout the world.

These two paramount conditions have compelled the recent revolution in Nazi and Soviet policy, as well as the tortuous twists in the position of China. The concept of collective security program was wrecked on the rock of British-Soviet antagonism embedded in the Munich settlement. Less than a year later the Munich front was broken by the irrepressible conflict between Nazi and British aims. Meanwhile British policy shifted from lukewarm gestures toward collective security before Munich, to an attempted appeasement in the face of German pressure on the Soviet Union, and back to maneuvers to build a peace front in which Moscow would bear the brunt of Nazi pressure. Both the policy of Mr. Mack and the later peace front policy could be described as efforts by Chamberlain to avert the hurricane headed his way by turning it toward the eastern front. This is the policy of "warmongering" which has accustomed to have others pull chestnuts out of the fire for them. It is an old British custom.
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EUROPE GOES TO WAR

Europe's long armistice is ended. The "white war" of desperate diplomacy, nerve-shattering threats and unresisted conquests has been replaced by the war of hammering armies and mass slaughter. The beginning of military action does not begin the real war. It merely opens an accelerated and more terrible phase in the relentless conflict of imperialist powers that has absorbed the world for more than a generation.

Naziism—Child of Versailles

The Nazi drive to dominate Europe has produced the conflict. However, this aggressive movement has been the culmination of the policies followed by the British and French governments for more than twenty years. The period from the end of the last World War to the beginning of the world economic crisis of 1929-32 was a dominant phase in Europe. The repercussions embodied in the peace of Versailles aggravated the already unstable economic positions of most of the European peoples. The conditions maintained throughout Europe by British and French force and diplomacy, kept Germany and other nations in a state of economic collapse and political frustration. These conditions formed the immediate basis for the international economic crisis. Out of these conditions during the crisis came the rise of German Fascism, world depression and the growth of Nazi power. These movements began the eclipse of British and French power in Europe. And then France and Britain, having created the Nazi frankenstein, needed to make him strong. The reparations paid by Britain and France were so heavy that they were able to consolidate national economic life to the people of Germany and the other countries of the central European Reich. The policies of Great Britain and France in this war are two-and-a-half years old. Britain's aims in this war must be criticized as decidedly negative in character. What do the British and French ruling classes propose in place of Hitlerism? What arrangements do they contemplate for a lasting and a just peace? How do they propose to restore an expanding economic life to the people of Germany? How do they propose to create the basis for stable democracy in Europe? These are the questions that the British and French imperialist objectives, there are no answers.

The light of this record, the issue of the present conflict is plain. It is the struggle between Fascism and democracy. It is not Democracy versus Fascism. It is the old struggle between Britain and France on one side and Germany and other countries on the other for control over Europe and influence in the world. The record of events leading to this war ends conclusively the illusion that the capitalist world order is peaceful. In the world of today and yesterday peace is the enforced domination of one group of nations over all the rest. And this peace only prepares the way for more terrible war.

One hand, the Nazi-Soviet pact has caused the speedy evaporation of the anti-communist line and the collapse of the democratic front. But it has also brought a new threat to the West. Germany is striving to maintain neutrality, even the ironclad Rome-Berlin axis seems to have undergone a modification.

Nazi Aim: Peace Without Poland

Germany in the first days of war continues with the practical steps necessary for the conflict. The German aim is to localize the conflict, overwhelm Poland, and offer Britain and France peace without Poland. Hitler does not want to engage in a direct conflict with Britain and France, and, most significantly, the German people do not want to fight Britain and France. The Nazi dictatorship, by repeatedly announcing that it has no quarrel with the powers of the west, hopes to leave the way open for peace, and what is more important, to present the British and French governments as the aggressors in the eyes of the German people.

The opening of military action placed the Reich temporarily in a strong position. Soviet neutrality on one side and the Westwall on the other have given the Reich the opportunity to gain a sustained advantage. The pressure becomes effective. The possibility of access to Soviet goods as well as the goods of southern Europe encourages Nazi expectations of maintaining economic strength despite the British blockade.

Outlook for the Allies

This time, in place of Munich, France and Britain have chosen war. What factors led to this reversal of position since last September? What are the most important factors that make sure of Nazi aggression, heading up into the seizure of Czechoslovakia and provocation of the Polish crisis. These moves nullified all that the British and French governments hoped to gain from the Munich settlement. They demonstrated the illusory character of the appeasement policy. And they resulted in the sudden hardening of attitudes on the part of both the people and the ruling circles of the capitalist democracies.

The Allies are embarking on war better prepared than they were last year in two respects. Britain is in a stronger position. In any case, Britain is in a stronger position in armaments and the perfection of home defenses. But public opinion is also better prepared. In both countries it has had time to solidify behind the government.

However, as regards the general situation in Europe, the Allied position is probably not as strong as it would have been last year. Most important, they might have had the assistance of the Soviet Union in defense of Czechoslovakia as they do not in defense of Poland. At present there are enormous difficulties in the way of direct Allied cooperation with Poland. The system of guarantees to Greece, Turkey, Roumania and others has so far shown no indications of being converted into an active front in defense of Poland.

Allied objectives in this phase of the war are limited to the blockade by sea and the slow forcing of the German west wall. These lines of attack can show results only after long and tedious operations. Meanwhile Germany may overrun Poland and thus terrorize all of Eastern Europe into yielding to her economic and political hegemony once and for all. Or Poland may be but the opening phase of a thoroughgoing German drive to the southeast.

Poland a Police State

And what of Poland? This little dictatorship, the immediate catalyst of Europe's disaster, offers little to kindle the enthusiasm of either the partisans of democracy or the crusaders for international morality. Poland has been a prisoner state practically since its rebirth in the last world war. Here a coalition of feudal landowners, capitalists, intellectuals and special-interest groups has ruled with the iron hand of military dictatorship. This regime was favorable to the Nazis on all grounds down to the very eye of the present crisis. Had the anti-Bolshevik German hordes not had their counterpart in Poland. In line with its policies Poland assisted the Reich in the Czech crisis and gobbled up its own small part of Czech territory. Today it is Poland's turn. Within the first week of war Polish resources and most of Polish industry has been sucked up by the swift-moving German war machine.

Italian Neutrality

The outbreak of war puts Italy on the spot. Although Italian neutrality at this point is consistent with German efforts to localize the conflict, there is plenty of reason for the Italian government's desire to preserve Italian neutrality as long as possible. Italy has little to gain and much to lose from throwing in her lot with either side. The Axis partnership so far has yielded to Italy little except the picture of growing German economic penetration of southeastern Europe. Italy's aims in the Balkans, the Mediterranean, and Africa bring her equally into conflict with Germany, Britain and France. Only the inevitable pressure from all sides will bring Italy into the war, and she will go to the highest bidder.

Allied War Aims Inadequate

As the slaughter begins, the announced aims of Britain and France in this war are two—
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of our people. In no other way can we come to control our economic destinies.

The core of a realistic program against war must be to gear American consumption with American production capacity in an expanding economy. Only when this has been undertaken will we be in a position to decide consciously and wisely our relationships with other nations. For only then will we be in control of those unseen factors which today are controlling us. In this grim light of war may we come to see those domestic tasks which too long have remained undone.

The time is short.