

II - 66 - 4. World Events Interpreted By Scott Nering, Vol. 1, No. 8.
October 19, 1944.

The controversy raises several questions of major strategy for the Big Three:

1. If the U.S.S.R. refuses to support Chungking and insists on supporting Japan, and if British policy has consistently refused arms and equipment to Chinese armies, officered by Chinese,
2. And if British and American interests are both fearful of a unified, well equipped, revolutionary China,
3. Does not the logic of the situation call for a compromise peace with Japan at the expense of both Chungking and U.S.A. ambitions to dominate the Pacific?

Argentina's refusal to support U.S.A. hemisphere policy has led to further American reprisals. The State Department summary of Argentina's pro-Axis position issued July 26 was reiterated by President Roosevelt on September 29. In a prepared statement handed to his press conference, the President referred to "the growth of Nazi-Fascist influence and the increasing application of Nazi-Fascist methods in a country of this hemisphere. . . . The Argentine government has repudiated solemn inter-American obligations on the basis of which the nations of this hemisphere developed a system of defense to meet the challenge of Axis aggression."

This warning to Argentina followed Secretary Hull's announcement that U.S.A. ships would no longer call for cargo at Argentine ports.

Washington expects Latin American republics to follow its made-in-USA policy. If they fall out of line, as Argentina has recently, the policy of the Good Neighbor will be put in its appropriate pigeon-hole and the Big Stick will come out of the corner where it has gathered cobwebs since 1933.

Incidentally, Argentina is being punished, not for its fascism, but for its anti-USA policy. Brazil, the Latin-American nation that is cooperating most actively with the Big Three, has been under a fascist dictatorship for years and has a constitution which authorizes dictatorship.

Note that the U.S.A. is handling Argentina on its own. Argentina may be designated an international criminal (1) by the United Nations or (2) by the American nations. Either

action would be a collective decision regarding the conduct of a member nation. The Hull-Roosevelt line puts U.S.A. in the role of judge, jury and executioner as far as Argentina is concerned. The Argentine government may choose to consider Washington's actions as preliminary moves toward the severance of diplomatic relations and a declaration of war.

General Eisenhower and Police Chief Heinrich Himmler are agreed on one thing—the probability of guerilla war in Germany. Eisenhower warns against it. Himmler promises it. It would be strange indeed if it did not materialize.

Guerilla or partisan bands played a role in the civil wars that followed the Cuban, Mexican, Chinese and Russian revolutions. They have been an important factor in the Japanese-Chinese conflicts that began with the invasion of Manchuria in 1931. They have been active in Nazi-occupied Europe during the past five years. There is every reason to assume that they will continue to function in Allied-occupied Europe.

On the surface there is a contradiction between the force-potential of tanks and bombing planes and the hit-and-run tactics of guerilla bands. Actually they are complementary. Unlimited military force annihilates at the first blow, those against whom it is directed will employ the most expedient methods of combatting it. A well governed military machine like that of Japan, Germany or the U.S.A. cannot be met in open battle by the people of an occupied country. It can be sabotaged and sniped at from underground. The more formidable the military machine, the more certain is underground or guerilla opposition, since no other form of defense is possible. Consequently, in an age where military fire-power has reached a level of all-time intensity, underground opposition and guerilla tactics have become once again the answer which men, women and children are making to their invaders and oppressors.

Scott Nearing

Jamaica, Vermont
October 19, 1944

The contents of this letter may be reproduced in whole or in part, without special permission. "World Events" is published monthly, with occasional extra issues. Subscription, \$2.00 per year. 125 Fifth Street, N. E., Washington 2, D. C.

Extra copies will be supplied without charge to subscribers desiring them for free distribution. Three weeks' advance notice of change of address is necessary. If temporary, specify duration.

Special introductory offer to new subscribers, ten issues for one dollar.

World Events

INTERPRETED BY SCOTT NEARING

VOL. 1

No. 8

Friends:

SOME folks are worried about the workers of western Europe. Not quite sure how they will behave through the trying months ahead. Afraid they will not follow their tried and true leaders—Churchill, Roosevelt, Eisenhower. Concerned lest they get us all into trouble.

I DO NOT worry one little bit on that score. I have been about the world. Mostly I have associated with workers. I began as a youngster, working shoulder to shoulder with them in the mines, mills, woods, and have spent considerable time with them ever since.

Back in 1906, when I was teaching in the Wharton School, one of my students, C. Allison Scully (if he is still alive and sees this, he may remember) wrote an essay to prove that workers did not have souls. At least, they did not have nice clean souls, like the people in Chestnut Hill and on the Main Line.

Whenever I ride on a train at night, I always think of Scully and the souls, and I say to myself, "They may not have white-collared souls, but they are the boys who make the stations on schedule and they are the boys, at 70 m.p.h., who stand between me and catastrophe."

Every day, on the rails, in the mines and shops and woods, these workers do things for each other and for the rest of us that would win the D.S.M. on the battlefield. They don't expect headlines or honors or rewards. They do not even expect thanks. It is all in the day's work. Their energy, courage, steadfastness, quick thinking and fearless deeds hold our society together.

Workers in Europe have had nine years of war-hell out of the past three decades. Between the wars they have been ground down by poverty and have had their families minced up by unemployment. Latterly they have been slapped down, jailed and shot for trying to lift

the nightmare of insecurity and uncertainty resting on them and their fellows.

Now the day is approaching when they can make a stand against poverty and war, in favor of plenty and a decent life-chance for all. When they take that stand, the *New York Times* and the *Reader's Digest* will scream "bloody murder." Yes, there will be some European history for a thousand years hashed with it, and for a thousand years Europe's "best people" have organized and directed the murder and profited by it when the workers murdering on their side won the wars for them.

Now, if the workers get control and if they succeed in establishing an age of plenty and peace on a continent seared and scarred by centuries of plunder and blood-letting under the direction of Europe's "best people," its kings, princes, dukes and lords spiritual and temporal, Churchill, Roosevelt and Eisenhower will not head the procession. On the contrary, they are doing everything in their power to see that this procession of, by and for Europe's workers neither assembles nor gets under way.

Scarcely a day passes but the papers owned by big-business interests repeat the warning. When British forces invaded Greece, they found men and women so weakened by hunger that few of them could do any sustained work, yet the danger of civil war there is plain (*N. Y. Times* 10/6/44, p. 5 and 10/9/44, p. 1). Left elements have made an attempt to seize power

in Athens (N. Y. Times 10/16/44, p. 6). The British put the rebellious Greek soldiers and sailors in Egyptian jails and concentration camps last spring. (They should know a rebellion when they see one.)

Luigi Antonini, vice-president of the International Ladies Garment Workers, returned from Italy October 3. Before reporting to President Roosevelt, he met with the Joint Board of his organization in Atlantic City. He "drew a sombre picture of the situation, marked by mass unemployment, hunger, despair, prostitution, delinquency and painful disappointment in the Allies' not having 'helped the Italians to help themselves.'" Mr. Antonini warned that the Communists were waiting, "knowing that, unless there is a marked improvement very soon, the facts of the picture will play into their hands" (N. Y. Times 10/5/44, p. 5).

From France come authenticated reports of homelessness, widespread unemployment and impressive mass demonstrations in favor of a socialized economy, and unauthenticated reports that the Communists are gaining control of the government and that seven departments in southwestern France are under Communist leadership and are cooperating with Spanish Loyalist emigres.

General de Gaulle spoke at Lille for an economic plan and government control of big business. A fortnight later (October 14) he spoke over the radio against revolutionary and left elements that refused to accept the authority of his government.

Big Three spokesmen have been playing the game of world domination with desperate earnestness. Weeks of meetings, at Dumbarton Oaks, at Quebec and at Moscow, have produced one definite result—disagreement.

This disagreement was publicly acknowledged in the draft proposals for an international organization prepared at Dumbarton Oaks. The text of Chapter VI, Section C of the proposals reads: "Note: The question of voting procedure in the Security Council is still under consideration."

After that, spokesmen for the Conference had the effrontery to tell the public that 90% agreement had been reached. They remind me of a neighbor who told about selling his place. He had agreed with the buyer on everything—except the price.

The price of world government is the limitation of national sovereignty. Voting in the Security Council turned on that issue—how much voting power were the Big Three willing to concede to the fifty-odd little-nation members of a world organization and how much

were they willing to concede to each other? After a month and a half of hurry-scurry, the matter was "still under consideration."

Two words in passing about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which are an abridged edition of the League of Nations Covenant. The proposed council has no more authority than the League Council; the Assembly has less. Basic economic issues—resources, raw materials, international transport, communication and the like—are ignored. The proposals leave the empires intact and national sovereignty supreme. They leave the big guns in the hands of the Big Three. It is a document that should warm the hearts of the most reactionary British and American Tories.

Efforts to iron out the differences that developed at Dumbarton Oaks were made by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt at Quebec. The Chinese were left out as a matter of course and "military considerations" prevented Premier Stalin from attending. But, when Prime Minister Churchill made his report to Commons on September 28, he admitted that "there are, however, still some important outstanding questions" and spoke anxiously about the "great difficulties" in the way of Big Three harmony. "The fact that the President and I have been so closely brought together . . . makes it all the more necessary that our third partner, Marshal Stalin, who has, of course, been kept informed, should join with us in a tripartite conference as soon as the military situation renders this possible.

"The future of the whole world," he continued, "and the general future of Europe, perhaps for several generations, depends upon the cordial, trustful and comprehending associations of the British Empire, the United States and Soviet Russia, and no pains must be spared and no patience grudged which is necessary to bring this supreme hope to fruition."

Since military considerations made it impossible for Marshal Stalin to be in Quebec and political considerations held President Roosevelt in Washington, Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden flew to Moscow for a long series of conferences that seemed to centre about Poland.

Action paralleled the talk-fests. Prime Minister Churchill, in his August 2nd report to Commons, turned over the Balkans to the Soviet Union. The Soviet armies, after reaching the German frontier (East Prussia), made no attempt to enter the Reich, nor did they capture Warsaw. Instead, they directed their full

energies to the Balkans and, in a series of rapid military and political moves, occupied Roumania and Bulgaria and are now in a position to take control of Hungary and perhaps of Yugoslavia.

These successes, which place the Red Army on the frontiers of Turkey and Greece and threaten Britain's control of the Mediterranean, led to the British invasion of Greece.

Meanwhile, Soviet military forces had won virtual control of the Baltic States. Consequently, the Red Army is in actual occupation of about two-thirds of the land area of Europe, with every prospect of going considerably farther in the immediate future.

No wonder Premier Churchill, in his Commons report of September 28, wooed France, Belgium and Holland with such ardor. As Marshal Smuts pointed out a year ago, Britain's only hope for European status lies in a close alliance with the countries lying on the western fringe of the continent. The British government is now working overtime to bring these four countries into economic and political harmony.

Chinese delegates took their places at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference October 2. Three days later they accepted the draft report prepared by the British, Russian and American delegations after six weeks of discussion. Thus the work of the Big Three won the approval of the fourth among the Allied Powers.

The recognition of China by inclusion in the Conference was sorely needed to offset the stunning blows recently suffered by Chiang Kai-shek's Chungking government. The most damaging reverse is a series of Japanese military successes that are destroying or neutralizing U.S.A. air bases in China, cutting off the new Burma Road before it is put into operation and actually threatening the city of Chungking. The continuance of Japan's military victories would not only eliminate Chungking as a factor in the Chinese military situation but would leave the Chinese Soviet government as the leader of Chinese resistance to Japanese aggression.

The probabilities of such an outcome are enhanced by the breakdown of negotiations between Chungking and the Chinese Soviets. Four and a half months of discussions failed to produce agreement on a single point, and on October 2 Lin Tao-han, Chairman of the Chinese Communist government, left Chungking. Having failed to establish a united front with the Chinese Soviets, Chungking must continue to divide its forces between those blockading the Chinese Soviet areas and those fighting the Japanese.

When a Chinese representative was selected by the Big Three to sign the Moscow Declaration, it was generally assumed that China's trials were over and that, after five bitter years of defeat at the hands of the better armed Japanese forces, the Chinese armies would be supplied with adequate military equipment and would thus be enabled to drive the Japanese invaders from their soil.

The Moscow invitation meant more than that. It meant, presumably, that the Big Three had agreed upon China as their Asiatic representative, in the same sense that Japan had been Britain's Asiatic representative from the signing of the Anglo-Japanese Agreement of 1902 down to 1936, or perhaps even later.

Soviet diplomacy has not conformed to this line. On the contrary, the relations between Moscow and Chungking have become more strained, and at the same time those between the Soviet Union and Japan have become more friendly, culminating in a series of agreements dealing with fishing rights, the Sakhalin oil deposits and the garrisoning of the Manchukuo frontier.

This development divided the Big Three on the issue of Asiatic policy. On September 28 Prime Minister Churchill swung toward the Soviet position by describing the Chinese situation in these words: "I must note with keen regret, in spite of the lavish American help afforded China, that that great country has suffered severe military reverses, including the loss of valuable air fields upon which the American air force under Chennault had been counting. It is one of the most disappointing vexations."

Chungking's retort was decisive. A spokesman for the Chinese Military Council described Churchill's "lavish American aid" as "so small it would hardly be credited if it could be disclosed." The spokesman added that the tonnage of American supplies to the Chinese army in eastern China from Pearl Harbor to the present would not sustain "a single British or American division in combat for one week . . . Our armies in East China, after seven years of war and blockade, are pitifully lacking in every kind of essential equipment . . . and are continuing to fight virtually alone." The spokesman might have added that, during those seven years, the sum total of American supplies going to Japan had been many-fold those going to China.

President Roosevelt entered the controversy at his October 3rd press conference. He admitted that the total volume of supplies reaching the Chinese armies was small but insisted (1) that it was larger than it had been a year ago and (2) that serious obstacles prevented the sending in of larger supplies.