

that we were so closely knit in bonds of brotherhood and sympathetic regard today. The ground that we have lost in this respect may be regained but not without mutual respect and confidence.

Every one of those hardy pioneers loved his fellows engaged in the common struggle to build here "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We have a rich, common heritage from these founding fathers. There is much to love in the citizens of every part of our great Nation. We may look on this and be drawn closer together. We may look on the divisive elements and become hostile camps. The future is in our hands today to mar or to make. The South asks and will have no part in the local problems of other sections. We have full confidence in our brethren that they will work out their own difficulties wisely and well. We may consider the things that will make us one or the things which divide. My plea is not made as a southerner nor as the Representative of a great district of Alabama, but as a humble citizen of this great Republic. I plead with you, my colleagues, and with all who have ears to hear, that we set ourselves against consideration of those things which tend to divide us and give our best thought to those things which unite. There are many measures challenging our best united thought.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. The war must be won. We must be united in its prosecution. It is a war for survival. We are all in the same boat. None should be thrown out. Let us press forward toward our glorious destiny in unity, "discourteasing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

I am appealing to the membership of this House to think on these things. There is no reason why we should adopt the unconstitutional, statutory way when we have a perfect right to submit a constitutional amendment which might do legitimately what the proponents of this heinous bill want done. I beg of you, whether you support the objective of this bill or not, that it be defeated, because it is illegitimate, and its passage would assassinate interstate comity. I beg of you to think on these things and be on your guard lest plausible arguments, artfully advanced, should sway your better judgment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not have the privilege of hearing the first half of the gentleman's address and therefore do not

know whether he discussed from a legalistic point of view what I understand he conceives to be a constitutional prohibition against legislation of the type of the Geffer bill. Did the gentleman go into that discussion?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes; I did sir; and cited authorities.

Mr. KEEFE. And discussed the question of whether or not the prohibition—it is not a prohibition, I would say more of a directive in the Federal Constitution, which directs the qualifications of electors in the States to be those of the numerous branch of the legislature of the respective States, and does the gentleman discuss in his argument the over-all power of the Federal Government to prescribe the qualifications of voters who are voting for Federal officials, those who are to serve the Federal Government, and who are to direct the affairs of the Federal Government. I have read some very appealing briefs submitted to me by very able lawyers who seem to draw a very definite line of distinction in the interpretation of that constitutional provision by which the over-all power of the Federal Government should extend to the point where it can prescribe the qualifications of voters who are to vote for Federal officials and leave the State control over its own affairs to itself, and thus limit it to Federal officials. Does the gentleman cover that or answer that type of argument in his statement? I would be very happy to read it.

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the gentleman's question. It is, as are all of his questions, searching and sound. I appreciate his ability as a lawyer and his sincerity in asking the question. My answer is that I did not deal with any such power of the Federal Government, the over-all power, as the gentleman calls it, because there is no such power. There never has been any such power and there never has been a single authority in the history of jurisprudence that supported such a theorem. All of the briefs that are in support of that dogma grow out of a misconception of the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Classic case. That case did not involve any question relating to the poll tax. It had to do solely with the question: Can crooks violate with impunity a criminal law of the United States, validly enacted to protect a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States?

[Here the gavel fell.]

(Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by J. W. Powell, of Indianapolis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN THE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair

recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent meeting of the Communist Party in Union Square, New York City, addressed by the secretary of the Communist Party, Earl Browder, ex-convict, lately pardoned at the insistence of the C. I. O. upon the pretense that such action would promote the general morale of the Nation, at which he demanded the immediate establishment of a second front to relieve the pressure on Russia, should be sufficient to convince every sincere American citizen that the interest of the Communist Party in this Nation is centered 100 percent upon Russia. The speech of Browder is the most brazen insult to the intelligence of the American people which has ever been offered by this detestible bunch of subversive termites who should be in concentration camps along with the other enemies of this Nation.

Intoxicated by the elixir of the freedom which they seek to destroy, they, in their insufferable arrogance, believe the memory and patience of the American people to be much shorter than they really are. They hope that their silly yammering may be interpreted as foresight and a knowledge of strategy and that their clamor will conceal the comparatively small number of greasy, long-haired, pimply faced individuals who fill their ranks.

These parasites have a three-point program in connection with this war, and none of the three points concern the welfare of the United States. First, they are out to provide good safe places for themselves during the war, and so far, with a great deal more assistance than they are entitled to, they are succeeding. Second, they are out to do everything within their power to help Russia at the expense of any or all of the other United Nations. Third, while in safe places during the war they are preparing the blueprints and laying the foundation for a new world after the war. It is time for the American people to face the facts and take whatever measures are necessary to preserve this Nation from its internal, as well as from its external foes.

Thoroughly discredited by the results of their own subversive labors; convicted before the bar of public opinion, by the effect of their own efforts; exposed in this very body by the votes of those who spoke for them here, who prior to the Axis attack upon Russia voted 100 percent against assistance to the Allied Nations and our own rearmament program; and now caught in their own trap, they can only raise their voices in miserable wails of rage and disappointment, which deceive no one of any ability.

We are out to win this war and we are going to win it, in spite of the efforts, past, present, and future, of the Communists in this Nation. We are going to win it by following a plan dictated by our military and naval experts, who are as able as any in the world. We are not going to be stampeded into taking or even considering the advice of some wild-eyed fanatic, who prior to June 22, 1941, was out to wreck this Nation and all of its institutions and who as soon as nazi-ism and fascism is crushed will

come out of his hole and again start gnawing. Before we can win, however, we must recognize a fact as a fact and call a spade a spade. We might just as well start doing so now.

Wars are won by following carefully prepared plans, which are based upon the principles of strategy, tactics, and logistics, and by decisions arrived at by a thorough evaluation of all of the factors involved. Of course, we want to help Russia in every possible manner, consistent with our own safety, which comes first. We know such action to be strategically necessary, because we need and desire all the help we can get. We know we must destroy the armed forces of Germany and that we must do so in Europe. This means a second front. When, where, and how this is established is a strategic question, not a political one. The decisions affecting the establishment of a second front must be made by our military and naval authorities, who are responsible for its success, and not by some gas bag of a soap-box orator whose patriotism is even more questionable than his ability. Neither can this decision be made by the officials of some other nation to whom the preservation of their own nation is sure to be the dominant motive.

The establishment of a second front involves considerations of the movements of vast tonnages of men, equipment, foodstuffs, and supplies, the convoy protection, the seizure of a proper beach head, the maintenance of the subsequent line of communications to insure the flow of reinforcements, replacements, supplies, equipment, ammunition, and the evacuation of the wounded, sick, and the disposition of the dead. Propagandists are not limited in their decisions by such matters, but our military leaders are. It is not a matter of a commando raid. It is a movement which will be so costly in every respect and especially in life that it must be undertaken only if it is believed that it can be made to succeed.

Upon the success of such an undertaking the very future of our Nation—indeed the very future of democracy throughout the world for centuries to come—will hang in balance. It must not be lightly undertaken. It must not be improperly planned. It must not be insufficiently supported. It must not be abortive. It must not fail. It must stick. It must win. It must furnish a base from which to launch the assault which will sweep through Europe like a mighty tide, crush the German military machine, destroy the German will to wage combat, and free all the conquered peoples of Europe. It must make possible a freedom, world wide, wherein every nation may be privileged to institute its own form of government and enjoy all of the freedoms and liberties which make life worth living. It must succeed in order to justify the certain awful cost. It must insure victory so that those who die shall not have died in vain.

Russia is worthy of every possible assistance which can be extended to her consistent with our own security. This, however, must be recognized as a ques-

tion of strategy—not a political or social one. Certainly, the most ardent exponent of communism, who prior to June 22, 1941, exerted every effort to render this Nation so impotent that we could not help even ourselves, much less Russia, and who fomented strikes so as to hinder our aid to Britain, cannot deny but that we have extended Russia untold millions of times more assistance than she extended to the United Nations prior to the time she was attacked by the Axis Nations. Not only did she not help them, but she was allied with Germany by treaty under which she was obligated to furnish vast quantities of foodstuffs, oils, and raw materials to Germany.

Throughout all of the time Germany was carrying out her program of defeating all Europe in detail, Russia sat gleefully on the sidelines enjoying the spectacle of the destruction of the so-called capitalistic nations. She even participated in the rape of Europe by pouncing upon the cripples in the conflict—Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania. She coolly took the half of Poland and reached for Bessarabia. In those days she was, without a doubt, the second strongest power in Europe, yet while there was fight in the French, the Dutch, and the Belgians, she not only did not lift her hand in their defense, but actually assisted their assailant. The pretended champion of all freedom, she calmly watched the panzer juggernaut crush helpless freedom-loving nations, without even a protest.

When, after Dunkerque, the invasion and destruction of Britain seemed imminent, she still continued to furnish supplies to Germany. When we were straining every resource to furnish the British with the munitions necessary to secure the British Isles in order that we might have a European base from which one day to launch the assault which will free Russia as well as other European nations from the chains of nazi-ism, what were those individuals doing who, from their soap boxes, cry so loud for a second front? They were working against all measures designed to rearm this Nation or to assist the British. They were flooding this Nation with isolationist and pacifistic propaganda. They were crying about a capitalistic war. They were committing acts of sabotage. They were organizing strikes and slow-downs. They were doing everything within their power to bring about the situation with which we are now confronted. They are the last who should raise their voices in criticism or advice. The actions of Russia up until the time she was attacked were governed by selfish considerations, just as were those of France and Britain, when they allowed the seizure of Czechoslovakia and just as were ours at that time and up until we were attacked. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. True, it is often difficult for a people to so subordinate their own selfish considerations, in order to be able to recognize that self-preservation can be more easily and cheaply achieved with the assistance of allies than it can later alone. This is a mistake which in this

Nation was urged the most fervently by those who are now so generous in their senseless soap-box criticism.

Let the facts be made plain right here to those who criticize the British in this war. She is the only nation actively engaged who came in before she was attacked. In 1939 she came in when she might have made a deal and have temporarily saved herself. Japan did not attack her or declare war upon her. She declared war upon Japan when she might have avoided such action for a time. The same was true of Britain in 1914. She, of her own free will, came to the assistance of France and Belgium. Those who are the champions of Russia are the loudest critics of Britain and are the very ones who, even in this critical period, are doing all they can to foment trouble in India.

Then after Russia had been attacked and while we were assisting her we were attacked by her traditional enemy—Japan, which for a decade has hung upon her Siberian flank with an army waiting only for an expedient time to launch the attack. Has Russia offered us the use of her facilities in Vladivostok, or other Siberian bases that we may more speedily or economically operate against the Japanese home bases? Not at all. Self-preservation is the governing factor in that case, as it should be.

I have nothing but praise for the gallant fight the Russians are waging in preservation of their homeland. They have gained for us invaluable time in which to prepare—time without which the United Nations would undoubtedly be much harder pressed than they are even now. All honor and praise to them and to their system of political philosophy, which gave the average Russian a share in that vast nation sufficient in which he feels warranted to risk his life in its defense. If their system of political philosophy suits the majority of people of Russia then it is the proper system for that nation. I would not spend one dollar or risk the life of one American boy to force the philosophy of democracy upon Russia or any other nation on the face of the globe. If we are to have a free world it must be free to the point where every nation can decide for itself just what course to follow in its internal affairs, religious, social, and political. If we are to accord the Russians that freedom, let them reciprocate in a like manner toward us and toward all other nations.

The question now confronting us is to win the war in order to make such freedom possible. There can be no doubt but that the delay in establishing a second front has in no small degree been accentuated by the former tactics of those now most loudly calling for one. Chickens come home to roost. Sort of ironic is it not? The subversive forces in this Nation, planted here by Soviet Russia, trained and financed by that nation to commit all sorts of political and military sabotage; responsible for a condition whereby the assistance we would like to extend to the land which is the fountain head of their activities, is de-

layed because of the partial success of their own program.

After all, in spite of the politicians, the cranks, the soap-box haranguers, the ex-convict yammerers, the social reformers, the arm-chair strategists, there are certain principles of warfare, which throughout the centuries, have proven to be immutable. They are known to those educated and trained in military science. They are as fixed and as inviolable as are the principles of mathematics, or the movements of the stars in the heavens. They cannot be disregarded with impunity. To ignore them means disaster. Unless they are observed no nation can win. Time and again nations have violated them and in doing so have won the most of the battles but have lost the war.

In substance, the sum of these principles means that a nation to win must be able to concentrate superior forces at the strategic crossroads of the theater of warfare—in this case, the world—at the critical time. We cannot undertake to fight the fight of any one nation in this war. Our objective must be the destruction of the armed forces of the Axis Powers. When this has been accomplished—and not until then—the war will be won. It is up to our military leaders to choose the time and place. Territory lost can be regained, provided manpower, which can never be replaced, is not wasted in sporadic, untimely, unsupported operations. The factors, which regulate such movements, can only be controlled by those who are experienced in handling such details. It is no job for amateurs or for those who have already demonstrated their inability in such matters, as have the members of the American Communist Party.

I am sure the American people will turn a deaf ear to the brass heads in this Nation, who cry of brass hats, and leave the conduct of the war in the hands of the only ones capable of exercising it—the officers of our Army and Navy, who have been trained for years for just such an emergency as we are now facing, and about whose patriotism and concern for the general welfare there can be not the slightest possibility of a doubt.