

**Chapter 1 : World War II - HISTORY**

*Meagan Harbison Professor Wahlstrom HISTORY World War II During the mid 20 th century the United States became the most powerful nation that took on the role of the protector.*

This idea has been reinforced many times over through books, movies and TV shows. So untouchable is this image of the Second World War that our rulers surround almost all of their new military adventures with its glowing halo. But if you look seriously behind the myth at what really happened in the Second World War, it becomes clear that the U. In the process, the U. By winning the Second World War, the U. More civilians died in this war than did military personnel. Fifty-five million people lost their lives, and civilian casualties were six times higher than in the First World War. The Second World War had its roots in the capitalist crisis of the s. World industrial production collapsed by 50 percent between and and trade plummeted by a third over the same period. At the same time, the crisis drove the ruling classes to build protectionist blocs to defend their weakened economies. Britain built its Sterling Bloc, while the U. Inevitably, economic competition burst into open warfare to grab markets and territory from rival states. Leon Trotsky put it this way: The present war is a direct prolongation of the previous war. They were therefore able to pass themselves off as "reasonable" countries that sought to avoid war. The present war--the second imperialist war--is not an accident; it does not result from the will of this or that dictator. It was predicted long ago. It derived its origin inexorably from the contradiction of international capitalist interests The immediate cause of the present war is the rivalry between the old wealthy empires, Great Britain and France, and belated imperialist plunderers, Germany and Italy The world is divided? It must be redivided. History is bringing humanity face to face with the volcanic eruption of American Imperialism. Roosevelt and his cabinet were explicit about their plans for world domination. There is no other way if we would avoid painful economic dislocations, social readjustments, and unemployment. Leadership toward a new system of international relationships in trade and other economic affairs will devolve largely upon the United States because of our great economic strength. We should assume leadership and the responsibility that goes with it, primarily for reasons of pure self-interest. The combatants developed military strategies that would secure their hegemony at the conclusion of the conflict. As Germany collapsed, the Allies raced to conquer as much of Europe as possible. Russia swallowed up the Balkans and the rest of Eastern Europe, while the U. Then they sat down at Yalta to ratify their military conquests. In his memoirs, Churchill describes a meeting with Stalin to divide the continent: The moment was apt for business, so I said, "Let us settle our affairs in the Balkans. Your armies are in Rumania and Bulgaria. We have interests, missions and agents there. So far as Britain is concerned, how would it do for you to have 90 percent predominance in Rumania, for us to have 90 percent of the say in Greece, and go about Yugoslavia? There was a slight pause. Then he took his pencil and made a large tick upon it, and passed it back to us. It was all settled in no more time than it takes to set down After this there was a long silence. The pencilled paper lay on the center of the table. At length I said, "Might it not be thought rather cynical if it seemed we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an off-hand manner? Let us burn the paper. Once it became clear that the U. In reality, Japan was on the verge of collapse. The economic blockade had choked off its supplies. The country already had been bombed to pieces. Secretary of War Henry Stimson told Truman, "I was a little fearful that before we could get ready, the air force might have Japan so thoroughly bombed out that the new weapon would not have a fair background to show its strength. Naval Admiral William Leahy even admitted after the war in Use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender because of the effective sea blockade and the successful bombing with conventional weapons My own feeling is that in being the first to use it, we had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. Strategic Bombing Survey concluded after the war that certainly prior to 31 December , and in all probability prior to 1 November , Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated. The Russians had entered the war in the East reluctantly and only after the defeat of Germany. Stalin then realized that he could extend his

empire eastward and began an aggressive march through China and Korea. He then bombed Nagasaki three days later, leveling it and killing 70,000 people. Japan surrendered to the U.S. With the impact of radiation poisoning, the U.S. A war for democracy? While the ruling classes aimed for empire, they could not simply tell their working classes to go off and die for the sake of profit. Workers bitterly remembered "the war profiteers" and "merchants of death" who had sent them to die in the trenches of the First World War. They systematically covered up their real motives. The Council on Foreign Relations, an organization that worked closely with the State Department, issued a series of studies to help define U.S. A history of the council cites one study warning that "formulation of statement of war aims for propaganda purposes is very different from formulation of one defining the true national interest. If war aims are stated which seem to be concerned solely with Anglo-American imperialism, they would offer little to the people in the rest of the world and will be vulnerable to Nazi counter-promises. Such aims would also strengthen the most reactionary elements in the United States and the British Empire. The interests of other people should be stressed, not only those of Europe, but also of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This would have a better propaganda effect. But this was hot air. No less a lie is the slogan of a war for democracy against fascism. The imperialist democracies are in reality the greatest aristocracies in history. England, France, Holland, Belgium rest on enslavement of colonial peoples. The democracy of the United States rests upon seizure of the entire continent. All the efforts of these "democracies" are directed toward the preservation of their privileged position. The oldest cop, England, ruled undemocratic colonies with brute force throughout the war. Without ever allowing Indians to vote whether or not to join the war, the British regime committed Indian troops to battle. Western rulers had a problem with this during the war, so their propaganda offices dressed Stalin up as an honorary democrat. They churned out a book and movie called Mission to Moscow that presented Stalin in the best possible light. Life magazine went so far as to write that Russians "look like Americans, dress like Americans, and think like Americans. American officials commonly referred to Chiang as a "gangster. Truman even proclaimed, "Our government is not a democracy, thank God. We elect men to use their best judgment for the public interest. Eager to catch up with other colonial powers, the U.S. Between and , the U.S. When it invaded the Philippines in , the U.S. They denied basic political rights to Blacks in the South, enforcing Jim Crow segregation through poll taxes, literacy tests and Klan terror. As a result, Blacks lost their right to vote and suffered vicious repression. Not surprisingly, the ruling class extended this racism to Blacks inside the U.S. The American military maintained segregated units and systematically denied promotion to Blacks during the Second World War. Secretary of War Stimson justified his denial of field commands to Blacks by saying, "Leadership is not embedded in the Negro race yet; trying to make them into combat officers would be a disaster. The ruling class also took advantage of the war to suppress the democratic rights of the entire working class. They forced workers to produce machinery for the war at a relentless pace but denied them the right to strike. While the bosses convinced union bureaucracies to sign the no-strike pledge, rank-and-file workers went ahead and struck anyway. In fact, more than half of the United Auto Workers went on strike in . To halt these strikes, rulers passed the Smith-Connally War Labor Disputes Act in , which gave the government the power to take over strike-bound plants, make it a crime to advocate striking and forbid unions from making contributions to political campaigns. Roosevelt even suspended the right to political dissent. In , the U.S. But by far the most outrageous U.S. He fumed that "the Japanese race is an enemy race. It makes no difference whether he is American or not.

**Chapter 2 : Project MUSE - Detroit And The "Good War"**

*African Americans and the Pacific War, Race, Nationality, and the Fight for Freedom Aug 31, by Chris Dixon. Paperback. \$ \$ 29 99 Prime.*

Print this page  
Roots of war On 22 June , some three million soldiers of Germany and her allies began an attack on the Soviet Union. This war was supposed to be over in a matter of months, but it lasted for four years, and grew into the largest and most costly conflict in all history. The roots of the war lie in the appointment of Adolf Hitler as German chancellor in 1933. The cost to the Soviet Union was an estimated 27 million dead. After the outbreak of war in 1939 came the added fear of Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, while Germany was fighting the British Empire and France in the west. All of these factors contributed to the decision taken by Hitler in July 1941, after the German defeat of France, to plan for an all-out assault on the Soviet Union. Not until December 1941, however, did Hitler make a final decision to go ahead with what became known as Operation Barbarossa. The original date, set for May 1941, had to be revised to complete the vast preparations for the attack - following other German attacks on Yugoslavia and Greece in April. The date of 22 June was late for starting a campaign over such a vast area, but German commanders were confident that the Soviet armed forces were primitive, and that the Soviet people were waiting for liberation. Victory was expected by the early autumn. It has been argued that Stalin in fact planned a pre-emptive attack on Germany for the early summer of 1941, and was then thrown off-balance by the German invasion. For two years Soviet forces pushed the German army back into Germany. The evidence makes clear the defensive posture of the Soviet Union in 1941. Stalin did not want to risk war, though he hoped to profit from the German-British struggle if he could. In the event, the shock of attack almost unhinged the Soviet state, and by the autumn German forces had destroyed most of the Red Army and the Russian air force, surrounded and besieged Leningrad - where over one million people died of starvation and cold - and were approaching the outskirts of Moscow. The Red Army had sufficient reserves to stop the German army from completing the rout in December 1941, but the following summer German offensives launched far to the south of Moscow, to seize the rich oilfields of the Caucasus and to cut the Volga shipping route, created further chaos. Hitler hoped that German forces would capture the oil and sweep on through the Middle East to meet up with Axis forces in Egypt. The Volga was to be blocked at Stalingrad, after which German forces could wheel northwards to outflank Moscow and the Soviet line. The southern attack failed at Stalingrad. After weeks of chaotic retreats and easy German victories, the Red Army solidified its defence and against all the odds clung on to the battered city. Some historians have seen this as the turning point of the war. But not until the Red Army had decisively defeated German forces in the more favourable summer weather of 1942 did the tide really turn. The Battle of Kursk in July 1943 was one of the greatest set-piece battles in military history. The Red Army withstood a massive German assault, and then counter-attacked. Top Turnaround The central question of the German-Soviet war is why, after two years of defeats, and the loss of more than five million men and two-thirds of the industrial capacity of the country, the Red Army was able to blunt, then drive back, the German attack. Camouflage, surprise and misinformation were brilliantly exploited to keep the German army in the dark. The idea that the USSR had limitless manpower, despite its heavy losses, is inadequate as an answer. Germany and her allies also possessed a large population, and added to it the peoples of the captured Soviet areas - men and women who were forced to work for the German army or were shipped back to work in the Reich. Soviet armies were always desperately short of men. Above all, Soviet tactics in 1941-42 were extremely wasteful of manpower. If the Red Army had continued to fight the same way, it would simply have sustained escalating losses for little gain. Nor did the USSR enjoy an advantage in economic resources. After the German attack, Soviet steel production fell to eight million tons in 1941, while German production was 28 million tons. In the same year, Soviet coal output was 75 million tons, while German output was 100 million tons. The USSR nevertheless out-produced Germany in the quantity though seldom in the quality of most major weapons, from this much smaller industrial base. Without Lend-Lease aid, however, from the United States and Britain, both of whom supplied a high proportion of food and raw materials for the Soviet war effort, the high output of weapons would still not have been

possible. The chief explanation lies not in resources, which Germany was more generously supplied with than the Soviet Union, during the two central years of the war before American and British economic power was fully exerted. It lies instead in the remarkable reform of the Red Army and the Russian air force, undertaken slowly in Every area of Soviet military life was examined and changes introduced. The army established the equivalent of the heavily armoured German Panzer divisions, and tank units were better organised - thanks to the introduction of radios. Soviet army tactics and intelligence-gathering were also overhauled. Camouflage, surprise and misinformation were brilliantly exploited to keep the German army in the dark about major Soviet intentions. The air force was subjected to effective central control and improved communications, so that it could support the Soviet army in the same way as the Luftwaffe backed up German forces. The Communist Party also accepted the need to give the Red Army greater flexibility in fighting the war, and in the autumn of scaled down the role of political commissars attached to the armed forces. Many women joined the partisan movement operating behind the German lines The Soviet people also played their part. Despite exceptional levels of deprivation and loss, they kept up the production of food, weapons and equipment. Some were terrorised into doing so, particularly the millions of camp labourers who worked fully for the war effort. But others did so from a genuine patriotism or a hatred of German fascism. The harsh treatment of the Soviet population in those areas of Russia occupied by Germany made it easier for the Stalinist regime to mobilise support elsewhere in Russia for the war effort. Stalin relaxed the repression of the Church so that it could be used to mobilise enthusiasm, while propaganda played on the theme of past Russian glories against European invaders, rather than on Communist successes. An exceptional burden was borne by Soviet women. By over half the workforce was female, and on the land, more than four-fifths. Women fought in their thousands in the Soviet armed forces as pilots, sharpshooters, even tank commanders. Many women joined the partisan movement operating behind the German lines - and by there were an estimated , of them. They constantly harried German troops, and were themselves the victim of harsh punitive expeditions, which led to the death of hundreds of thousands of innocent villagers along with the partisan bands. Conditions were harsh for both sides, and losses were high. Soviet resistance made possible a successful Allied invasion of France By the autumn of these instructions had expanded to include all suspected partisans and other categories of Jew. In the remaining Jewish population was rounded up and killed on the spot or sent to extermination camps. The mass-murder of the Jews illustrates the importance of ideology in the conflict. Both sides fought in effect a civil war - the Soviets against imperialist invaders, the Germans against Jewish Bolshevism. The nature of the dictatorships determined the savage character of the eastern conflict. Soviet victory came at a high price, but a combination of total-war mobilisation, better fighting methods and high operational skills defeated a German army that in was a formidable, heavily armed and modern fighting force. Soviet resistance made possible a successful Allied invasion of France, and ensured the final Allied victory over Germany. The Soviet state was transformed in the process into a superpower, and Communism, close to extinction in the autumn of , came to dominate the whole Eurasian area, from East Germany to North Korea.

**Chapter 3 : Race War! by Gerald Horne**

*The latest Tweets from WAR Race (@WAR\_Race). Warrior Adrenaline Race (WAR) is a uniquely challenging OCR event. There are options of 20k, 10k and 5k, each will test your limits!*

Not ALL the white boys. You think your lack of pigmentation is a special sign of your supremacy. Well let me tell you something, white boy. What you take for superiority is just a misguided attempt at self-esteem. All those melanin-starved faces wearing matching eggshell t-shirts and fat-ass khakis. All those brave, young men holding Tiki torches and an inflated sense of self worth. Nazis, the Klan, white supremacists. We see your twisted lips, scrunched eyes and flaring nostrils. Your hood-starved heads and sweat-gelled haircuts. Your hate warped faces spouting reheated leftovers from WWII. My grandparents fought people like you. They dressed in army green and hopped the ocean to pound people like you into the ground. They took your goose-stepping forebears and blasted them into bits. They buried your intellectual precursors under the ashes of their eternal Reich. Your attitudes and beliefs still percolated just beneath the surface of so many frustrated white boys. The difference was that they were too smart to actually give voice to the darkness in their hearts. Segregation, red lining, broken windows policing, and a plethora of others. It was all polite, all deniable, all just the colorblind way we do things around here. The face of America is changing. People are starting to speak up. The lie you told yourself about being special. With numbers or with a gun. Then you can say whatever you want. You can pretend whatever racial fantasy will protect your fragile little egos. Insult them until they fight. Bring them down to your level. Prove your moral superiority by stoking a race war. You can just hope to reset the clock. There will be no race war. Oh, there may be fighting. It will be your tiny minority of cowards and fools vs. Do you really think people like me will fight on your side? There need be no violence. All you can do is unite the rest of us against you. This is the world we cover. Because of people like you, another world is possible. There are many battles to be won, but we will battle them togetherâ€”all of us. Common Dreams is not your normal news site. We want the world to be a better place. If you can help todayâ€”because every gift of every size mattersâ€”please do.

**Chapter 4 : BBC - Higher Bitesize History - Post-war race relations : Revision**

*Race War! delves into submerged and forgotten history to reveal how European racism and c Japan ;s lightning march across Asia during World War II was swift and brutal. Nation after nation fell to Japanese soldiers.*

Authored by Kevin Barrett via Unz. Scenarios for a second American Civil War have existed ever since the first one ended. Some hyperbolists called Reconstruction the Second Civil War. How might civil unrest spill over into civil war? The late Charles Manson, we are told, staged his killer-hippie mass knifings because he thought the Beatles were sending him secret orders to start a black-vs. Manson lieutenant Tex Watkins explained: Even before the Deep State murdered Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. King with the help of their organized crime assets - once spoke with a US Army Colonel who admitted to helping plan the assassination. The Colonel said that the military had done extensive focus group style interviews with participants in the race riots and determined that Dr. Counterintuitively, the apostle of nonviolence was inspiring the psychological liberation of black people in such a way that a certain percentage felt empowered to act out their repressed anger. This, the Colonel explained to Pepper, was the primary reason King had to be terminated with extreme prejudice. King did not solve the racial violence problem. The assassination itself set off a wave of new riots in cities including Chicago, Baltimore, and - sorry, Colonel - Washington, DC. White-dominated forces of the State retaliated with escalating repression. Black communities felt increasingly under siege, and have continued to feel that way until the present day. Most red state vs. In other words, just as the first Civil War was really about race i. American War Or will it? Instead, the Yankee Terror State turns its savagery against the New Rebels of the Free Southern States because those good ole boys and girls of all shades of skin pigmentation and sexual preference refuse to give up fossil fuels, choosing instead to secede from the Union. Al-Akkad fosters empathy and identification with our victims by casting the archetypal victim-turned-resistance-fighter as ordinary American rather than exotic foreigner. Omar El Akkad, despite the subversive aspects of his book, is basically a blue pill kind of guy: Hopkins offers a deeper, more accurate, vastly funnier, more genuinely subversive vision. His far-future America, which bears an uncanny resemblance to our nightmarish present, features drone-patrolled hyper-surveiled cities, each of which is divided by an Israeli-style Wall complete with Israeli-style checkpoints and incursions featuring Israeli-style killings of hapless untermenschen. But instead of Israelis vs. Palestinians, the divide here is between the Normals on one side of the wall and the Anti-Socials on the other. But it is, nonetheless, very much about behavioral genetics. In other words, perfect corporate citizens! The plot follows two of those ASP antiheroes as they throw rocks at the Israeli bulldozer of corporatist genocide. Through the Brechtian device of estrangement, Hopkins forces us to recognize ourselves in his beleaguered ASP antiheroes. According to their bleak vision, we are doomed to fight and kill our cousins whose slightly different average genetic profiles mark them as Other. Perhaps there is some truth to this notion. Perhaps our nature includes a strong tendency to in-group vs. And perhaps we tend to divide in-group from out-group on the basis of ascribed ancestry, that is, along tribal lines. But those who are hugely bothered by other races or their own race , like those who loathe the people of a different ideology or religion or language, may be getting all worked up over nothing. They may in fact be projecting their own experience of a much deeper alienation. They may simply be natural-born hunter gatherers caught in the trap of modern technological civilization, living fantastically comfortable yet somehow miserable lives, desperately seeking someone Other to blame for their predicament.

Chapter 5 : BBC - History - World Wars: The Soviet-German War -

*D isgraced former White House aide Omarosa Manigault Newman warns that President Trump may trigger a "race war." But that war is already underway, and the Left fired first, emboldened by the poison of identity politics.*

The Civil Rights movement owed its beginnings to several factors. During the war, black Americans had served in segregated units in the US army. They had been told they were fighting for freedom, human rights and democracy. Yet, these ideas did not seem to apply to them, particularly if they lived in the Southern states. Black Americans were now more ready to ask why they did not share these rights. As part of this struggle, the USA tried to demonstrate the superiority of its way of life compared to the Communist alternative. This meant that, increasingly, it was no longer possible for the federal government to ignore the racism endemic in the Southern states. If all people were held to have been born equal, then that meant black men as well white men. For the first time, the federal Government was prepared to address some of the inequalities that black Americans suffered. Also, a new generation of black leaders had emerged. Foremost among these, was a southern Baptist preacher called Martin Luther King. King and his supporters formed a new organisation - the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. They adopted new methods and tactics in the struggle for equality, and found considerable success in doing so. In doing so he gained widespread support from black Americans, and even from many whites. King wisely realised that television could help increase awareness of the plight of black Americans and spread his message. For the first time, white Americans outside the South became fully aware of the racist treatment of black Americans. This meant an end to segregated schools. Across the South, white segregationists were furious. They made it clear that they would resist any attempts at racial integration. In , a crisis developed in the town of Little Rock, Arkansas, where the state governor tried to forbid nine black teenagers from entering the local high school. President Eisenhower eventually had to send troops to Little Rock so that the teenagers could attend school.

Chapter 6 : Review "Race War!", by Horne (print) pa

*Recent years have seen a revisiting of the 'Good War' and the 'greatest generation.' These drumbeats have echoed from best sellers, Hollywood blockbusters, and campaign speeches including W's D-day remembrance and Reagan's speech on the windy cliffs of Normandy replayed throughout the weeklong spectacle of his funeral.*

Visit Website Did you know? As early as 1919, in his memoir and propaganda tract "Mein Kampf" My Struggle , Adolf Hitler had predicted a general European war that would result in "the extermination of the Jewish race in Germany. In the mids, he began the rearmament of Germany, secretly and in violation of the Versailles Treaty. After signing alliances with Italy and Japan against the Soviet Union , Hitler sent troops to occupy Austria in 1938 and the following year annexed Czechoslovakia. Hitler had long planned an invasion of Poland, a nation to which Great Britain and France had guaranteed military support if it was attacked by Germany. The pact with Stalin meant that Hitler would not face a war on two fronts once he invaded Poland, and would have Soviet assistance in conquering and dividing the nation itself. On September 17, 1939, Soviet troops invaded Poland from the east. Under attack from both sides, Poland fell quickly, and by early 1940 Germany and the Soviet Union had divided control over the nation, according to a secret protocol appended to the Nonaggression Pact. In fact, the Germans broke through the line with their tanks and planes and continued to the rear, rendering it useless. Hitler now turned his attention to Britain, which had the defensive advantage of being separated from the Continent by the English Channel. To pave the way for an amphibious invasion dubbed Operation Sea Lion , German planes bombed Britain extensively throughout the summer of 1940, including night raids on London and other industrial centers that caused heavy civilian casualties and damage. Arguments between Hitler and his commanders delayed the next German advance until October, when it was stalled by a Soviet counteroffensive and the onset of harsh winter weather. World War II in the Pacific With Britain facing Germany in Europe, the United States was the only nation capable of combating Japanese aggression, which by late 1941 included an expansion of its ongoing war with China and the seizure of European colonial holdings in the Far East. On December 7, 1941, Japanese aircraft attacked the major U. S. naval base at Pearl Harbor, and Germany and the other Axis Powers promptly declared war on the United States. After a long string of Japanese victories, the U. S. Pacific Fleet won the Battle of Midway in June 1942, which proved to be a turning point in the war. On Guadalcanal, one of the southern Solomon Islands, the Allies also had success against Japanese forces in a series of battles from August to February 1943, helping turn the tide further in the Pacific. In mid-1944, Allied naval forces began an aggressive counterattack against Japan, involving a series of amphibious assaults on key Japanese-held islands in the Pacific. The approach of winter, along with dwindling food and medical supplies, spelled the end for German troops there, and the last of them surrendered on January 31, 1945. Soviet troops soon advanced into Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania, while Hitler gathered his forces to drive the Americans and British back from Germany in the Battle of the Bulge December 16-1944, the last major German offensive of the war. An intensive aerial bombardment in February 1945 preceded the Allied land invasion of Germany, and by the time Germany formally surrendered on May 8, 1945, Soviet forces had occupied much of the country. Hitler was already dead, having committed suicide on April 30 in his Berlin bunker. Post-war Germany would be divided into four occupation zones, to be controlled by the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States and France. Heavy casualties sustained in the campaigns at Iwo Jima February 1945 and Okinawa April-June 1945, and fears of the even costlier land invasion of Japan led Truman to authorize the use of a new and devastating weapon—the atomic bomb—on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in early August. On August 10, 1945, the Japanese government issued a statement declaring they would accept the terms of the Potsdam Declaration, and on September 2, 1945, U. S. World War II proved to be the most devastating international conflict in history, taking the lives of some 35 to 60 million people, including 6 million Jews who died at the hands of the Nazis. Millions more were injured, and still more lost their homes and property. The legacy of the war would include the spread of communism from the Soviet Union into eastern Europe as well as its eventual triumph in China, and the global shift in power from Europe to two rival superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—that would soon face off against each other in the Cold War. Start your free trial today.

**Chapter 7 : International Socialist Review**

*Lecture 10/ The Good War, 62 Million Deaths, and a Strange Alchemy of Race THESIS: World War II has been remembered, for good reason, as the 'Good War' and it is often understood as a simple, shining triumph but it was a more complicated event than this implies and it deeply stirred thinking about race in the U.S. ( ) 1.*

This global clash -- with the United States and the other "Allies" on one side, and Nazi Germany, imperial Japan and the other "Axis" countries on the other -- is routinely portrayed in the US as the "good war," a morally clear-cut conflict between Good and Evil. For more than 60 years, this view has been reinforced in countless motion pictures, on television, by teachers, in textbooks, and by political leaders. The reverential way that the US role in the war has been portrayed moved Bruce Russett, professor of political science at Yale University, to write: Whatever criticisms of twentieth-century American policy are put forth, United States participation in World War II remains almost entirely immune. Except for a few books published shortly after the war and quickly forgotten, this orthodoxy has been essentially unchallenged. As we shall see, it does not hold up under close examination. First, a look at the outbreak of war in Europe. When the leaders of Britain and France declared war against Germany on September 3, , they announced that they were doing so because German military forces had attacked Poland, thereby threatening Polish independence. In going to war against Germany, the British and French leaders transformed what was then a geographically limited, two-day-old clash between Germany and Poland into a continental, European-wide conflict. It soon became obvious that the British-French justification for going to war was not sincere. When Soviet Russian forces attacked Poland from the East two weeks later, ultimately taking even more Polish territory than did Germany, the leaders of Britain and France did not declare war against the Soviet Union. And although Britain and France went to war supposedly to protect Polish independence, at the end of the fighting in 1945 after five and a half years of horrific struggle, death and suffering 1945 Poland was still not free, but instead was entirely under the brutal rule of Soviet Russia. Sir Basil Liddell Hart, an outstanding twentieth-century British military historian, put it this way: The immediate purpose was to fulfill their promise to preserve the independence of Poland. The ultimate purpose was to remove a potential menace to themselves, and thus ensure their own security. In the outcome, they failed in both purposes. In his famous "Blood, Sweat and Tears" speech, the great British wartime leader said that unless Germany was defeated, there would be "no survival for the British empire, no survival for all that the British empire has stood for Upon it depends our own British life and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. Even though Britain supposedly "won," or at least was on the winning side in the war, the once-mighty British empire has vanished into history. No British leader today would dare defend the often brutal record of British imperialism, including killing and bombing in order to maintain exploitative colonial rule over millions in Asia and Africa. Americans like to believe that "good guys" win, and "bad guys" lose, and, in international affairs, that "good" countries win wars, and "bad" countries lose them. As one official Soviet history book, published in the 1950s, put it: The war further demonstrated the social and political unity of the Soviet people Once again it underscored the significance of the guiding and organizing role of the Communist Party in socialist society. The Communist Party consolidated millions of people in their fight against the fascist aggressors The selfless dedication demonstrated by the Communist Party during the war years further solidified the trust, respect and love it enjoys among the Soviet people. Some percent of German combat forces were destroyed by the Soviet military on the Eastern front. In President Franklin Roosevelt, together with British prime minister Winston Churchill, issued a formal declaration of Allied war aims, the much-publicized "Atlantic Charter. At the outbreak of war in 1939, Britain ruled over the largest colonial empire in history, holding more millions of people against their will than any regime before or since. In fact, the record of Allied misdeeds is a long one, and includes the British-American bombing of German cities, a terroristic campaign that took the lives of more than half a million civilians, the genocidal "ethnic cleansing" of millions of civilians in eastern and central Europe, and the large-scale postwar mistreatment of German prisoners. In doing so, the US and its allies held German leaders to a standard that they did not respect themselves. US Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson

was not the only high-ranking American official to acknowledge, at least in private, that the claim of unique Allied righteousness was mere pretense. In a letter to the President, written while he was serving as the chief US prosecutor at the great Nuremberg trial of , Jackson acknowledged that the Allies "have done or are doing some of the very things we are prosecuting the Germans for. The French are so violating the Geneva Convention in the treatment of [German] prisoners of war that our command is taking back prisoners sent to them [for forced labor in France]. We are prosecuting plunder and our Allies are practicing it. We say aggressive war is a crime and one of our allies asserts sovereignty over the Baltic States based on no title except conquest. Among crimes against humanity stands the offence of the indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations. Crimes against humanity also include the mass expulsion of populations. Can the Anglo-Saxon leaders who at Potsdam condoned the expulsion of millions of Germans from their homes hold themselves completely innocent? The nations sitting in judgment [at Nuremberg] have so clearly proclaimed themselves exempt from the law which they have administered. In fact, on each side there were regimes that were repressive or dictatorial, as well as governments that had broad public support. Many of the countries allied with the US were headed by governments that were oppressive, dictatorial, or otherwise non-democratic. In crass violation of their own solemnly proclaimed principles, the US, British and Soviet statesmen disposed of tens of millions of people with no regard for their wishes. The deceit and cynicism of the Allied leaders was perhaps most blatant in the infamous British-Soviet "percentages agreement" to divide up South Eastern Europe. At a meeting with Stalin in , Churchill proposed that in Romania the Soviets should have 90 percent influence or authority, and 75 percent in Bulgaria, and that Britain should have 90 percent influence or control in Greece. In Hungary and Yugoslavia, the British leader suggested, each should have 50 percent. Churchill wrote all this out on a piece of paper, which he pushed across to Stalin, who made a check mark on it and passed it back. Churchill then said, "Might it not be thought rather cynical if it seemed we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an off-hand manner? Let us burn the paper. The three Allied leaders accomplished what they accused the Axis leaders of Germany, Italy and Japan of conspiring to achieve: During a meeting in Washington, President Roosevelt candidly told the Soviet foreign minister that "the United States, England and Russia, and perhaps China, should police the world and enforce disarmament [of all others] by inspection. Once Germany and Japan were defeated, though, the US and the Soviet Union squared off against each other, which made it impossible for the UN to function as President Roosevelt had intended. While the US and Soviet Union each sought for decades to secure hegemony in its own sphere of influence, the two "super powers" were also rivals in a decades-long struggle for global supremacy. They proceeded to share and contest with one another the domination of the world, to build military machines far greater than the Fascist countries had built, to control the destinies of more countries than Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan had been able to. They also acted to control their own populations, each country with its own techniques " crude in the Soviet Union, sophisticated in the United States " to make their rule secure. Until then, the US was officially a neutral country, and most Americans wanted to keep out of the war that was then raging in Europe and Asia. As part of this effort, the President and other high-ranking American officials broadcast fantastic lies about supposed plans by Hitler and his government to attack the United States and impose a global dictatorship. Among those who have sought to justify his policy is the eminent American historian Thomas A. The country was overwhelmingly noninterventionist to the very day of Pearl Harbor, and an overt attempt to lead the people into war would have resulted in certain failure and an almost certain ousting of Roosevelt in , with a complete defeat of his ultimate aims. But because the masses are notoriously shortsighted and generally cannot see danger until it is at their throats, our statesmen are forced to deceive them into an awareness of their own long-run interests. This is clearly what Roosevelt had to do, and who shall say that posterity will not thank him for it? This was reinforced by a presidential "shoot on sight" order to the US Navy against German and Italian ships. Hitler, for his part, was anxious to avoid conflict with the United States. Other equally unneutral acts followed " the seizure of Axis shipping, the freezing of Axis funds, the transfer of tankers to Britain, the occupation of Greenland and, later, of Iceland, the extension of lend-lease to the new ally, Russia, and Fuller, President Roosevelt "left no stone unturned to provoke Hitler to declare war on the very people to whom he so ardently promised peace. He provided Great Britain with

American destroyers, he landed American troops in Iceland, and he set out to patrol the Atlantic seaways in order to safeguard British convoys; all of which were acts of war. In spite of his manifold enunciations to keep the United States out of the war, he was bent on provoking some incident which would bring them into it. Stark, chief of US naval operations, acknowledged in a confidential September memorandum for the President: Americans, though, were spared the horrors of large-scale bombing, combat fighting on their home soil, or occupation by foreign armies. At the end of the war the United States was the only major nation not shattered in the global conflict. For the US, the half-century from to the mids was an era of spectacular economic growth and unmatched global stature. The war had also prompted the country to invent a miraculous economic machine that seemed to grant as many wishes as were asked of it. The continental United States had escaped the plague of war, and so it was easy enough for the heirs to believe that they had been anointed by God. Among those who has not thought so is Prof. Bruce Russett, who wrote: In fact, most Americans probably would have been no worse off, and possibly a little better, if the United States had never become a belligerent. In cold-blooded realist terms, Nazism as an ideology was almost certainly less dangerous to the United States than is Communism. In August, the prestigious British weekly, *The Economist*, noted: This is the real measure of their failure. All the effort that was put into the destruction of Hitlerite Germany resulted in a Europe so devastated and weakened in the process that its power of resistance was much reduced in the face of a fresh and greater menace – and Britain, in common with her European neighbours, had become a poor dependent of the United States. These are the hard facts underlying the victory that was so hopefully pursued and so painfully achieved – after the colossal weight of both Russia and America had been drawn into the scales against Germany. Three years after the end of the fighting, he wrote: Lindbergh, the world-famous author and aviator, the war was a great setback for the West. Twenty-five years after the end of the conflict, he wrote: In order to defeat Germany and Japan we supported the still greater menaces of Russia and China – which now confront us in a nuclear-weapon era. Poland was not saved. Much of our Western culture was destroyed. We lost the genetic heredity formed through aeons in many million lives. We hazard to reply – blind hatred! Their hearts ran away with their heads and their emotions befogged their reason. For them the war was not a political conflict in the normal meaning of the words, it was a Manichean contest between Good and Evil, and to carry their people along with them they unleashed a vitriolic propaganda against the devil they had invoked. American schools, the US mass media, government agencies and political leaders have for decades carried on a campaign of emotion-laden, one-sided propaganda to uphold the national mythology of World War II. How a nation views the past is not a trivial or merely academic exercise. Our perspective on history profoundly shapes our actions in the present, often with grave consequences for the future. Drawing conclusions from our understanding of the past, we make or support policies that greatly impact many lives. It has helped greatly to support and justify a series of arrogant US foreign policy adventures, with harmful consequences for both America and the world. LaRoque, who served in 13 major battles during the war. But the twisted memory of it encourages the men of my generation to be willing, almost eager, to use military force anywhere in the world. World War II is the war thrown into our faces by the war-making establishment, as it tries, in each war that we face, to wrap itself in the mantle of good and righteous World War II.

**Chapter 8 : Dear White Supremacists: There Will Be No Race War**

*The 'Good War' Myth of World War Two. By Mark Weber. World War II was not only the greatest military conflict in history, it was also America's most important twentieth-century war.*

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Schachern, and Walton Stoddard White. Here, too, are many of George C. Reuther Library, Detroit, house the George C. Edwards Collection, which includes his military , political, and private wartime correspondence: Those from James P. McElhone, and Joseph P. Lash are most valuable for this book, but many others provide insights into the lives of Edwards and his wife, and their important contributions to the city and its liberal forces. Finally, family members and relatives of the letter writers have lent the author some of the correspondence and other priceless materials in their possession, such as the "Diary of Martin S. June October ," a compilation of John M. Win Some, Lose Some: Mermen Williams and the New Democrats. Race Relations in Wartime Detroit: The Sojourner Truth Housing Controversy of The Detroit Rioters of Press of Mississippi, Stories about the 32nd Division on the Villa Verde. Michigan in World War II. Race and Uneven Development. A Legacy in the Pursuit of Justice. Notes on the Media. Violence in the Model City: Progressivism in Detroitand After, The Challenge to Urban Liberalism: A Nation of Cities: The Federal Government and Urban America, The American Home Front, Litoff, Judy Barrett, David C. Since You Went Away: Meier, August, and Elliott Rudwick. Bibliography Perret, Geoffrey. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

**Chapter 9 : The Race War by Ronald Segal**

*Detroit And The "Good War" Dominic J. Capeci, Jr. Published by The University Press of Kentucky Dominic J. Capeci, Jr.. Detroit And The "Good War": The World War II Letters of Mayor Edward Jeffries and Friends.*

Explanations generally fall into one of three schools of thought: More recent scholarship draws on all three schools. Horowitz argues that this kinship "makes it possible for ethnic groups to think in terms of family resemblances". Ethnic groups will consequently always threaten the survival of civil governments but not the existence of nations formed by one ethnic group. A number of political scientists argue that the root causes of ethnic conflict do not involve ethnicity per se but rather institutional, political, and economic factors. These scholars argue that the concept of ethnic war is misleading because it leads to an essentialist conclusion that certain groups are doomed to fight each other when in fact the wars between them that occur are often the result of political decisions. However, ethnic violence occurs in sporadic outbursts. For example, Varshney points out that although Yugoslavia broke up due to ethnic violence in the s, it had enjoyed a long peace of decades before the USSR collapsed. Therefore, some scholars claim that it is unlikely that primordial ethnic differences alone caused the outbreak of violence in the s. Peterson argues that the existence of hatred and animosity does not have to be rooted in history for it to play a role in shaping human behavior and action: However, if hatred is conceived as a historically formed "schema" that guides action in some situations, then the conception should be taken more seriously. Moreover, the scholars of this school generally do not oppose the view that ethnic difference plays a part in many conflicts. They simply claim that ethnic difference is not sufficient to explain conflicts. Hence, it is difficult to completely discount the role of inherent ethnic differences. Additionally, ethnic entrepreneurs, or elites, could be tempted to mobilize ethnic groups in order to gain their political support in democratizing states. Instrumentalist scholars have tried to respond to these shortcomings. For example, Hardin[ who? He points out that a charismatic leader acts as a focal point around which members of an ethnic group coalesce. The existence of such an actor helps to clarify beliefs about the behavior of others within an ethnic group. Identity cards were issued on this basis, and these documents played a key role in the genocide of For example, Varshney highlights that in the s "racial violence in the USA was heavily concentrated in northern cities; southern cities though intensely politically engaged, did not have riots". Scholars of ethnic conflict and civil wars have introduced theories that draw insights from all three traditional schools of thought. In *The Geography of Ethnic Violence*, for example, Monica Duffy Toft shows how ethnic group settlement patterns, socially constructed identities, charismatic leaders, issue indivisibility, and state concern with precedent setting can lead rational actors to escalate a dispute to violence, even when doing so is likely to leave contending groups much worse off. As Varshney notes, "pure essentialists and pure instrumentalists do not exist anymore". At the end of the Cold War, academics including Samuel P. Huntington and Robert D. Kaplan predicted a proliferation of conflicts fueled by civilisational clashes , Tribalism , resource scarcity and overpopulation. Conflicts have involved secessionist movements in the former Yugoslavia , Transnistria in Moldova , Armenians in Azerbaijan , Abkhaz and Ossetians in Georgia. Research shows that the fall of Communism and the increase in the number of capitalist states were accompanied by a decline in total warfare, interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, and the number of refugees and displaced persons. If true, general explanations of ethnic violence would be impossible. In the years since, however, scholarly consensus has shifted to consider that ethnic groups may in fact be counted as rational actors, and the puzzle of their apparently irrational actions for example, fighting over territory of little or no intrinsic worth must therefore be explained in some other way. Public goods provision[ edit ] A major source of ethnic conflict in multi-ethnic democracies is over the access to state patronage. Conflicts over state resources between ethnic groups can increase the likelihood of ethnic violence. In ethnically divided societies, demand for public goods decreases as each ethnic group derives more utility from benefits targeted at their ethnic group in particular. Targeted benefits are more appealing because ethnic groups can solidify or heighten their social and economic status relative to other ethnic groups whereas broad programmatic policies will not improve their relative worth. Politicians and political parties in turn, have an incentive to favor co-ethnics in

their distribution of material benefits. Over the long run, ethnic conflict over access to state benefits is likely to lead to the ethnification of political parties and the party system as a whole where the political salience of ethnic identity increase leading to a self-fulfilling equilibrium: If politicians only distribute benefits on an ethnic basis, voters will see themselves primarily belonging to an ethnic group and view politicians the same way. They will only vote for the politician belonging to the same ethnic group. In turn, politicians will refrain from providing public goods because it will not serve them well electorally to provide services to people not belonging to their ethnic group. In democratizing societies, this could lead to ethnic outbidding and lead to extreme politicians pushing out moderate co-ethnics. The dependence of ethnic groups on their co-ethnic local politician for access to state resources is likely to make them more responsive to calls of violence against other ethnic groups. To identify possible causal stories, Humphreys and Habyarimana ran a series of behavioral games in Kampala, Uganda that involved several local participants completing joint tasks and allocating money amongst them. Humphreys and Habyarimana argue that cooperation among co-ethnics is primarily driven by reciprocity norms that tend to be stronger among co-ethnics. The authors find no evidence to suggest that co-ethnics display a greater degree of altruism towards each other or have the same preferences. Ethnic cooperation takes place because co-ethnics have common social networks and therefore can monitor each other and can threaten to socially sanction any transgressors. John Coakley, for example, has developed a typology of the methods of conflict resolution that have been employed by states, which he lists as: With increasing interest in the field of ethnic conflict, many policy analysts and political scientists theorized potential resolutions and tracked the results of institutional policy implementation. As such, theories often focus on which Institutions are the most appropriate for addressing ethnic conflict. Each nation or ethnic group is represented in the government through a supposed spokesman for the group. In the power sharing agreement, each group has veto powers to varying degrees, dependent on the particular state. Moreover, the norm of proportional representation is dominant: Many scholars [16] [38] maintain that since ethnic tension erupts into ethnic violence when the ethnic group is threatened by a state, then veto powers should allow the ethnic group to avoid legislative threats. Switzerland is often characterized as a successful consociationalist state. A tripartite presidency was chosen and must have a Croat, a Serb, and a Bosniak. The presidents take turns acting as the forefront executive in terms of 8 months for 4 years. This assumes a primordial stance that ethnic identities are permanent and not subject to change. In power sharing-systems that are based on pre-determined identities, there is a tendency to rigidly fix shares of representation on a permanent basis which will not reflect changing demographics over time. The inherent weaknesses in using pre-determined ethnic identities to form power sharing systems has led Ljiphart to argue that adopting a constructivist approach to consociationalism can increase its likelihood of success. Ljiphart claims that because ethnic identities are often "unclear, fluid and flexible," [9] self-determination is likely to be more successful than pre-determination of ethnic groups. A constructivist approach to consociational theory can therefore strengthen its value as a method to resolve ethnic conflict. Another critique points to the privileging of ethnic identity over personal political choice. This might lead to the polarization of ethnic groups and the loss of non-ethnic ideological parties. Federalism[ edit ] The theory of implementing federalism in order to curtail ethnic conflict assumes that self-governance reduces "demands for sovereignty". In this sense, special privileges are granted to specific minority groups as concessions and incentives to end violence or mute conflict. The sub-state was named after a titular minority who inhabited the area as a way to Sovietize nationalist sentiments during the s. Moreover, federalism brings in the elites and ethnic entrepreneurs into the central power structure; this prevents a resurgence of top-down ethnic conflict. Nevertheless, after the fall of the USSR many critiques of federalism as an institution to resolve ethnic conflict emerged. The devolution of power away from the central state can weaken ties to the central state. These competing elites can gain access through federal structures and their resources to solidify their political power in the structure. Gagnon this was the case in the former Yugoslavia and its violent disintegration into its ethno-federal sub-states. Ethnic entrepreneurs were able to take control of the institutionally allocated resources to wage war on other ethnic groups. NTA has emerged in recent years as an alternative solution to ethnic tensions and grievances in places that are likely to breed conflict. Their group rights and autonomy are not constrained to a particular territory within the state. This is

done in order not to weaken the center state such as in the case of ethnofederalism. Despite similar levels of ethnic diversity in a country, some towns and cities have often found to be especially prone to ethnic violence. For example, Ashutosh Varshney, in his study of ethnic violence in India , argues that strong inter-ethnic engagement in villages often disincentivizes politicians from stoking ethnic violence for electoral gain. Formal inter-ethnic associations[ edit ] However, in cities, where the population tends to be much higher, informal interactions between ethnic groups might not be sufficient to prevent violence. This is because many more links are needed to connect everyone, and therefore it is much more difficult to form and strengthen inter-ethnic ties. For example, inter-ethnic business organizations serve to connect the business interests of different ethnic groups which would increase their desire to maintain ethnic harmony. Any ethnic tension or outbreak of violence will go against their economic interests and therefore, over time, the salience of ethnic identity diminishes. Interactions between ethnic groups in formal settings can also help countries torn apart by ethnic violence to recover and break down ethnic divisions. Paula Pickering, a political scientist, who studies peace-building efforts in Bosnia, finds that formal workplaces are often the site where inter-ethnic ties are formed.