

The United Front—The Key to Our New Tactical Orientation

By EARL BROWDER

(Report to the November Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.U.S.A.)

COMRADES, we open this Plenum of the Central Committee with the main political report already before the Party. This is in the form of the Seventh World Congress reports. Chief of these is Dimitroff's report, of which over 400,000 copies have already been distributed in this country. The proposed application of the line of the Congress to the U.S.A., which was submitted to the Congress by the American delegation and approved, has also been in the hands of the Party for many weeks. Oral reports by the returned delegates have been made to packed halls in almost all of the important cities. In these meetings we had a mass demonstration of approval of the Seventh World Congress decisions on a scale unprecedented in our movement.

Thus, the basic preparatory work of our plenum is thoroughly done. The line is clearly laid down. The enthusiastic endorsement by our Party has been completely expressed. What we must do at this Plenum is to proceed deeper and in more detail to the application of this line to the concrete problems of our movement, and to discuss as thoroughly as time will permit all of the tasks of applying this line in everyday life, of meeting and overcoming all the difficulties, answering all of the arguments that arise in the minds of our Party members, our sympathizers, and of the broad masses generally.

First, of course, we must again speak about the significance of the Seventh World Congress and again evaluate this Congress in the light of its effect upon our movement, and the outstanding feature of this Congress which becomes more and more apparent as time goes on.

THE NEW TACTICAL ORIENTATION FORMULATED BY THE COMINTERN

The Seventh World Congress formulated a new tactical orientation for our Party, an orientation suited to the new developments in the world situation.

When we say that, we are met with two sorts of arguments

from certain quarters. The general type of these arguments is indicated, on the one hand, by those who say: "So, you admit that your old orientation was wrong"; the second is, "Never mind 'new orientation'—that is bluff, the Communists have changed nothing".

The first argument says that by adopting a new tactical orientation the Communists are admitting, whether they want to or not, that their old tactical orientation was wrong and had to be changed because it was wrong. To this our answer is: Not at all. The Seventh World Congress formulated a new tactical line because new conditions have arisen, not because the old line was wrong. The Communists are Marxists, Leninists, Stalinists. We adopt such tactics as best suit the concrete conditions. We will adopt new tactics again when changing conditions will demand it. What Communists do not change, of course, is their strategic aim—the proletarian revolution and Socialism. Naturally, the Seventh World Congress made no change in that at all. On the contrary, it equipped the working class vanguard with such a tactical line as will enable them to fight most effectively for this aim in the present world situation.

If that second argument meant that the Communists did not change their revolutionary aim, we would have no differences with it. But those arguing that we have changed nothing mean to say that we have not changed our tactical orientation. They seek to question our sincerity in the matter of tactics. This is slander, designed to hamper the united front against fascism and war, which we must expose and reject. The essence of the new tactical orientation can be stated briefly:

The working class is now in a position to exercise a decisive influence upon the affairs of its own country, as well as upon world affairs. Can it be said that this was always the case? No, it cannot. A split working class could not undertake to exercise a decisive influence upon internal and external affairs. But a working class that is moving in the direction of united action, of unity—such a working class can. Further, the working class that was dragged along by reformism in the path of class collaboration, in the path of paving the way for fascism, of uniting with the bourgeoisie to suppress the revolutionary movement—such a working class could do nothing in its own interest. But a working class that is moving away from class collaboration, a movement participated in by ever larger numbers of Socialists, Socialist organizations, trade unions—such a working class can.

Clearly, the Seventh World Congress was basing itself upon a change of first rate importance in the world situation when it proceeded to ground its tactics upon the ability of the working class now to exercise a decisive influence upon affairs.

But this is not all. The final and irrevocable victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union strengthens immeasurably the positions of the workers throughout the world. That is undeniable. From this follows that the working class can now undertake bigger things for itself than it could in the past. Inspired and strengthened by the socialist successes in the Soviet Union, the workers in the capitalist world are gaining confidence in their own strength, their actual organized strength to carry on the struggle.

THE SOVIET UNION—THE BULWARK OF STRENGTH
AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR

Is it not clear that in the lineup against fascism the Soviet Union stands as the most powerful base of support? Is it not clear that in the lineup against war, for peace, for the oppressed and threatened rights of nationalities, for cultural development and freedom, the Soviet Union is the impregnable bulwark of strength? What has happened? These are some of the great changes taking place: the final victory of socialism has greatly strengthened the Soviet Union and the change in the working class described above (the movement towards unity and struggle) enables the working class to take advantage of the increased strength of the Soviet Union in order to carry on a decisive fight against war, fascism, and capitalism.

And then another change: the proved inability of the bourgeoisie to overcome the collapse of capitalist stabilization, its proved inability to make any progress towards overcoming the final crisis of the capitalist system. The victory of fascism in Germany, made possible by the surrender of Social-Democracy, was a great defeat of the working class; but Hitler did not solve the contradictions of German capitalism. Hitler could not and did not bring German capitalism out of the state of general crisis. He intensified the crisis and hence the general crisis of capitalism as a whole. Similarly with Mussolini and fascism everywhere. Everyone can now see that the outstanding "achievement" of fascism is the war on Ethiopia which threatens to become a new world war.

From this follows a new realization of the widest masses and toilers, who are beginning to realize much more than ever before, that, in the interests of mere self-preservation, they must begin a decisive fight to shift the burden of the crisis to the shoulders of the rich, to combat and liquidate fascism, to maintain and expand their rights and liberties, to fight against war and for peace.

That is why the Seventh World Congress formulated the new tactical orientation which sees the final and irrevocable victory of Socialism, the inability of the bourgeoisie to overcome the collapse of capitalist stabilization and the growing urge of the Socialists and

trade unionists for the united front—all these enabling the working class to carry on an active revolutionary policy, weakening the position of the bourgeoisie and strengthening the positions of the working class.

This is a policy of frustrating, not merely combatting, the offensive of the bourgeoisie against the toilers. It is a policy of checking, not merely resisting, the introduction of fascism. It is a policy of actually thwarting the imperialist designs of the bourgeoisie and its contemplated attack on the Soviet Union; not merely of propaganda against it.

From these considerations it is clear that the policy of the Seventh World Congress is profoundly opposed to the policy of reforming capitalism, profoundly opposed to any policy which makes the working class the tail end of the bourgeoisie. The policies of reformism have proved bankrupt, and ever larger numbers of workers in the reformist organizations are becoming convinced of this. From this it follows that the opportunities for winning the masses and their organizations for an active revolutionary policy are much greater now than before. It therefore follows also that the Communists must and can become an important political factor in the daily life of their country as well as in the life of the world.

But this objective will not be reached automatically. The conditions are now such that the Communists must and can assume responsibility for the fate and well being of the working class and of all toilers today and every day. This means, however, that we must break with the remnants of the old method of mere propaganda; it means that we must thoroughly eradicate all remnants of the old traditions that we are only an opposition that has little to offer the masses until the revolution becomes mature. It is true that we have already moved away from such conceptions. But in actual methods of approach and work, we still meet all too often the attitude of pure revolutionary opposition to the Socialist Party and to the reformist leaders of mass organizations of the workers. We must say: no, we are not merely a revolutionary opposition, we are a political Party whose aim is the proletarian revolution, Soviet power, and Socialism, and because of this we are advocates of an active revolutionary and practical policy for today and every day, a policy of the day which the American proletariat can accept as its own, and by so doing can exercise a decisive influence in the affairs of America and of the world.

What must we do? We must find that decisive link in the present class struggle which will enable us best to prepare the toilers for the coming great battles of the second round of revolutions. And what is that link? It is the united front against fascism and war.

FOR THE POLITICAL UNITY OF THE PROLETARIAT

The new tactical orientation of the Seventh World Congress—this is the link that will lead us to the next link, the united party of the proletariat. It is the link that will fuse the proletariat into a single mass political army and will insure its victory in the struggle against fascism, against the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the power of the Soviets.

This gives us also the line and methods for the propaganda of Communism, of the principles of Marxism-Leninism in the present period. Those who say that we want to gloss over our differences with reformism are obviously falsifying. We want to convince the workers that reformism is wrong and that Communism is right. But we want to do this in a new way, in a better way; a way made possible by the changed conditions and by our new tactical orientation.

And what is that way? It is to propagate Communism on the basis of the experiences of the united front which lays the basis for political unity of the proletariat. It is the way of helping the Socialists and trade unionists who are moving in the direction of class struggle to reach the acceptance of Leninism on the basis of their own experience in the class struggle and in the united front.

It is clear that the tactics of the Seventh World Congress give us a most powerful weapon for the building and strengthening of the Communist Party, for the development of broader and better Bolshevik cadres and for the realization of the political unity of the proletariat. But in order to use this weapon effectively, we must eradicate all vestiges of sectarianism. The Seventh Congress and Comrade Dimitroff in his report had some very harsh words to say about sectarian habits, about stereotyped and mechanical approaches and methods in our work. We must do away with these things. They are the main obstacles in our path. At the same time we must be vigilantly on guard against Right opportunist tendencies, a tendency to get lost among the masses, to become dispersed. These will occur, no doubt. And the freer we can make ourselves from sectarianism, the better we will ward off these Right opportunist dangers. What we need is more initiative; greater ability to apply in a living way the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; political alertness and tactical flexibility. All these are inseparably linked up with firmness in the prosecution of our revolutionary aim and boundless loyalty to our revolutionary principles and to our Party.

You are already acquainted with the practical and effective policies for trade union unity worked out by the Congress. Here it is important to recognize the tremendous effect these decisions already have had. The movement for trade union unity nationally and inter-

nationally has received an enormous push forward. We can see it in France, where unity is about to be concluded. We can see it in the strengthening of the demand for trade union unity by the rank and file, by genuine progressive trade unionists everywhere.

Another thing should be emphasized: the united front between Socialists and Communists exercises a powerful influence in speeding up trade union unity. It is beyond doubt one of the most potent means of strengthening the proletariat against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and war.

There will be a special report on the Sixth World Congress of the Young Communist International. It is necessary, however, in my report, to point out the tremendous importance attached by the Comintern Congress to the task of uniting the toiling youth in the struggle against fascism and war. This is a crucial task from which follow serious duties of the Communist Party to help the Young Communist League to achieve the change in its character which is dictated by the present circumstances.

It is clear that the most important task of the Young Communist League is to help create a genuine non-party mass youth organization embracing the Communist youth, Socialist, Negro, pacifist, religious organizations, etc., in which all members would be educated in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. The conditions in the United States are quite mature for such an organization. The united front between the Young Communist League and the Young People's Socialist League, and organic unity will prove the most effective way of bringing about the widest non-party mass youth organization. It is clear, however, that the Young Communist League will have to reconstruct radically its work in order to achieve these correct aims. It will be the task of the Communist Party to render the maximum help to the Young Communist League along these lines.

Now, I want to discuss some of the developing aspects of the struggle for peace and for the defense of the Soviet Union, on the basis of applying the line of the Seventh Congress to the current problems of the day which are being discussed among all the workers. It is no longer necessary to convince the masses about the immediate danger of war. This is now universally recognized.

The problem now facing all who want peace is how to stop the war against Ethiopia; how to postpone or prevent the spread of this war to the whole world; and if it spreads in spite of all our efforts, how to insure the isolation and defeat of the fascist instigators of war. It is also clear that the war of Italian fascism against Ethiopia threatens to become the prelude of the new world war. From such a war the capitalists of the United States will not keep out, despite

all assurances to the contrary. Like a beast of prey, the German fascists are watching for the moment to jump at Lithuania, to grab Memel and to open up a criminal counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. And in the Far East the military forces of Japan already feel emboldened to proceed with their designs to separate China, have fortified their military outposts in Central China for a counter-revolutionary attack against the Soviet Union.

Is it not plain as daylight that if the forces of peace do not make a supreme and united effort, fascism will surely bring on a new world war? What are the basic forces in the fight for peace? The working class first of all—the head of the toiling masses in the capitalist and colonial countries, and in that country in which the working class holds power, the Soviet Union. To these main forces are rallied the peoples of the weaker nations whose independence is threatened especially by Hitler fascism. And lastly, the revolutionary use of the imperialist contradictions in the interests of peace.

Can anyone doubt today that the Soviet Union tries with all its might to prevent war? Can anyone doubt that the Soviet Union is the chief bulwark for peace in the world, not because it is weak, but precisely because it has grown strong and powerful, and demonstrates that Socialism means peace, in contrast to fascism, which is the chief threat of war? The Soviet Union participates in the collective efforts to avoid war taken by the League of Nations. It must be clear, however, that the Soviet Union does so with different motives from those of Great Britain. It has no selfish interests of its own, it has no Lake Tana to preserve under its hegemony, no sea route to colonies to protect against rivals. The sole interest of the Soviet Union, as the country of Socialism, is to preserve humanity from the supreme calamity of imperialist war. All the more shameful therefore are the slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union being carried on now by the "Old Guard" leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the Socialist Party, those who work hand in glove with Hearst, at the moment when the Soviet Union is contributing most powerfully to peace. All the more shameful is the role of the present administration, following in Hearst's steps, by inciting the war-making nations, Japan and Germany, against the U.S.S.R. through the recent Hull note. The American workers, and especially the trade unions, and all friends of peace, should recall the fact that following Hull's note, William Green demanded that the government break off its relations with the Soviet Union. That is the way of William Green and Woll to fight for peace, inciting for war against the country where the workers rule, and which is fighting to secure peace. One might ask Green a pertinent question: Since you seem to be in such a hurry to break off relations with

other countries, why not try it first on Mussolini, whose war you have condemned? Why don't you try it on Hitler, or the fascist-military clique of Japan? Is it because that would not suit Hearst, and the Liberty League, and the Civic Federation?

THE UNITED FRONT—THE CHIEF REQUIREMENT OF THE
PROLETARIAN PEACE POLICY

The working class of the world, rallying behind it the support of the farmers and all toiling masses, is the only class that can stop war and can prevent war from spreading. It is the only force that by its independent struggle against imperialist governments can utilize the League of Nations as a partial and temporary instrument for peace through the application of sanctions on Italy. The slow and weak character of the steps taken by the League of Nations in declaring Italy the aggressor, and in setting sanctions in motion, prevents the League of Nations from exerting full power to bring a speedy conclusion of the war. Yet these actions, slow and weak as they were, were useful steps in the fight against fascist warmongers—these actions were brought about under pressure of the masses, and helped mobilize the masses for peace. But nothing would be more dangerous than to rely on the powers in the League determinedly to carry out these sanctions, and thus give a deadly blow to Mussolini. No one can be sure that the secret negotiations going on behind the scenes, between Great Britain, France, and Hitler, may not at any moment be consummated and thus encourage, not only Mussolini, but Hitler and Japan to plunge the whole world into war. The conclusions of this cannot be to withhold the struggle for League sanctions, but must be a more determined struggle of the masses for sanctions, making more difficult their abandonment by the imperialists and above all to carry out independently, by the working class, the imposition of sanctions, through the stoppage of all shipments to Italy, by working class sanctions, and a working class blockade. It is this independent action by the toiling masses on the basis of the united front to isolate the fascist warmakers that will be the crucial test of true proletarian peace policy. To compel League sanctions by mass struggle is important, but it is a subordinate and secondary thing. But this is not the understanding of the leaders of the British Labor Party and of "our own" reactionaries, the "Old Guard" of the Socialist Party. These people are waging war against the chief requirement of the proletarian peace policy—the united front.

Is it not fully clear that without a united front there can be no proletarian peace policy and no effective struggle for peace? More-

over, these same people reject the united front in favor of collaboration with their own imperialist bourgeoisie, with the result that their so-called struggle for peace turns out to be in fact a "struggle" in support of the imperialist interests of the British government, of the American imperialists, and so on. It is a policy that offers no effective opposition to war and makes the workers the tail end of imperialism.

Nor can we be satisfied with the decisions of the 55th Convention of the American Federation of Labor. There was a unanimous desire for peace at this Convention. Even Woll and Hutchison were for peace. What else could they do? The working class is for peace and against the fascist warmakers. This is a fact of the utmost importance. The question is how shall the American masses fight most effectively for peace. The answer given by the 55th Convention of the American Federation of Labor was not satisfactory. The convention floor gave support to the neutrality policy of the Roosevelt government and endorsed support of the British government by the British trade unions. They endorsed also the Labor and Socialist International's policy of supporting the League of Nations. What is the essence of the position of the 55th Convention? They told Roosevelt: go ahead with your policies and we will support you. But is it not clear that Roosevelt has no consistent policy of peace? This is shown in his stoppage of shipments; and yet cotton, etc., raw materials are shipped for war. It does not enable Ethiopia to secure anything necessary for carrying on a defense against the aggressions of Mussolini. It has not brought about collaboration for peace between the United States and the Soviet Union which would immeasurably strengthen the struggle for peace. It is therefore clear that, while we must utilize Roosevelt's peace moves in order to isolate the Hearst-Liberty League warmongers and to compel the American government to adopt more effective peace measures to strengthen the fight of the masses for peace, it would be a fatal mistake to depend upon Roosevelt and, depending upon Roosevelt, to reject the slogan of "Not a ship, not a train to Italian fascism", to be enforced by the masses themselves, and thus make the working class the tail end of American imperialism.

The most important thing the American Federation of Labor can do to fight for peace is to organize and lead the workers to stop all shipments to and from Italy. That the American Federation of Labor workers will follow such a lead is indicated by the action of the American Federation of Labor unions on the Pacific Coast which carried out such a policy.

It must be realized that the things shipped to Mussolini are materials to make possible his criminal war. I am glad to state on

this basic point there is full agreement between us and the militant Socialists led by Norman Thomas who come out for an absolute embargo on goods that will help Mussolini's conquest. However, it must also be realized that such an embargo can be brought about only by the united front of the workers and all toilers and, in the first necessity, the united front between the Socialist Party and the Communist Party. The masses in the United States have a strong fear of being drawn again, as in 1917, into a world war. Starting from this fact, some sincere opponents of imperialist war, among them the Leftward moving majority of the Socialist Party under the leadership of Norman Thomas, placed the whole question of struggle against war as keeping the United States out of it. But is this a proper placing of this question? Are our memories so short? This was precisely the slogan under which Wilson was reelected in 1916. And in April, 1917, he plunged our country into a bloody war. Was it not clear that it was this very slogan in 1916 which was an essential means of getting the United States into war? And why? Because the only possible way of keeping America out is to keep the world out and to combine all the anti-war forces of the United States with similar forces throughout the world—including the Soviet Union, which Norman Thomas still refuses to say is a force for peace—in a spirited struggle against every step in the development of war, whether it is a step taken by our own or another imperialist government. The idea that the United States can be kept out of war by a policy of isolation from the rest of the world must be examined more closely. The origin of this idea comes back from the days when imperialism was beginning in America, fighting to establish itself as an independent nation. In those bygone days, Washington's policy of no foreign entanglements served the interests of the then progressive American bourgeoisie. But it is not to be supposed that America was following the policy of isolation even in those days. It was successfully utilizing the contradiction between France and England to strengthen the struggle for national independence. Complete isolation we never had. It was at no time possible. We had a policy of no permanent alliance with any country or group of countries. What we did have was petty bourgeois illusions about the possibility of complete isolation.

But even in the carrying out of no permanent alliance, Washington's dictum of no permanent entanglements was broken down by the capitalists in the United States. The Monroe Doctrine is one example, the Open Door policy in China another. Why? Because these policies and doctrines had launched American capitalism on its career of expansion, subsequently turned into political conquest, and thus brought this country into the midst of imperialist rivalries and

foreign entanglements—the Spanish-American war followed by the world imperialist war of 1914-1918.

What was there left of the doctrine of no foreign entanglements? Nothing except the illusions of isolation which are being played upon by the reactionary imperialists and warmongers.

We must therefore distinguish between the isolationist illusions of certain sections of the toilers, especially the Middle Western farmers, and the isolation demagoguery of the Hearsts, Coughlins, etc. When the masses speak of isolation, they mean peace. When Hearst, Coughlin and Co. speak of isolation, they mean war. They seek to exploit the very peace sentiments of the American masses for war against the colonial peoples and the Soviet Union, which we must expose most energetically and at the same time show the masses and sincere pacifists that their correct desire to keep America out of war can be accomplished and fought for effectively, not by dreams of isolation, not by following the line of Hearst-Coughlin, not by tying ourselves up with Roosevelt's half-hearted inconsistent policy which in Central and South America was a policy of war provocation, but by following an active, consistent and truly international policy of peace. We must patiently explain to the masses that the only way of seriously fighting against the involvement of the United States in war is by the independent mobilization of the workers, farmers, and middle class against every help to the warmakers, while making use for this purpose also of the League of Nations sanctions and Roosevelt's proclamations, and demand their complete application.

DANGERS AGAINST WHICH WE MUST GUARD IN PURSUING OUR PROLETARIAN PEACE POLICY

We must also differentiate very sharply the internationalist proletarian policy of peace from the so-called international imperialist and pro-League of Nations policy of certain sections of American finance capital. There is a move on the part of some monopolists advocated most strongly in the *New York Times* to bring about closer collaboration between the United States and the League of Nations. Renewed efforts in this direction by certain sections of the bourgeoisie arise from the realization that the status quo on a world scale could be best preserved by joining the League or at least by collaboration with it. This tendency expresses the desire of strong, perhaps dominant, sections of the bourgeoisie, to preserve peace for the moment. Roosevelt, as is evident, moves hesitatingly in this direction. It is clear that this so-called internationalism is imperialist and fundamentally different from our proletarian internationalism, the only true internationalism. And this we must make clear to the masses beyond any doubt. At the same time the question arises, can the Amer-

ican workers and in what way can they utilize for their own peace policy these peace tendencies and contradictions within the bourgeoisie—for example, the contradiction expressed by the *New York Times* on one hand and the Hearst-Coughlin group on the other. The answer is yes, we can; we must try to utilize it and we can be successful, despite the doubts of Comrade Thomas, if we are to do it in a Leninist-Stalinist way. This way demands, first, independent action of the masses through the united front against war and fascism and imperialist aims. This way demands, secondly, complete abandonment of policies of class collaboration and an energetic policy of class struggle. This way demands, thirdly, the propagation of the correct Stalinist view of the League of Nations as a slight impediment to the fascist warmongers. This way demands, fourthly, the exposure of the reformist view that the League of Nations is a cure for war and that the workers should confine themselves to supporting the League. And, fifthly, we must demand cooperation for peace between the United States and the Soviet Union as the very basis and essence of any policy of United States collaboration with the League of Nations.

Only in this way can the American workers and toilers pursue an independent, effective and truly international peace policy, a policy that aims to keep the United States out of war. Only in this way can we act against the two dangers that are becoming most acute—one, the American masses becoming victims to the isolationism of Hearst-Coughlin, and, two, the danger of becoming the tail end of Wall Street internationalists.

We don't, of course, seek to have a big debate with Comrade Thomas and the Left Socialists on the question of sanctions. From what we already agree on, there is sufficient basis for a fruitful united front in the struggle for peace. Moreover, we are firmly convinced that such united mass action will do more to remove doubt from the minds of the doubters than any kind of debate. However, when the question is up for discussion, we are in duty bound to do the following. First, the objections to demanding League sanctions are in truth not objections to our way, the revolutionary way, but to the reformist way of supporting the League and the imperialist governments. Second, Thomas' doubts on the question of sanctions arise not so much from a revolutionary and proletarian class position as from certain pacifist and isolationist illusions together with his refusal to understand the peace policy of the Soviet Union. By working to remove these pacifist and isolationist illusions in the course of working for the united front, we shall find the common language and common policy also on these questions.

Much has been said by our enemies to discredit the peace policy

of the Soviet Union, especially what is called its diplomacy. We must say to those who attack the Soviet peace policy that this becomes the last resort to help the fascist warmakers. But all this slander will be in vain; because the Soviet Union's unselfish and consistent struggle for peace is so convincing that no amount of misrepresentation can obscure for any length of time for large masses the realization that to support the peace policies of the Soviet Union is the most effective way of fighting for peace.

Much also has been said by our enemies to discredit the peace strategy of the Seventh Congress of the C.I., especially its rallying call to the toilers of all countries to defend the Soviet Union, the bulwark of socialism and peace. We must say that no matter how much misrepresentation and slander are directed against this slogan, it is unable to obscure for the masses the main idea, that idea from which everything else flows, the idea which is more and more enthusiastically received by growing numbers of workers and toilers throughout the world, not only Communists and sympathizers, Socialists, non-party trade unionists and others — the plain, crystal clear, world-shaking proposition which says: "If the commencement of a counter-revolutionary war forces the Soviet Union to set the workers' and peasants' Red Army in motion for the defense of socialism, then the Communists will call upon all toilers to work with all means at their disposal and at any price for the victory of the Red Army over the armies of the imperialists."

The defeat of fascism and thereby of the warmakers must be brought about by the uprising of the masses under the fascist oppression. This uprising will be greatly stimulated and made easier, as in Italy for example now, if a great international peace action would compel the League of Nations to proceed determinedly with sanctions against the aggressor, and bring about his shameful defeat, and if thereby the Italian workers are inspired to fight against the system which brings them misery and death. This blow against Mussolini would become a blow against Nazi Germany and military fascism in Japan, these chief menaces of the peace of the world.

This is one possible course of development. The other which is possible, if the masses do not intervene to prevent it, is the course of the bargain between Britain and Italy, which will enable Mussolini to retreat in good order, to reconsolidate his regime, and thus encourage Hitler and the Japanese firebrands to proceed in their attempt to remold the world in their own image.

What practical tasks follow from this examination of the war dangers? We would summarize the practical tasks of the day in six points:

1. To secure the adoption of resolutions condemning the fascist

warmakers and declaring support of their victims, in all trade unions and all other organizations of workers, farmers, and middle classes, in churches, schools, clubs, etc., everywhere. This is the first, most simple, most immediate and universally applicable line of struggle for peace.

2. To organize mass meetings, demonstrations, parades of all kinds, small and large. To popularize and dramatize this anti-war program and bring it sharply to the attention of masses not yet aware of the issues.

3. To place emphatically before the President and Congress, by means of these actions, the demand for enforcement of a complete embargo on trade and loans for Italy.

4. To do everything possible to bring together all the peace forces in every locality, and in the nation, into a great concentration for peace, into a great National Congress for peace and against war and fascism. For this purpose we must mobilize support everywhere for the coming Third United States Congress Against War and Fascism to take place in Cleveland on January 3, 4 and 5. This great anti-war congress, which already represents the largest united front ever built in America, is of the most strategic importance at the present time. No one can be said to be doing his duty in the fight against war unless he is actively participating in building up a great, broad representation to the Third United States Congress against war and fascism.

5. To begin independent action of the workers to stop all shipments to Italy. This can be begun in a small way and can be developed by a series of small actions, decisive actions which will influence the whole world. Those who doubt the efficacy of small actions should remember the historic case of the tearing down of the Nazi flag from the steamship *Bremen*, that shook the whole world and is still the subject of conversation among all the masses in Germany and in Europe.

6. To secure united action between Socialists and Communists in the United States and to call upon the Second International to accept the proposals of the Communist International for world-wide united action against war.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RECENT ELECTIONS

Now we take up the examination of the meaning of the 1935 election results.

This year in American politics was essentially one of gathering of forces, of beginning their realignment, maneuvering for position in preparation for the decisive 1936 Presidential elections. Two things are outstanding: (1) the sharpening struggle within the bour-

geoisie and, most important, the further and more rapid crystallization of the reactionary camp with strong incipient fascist tendencies (the Liberty League and Hearst group); (2) the growth of the forces that are taking up the formation of a Farmer-Labor Party.

It is becoming more evident every day; also to American finance capital, that improvement in the economic situation does not signify the lessening of the general crisis of capitalism. Whether or not the New Deal contributed anything to the rising curve of business, the fact remains that unemployment has not materially decreased. Agriculture continues in crisis, foreign trade shows no signs of improvement. In addition, Japanese military penetration in China has blocked for the time United States imperialist expansion, and even in Latin America, the private preserves of Yankee imperialism, Britain, and lately Japan, are stubbornly challenging further American expansion.

From these facts certain conclusions are being drawn by large sections of monopoly capital, especially the groups around the Morgan and Du Pont interests, the interests which are decisive forces in the American Liberty League. What are these conclusions?

First, that Roosevelt's policies do not any more meet the situation, and that Roosevelt must be replaced by some one who can do the job for capitalism better.

Second, that more determined efforts must be made to reduce the standards of living of the masses in order to cheapen the cost of production, balance the budget, and take government out of business.

Third and most important, that this must and can be achieved only by the sharpest attack against the masses by the open and brutal methods of reaction, fascist methods of war, and, in general, an iron hand against the toiling masses, against their organizations.

This program, as is well known, finds complete support from the Manufacturers' Association, the Chambers of Commerce, Bankers Association, etc. These reactionary groups concentrating in the one camp are trying to bring fascism into the United States. They already indicate that they will stop at nothing to achieve their reactionary aim. They will make the utmost effort to defeat Roosevelt in 1936 and to place an administration in power that will carry through this program to the full satisfaction of Morgan, DuPont, General Motors, Hearst and Company. Roosevelt, of course, seeks to achieve fundamentally the same class objectives as his Right opponents. But, as is well known, he is pursuing a different path and is necessarily basing himself upon different groups within the bourgeoisie, seeking to retain the support of the workers, farmers, and middle class. It would be a mistake to underestimate the importance of the differences of Roosevelt's policy. It also would be a mistake to think that Roose-

velt has no basis among the finance capitalists, for he has such a basis. He is the spokesman, primarily, of the large independents and monopoly groups which are in conflict with the Morgan interests. What is necessary to emphasize today is that Roosevelt continues to hold his mass base of farmers and workers. He is trying to accomplish this end by some tangible concessions to the well-to-do farmers and very niggardly concessions to the workers. It is precisely this fact that presents us with the problem of winning the masses away from Roosevelt as well as combatting the dangerous possibilities of certain sections of the masses who, becoming disillusioned in Roosevelt, have returned to the Republicans.

The danger of growing fascism in the United States cannot and must not be underestimated. The material and political resources of the big monopolists and bankers behind the Liberty League and Hearst are tremendous. They are developing the wildest demagoguery on all fronts. They attack Roosevelt on his spending program and liberalism to trade unions in order to gain the ear of the bourgeoisie and some sections of the petty-bourgeoisie. They also attack Roosevelt for his inability to solve the unemployment situation in order to gain the ear of the disillusioned workers. They attack Roosevelt for the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, and the processing tax in order to win the support of the manufacturers and capitalists. At the same time they attack Roosevelt for his failure to improve conditions of farmers in order to gain the support of the farmers themselves. It is not to be supposed that the masses are not falling victim to the demagoguery of the Liberty League and Hearst. It would be a fatal mistake to think that it would have no effect on the masses. To expose, therefore, the interests behind Roosevelt's Right opponents and Hearst, to show the fascist plans of these and the danger that they carry for the masses is a political task of the first importance.

Another matter that must not be overlooked is the fact that the very reliance of large masses upon Roosevelt, as an effective check against the coming of the Liberty League to power, works into the hands of the Liberty League itself. Our task is not only to show the masses where the danger of fascism comes from but, what is most important, to convince them that Roosevelt, while no longer as in 1933-34 representing also the main fascist camp, still is not working against it, but is no obstacle to the growth of fascist forces. Roosevelt's entire record proves that.

It should therefore be clear that in the further development of the Farmer-Labor movement which is growing on all sides, one of our central tasks is to convince the masses that they can place no dependence upon Roosevelt. They must build their own Party—a Farmer-Labor Party—in order to combat and fight effectively

against the dangers confronting them. We must prove to the masses that only a Farmer-Labor Party will challenge the policies of the Liberty League and both capitalist parties. Only such a Party will be able to shift the burden of the crisis on the rich, on the monopolists, will be able to check the capitalist attacks and frustrate the attacks of fascism and prevent war. It is necessary to add that both capitalist parties realize the danger for them in the emergence of a Farmer-Labor Party and are doing all in their power by different means to check the growth of such a Party.

The elections show these two main features: first, the growing mass disillusionment in the two old parties, and specifically, with the New Deal. The masses did not yet make a break with old alliances. There was to be seen the dangerous tendency for the growing discontent to return to the channels of the two-party system—be returning to the Republicans. But it would be a great mistake to see only this.

The second chief feature was that where a strong effort was made by drawing in a substantial part of the trade union movement, placing it in the lead of the broad mass discontent, and giving the masses the feeling that they had a chance to win, there labor registered a really serious labor opposition to the New Deal and the Republicans. While the Communist Party vote increased everywhere in no case less than 25 per cent, and often many times more, yet in such localities where the Communists participated in broader united front efforts, there the masses responded on a tenfold scale and more.

This is seen especially in Detroit, Reading, Bridgeport, Toledo and many smaller places. On the other hand, in the center of the strongest organization of the trade unions, of the Socialists and the Communist Party, in New York City, where there was no possibility of united effort in the elections because of the reactionary policies of the Old Guard in control of the Socialist Party, here the Socialist Party lost even more than the Communist Party gained, while the masses voted even more than before for the two old parties. While in New York we must note this as a sign of the fact that the Communist Party in relation to that of the Socialist Party advanced in the past few years from a ratio of about 1 to 10, up to a position of approximate equality, yet we can by no means be satisfied with this, in the midst of a national crisis which calls for a united Socialist and Communist effort to lead and organize the masses solidly against growing reaction and fascism. The vacillating supporters of the Farmer-Labor Party, as well as the open opponents, are emphasizing the first feature, that the masses did not break with the old two-party system, and sneer at the significance of the fact that in important centers such a break did take place. To such an argument we

must answer: we do not expect the masses to break spontaneously with the old parties without leadership any more than we expect the workers spontaneously to organize trade unions without leaders and organizers. What can we expect so long as the leadership existing in the influential organizations among the workers and farmers continue openly to support the old parties, or, like the Old Guard Socialist Party leaders fight more bitterly against every effort of the united front than against the capitalist parties. What can we expect so long as Green's argument demands that the American Federation of Labor go into a Labor Party movement only after the workers are convinced and when they force the unions into the movement, but himself does nothing to lead them in this direction, but, on the contrary, proposes to expel the Communists? What can we expect when the militant Socialist Party leaders who are for a Labor Party waver and hesitate under the pressure of the Old-Guard and Green bureaucracy?

THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY WILL BE BUILT
ONLY THROUGH STRUGGLE

The Farmer-Labor Party will not be born spontaneously. It must be led and organized by a united front coalition of the most advanced workers and toilers. The building of the Farmer-Labor Party is not a question of weeks and years of quiet philosophical discussion until we clear up every question in advance. This is an urgent bread-and-butter question of the day. The Farmer-Labor Party is a question of gathering the forces of the toiling masses for the daily struggles for bread, for wages, for relief and insurance, for democratic rights, against the rising tide of reaction. This is a struggle which cannot be postponed, except at the cost of a shameful surrender to fascism, at the cost of a shattering of living standards, the wiping out of all organizations of toilers, even trade unions, and a period of terror and reaction in America.

Opponents of the Farmer-Labor Party argue: But look at the menacing fascist combination of the American Liberty League, Hearst, etc., all around the Republican Party. This most reactionary camp attacks Roosevelt and the New Deal from the Right, even more sharply than it does those on the Left, even calling him a Communist. Don't you see that the Farmer-Labor Party now will play into the hands of the Old Guard of the grand old party of reaction? No, they say, we must instead rally around Roosevelt, unsatisfactory as he is, as the only bulwark against reaction and fascism.

It is true that the most reactionary capitalist circles have formed a combination to the Right of Roosevelt and fight against his administration in the sharpest way. In this they are guided by three main

aims. First, they want to prepare an alternative administration more Right, more openly fascist, more able to attack the living standards of the masses. Second, they want to force Roosevelt more to the Right, to abandon even more the promises of social security, and of course they are determined that these should never be granted. Their efforts to move Roosevelt to the Right have met with good success. Third, they want to discredit the Socialists and Communists by identifying them in the public mind with the shameful New Deal, while themselves, having already nabbed the profits of the New Deal, clear their own skirts of the whole responsibility for it and divert the disillusionment of the masses towards the Right, into the channels of semi-fascist and fascist reaction against Roosevelt. Can the toiling masses defeat these three main aims of the Liberty League, by coming to the support of Roosevelt? No, that is impossible. Even the recent American Federation of Labor Convention had to register the fact of growing reaction, political oppression, misery, starvation, now under Roosevelt. The very non-radical John L. Lewis after the convention found it necessary to issue the threat of a national general strike to halt the increasing murder of striking miners in the Southern cities, the basis of Mr. Roosevelt's administration. Under Roosevelt, the company unions made the greatest gains in history; and now precisely when Roosevelt has lost the support of finance capital which he enjoyed in the first period when his administration was supported by all the leading forces leading to fascism and reaction, it is precisely now that from leaning to the Left, Roosevelt moves more to the Right, to the way outlined by the dictates of the camp which attack him most sharply.

We cannot fight against reaction by supporting Roosevelt, whose whole strategy of fighting against reaction consists in making one concession after another to it, and who maintains not one single fixed struggle against the Right.

You give over unconditionally the support of the masses, in return for empty promises. When Roosevelt spit in your face, you looked up at the sky and complained that the weather was getting bad. This is what you recommend to us as a means of fighting against reaction.

This is the method of fighting reaction which was followed in Germany, and which led to the victory of Hitler. And the present trend revealed in the elections—where large masses gave a victory to the reactionary Republican Party, with its Liberty League, Hearst allies, etc.—must serve as a flaming danger signal that the same thing will happen in America as happened in Germany if the masses in the trade unions and the Socialist Party do not unite for an independent movement of the masses.

HOW CERTAIN "PROGRESSIVES" ARGUE AGAINST THE
FARMER-LABOR PARTY

Another argument against the Farmer-Labor Party (expressed at the American Federation of Labor Convention by the "progressive" Howard) is to point to Germany where the progressives had great political power, but where fascism was triumphant. From this they draw the conclusion that the old traditional two parties should be supported in order to fight fascism. But the reason fascism could come to Germany in spite of strong independent workers' parties was that the most powerful of these parties, the Social-Democratic Party, followed exactly the same policy that such progressives advocate in supporting Roosevelt, and they consequently split the workers by refusing to unite with the second most powerful workers' party, the Communist Party, in a joint struggle against capitalism and fascism. If we repeat the mistakes made in Germany, the same result will follow; just as surely as the same result will follow from the policy that Mr. Howard advocates. We are supposed to be intelligent people. Presumably, we should learn from the mistakes of the German people. Francis Gorman of the textile union, a man far from being a Communist, a man who lost the textile strike by believing in Roosevelt, has seemingly been able to learn from experience. In his resolution and speech on the Labor Party question, he showed that it is not necessary to be a Communist in order to shatter such arguments and to prove the burning necessity for a broad independent political party of the toilers in order to fight effectively against reaction.

If we believed the spokesmen of the two major capitalist parties, it would appear that prosperity is not only just around the corner as it used to be in the days of Hoover, but that it is actually in our very midst. This, of course, is not so. We still have not less than fourteen million unemployed, with about twenty million dependent upon the relief rolls. The weekly earnings have been lowered by the Roosevelt administration, except for a few sections of workers who have been given wage increases as a result of bitter struggle. The farming population, especially the main bulk of them, are in a more dangerous crisis than ever. The A.A.A., which created concessions to the well-to-do farmers, and to a narrow stratum of middle farmers, is immeasurably worsening the conditions of the rest of the farming population, especially the small farmers, sharecroppers and agricultural workers.

We have already referred to the fact that the foreign trade has not improved. The argument is made that the outlook is much brighter, that conditions are improving and will keep on improving.

Of course, this is not so. While it is true that production has risen and may even continue to rise for a while, until a new collapse takes place due to the operation of the natural laws of capitalism and the increasing government expenditures, not the least of which were devoted to war purposes, it is quite certain that American capitalist economy cannot and will not emerge from the stage of general crisis. The decline of American capitalism is a fact. The general world situation, the acute imperialist rivalries, the danger of a new war, the permanent army of unemployed, the lowered standard of living of the masses, make it impossible for American capitalist economy to overcome its contradictions. Even spokesmen for capitalism, including Roosevelt, have repeatedly admitted that even if production should rise to the level of 1929 industry will not be able to absorb more than a small fraction of the present army of unemployed, leaving a permanent army of between ten and fifteen millions whom Roosevelt may again characterize as unemployables, who will not be able to find room in production. Doesn't this expose the hollowness and mockery in the assertions of spokesmen of capitalism that prosperity is already with us, or that it is just around the corner? No one of these spokesmen has as yet indicated how they propose, under existing conditions of capitalism, to abolish unemployment; not one has given a hint that they expect unemployment to be solved at any time. Yes, the Republicans have proposed that we should abolish expenditures for unemployed relief. That only means abandoning the unemployed completely. Roosevelt is also cutting down expenditures for relief, but this again only makes the conditions of the unemployed worse and worse; it does not abolish unemployment.

To repeat, therefore, the demagogy of both parties on the question of prosperity is a fraud and deception, if by this is meant prosperity for the masses, and not merely higher profits for the monopolists.

What is behind the demagogy of prosperity? Both capitalist parties try to make out that capitalism is succeeding in overcoming the depression, that it will now be possible to get along with normal measures. The idea is to fill the masses with illusions about the strength of capitalism, to break the fighting spirit, the desire to organize, to keep them from organizing their own political party, a Farmer-Labor Party, to try to make them swim along with the illusion that the upswing of capitalism will solve all their difficulties.

The difference between the Republican and Democratic demagogy on this question is simply that Roosevelt claims that prosperity is returning because of the New Deal, and just as he planned it. The Republicans try to show that this prosperity is coming back in

spite of the New Deal and because the Supreme Court cancelled the N.R.A. The Republican Party is trying to win the masses with the idea that in order to hasten the further development of prosperity, it is necessary further to liquidate the New Deal, and put a Republican administration in power. They call upon the workers and farmers to abandon the fight for their own interests, to surrender their political independence, and throw themselves upon the mercy of their worst exploiters and enemies.

The question has been raised whether our Party will work with those workers who are ready to build local and state Farmer-Labor Parties, but who are not yet ready to support a Farmer-Labor Presidential candidate in 1936. Our answer to this should be: we are not going to break with such workers. We are going to build with them local and state parties, and fight with them for control of local and state governments.

In this way we will seek to convince them of building a national Farmer-Labor Party and putting forward a national ticket in the 1936 election. What conclusion must we draw from this? Every new event and argument brought forward emphasizes the analysis made by our Party and the tasks of the labor movement worked out on that basis. This means, in the first place, it is necessary to turn all our energies to the central task of the period—to the building of a broad and aggressive Farmer-Labor Party in every town and city, in every state and in the whole nation in preparation for the election struggles and for the decisive election of 1936.

OUR AGITATION FOR THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY MUST BE IMPROVED

What are the next steps towards the Farmer-Labor Party? We must say that the tempo with which we are moving towards bringing the Farmer-Labor Party into existence throughout the country is at present very unsatisfactory. If we continue to lag behind in this work, we will soon create a grave danger to the movement. It is becoming a question of primary importance to speed up the first stages of building the Farmer-Labor Party everywhere. This requires in the first place a serious improvement in the quality of our work. In the first place it requires improvement of our agitation for the Farmer-Labor Party. Having convinced our Party members of the need for such a Party, we have shown the tendency that this question is closed and needs no further discussion. But the question is not closed and we have yet to convince the masses without whom the Farmer-Labor Party will continue to be nothing but a wish and not a reality. It is necessary to take up the task of bringing them the firm convictions we have. We must answer all the arguments of our

opponents. We must show how the difficulties can be overcome. We must show this in terms of the daily life of each locality, industry and group of people with whom we are dealing at the particular moment.

Our press, pamphlets and speeches are entirely unsatisfactory in this respect. While the Central Committee and Political Bureau are improving the work of the Center in this respect, it is necessary that the same question be taken up by every District Committee, Section Committee, and leading fraction of mass organizations. The language used in our agitation, both written and spoken, is still too much taken bodily from our resolutions, reports, and discussions. These must be translated into the language of the streets, shops, etc. We must find the needed popularity of language.

How can we do it? By bringing into our agitprop work, into the work of the press, and leaflets, those workers who know how to speak to the masses. We must get rid of the idea that the qualities of being agitprop specialists are to be as far away from the masses as possible. We must find workers who can take our resolutions and translate them into the language of the masses and convince them by the use of language that the masses take to as natural language. There are such forces in our Party, but they are not drawn into the work of agitation. This must be done. We must find such people to talk to the masses and not just in committees. These comrades will introduce those appealing arguments, such arguments as they know how to make to the masses. We need mass agitators. We must find them in our midst and push them forward. We must select those who have the knack of humorous, picturesque and salty language of the masses. The agitational work must be made popular. An agitprop department that does not do this and organize the people to do this is no agitprop department, but an obstacle in the way. Many big capitalist politicians owe their success to their ability to speak the language of the masses.

They know how to clothe the most reactionary policies with a human touch that reaches the masses much more quickly than the most perfect and dignified English. How much easier it ought to be for us to be intimately human with the policies that represent the most human interests of the masses. We must be able to learn to do this and we can if we set ourselves to do it.

We need to carry on a systematic campaign for the Farmer-Labor Party in every mass organization, create discussions, have issues raised in many ways, and finally crystallize support into resolutions supporting the Farmer-Labor Party. Such a resolution should always include a series of decisions directed towards bringing that organization into cooperation with others for creating groups of

specially active members and delegates charged with the responsibility for developing the issue of the Farmer-Labor Party.

There is no reason for not carrying such work into the neighborhood clubs, into Republican and Democratic clubs. Our comrades, when they come to the door of a Republican or Democratic club, draw back as though there was a sign on the door, "Smallpox, keep out!" But the Farmer-Labor Party will be created by the people whom you will get out of such parties, or never created at all. Even occasionally leaders will have to be taken. We must turn all energies with this in view.

This is especially true of organizations that show discontent with the official line of the old parties, such as Sinclair's Epic, the "Share the Wealth", the Townsend Plan, the Union for Social Justice, etc. The Sinclair idea that it is possible to reform the Democratic Party must of course be fought, but this must not lead us to think it is useless to change the ideas of individual members, and even their local membership organizations as a whole.

ON THE URGENCY FOR WORKING AMONG THE POOR AND MIDDLE FARMERS

Special attention must be paid to the existing farmers' organizations, especially those that contain poor and middle farmers. This is a rich field for the work for the Farmer-Labor Party.

The thing which must especially be emphasized is the need of linking up our slogans for partial demands with the support of the struggles for partial demands that the farmers are carrying on under slogans different from ours. This is an essential development of the struggle for the united front among the farmers. Large numbers of farmers, especially the middle farmers, are interested in the question of higher prices for farm products and lower prices for industrial products. There is a popular demand among the farmers for legislation that would secure to them the "cost of production". The Massingale Bill now before Congress seeks to embody this popular demand. We cannot take a completely negative attitude towards this Bill. We must eliminate sections of this Bill and make amendments and try to unify the struggle of the workers and farmers on the issue of better prices for the farmers and lower prices for the workers.

Another example is the Frazier-Lemke Bill, which is not a Bill in the interests of the farmers. Our own proposals embodied in the Farmers' Relief Bill are in the interests of the farmers, yet it would be a mistake to take a complete negative attitude to the Frazier-Lemke Bill. By a method of amendments we can succeed in mobilizing the masses to fight for clauses in our Bill, through

qualified support through amendments to these Bills. This question naturally must be discussed more thoroughly. Here we must point out that the building of the Farmer-Labor Party among the toiling farmers depends upon the correct solutions of the problems of the farmers. The whole work and agitation of the Farmer-Labor Party must be carried on in such a way that the Farmer-Labor Party becomes the dominating thought of the masses in all their organizations. Only when the masses seize upon the idea of the Farmer-Labor Party, when this idea possesses and dominates the masses, only then will a powerful Farmer-Labor Party come into existence. We must break through the practice of hostility and silence thrown around this issue by the people who, in their own interests, try to keep the workers in the old parties. Our agitation is the chief weapon to this end; the weapon must be improved and sharpened, and kept constantly in use.

It is necessary to say a few words about the city middle classes and the necessity to bring these city middle classes into the Farmer-Labor Party. They also are suffering under the crisis and must also be won for the Farmer-Labor Party. In order to avert the dangerous situation where fascists and semi-fascists can use the situation of the middle classes in order to organize their storm troops, it is necessary to form a fighting alliance between the workers, farmers, and city middle classes. It is necessary that we study more carefully questions, problems, needs, and demands of the middle classes, including the farmers, as a special problem, and the middle classes in the cities also as a series of special problems. Only thus can we bring united action between the city middle classes, farmers, and petty bourgeoisie.

**EVEN A MINORITY FARMER-LABOR PARTY WOULD STRENGTHEN
THE WORKING CLASS TREMENDOUSLY**

We always have to answer the "practical" people, who say: "Yes, it sounds good, but we cannot elect a Farmer-Labor Party President in 1936 and in most cases cannot elect a majority of the legislatures; therefore let us be practical and choose the best men of the old parties as the lesser evil." They will agree with everything in principle, but not "practically" yet. This is the same "practical" policy which has brought us to the present situation and exactly what we have been doing for generations. The more we go along this path, the more we go deeper into the crisis with lower living standards, loss of civil rights, company unions, and reaction generally. Surely the time has come when these people must begin to see there is something wrong with the practicability which always

brings us the exact opposite of what we are trying to get. This is really a sort of political company unionism.

This is also true in the political field. Even a minority party (and every new party must be a minority party until it wins the majority) will be a tremendous weapon for the workers and farmers. Even the beginning of the Farmer-Labor Party would increase working class power, not only in the elections and government affairs, but would strengthen the trade unions in the daily fight for wages and better conditions. What a contrast even a small gain would be to our past experience when we were told we had placed our best man into power, that we had a new charter for labor, and in a few months we would wake up and see we were worse off than before and were again the suckers. But the Farmer-Labor Party could be a serious challenge to the old parties for government position. Imagine in New York if we could bring a big part of the trade union movement into the Farmer-Labor Party, together with a thousand other workers' organizations, middle class, and other groups, on such a minimum program on which there is substantial agreement. The very existence of such a party would throw a scare into the leaders of the old parties and they would drop their indifference to our demands.

The issues which interest the masses in the Farmer-Labor Party, the demands and proposals which express the deep-felt needs of the masses, require to be popularized in all our work of agitation. The Farmer-Labor Party needs to be made more realistic by showing what kind of measures it could and would take if its candidates were elected, and what such a Party can do even today to push these demands even before beginning to capture office. Our resolution lists ten types of demands and proposals. We have discussed them many times. We are all familiar with them. We give these demands in the resolution not in order that you should go out at once to fight for these ten demands, clipping them from our resolution, and putting them into all the agitation and leaflets for the Farmer-Labor Party. They are merely suggestions for the basis of mass discussions out of which the workers must write their own platform, the workers who organize the Farmer-Labor Party.

Most of these demands are self-explanatory to our Party members; it is not necessary to discuss them here at length. But some of them still have not been taken up systematically by our Party because the Party members are still unclear about their significance and the methods of their use. We will therefore elaborate to some extent on those around which questions still exist in our ranks.

THE DEMAND FOR OPENING THE CLOSED FACTORIES

First is the demand for opening the closed factories and enter-

prises by the government, to employ labor at union wages. This is not merely a promise of what the Farmer-Labor Party will do after it obtains control of the government. It is a demand that is put up to the present government also, local, state or national, as the case may be. This is not a demand for partial socialization. It does not break through the boundaries of capitalism. It is a partial demand to be realized under capitalism, by capitalist forms. It does not require of its supporters already to be adherents of socialism. It does not propose governmental replacement of the private capitalist and his private initiative, except where that private capitalist has already used his private initiative in order to depart from the field altogether. It is thus limited in its application. At the same time and for the same reason it is very broad in its appeal. Masses of Republicans and Democrats, convinced supporters of the capitalist system, can be won for this demand in cases where capitalism so obviously no longer works.

This demand for the government to open the factories must be concretized in each town, in each industry. It is especially powerful in its mass appeal in those towns which depend primarily upon single industries and where capitalist rationalization has shifted production elsewhere, leaving whole populations stranded. But it is a living and vital demand everywhere and touches the masses in their most sensitive spot. The millions of unemployed want work above everything else, especially at union wages, not the artificially made work so obviously of little use to anyone, and for which the starvation relief wage is paid. This demand to open the factories is destined to become a central, chief slogan in the development of a broad, mass Farmer-Labor Party.

Some comrades are still confusing this demand with the Sinclair Epic program. It has in common with Epic, however, only the feature that it touches the masses on the same popular issue. And this is its good side. We can well desire to make our program as widely popular as Sinclair made his. It differs from Sinclair basically in its rejection of the idea of segregating the unemployed from the normal, everyday economic life of the country into a separate watertight compartment of so-called economy for use, an economy which could have none of the advantages of socialism, and none of the advantages of capitalism either, but only all of the disadvantages of capitalism. Our proposal is for the government to produce for the regular market, to pay the regular wages, merely replacing the private capitalist who has run away. The capitalist objection to it has obvious answers. To the objection that it costs too much there is the obvious answer that it will produce values greater than the cost—values which will be in the hands of the government either for

sale on the market or distribution in the form of relief, or for public works. It thus has advantages over the relief system and over "made" work. The objection that it competes with private capitalism has validity only for capitalists; it is surely not of vital concern for the workers.

To the threat of the capitalists that they will be forced by such competition to close down more factories, there is the powerful answer: the more the capitalists will close down, the more the government will open up, and if all the capitalists want to withdraw from production, that's their responsibility. No one is forcing them to do it. As long as they keep running it, the factory is theirs; we are demanding only that the closed factories shall open up, with the capitalist owners if possible, without them if necessary.

The whole question of public works should also be handled concretely by the Farmer-Labor program, not only by fighting for union wages, which is the central issue, but in addition by demanding a change in the character of these public works. Is there any good reason why public works should be so completely dictated by the whims, interests, and profit of the private capitalists, and so little by the needs of the working population? Why should not public funds be spent for serious large-scale housing programs—houses, schools, libraries, community centers in working class communities, which are badly served in this respect? Why are municipal improvements so much confined to business and well-to-do residential sections, and not directed toward working class neighborhoods? These are all living issues, deeply felt among the masses, and should be taken up by the local and state Farmer-Labor Parties.

Another thing we must stress is the demand that the funds for public works and the execution of these works shall not be left in the hands of capitalist and corrupt bureaucrats, but shall be taken up as public control in the trade unions and mass organizations. The issue of public utilities, local, state, and national, needs also serious consideration by the Farmer-Labor Party—all the way from the problem of street car rates and the price of electric light burned in the workers' homes, clear up to the problem of hydro-electric stations, which affect many states, the question of public utilities, holding companies, etc. To this we should join the fight for lower rates, for effective public control, not bureaucratic control, abolition of financial abuses and racketeering, for municipal and government ownership, etc.

Around such demands we shall always fight against illusions that their realization means a step towards socialism. We should point out that these are immediate demands which are strictly in the bounds of capitalism, that they are not merely concessions, but that

they can be won from the capitalists by a well-organized mass militant movement.

**ONLY INTENSIVE ORGANIZATIONAL WORK WILL BRING ABOUT
THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY**

Now we come to the question of building the Farmer-Labor Party. It is not enough just to improve our agitation; we must begin to draw larger masses into building that party. In every small town and city and in every neighborhood where we have even one or two comrades, or a handful of sympathizers, we must bring them into activity directed towards setting up committees for the Farmer-Labor Party representing trade unions, fraternal organizations, Socialists, Communists, with special attention to farmers in agrarian communities, uniting them for common work in preparing for the Farmer-Labor Party, uniting already the broadest possible concentration of forces in every neighborhood, in every town, in every city, in every state. Special groups of organizations should be united together in special committees including language groups, etc. A broad network of such committees within a city should be quickly brought together under a broadly representative city committee for the creation of a Labor Party.

When a sufficiently broad representation is built up, such a committee should proceed to the decisive step of organizing the party itself through a well-prepared conference or convention which would hammer out an agreed upon program, elect a representative leadership and make all necessary preparation to participate independently in the coming elections.

In taking up this task we are, of course, here, as in other questions, confronted with two dangers. One danger is passivity, waiting for something to happen. The Labor Party will not come of itself. It must be fought for, it must be organized. The second danger is the one where our own forces and the immediate sympathetic organizations around us may make a short cut of it and declare themselves the Labor Party. No matter what good intentions we may have here we will not be able to substitute the hard work of building the basis for a Labor Party by revolutionary impatience. There are already several examples of such premature formations. But clearly this is not yet the big danger. The main danger is lagging behind the possibilities which are growing and maturing.

We have already spoken extensively about the agitational tasks. But what is being done in such places organizationally? One thing we must be clear about in the beginning—we cannot place the question of building the Farmer-Labor Party first by developing the

work successfully among the trade unions and then taking up the task among the other organizations in other strata of the population. Such a mechanical placing of the question will bring very bad results in both directions. But we can say that unless we win the support of the trade unions we cannot talk of a real Labor Party. This is, therefore, the strategic task of forging the Labor Party movement.

But are we doing this? In how many local unions under our influence, where Party fractions function, have we raised the question and committed the local to the Farmer-Labor Party? Unfortunately, in very few cases. Many of our comrades are afraid they will be branded as Reds if they raise in a Left union the question of the Labor Party. Many think it is not necessary to raise it in those organizations we lead—it is sufficient if we raise it in those we do not lead.

More and more we have proof that while in unions not directly under our influence, the issue is taken up, there are times when our own comrades hesitate to bring up the question. This is a form of sectarianism. Perhaps this will not be such a problem now since the Labor Party issue developed such big support in the A. F. of L. convention.

In both New York and Cleveland, if we make a careful survey, we will find a large number of unions that can very easily be brought together into a conference to organize a trade union Committee for the Promotion of a Labor Party. But we also know that such a conference will get much broader support if it is initiated, not only by the unions close to us, but, together with them, other unions in which there are outstanding progressives.

The reported caucus meetings at the American Federation of Labor Convention on the Labor Party, which brought together all unions committed to the Labor Party, shows that this can be done now on an even wider scale in the locals because such a conference on a local scale, in addition to rallying locals affiliated to those unions that stood for a Labor Party in the 55th Convention, can also gather locals from the national organizations whose officials were against the Labor Party in Atlantic City.

We can say in general that the Labor Party movement is connected up most closely with the task of building a progressive movement in the local trade unions and the establishment of joint action with the locals of the Socialist Party. The carrying through of this chief task, the crystallization in the beginning of organization for the Labor Party in the trade unions will assure a solid face for the Labor Party and become the force of attraction for all other organizations of the masses.

THE SITUATION IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY

And now comes the special questions of the united front with the Socialist Party. When we speak about the situation in the Socialist Party, let us make it clear we are not speculating on or hoping for a break-up of the Socialist Party in the hope that such events will give us a few more members and remove some problems. Such a narrow sectarian attitude towards the Socialist Party has nothing in common with our program.

Our position towards the Socialist Party is that which we laid down at the Seventh World Congress, that is, towards the establishment of united action. We hope that it will be possible in the same form as in France; as long as that is not possible, then on individual questions. How much will this benefit the struggle for the unemployed, the organization of the unorganized, the fight for the Labor Party, etc., if our two parties work jointly for these measures? Furthermore, our line is for the ultimate unification of Socialists and Communists into one revolutionary party of the working class. This will become possible the more we develop successful united action, the more our Socialist comrades break with the "Old Guard" reactionary forces, isolate them and defeat them, and when these comrades are ready, by the experience of the struggle itself, to adopt a real, consistent revolutionary position.

We are anxiously studying the Socialist Party inner development, however, in order to see which way that Party is going, whether it will become a factor for progress and unity of the working class and the people's movement against fascism, or whether it will go along the path of reaction and finally become an instrument toward the development of fascism in America. Factors making for both these courses exist in the Socialist Party. They are engaging in struggle, and the issue is not yet entirely closed.

At the Seventh World Congress we noted with alarm that the national leaders of the Militant section of the Socialist Party at the simultaneous July meeting of the National Executive Committee had made a peace pact with the "Old Guard" reactionaries. This would not have been bad at all if it had been a pact in which the "Old Guard" made peace with the inevitable Leftward move of the membership and were reconciled to moving in the direction of the united front. But it was clear that the "Old Guard" had no such idea. Their idea was just the opposite. They thought that the Militants had made their peace with "Old Guardism", an alliance with Hearst and Woll; while the Militants did not then make clear that this was not their attitude. But within a few weeks after the signing of that peace pact, it became clear that there was no peace at all, but rather the beginning of a new and higher stage of struggle.

We cannot be indifferent to this development; what happens inside the Socialist Party is of concern to the entire working class, and therefore also to us Communists.

It is of enormous significance to establish what was the rock on which the peace pact was wrecked within a few weeks after it had been signed. That rock was the issue of the united front in its most concrete expression in the daily work of activity of members of a trade union, specifically, the Teachers' Union. The "Old Guard" demanded the unconditional subordination of the Socialist teachers to the reactionary administration of the Teachers' Union in a move towards the Right, in the wrecking of the democracy of the union and its subordination to a Right-wing dictatorship. Really, the Right wing was in the role of teaching the teachers the road to fascism. All the progressive forces in the union rallied in a broad united front to resist this reactionary movement. The Militant Socialists had to choose which way they would go—the "Old Guard" way, the Hearst way of a united front with reaction, or the Left-wing way, towards the united front of all progressive forces including the Communists. The issue was clear-cut, so immediate, so concrete, that all the honest Socialists, no matter what their degree of militancy is, no matter how deep their prejudice against Communists, no matter how many times or how energetically they fought against the united front, could no longer hesitate. We must greet with joy the fact that they chose the road of the progressive united front, even though they had to come fresh from the committee room from which they signed the peace pact with the "Old Guard". That was a heartening sign of an essentially healthy development, not of apparent surrender to the "Old Guard", not of deliberate choice to move towards the "Old Guard". It was the sign of invincible power of the urge towards unity that is moving among the masses. It was a sign that there exists every possibility for the great majority of the Socialist Party to take its place as a force for progress among the American masses.

We don't stand aside as passive observers, registering the developments in the Socialist Party. We have done everything we could to give practical help to those who move towards unity, to all progressive forces. We will continue to go out of our way to make the road toward unity constantly easier. We have made, and we will make, all the necessary concessions to this, so long as we are not called upon to make concessions of principle.

We gathered valuable fruits from the lessons of the struggle among the teachers. These lessons were applied in an unprecedented scale at the American Federation of Labor convention. And here Socialists and Communists learned how valuable joint work could be

through this unity which rallied broader groups of our forces for a Labor Party and played a great role in carrying forward the historic cleavage of the old bureaucracy by a big vote for industrial unionism, a bloc consisting of 40 per cent of the whole convention of the American Federation of Labor.

It is in the light of these developments that we must estimate the meaning of the great mass interest that has developed in the coming debate with Norman Thomas in Madison Square Garden. That mass interest shows how deeply the masses feel the issue of the united front. The announcement of this debate and the unprecedented support it immediately received is already a smashing defeat to the "Old Guard", which is testified to by their hysterical rage against Norman Thomas. It reveals the tremendous reserves that the Militant Socialists have at their disposal in their fight against the "Old Guard" if they will only come out with a bold, clear stand on the question of unity.

At the October meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, the appeal of our Party for united action against Italian aggression and to meet the immediate danger of war was laid over for future action. At the same time, the N.E.C. voted to send a copy of their resolution on war to our Party—an action denounced by the "Old Guard" as an unprecedented friendly gesture towards us. Thus the National Executive Committee registered approximately the same point in the movement towards united action that the Brussels meeting of the Second International did, where five parties out of seventeen represented were able to prevent the decision on the appeal of the Comintern. It will be necessary to win larger and more energetic support among Socialist Party members and local organizations in order to convince the National Executive Committee of the practicability and necessity for affirmative action on the united front. In every city what is now required is that the leading comrades shall establish the most friendly, helpful connections with the Socialists, and that in every shop and union Communists and Socialists shall establish friendly relations, and utilize every opportunity to develop discussions on the issues of the day, both to bring out and clarify the points of difference between us, and to consolidate the growing points of agreement which must be transferred into common action, even without formal agreements, when these cannot yet be arrived at, but as quickly as possible to pass over to the stage of formal, definite pacts and agreements.

**OUR WORK IN THE TRADE UNIONS DECISIVE FOR ALL
OTHER FIELDS OF WORK**

Comrades, I now want to discuss some aspects of the trade union

question. We have always emphasized that the basis of the work for the Farmer-Labor Party, and all the large scale united front movement, is in the trade unions, and that our work in the trade unions is decisive for all other fields of work.

What are the special features of the trade union situation? What are the new details that arise out of our tasks in the trade unions, and in the field of economic struggle in general?

First of all, let us make a little review of the factors which brought about the present situation in the trade union movement. The advance toward trade union organization that began in the first months of 1933 has now been checked. The workers in the basic industries, especially the steel workers, and the auto workers, and generally the workers in the decisive mass production industries remain for the most part unorganized. Moreover, in the recent period there has been developing a well-organized, persistent attack by the capitalists against all efforts to organize the unorganized. This effort, further, more and more becomes an attempt to smash the existing unions, particularly the largest unions organized on an industrial basis, the United Mine Workers of America, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and the United Textile Workers. As part of this movement we can cite the recent attempt of the shipowners to break the maritime unions on the Pacific Coast, and the brutal suppression now mobilized against the striking longshoremen on the Gulf Coast. These attacks on the unions, and upon all workers fighting to improve their conditions, become ever sharper. Police brutality and use of the militia in strikes have added dozens of victims to the large numbers since the beginning of the New Deal. Violence is especially widespread in the South where over fifteen workers were killed, and many times that number wounded in the recent strikes of the miners and longshoremen. This condition confronts workers everywhere.

Since the voiding of the N.R.A. by the United States Supreme Court, a decision which only confirmed that the N.R.A. had already fulfilled its purpose for the ruling class and was the signal for a fresh onslaught on the workers, wages have been lowered, hours lengthened, and conditions generally worsened—especially in the industries where the workers' organizations were not strong enough to offer immediate resistance. Only where the unions were strong and met the challenge of the capitalists with full determination were the workers able to defeat the bosses' attack. As a concrete example, we can compare the situation of the miners as against that of the textile workers in those centers where the latter are largely unorganized, particularly in the South. The miners were able to force at least some additional concessions in the new agree-

ment, while the textile workers suffered in the last period considerable lowering of wages, with increases in hours of labor.

But even those workers who have maintained or even slightly increased their wages have in reality suffered a decline in their standards of living due to the rise in living costs, which more than wiped out the gains since the beginning of the Roosevelt administration, even where money wages were increased. The high hopes promised by the leadership of the American Federation of Labor in the Wagner Bill have not materialized, and it is becoming apparent to the masses of workers that this measure, like the N.R.A., offers no guarantees of collective bargaining unless workers can enforce this right through organization.

This condition of the American working class today is a direct result of the unwillingness and inability of the leadership of the A. F. of L., and of the various international unions, to organize effective resistance to the capitalist attacks—a result of its reliance on, and practice of, the policy of class collaboration. More than that, the A. F. of L. Council and its policies served to defeat the workers, wherever they undertook to organize themselves and carry on struggle against the capitalists. The upsurge of 1933 brought hundreds of thousands of workers into the American Federation of Labor. Among these there were great sections from the basic industries. These workers, organizing to improve their conditions, and ready to sacrifice to build their union, found, instead of encouragement and support, obstacles placed in their way by the A. F. of L. bureaucracy in its policy of class collaboration, reliance upon governmental measures, attempts to disrupt newly formed organizations, and enforcing of old, outworn and bankrupt craft union policies in the mass production industries. Hence millions of workers were forced into the company unions, and the efforts of the workers to join the American Federation of Labor were checked because of loss of strikes, etc., in this way enabling the capitalists to carry through their attack.

The A. F. of L. Council, in its report to the Fifty-fifth Convention, try as it might, could not escape reflecting this condition. While at previous conventions held since the New Deal, the leadership could still cover up this policy with promises, in this convention all they could do was to try to hide their failure to build the unions, hide the setback of the labor movement generally with attempted praise for the "successes" achieved on the legislative front. But as we know, this attempt succeeded very little. For the workers are growing very skeptical about these legislative "victories" as a result of their experience with the so-called "Security" Bill, Wagner Law, etc. Even the Guffey Bill, the workers understand, came only after a

show of strength on the part of the miners during the strike by which the miners secured some improvement in their agreement, while the Guffey Bill did not help to organize the miners in the captive mines who were forced into company unions.

Only if we understand and correctly estimate these developments can we correctly estimate the meaning and significance of the serious rift in the top leadership of the American Federation of Labor that showed itself in the Fifty-fifth Convention. In order to understand the sharpness of the struggle that took place at the convention, we must not stop with a superficial view of the main issue that divided the convention, namely, the question of industrial unionism versus craft unionism.

THE INDUSTRIAL UNION BLOC IN THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

To a greater or less extent the advocates of industrial unionism reflected not only the disappointment of the masses with the old American Federation of Labor policies, but also reflected the growing fear of fascism in the United States, the fear of the complete destruction of the trade union movement. They showed a growing understanding that the continuing of the old policies and methods will destroy the unions, will repeat the German experience in America. This was clearly indicated in the remarks of John L. Lewis.

“There are forces at work in this country that would wipe out, if they could, the labor movement of America, just as it was wiped out in Germany or just as it was wiped out in Italy.”

This note was sounded in the speech of Philip Murray, Sidney Hillman, and many others, and was presented in its ripest form in the speech of Francis Gorman who, understanding that the New Deal is no barrier to this development, was able to present this viewpoint in a more advanced form and draw the logical conclusion from it by advocating a break with the old parties and the building of a Labor Party. Gorman said:

“We looked with what now seems to us to be a naive faith, to the proponents of the New Deal, believing, I guess, that it meant a New Deal for Labor. We have been disappointed. . . .”

In dealing directly with the present renewed attacks on the trade union movement Gorman further said:

“This we have learned to expect from big business and the financial tycoons of this country. But we have learned an even more important lesson—we have learned that the efforts to destroy the trade union movement will go untrammelled by the government. We have learned that the government leans on big business. We have

learned that the Republican Party means destruction to the workers, and that the New Deal means a New Deal for big business and a "Raw Deal" for labor."

We, of course, cannot but welcome the position taken by those who fought for industrial unionism at the American Federation of Labor convention, especially those who fought for the Labor Party. We are by no means jealous that they had to repeat the arguments which we have for a long time brought forward. On the contrary, we are very happy that the issues of amalgamation, industrial unionism, the Labor Party, etc., for which the Trade Union Unity League under Foster's leadership, with the Party, had fought for years past, that these issues have now become the issues of the masses and whole sections of the organized labor movement. John L. Lewis, who was the spokesman for the industrial union bloc at the convention, openly charged that the experiences of the American Federation of Labor throughout its existence and especially in the last year have fully demonstrated that the old craft unions are incapable of organizing the millions of unorganized. It is encouraging to note that the issue was not debated on abstract grounds, but as an issue that is bound up with the life and death of the trade union movement—the organization of the millions of unorganized workers. And furthermore, that the issue of organization of the unorganized was correctly placed as a question which will be a chief factor in determining the ability of the masses to beat back and defeat the growing reaction, the threat of fascism.

The industrial union bloc, through the initiative of Lewis, was also responsible for the historic decision of the Fifty-fifth Convention which declared that "no officer of the American Federation of Labor shall act as an officer of the National Civic Federation or be a member thereof". This decision hits at the very root of the class collaboration policy of the A. F. of L.

THE GROWING MASS OPPOSITION TO THE CLASS-COLLABORATION POLICY OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

There is a growing sentiment among the masses against the whole class-collaboration policy of the American Federation of Labor. Our Party forces and those whom we influenced among the delegates of the American Federation of Labor Convention fully supported the industrial unionism bloc of which they were a part. On the Labor Party issue, the mine workers' delegation, the printers and others who supported the industrial union fight and other progressive measures parted company with a smaller bloc of delegates representing some 5,000 convention votes as compared to the 11,000 rallied for the industrial union bloc. But even in this smaller bloc

a number of old time leaders, because of the decisions of their conventions, were to be listed . . . with their hearts still in the New Deal. Gorman in this group of the old leaders stood out as the most consistent fighter for the Labor Party. On other issues only the Communists and the Socialists swinging to the Left carried out the fight to the end. This is particularly true in regards to the modified amendment against the Communists, which represented a defeat for the original plans laid by the Executive Council but which still registered an attack directed against us which must be defeated.

What conclusions can we draw from the development of the Fifty-fifth Convention? Some comrades, a very few, are already claiming that we are making an alliance with those who in the past betrayed the workers. They ask us what guarantees have we that these people will not in the future betray the workers. And we answer, we have no guarantees. They ask, furthermore, how can we unite with Lewis and the rest, who, while they talk radical, deny democracy to the workers in the unions which they head? But this is not the question. We most assuredly will not agree with their methods in their own labor unions, but on the contrary will fight against those methods which are directed against the interests of the workers in the trade unions. A typical question which we face nowadays is whether we can give any guarantee of the sincerity of these leaders. How do we answer all these questions? What is really our position? What tasks flow from this situation? The fact is that at the American Federation of Labor convention we found two camps arrayed one against the other. The issue which divided them was the issue of industrial unionism, the issue of the organization of the unorganized. The whole development of the labor movement, the growing sense of the danger of reaction which threatens the existence of the trade unions, was keenly felt at this convention. These two camps tended to line up on opposite sides on many other issues vital to the labor movement, besides the industrial unionism issue, with the industrial union side taking a progressive position, and the reactionary side a reactionary position. There were such issues as trade union democracy, the organization of the Negro workers, the organization of the youth, the Civic Federation, and even the anti-Red amendment, the first draft of which was definitely defeated by the industrial union bloc. The progressive, or more correctly speaking, the industrial union bloc was not and could not be a homogeneous, solid group. The reactionary group was of course more homogeneous, united on the side of reaction by fear of anything progressive. Republicans like Hutchison, Democrats of the Right-wing type who are definitely allied with Hearst, like Matthew Woll, "Old-Guard" Socialists belonged to this bloc. In the industrial union bloc were

represented Roosevelt Democrats, Socialists, Communists, and the sympathizers of the latter two, and in general honest progressive trade unionists with a strong inclination for a Labor Party.

We must undertake to get a clear characterization of the Lewis, Howard, Hillman group in the American Federation of Labor. On the basis of such a characterization, we must determine our attitude toward it. This group is fighting for a basic issue in the life of the American working class—organizing the unorganized into industrial unions. This is one of those crucial points which will strengthen the American working class tremendously and enable it to struggle for its class interests all along the line. It is clear that this issue will be supported by us, by all possible means. At the same time it must be said that the Lewis, Howard, Hillman group has not drawn all the conclusions from its struggle for industrial unionism. It has not yet drawn the conclusion that the struggle demands true trade union unity on the basis of class struggle policies which is totally incompatible with Red-baiting. On the contrary, Communists and militant class-conscious workers are a necessary part of the consistent struggle for industrial unionism. And another conclusion which must be drawn by the Lewis, Howard, Hillman group, if it shall consistently carry out this fight, is that the tremendous task of organizing the unorganized demands the restoring of trade union democracy in their own unions as well as its establishment in the new unions that are brought into being. It is clear that with the United Mine Workers, the textile workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and others in this group, these will be able to accomplish their task of being a driving force in the organization of the unorganized, not only in their unions but in others, only if their own unions are made stronger. And this cannot be done without trade union democracy.

Another conclusion of fundamental importance: the need of organizing the unorganized into industrial unions brings forth most sharply the need of a Farmer-Labor Party. It is clear that the tie-up between certain trade unions and Roosevelt, and between certain trade unions and the Republicans, militates strongly against the ability of these unions to organize the unorganized. It is also clear that the birth of a strong Farmer-Labor Party, especially in towns of basic unorganized industry, will prove a powerful support to the organization of the unorganized. In short, the Lewis, Howard, Hillman group is waging an important historic fight, and waging it closely, a fight which must be supported by us by all means. But the effectiveness of this fight and its eventual success will depend primarily upon the drawing of the conclusions I have just described.

It is our task to make the labor movement conscious of these

conclusions, to inspire the unorganized and organized workers for the need of fighting for the realization of these additional measures. The Communists will, after the Convention, support as they did in the Convention, every move of these progressive forces for the organization of the unorganized, etc. But, we will in no way be bound by any limitations that these leaders may try to impose on our independent activities. In the organizations which these leaders represent we will also support them, and every step they take to mobilize the masses to fight against the employers, to fight against the reactionaries. At the same time, we will conduct the fight there against their policy of supporting Roosevelt, trying, against them, to mobilize the masses, in their organizations, for the Labor Party. We shall, as before, fight against every measure they take to restrict the democratic rights, or hold back the initiative of the workers. We shall not forget their records in the past, but at the same time we will be ready to welcome any genuine change on their part, and to re-value our position towards them when the situation requires it. In a world where great changes are taking place, there may be many surprises for us—surprises in both directions. It is not impossible, at a time when the masses are moving to the Left, taking the first steps, breaking with the capitalist parties, that some of these leaders may also be carried along this road. But we shall make our decision with eyes open and in consultation with the masses. We shall judge every group and every leader not merely by words, but by the actual steps they take and the support they give to the workers in their own unions and in the labor movement generally, towards the organization of the unorganized, the establishment of industrial unions, combatting of company unions, and the winning of the masses in them to the trade unions, etc.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OUR PARTY IN THE PRESENT TRADE UNION SITUATION

In this connection, we must level against them the justified and necessary criticisms for voting for the anti-Communist amendment, even in its limited form. The industrial union bloc prevented the adoption of the original amendment, but in the end they voted for the modified amendment. Above all, we shall see how they try to unite in their own unions all the workers, Communists included, and whether or not they will lend their support in the central bodies against the reactionaries, who will try to use the anti-Communist amendment that they voted for, to split the forces of the workers. In the same manner, we must say that while we are ready to support every step in the direction of organization of the workers, in the long run, this will not be possible fully so long as these leaders

continue to keep their followers chained to one or the other of the capitalist parties. We cannot unite workers successfully in the trade unions, and carry through economic struggles, while at the same time leaving them in regard to some of the most vital questions of the day at the mercy of the capitalist parties without any effort to organize the workers as an independent force.

Our Party faces a great responsibility in the present trade union situation. If we are armed with a correct understanding of these forces, with a membership consisting of the most advanced, most self-sacrificing workers, disciplined as no other organization can be, we can, and must play a powerful role in this whole progressive development of the broad trade union movement. In order more fully to carry through this role, we must complete the organization of the unorganized Communists, those who are eligible but have not yet joined trade unions. All Party organizations must consider it one of their central tasks to bring the Communists into the organized trade union movement. Our press must make this a central task, giving the maximum of support to every union and every group of workers who are unorganized into organization. Our fractions in the mass fraternal organizations, many of which have in them tremendous bodies of workers in the basic industries, but who are not in the trade unions, must become of more practical help in bringing these workers into the trade union movement. Similarly our fractions in the organizations of Negro workers, of the youth, of women, etc., must become the builders of the trade unions. The Party shop units and the fractions must consider this task. Unfortunately we have in many instances shop units in large factories, who do very little to build the trade unions in these factories. We have in mind one instance of an auto industry, where the number of workers in the union are about the same as the number of Party members in the plant. In this same plant only one-third of the Party members belong to the trade unions. What a force to build the union this shop unit could become if all the Party members would join and take part in the work! We have had some examples where our comrades in the shops were formerly in the unions of the T.U.U.L. and then they considered it their task to build the union. But now since they have become part of the American Federation of Labor they no longer consider it their task to build the unions.

With regard to the company unions. This question has been dramatized recently in the steel industry where a convention was held of eleven different plant unions of one steel corporation which came together and drew up demands for a 15 per cent wage increase and for vacations with pay. This only emphasizes the need of penetrating the company unions and work for the winning of the workers

for the trade unions. This cannot be done merely by issuing circulars and leaflets calling on the workers to leave the company unions and join the trade unions. It is necessary to learn how to use the very machinery of the company unions to raise issues on behalf of the workers, develop them to the point of an open break, on the basis of their experience and confidence. One of the things which is holding back more rapid development of this movement inside the company unions is the present policy of the American Federation of Labor bureaucracy which resists all efforts to give any direction and leadership to these workers in the company unions. The steel workers, for example, were not attracted to the Amalgamated Association very much by the arbitrary expulsions of the rank and file because they wished to fight against the steel trust; nor are the steel workers attracted from the company unions to the Amalgamated Association when they see in many cases that the A.A. demands wages that are even less than the workers are now getting.

While on the subject of the steel industry, I think especially here our Party must enter with all of its forces and resources in the campaign of organizing the unorganized. There is some promise that with the reinstatement of the expelled lodges, thanks to the correct tactics of the progressives in the union, some serious progress can now be made. But we must not sit back and wait for it. We must be the most energetic forces driving for progress. Similar campaigns must be developed in auto and other industries. For some time we have tried to apply ourselves to the broadening out of the Left-wing movement in the trade unions. We raised this question in the January Plenum and many times since then. We have made considerable progress in some places. The joint work of the Socialists and Communists and progressives in the American Federation of Labor Convention within the industrial union bloc and independents on a number of issues shows that the situation is now ripe for bringing together all progressive forces in each union and in every locality. The experiences in Cleveland, the work in auto, steel and other industries, the important developments in the Teachers' Union, in some sections of the ladies' garment workers, show this movement is developing and must be taken up systematically, with a speedier tempo.

It is necessary to point out the existence of a certain danger that we must guard against. The feeling may creep in among the progressives in the labor movement that everything can be left to the Lewis group and the Lewis Committee—a national committee that has just been established. The Lewis Committee will be best able to achieve its aims if it is backed up in every local union by wide, capable, militant progressive forces. Without these forces it

will not do much. To fail to build up such forces in the local union means to render a disservice to the cause of organizing the unorganized and to the Lewis group itself. We must say, secondly, it is our task also to widen the vision of the forces around the Lewis group, to do all in our power to educate them to see that the conclusions, which we have spoken of as being necessary, shall be drawn by this group and their followers. This can be accomplished by the organization of the progressive forces on the widest possible basis in each union and in each locality. Failure to do this will react against the success of industrial unionism and of organizing the unorganized.

FOR INTENSIFYING THE STRUGGLES OF THE UNEMPLOYED

A few words now with regard to the problem of the unemployed. The unemployed army remains almost stationary even in the conditions of some increase in production. This presents a problem. The workers must take up the fight against increased speed-up. We have seen this speed-up developed to an unprecedented degree. The question should be taken into consideration especially in connection with the fight for a six-hour day and 30-hour week. One word of warning in this respect. Our Party must understand that we do not fight against the introduction of machinery in industry. We do fight for the protection of the interests of the workers and where the introduction of machinery is used for speed-up, we fight against this and for organized control of the introduction of machinery, to provide for work. We are not machine smashers. We are the enemies of the use of this progress by the capitalists to worsen the conditions of the working class.

Already with the announcement of the new Roosevelt works program some months ago, we knew that millions who were taken off relief rolls would not get jobs. These are the victims of capitalism whom Roosevelt calls unemployables, for whom local and state governments must care, while these agencies themselves are cutting down expenditures on the theory that the federal government is providing work. As a result of this, distress is rising among millions of unemployed with the threat of actual starvation. The whole working class must be rallied to demand adequate relief for those who in the coming months will be again thrown out of federal jobs. An immediate task is to spread the fight which has been successfully carried through in some cities with the assistance of the trade unions for the payment of prevailing wages on public works. The whole trade union movement must be rallied to the fight for a living wage to these workers. One of the most important tasks is the fight against discrimination practised against the Negro people. Another burning problem is to win the right to organize on these jobs.

In connection with the fight for unemployment insurance, now that everyone can see that the so-called Security Bill does not provide any relief for the unemployed, with only a few states having enacted legislation even to provide the miserable security, it is necessary now to extend and raise to a higher level the fight for genuine social insurance, for the Workers' Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance Bill, H.R. 2827. The fact that even William Green was compelled to state that the Roosevelt Security Insurance Law was inadequate should now make it possible to advance this fight more in the American Federation of Labor unions. One of the basic reasons for the inability to develop more intensive struggles for the unemployed is the still existing division into many organizations. This division itself keeps large sections of the unemployed out of all organizations. We have for some time been fighting for the unification of all these mass organizations of the unemployed. We must now take more definite energetic steps to bring this unification about. Party members already in the Unemployment Councils have been successful in committing the Councils to this policy of unification. Unfortunately, those organizations under the Socialist leadership, like the Unemployed Workers' Alliance, thus far have not been seen fit to join in such unification. There have been even attempts by them to unite with smaller unemployed organizations, with the exclusion of the Unemployment Council—the oldest and largest of these unemployed organizations.

What reason can there be for this? To date there has been only one reason given. That is, unity with the Communists would endanger the relations with the American Federation of Labor. But can they deny that though they claim they are for unity, such an argument is just repeating the same arguments that Abe Cahan and Jim Oneal give? We hope that these leaders of the Workers' Alliance will see the danger of their position and the crime that they are committing against the unemployed by contributing even in the least to keeping these organizations divided.

We, on our part, are prepared to do everything necessary to advance unification and to appeal to and convince all organizations to carry through this policy.

THE NEGRO NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

There are important recent developments which must be noted in the national liberation movement among the Negroes. First, there is a general upswing of mass struggle among workers and sharecroppers. As a result the question of Negro workers in the trade unions, the struggle against discrimination, has assumed great importance. The struggles of the sharecroppers have opened up new pos-

sibilities in the fight to improve the conditions of the most exploited section of the Negro population, against national oppression, and for joint struggle with white and Negro tenant farmers and sharecroppers. Then, too, there is the movement to the Left on the part of important sections of the Garveyites and also of the national reformist organizations, the N.A.A.C.P., the Urban League, etc. There is also the rise of the important movement for the National Negro Congress which rises out of these mass developments and which promises to embrace the wide masses of Negro people into a powerful movement for Negro rights and Negro liberation. The National Negro Congress movement was last month endorsed by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. Consequently, there arises for our Party a number of important political tasks. I will list these briefly:

1. To intensify the struggle for the organization of the Negro workers into the trade unions. To build up the widest united front for the breaking down of all barriers of discrimination. To develop the struggle for equal access to jobs and for Negro equality.

2. To prosecute most energetically the work of organizing the Negro farmers, the tenant and sharecroppers, to fight for their economic and political demands, and to seek to promote the unity of action of Negro and white farmers.

3. To render the utmost support to the Negro Congress in order to help it become the people's movement of the Negroes for equal rights and complete liberation. To mobilize the masses of white toilers against lynching and all forms of jim-crow rule and oppression.

Some people think because we do not insist that the issue of the right to self-determination be adopted now by the Negro Congress, our Party is abandoning its revolutionary demand for the right to self-determination in the Black Belt in the South. Nothing is further from the truth. Never was it more clear than it is today that the complete liberation of the people in the Black Belt will be accomplished only by the revolutionary overthrow of the white landlords and capitalists, the destruction of the semi-slave agricultural relations and the realization of the right to self-determination. But there is a problem which we must face. And how must we face it? The problem is how to link up the daily struggles of the Negro masses in the Black Belt today for their partial economic and political demands with our revolutionary slogan for the right to self-determination. It is clear that the Negro masses are not yet ready to carry through the revolution which would make possible the right to self-determination. But they are ready to fight against jim-crowism and oppression, for democratic rights and other partial economic and political demands. Our task, therefore, is not to stand

passively by and wait until the Negro toilers become ready for the revolution. No! Our task is to join with them in the organization for their immediate struggle and strengthen their position economically and politically, strengthen the bonds between the white and Negro toilers, and in this way create the transition to the revolutionary struggle which will make possible the realization of the right of the Negro masses in the Black Belt to self-determination.

In the meantime, we must continue to conduct the most careful, the most detailed, the most persistent agitation and propaganda for the slogan of the right to self-determination. We must carry the discussion of this question into the ranks of the reformist organizations. It is possible to do this. I would call to your attention the fact, for example, that the Negro magazine, *The Crisis*, published by the N.A.A.C.P., which in the October issue carried a very sharp attack against us on the grounds that we were advocates of jim-crowding of Negroes through self-determination—this magazine has agreed to publish a letter refuting this, and giving argument against this, which I wrote to the editor. We should constantly take advantage of every opportunity to carry this question of self-determination to the broadest possible masses, at the same time not attempting to make this a condition for the broadening out of the united front among the Negroes.

IN THE FIELD OF LABOR DEFENSE

It is not very often that we speak of the defense problems at the Plenums of the Central Committee. Very often we only bring such question to the Central Committee when we have complaints to make in regard to the handling of some matter by the I.L.D. The I.L.D., in the period of its existence, and, especially in the last year or two, has won for itself the admiration and support of wide circles of workers, farmers, middle class, and professional groups. It has performed with the small forces at its disposal what can be called miracles. When we consider the constantly increasing problems with which it is confronted, such as terror against the masses in various localities in the South, in California, in some sections of the Middle West, we can say that it is nothing short of a miracle that the I.L.D. has been able to meet this great mountain of problems with its small resources. Just to mention the Scottsboro case, the Herndon case, the Sacramento cases, the Burlington case, the Gallup cases, which the I.L.D. has recently had to conduct, is to show the tremendous problems facing the defense.

There are, of course, thousands of smaller cases, all the time. In addition, the I.L.D. has given great assistance to cases which it is not handling directly, outstanding among them, of course, being

that of the oldest, best-known political prisoner of the country, Tom Mooney, and McNamara, and the Terre Haute case.

The pressure of defense cases has lately grown tremendously. Where before we were confronted with an occasional case, now we have thousands for every one of them. In every struggle there are increasing victims of capitalist class justice. In California the situation is very acute: that state famous for its frame-ups and persecution—Mooney, Imperial Valley; lately, to the Sacramento case has been added the case of Louise Todd and the Anita Whitney case—where comrades are being sent to prison for long terms on technical violation of election laws, which occur every day with every party, and for which there was never a thought of prosecution except where they found that this was a way to keep the Communist Party out of the elections.

The South is experiencing the sharpest terror directed, in the first place, against the Negro people.

Other groups besides the I.L.D. have become active in this field. There is the American Civil Liberties Union, which has been most helpful in many cases. We must mention groups around Norman Thomas and others. In the Herndon case, we saw the first beginnings of a broad united front of defense, which is very promising, and in which Thomas played a big role. We must now try to find the road to a united labor defense to include Socialists, Communists, liberals—all those who fight for civil liberties and workers' rights, against injustice and capitalist frame-up. The fact that this issue was the subject of a heated debate at the last American Federation of Labor convention is further proof that conditions are ripe for such an organization, in which the I.L.D. should become an organic part. As far as we Communists are concerned, we declare that we are ready to throw all of our influence to such a unification movement in the field of labor defense.

(I want to interrupt my report to give you some news on the British elections which has just come in. Elected as a Communist Member of Parliament, Comrade Willie Gallacher of the British Communist Party, Member of the E.C.C.I. [*Wild applause.*])

HOW SHALL WE PREPARE OUR PARTY TO APPLY THE TACTICAL LINE OF THE COMINTERN?

Comrades, we now come to the last sections: the re-orientation and re-education of the Party. Why is it necessary to speak about this? Because, unless we quickly overcome the past methods, unless we educate the members in the new spirit of orientation of the Seventh World Congress, we will be unable to carry through the new tasks we have spoken about. Above all, this calls for a complete

break with what the Seventh Congress spoke of as self-satisfied sectarianism. This sectarianism almost ruined our Party during the period of partial stabilization of capitalism. It was carried over into the present period and resulted in overestimation of the radicalization of the masses and underestimation of the forces of our enemy. It was substituting revolutionary impatience and desire for overthrow of capitalism for the hard work of winning the masses for the struggle to overthrow capitalism. It is also a result of the failure to understand that now we are no longer in the stage merely of gathering the advanced forces of the working class and the formation of the Communist Party. Now we are in the stage where we must be among the millions, learn how to move them in struggle in the defense of their immediate economic needs, against political reaction and the menace of fascism, against the threatening world imperialist war which is more and more being developed by the imperialists as the crisis is not and cannot be solved in the old way.

To meet this new situation the Seventh World Congress reshaped the tactical line. We must remember the words of Comrade Dimitroff, who said in closing his speech:

“Standing firmly on the impregnable position of Marxism-Leninism, which has been confirmed by the entire experience of the international labor movement, and primarily by the victories of the great October Revolution, our Congress, acting in the spirit and guided by the method of *living Marxism-Leninism*, has reshaped the tactical lines of the Communist International to meet the changed world situation.

“The Congress has taken a firm decision that the united front tactics must be applied *in a new way*. The Congress is emphatic in its demands that Communists do not content themselves with the mere propaganda of general slogans about proletarian dictatorship and Soviet Power, but that they pursue a definite, active, Bolshevik policy with regard to all internal and foreign political questions arising in their country, with regard to all urgent problems that affect the vital interests of the working class, of their own people and of the international labor movement. The Congress insists most emphatically that all tactical steps taken by the Communist Parties be based on a sober analysis of actual conditions, on a consideration of the relation of class forces, and of the political level of the broadest masses. The Congress demands the complete eradication of every vestige of *sectarianism* from the practice of the Communist movement, as this represents at present the greatest obstacle in the way of the Communist Parties carrying out a really mass, really Bolshevik policy.

“While imbued with the determination to carry out this tactical line and filled with the conviction that this road will lead our Parties to major successes, the Congress has at the same time taken into account the possibility that the carrying out of this Bolshevik line may not always be smooth sailing, may not always proceed without mistakes, without deviations here and there to the Right or to the ‘Left’—deviations in the direction of *adaptation of trailing behind events and the movement*, or in the direction of *sectarian self-isolation*. Which

of these constitutes, 'speaking generally', the main danger is a dispute in which only scholastics can engage. The greater and worse danger is that which at any given moment and in any given country represents the greater obstacle to the carrying out of the line of our Congress, to the development of the correct mass policy of the Communist Parties.

"The cause of Communism demands not abstract, but concrete struggle against deviations, the prompt and determined rebuff, of all harmful tendencies, as they arise, and timely rectification of mistakes. To replace the necessary concrete struggle against deviations by peculiar sport—hunting imaginary deviations or deviators—is an intolerably harmful twist. In our Party practice every encouragement must be given to develop initiative in formulating new questions. We must assist in having the questions concerning the activity of the Party discussed from every angle and not hastily set down as a deviation every doubt or critical remark made by a Party member with reference to practical problems of the movement. A comrade who committed an error must be given an opportunity to correct it in practice, and only those who stubbornly persist in their mistakes and who disorganize the Party are to be flayed without mercy."

It is not enough that we here, and our leading forces in general, shall study the decisions of the Congress, the great and historical report of Comrade Dimitroff. It is necessary that the entire Party membership shall discuss them, master them and learn how to apply them. For this purpose we must exert all energy to carry through the directives of the Central Committee in organizing discussions in the Party organizations, special classes for the study of the Congress, not merely casual reading through of the report, but detailed study, the breaking up of reports into composite parts and the detailed examination of every part. See to it that all our comrades read and study the resolutions and speeches, especially the report of Comrade Dimitroff.

We must help the Party members master the decisions by answering all their questions. We must not assume that everything will be at once understood. We must translate each important decision in terms of the daily practical problems in the factories, in the trade unions, in terms of the tasks of building the united front, of the struggle against war and fascism, etc. Only in this way will we really be popularizing and bringing to the Party and the masses the decisions of the Seventh World Congress in the spirit of these decisions. More than that, these decisions must become the property of the broadest masses. We have already taken some steps in this direction through mass meetings, through open forums and through the issuance of the resolutions and main reports in hundreds of thousands of copies through our press and special pamphlets. We are now issuing Comrade Dimitroff's report in an abridged four-page leaflet, which we hope to circulate in millions of copies. This

is a very important task in connection with the building of the Party in the trade unions, in the building of the Labor Party, in the fight for the establishment of the united front with the Socialists. Comrade Dimitroff emphasized the importance of bringing the Congress decisions to the masses in his closing speech in the following words:

“So much the greater our duty as Communists to render the decisions of the Congress in actual fact the property of the entire working class. To have voted for these decisions is not enough. Nor is it enough to popularize them among the members of the Communist Parties. We want the workers affiliated with the parties of the Second International and the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions, as well as the workers affiliated with organizations of other political trends, to discuss these decisions jointly with us, bring in their amendments and make practical proposals; we want them to deliberate jointly with us how decisions can best be carried into life, how they can best realize them in practice jointly with us, hand in hand.”

Now, some words with regard to the problems of cadres. At the May Plenum of the Central Committee we spent much time discussing this question. We took to heart the historic speech of Comrade Stalin regarding the question of cadres, but we have not yet made the basic change in solving this problem, although there have been some attempts and here and there some advances. The problem of selecting and training cadres is for us a burning task, especially from the basic industries, from native-born workers, bearing in mind that the Open Letter that we gave the Party in 1933 with its policy of concentration remains for us a central directive. The solution of this problem will in the last analysis determine how far and with what success we will carry out our plans. Decisions, resolutions and plans by themselves, no matter how good, will not solve the problems in our mass work, unless we have a trained body of comrades capable and willing to carry out these decisions and give them meaning and life.

Why is it we have not solved the problem of the continued poor life of our lower organizations—the sections and units? Why are our trade union fractions not able to take advantage of the very favorable conditions for work? Why is recruiting to the Party unsatisfactory? Why is the turnover in our membership still intolerably large? Why are we at times unable to answer the numerous question workers confront us with or at times unable to convince them as to the correctness of our proposals, as, for example, in the recent election campaign? The answer to all these questions is because we lack sufficient trained and well-organized cadres, especially in the lower organizations.

OUR PRESENT-DAY TASKS CALL FOR THE VIGOROUS
DEVELOPMENT OF CADRES

We often speak of the shortage of forces for this or that. But are we really lacking in members of our Party who are willing to take up the tasks of the Party? No, we have many such comrades. In fact, our Party consists of really self-sacrificing elements. Witness the splendid response to the *Daily Worker* campaign. In every struggle and strike, our Party, in the main, responds with great enthusiasm. The problem consists of knowing our forces, promoting them properly, using people to advantage where they belong and can be used, giving them assistance, helping and training them—and also a very important task especially in the sharpened situation which exists today—knowing how to preserve our cadres. Despite many decisions we have not been able to tackle this question systematically. This unfortunately is true also of the Center, as well of many of the Districts and Sections. One reason for this failure to make a decisive change in our cadres policy is unquestionably our impersonal approach to leading cadres. We too often forget our leading forces are human beings and not merely mechanical objects to be moved around like on a checker-board. Here it is necessary to recall the words of Comrade Stalin that we must cultivate our cadres as “a gardener cultivates his favorite fruit tree, to appreciate people, to appreciate cadres, to appreciate every worker who can be of use to our common cause”.

The serious taking up of the carrying through of the present-day tasks requires that we at once take up the solution of our cadres problem. We must see that the proper forces are at the proper posts, that our people grow in their work and in struggles, that they develop themselves theoretically to be able to meet and solve the complex problems before them. We must make this a personal responsibility of particular people to take up the guidance and development of other comrades. In taking up this task, we shall be guided by the advice of Comrade Dimitroff who spoke at length on this question in his speech in reply to the discussion of his report to the Communist International Congress. Comrade Dimitroff said:

“What should be our *main criteria* in selecting cadres?

“First, *absolute devotion* to the cause of the working class. *Loyalty to the Party*, tested in the face of the enemy—in battle, in prison, in court.

“Second, the closest possible *contact with the masses*. The comrades concerned must be wholly absorbed in the interests of the masses, feel the life pulse of the masses, know their sentiments and requirements. The prestige of the leaders of our Party organization should be based, first of all on the fact that the masses regard them as their leaders,

and are convinced through their own experience of their ability as leaders, and of their determination and self-sacrifice in the struggle.

"Third, *the ability independently to find one's bearings* and not to be afraid of *assuming responsibility in making decisions*. He who fears to take responsibility is not a leader. He who is unable to display initiative, who says: 'I will do only what I am told' is not a Bolshevik. Only he is a real Bolshevik leader who does not lose his head at moments of defeat, who does not get a swelled head at moments of success, who displays indomitable firmness in carrying out decisions. Cadres develop and grow best when they are placed in the position of having to solve concrete problems of the struggle independently, and are aware that they are fully responsible for their decisions.

"Fourth, *discipline and Bolshevik hardening* in the struggle against the class enemy as well as in their irreconcilable opposition to deviations from the Bolshevik line.

"Our leading cadres should combine the knowledge of *what they must do*—with *Bolshevik stamina, revolutionary strength of character and the will power to carry it through.*"

THE NEED FOR RAPID, SYSTEMATIC RECRUITING

Our Party in the United States consists of some 30,000 members. This is indeed a very important force, but a very small number indeed for a country like the United States. This number in no way corresponds to the needs of the present situation, even to the growing influence of our Party among the masses. There will be a special report on this question and proposals for more rapid, systematic recruitment. I merely wish to raise this point briefly to emphasize the need for mass recruitment. If in the past we have put the question: how do we succeed in keeping so many militant workers out of the Party, I think we can put this question again with greater force today. None of us here will deny that in the factories, in the trade unions, among the masses generally, we see daily fresh militant workers coming to the front in battle against the class enemy. Why don't we win all of these forces to our Party? We have them in the struggles of the Negro masses, in the struggles of the farmers, in strike struggles. We do not yet get all of these, nor most of these, nor even a considerable section of these workers into our ranks, because we have not yet overcome our old sectarian policy, habits, and methods of work.

With the tactical reorientation, our efforts will meet with greater success; but there is the question of organization. It is not enough to have improvement in the agitation, in the general activity. We must organize our efforts to guarantee consistent, systematic, sustained contact with these workers, to help them in their work, discuss with them, listen to their grievances against us. And sometimes they have very justified grievances against us, which they talk about widely among broad sections of workers. And thus by listening to

them, by helping them, bring them closer and closer to us, and finally into the Party.

Recruiting into the Party is not a simple act of conversion that takes place in an instant; it is a long process that we must develop systematically, step by step. Some time ago the Central Committee addressed a letter to every Party member on this question, on the methods of recruiting. If we judge by results, the comrades didn't read that letter very carefully, or they forgot about it soon. It has not been carried into effect. Unless we learn how to bring into the Party these fresh forces that are thrown up in the class struggle, we will not be able to become the mass Party of the American proletariat.

Then there is the question of membership turnover, fluctuation. At the May meeting of the Central Committee we placed this question in the center of discussion. But we have not solved it. In fact, there was little progress from the decisions of the May Plenum. The good resolutions we adopted have been forgotten. We must admit that we do not know sufficiently the reasons for this huge turnover. We must study this problem more thoroughly than before. We must give up the old, inflexible, hard-boiled attitude on organizational forms, which may have something to do with the turnover and our inability to keep the new recruits who come in full of enthusiasm and then drop out of the Party. In most cases the fault is ours. But certain things we do know, although we do not study them enough. We know that our members are not being sufficiently educated. We know that some are being unduly burdened with routine tasks. We know that the financial burden is too great for a section of our membership. We know that there is not a proper assignment and distribution of work. We know that there is insufficient political discussion of the vital issues of the day.

If we have the will, we can solve these problems. They are all, of course, very closely linked with the question of cadres, the assignment of cadres. At the Plenum we are going to propose measures to remedy the situation. Some of these remedies may not be the last word. We will see how they will work out. We must begin to learn from the members; let's listen to what they think about this question, what suggestions they make. If we make this approach, try to adjust our Party life, our Party work, our Party structure to the express need of the Party membership and of the masses around our Party, then we will, I am sure, find the solution to these problems.

ALL EFFORTS TO BUILD THE CIRCULATION OF THE
"DAILY WORKER"

What is true about Party recruitment is even more true about

our press circulation, above all of the *Daily Worker*. We have made only very little progress in building the circulation of the *Daily Worker*. Comrade Mills will make a special report to our Plenum on the recruiting and circulation drives. What I want to do is merely call your attention to the impossible condition that now exists. I want to ask you comrades if you are satisfied with this condition? I want to ask: if all of us here would really tackle the problem of building the circulation of the *Daily Worker*, don't you think we could double the circulation in a few months? Our resolution on the press calls for more effort to build local papers, which, experience shows, can be built successfully. We are also going to concentrate on a new *Sunday Worker*, to establish a national circulation many times that of the *Daily Worker*. But surely, besides all these things, there is room to build the *Daily Worker* itself into a real mass organ, in the metropolitan area, also in the country and nationally.

In order to increase the circulation, we must, of course, in addition to the organization of the sales of the paper, the development of a broader body of the *Daily Worker* builders, more promotion work, etc., also carry through a radical step in the popularization of the contents of the *Daily Worker*. This will be, perhaps, even more necessary with the language press. It is, of course, possible, really it is possible, to have a real Communist paper which is at the same time a popular paper. There is nothing incompatible in these two things. We must not only write more simply, more convincingly, but we must also take up everything that is of interest to the masses and answer their questions. There is no need to expand on this question. We have time and again raised it. We have adopted resolutions, we made plans, we know what needs to be done. The question is to arrive at a real determination to do it and to carry it out. We must also establish responsibility, we must seek for an accounting from every comrade charged with responsibility. But only if the entire Party, and above all, the leading cadres, will constantly give help and guidance to those charged with the special responsibility, will we get the results we are after.

CONCLUSION

Comrades, this report, as you see, has merely been the enlargement or the digging deep at the roots of our problems, to find the application of the line of the Seventh World Congress to our specific situation, our specific tasks in the United States. We have in this report concentrated on just a few leading questions and tried to go as deep as possible into them in terms of the daily life of our movement, to answer the questions that come up every day among the

masses, among whom we must work. The purpose of this report is to make it easier for all of us unitedly to carry through the historic decisions of the Seventh World Congress, the decisions which are already shaping the lives of the millions of masses throughout the world, which are bringing into existence much more rapidly than ever before, a great movement for unity and struggle against capitalism and against reaction. This great movement we know, if we seize upon the key question of everyday life, will lead us surely, step by step, to the victory of our cause, to the victory of socialism all over the world.