

The
COMMUNIST

NOVEMBER

1917



1938

TWENTY CENTS

EARL BROWDER on
THE ANNIVERSARY
of the **SOVIET UNION**

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,
REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND
MARCH 3, 1933, of THE COMMUNIST, published monthly at New York,
N. Y., for October 1, 1938.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Fields, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of The Communist, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Communist Party of U.S.A., 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.
Editor, Earl Browder, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

Managing Editor, None

Business Manager, Joseph Fields, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

Communist Party of U.S.A., 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

Earl Browder, General Secretary, 50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

A non-profit organization—political.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is . . . (This information is required from daily publications only).

JOSEPH FIELDS, Business Manager.

(Seal)

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 5th day of October, 1938.

MAX KITZES, Notary Public.

(My Commission expires March 30, 1940.)

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME



CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	963
Twenty-One Years of Struggle for Peace	EARL BROWDER	979
Panacea Mass Movements	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	984
Preparing for the Opening of Congress	GENE DENNIS	993
From the Tribunes of the Socialist Fatherland	ANNE BENTLEY	1000
The Communist Party in China's War for Liberation	RUDY BAKER	1009
The Los Angeles Mayoralty Recall Election	PAUL CLINE	1019
The Significance of the Latin America Trade Union Unity Congress	R. A. MARTINEZ	1028
The People of Chile Unite to Save Democracy	CARLOS CONTRERAS LABARCA	1035
Primitive Negro Solidarity: New Light From Brazil	SAMUEL PUTNAM	1045
From the World Communist Press	1051
Book Reviews	GIL GREEN	1053

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

THE NEGRO AND THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

By **JAMES W. FORD**

Price \$1.75

Deals with —

Fundamental problems confronting the Negro people in their struggle for economic, political and social equality.

The need for unity of the Negro people with all progressive forces in a democratic front against reaction and fascism.

The role of the Negro in American history and his fighting traditions and culture.

Present-day struggles in the South, in Harlem, in the trade union movement, in the Scottsboro case and other issues uniting the Negro people.

Written by —

An outstanding leader of the Negro people in the United States, and therefore of interest to everyone concerned with the Negro problem.

One of the leaders of the American Communist Party, and therefore an authoritative statement of the position of the Communist Party on the many problems treated in the book.

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D

New York, N. Y.

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Save Spain from a Munich Settlement. National and International Action by a United Working Class. General Johnson Has a Comforting Thought. Against Whom Is the Munich Betrayal Directed? Helping Fascist Aggressors To Draw the World Into a Second Imperialist War. On Contradictions Between Fascist Powers. Munich Could Have Been Averted. Dimitroff's May Day Statement. Reaction Spreads Defeatism. Aided by Trotsky-Lovestone. Growing World Authority of Soviet Union on October Anniversary. Stalin's Great Principle. Factual Record of the Soviet Union's Peace Actions. What Is Collective Action? Independence and Initiative in American Foreign Policy. The People Must Speak. What Is Wrong With the Memorandum of the National Peace Conference? Herald Tribune Writes an Epitaph Revealing Secret Wishes. Present and Future of People's Front.

IT HAS been said that the consequences of the Munich betrayal are incalculable; and that is true in a general way. Yet it is also true that many of these consequences were foreseeable, and have been foreseen and foretold, while some of them are already pressing upon us. And one of these is the attempt to impose upon Spain a Munich "settlement."

What a Munich settlement would mean for Spain is not difficult to envisage. It would be a repetition of Czechoslovakia. The real aim of the Anglo-Italian agreement on the Spanish question is to extend the Munich conspiracy to Spain, to make the four powers (Italy, Germany, England and France) the arbiters of Spain's fate, with fascism dictating the terms and Chamberlain and Daladier signing on

the dotted line. For Chamberlain continues the policy of concession to and bargaining with the aggressors, and Spain is next in the line of attack.

Faced with this danger, the workers' organizations of Spain have addressed themselves to all international labor organizations (October 11) "to adopt practical measures internationally to defend Spain, to save the peace of the world." Holding the example of Czechoslovakia before the eyes of the world, our Spanish brothers say:

"But with Spain the outcome of Munich must not be repeated and will not be repeated. Once more we call for solidarity of the international proletariat to prevent a new four-power pact against the Spanish people."

A few days earlier (October 9), an appeal for international working class

action was issued by the Communist Parties of Western Europe, signed also by Comrades Browder and Buck on behalf of the Communist Parties of the United States and Canada. It calls upon the masses to force the governments to do all in their power to bring about a *complete withdrawal* of the German and Italian forces from Spain, "to apply sanctions against the fascist aggressors, to end the blockade and restore the international legal rights to Spain." Appealing further to the masses, it says:

"With all your forces impose upon the leaders of the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions the calling of an international conference to organize the struggle against fascism, against war, for the defense of Czechoslovakia, to save Spain and peace."

And it concludes:

"Let the defense of heroic Spain be organized everywhere. Let the growing solidarity with Spain every day be affirmed by giving bread, clothing and other necessities."

The defense of Spain is the central task of the moment. There is not the slightest doubt that Spain can be saved from the fate of Czechoslovakia, and by saving Spain from the Munich conspirators, the peace of the world can still be saved. As against the poison of defeatism spread by the pro-fascist reactionaries with the aid of the Trotsky-Lovestone agents of fascism, we say *fascism shall not pass*. The masses have it in their hands to prevent Spain (and later, China) from being Munichized. This calls for the widest mass struggles and activities in defense of Czechoslovakia and Spain. The people of France, the real people, not the capitulatory and traitorous circles of the bourgeoi-

sie, are today rallying all their forces to bring help and assistance to the Spanish republic. We must do the same.

Broader forces of the American people can and must be drawn into the fight to save Spain and peace from the Munich conspirators. It is of crucial importance that the American people be helped to see clearly that *their own future* demands the defeat of the Chamberlain plans to impose a Munich "settlement" upon Spain. Such a settlement would not only bring nearer the day of a second imperialist war but would inevitably strengthen those forces which are seeking to draw the countries of Latin America into the sphere of influence of international fascism. We would then have the menace of fascist aggression right by our doorsteps. In the name, therefore, of all that is dear to the American people, in the name of our national security and peace, the American people cannot allow Spain to be Munichized. We must also remember this: if a Munich "settlement" is allowed to be imposed upon Spain, *China will be next*, international fascism will be moving on many fronts, including the pro-fascist forces within our country. The American people can effectively combat these consequences of the Munich betrayal by demanding *the immediate lifting of the embargo from republican Spain*, by demanding that the government make available to the Spanish people some of the domestic surpluses of food and cotton, by the mass organizations of the people themselves collecting and shipping to Spain food, clothing and other necessities, by demanding finally that the

government do all in its power to make it impossible for the fascist powers to secure in the United States anything that can help them to carry on their murderous aggressions.

* * *

PERHAPS it is of little account as to what our synthetic general, Hugh S. Johnson, as an individual, thinks about the Munich betrayal. Yet, considering his closeness to certain circles in Wall Street, the fact that he may be speaking loudly the quiet thoughts of his employers, the following outpouring of his deserves attention.

Like most other people in this country, the general sees little hope for peace in the Munich agreement. But being an optimist, he finds one thing in it that gives him comfort. And what is this? Read:

"There is only one comforting thought in the whole dark future—Hitler, at least, seems to be headed in the other direction—toward the East and away from Britain, France and, eventually, us. His 'only friend,' Mussolini, threatens English and French possessions in the Mediterranean, but his position and arms are weak, compared with Hitler's possible push to the East.

"If Hitler continues his charted course as advertised, sooner or later he must collide with Russia and perhaps even with his 'only friend.' It might possibly be that the salvation of the democracies will be the tactics of the Chicago police when ganghood was in flower, to let the mobsters kill each other off. It saved trouble and expense and juice for the electric chair. And it was much more effective than police intervention in ridding the world of rats." (*New York World-Telegram*, October 11.)

A rather lengthy quotation, but a revealing one; revealing, that is, for the state of mind of those Wall Street sharks who say they agree with the

humanitarian objectives of the New Deal but take exception only to its "methods." It reveals, of course, not realistic and practical thinking, but wishes, desires, dreams. And it also throws a little light on the brutality, callousness and degeneracy of the reactionaries, the real depth of which we can only surmise.

It is "comforting" to General Johnson and his Wall Street masters that Hitler will proceed to devastate Eastern Europe but will spare them and their cronies abroad. He is especially comforted by the thought that it may be the Soviet Union that Hitler will attack next. With these and similar "thoughts" the Johnsons are only deepening the chasm that already separates them from the mass of the American people.

That the Munich betrayal is directed against the Soviet Union, of this there can be not the slightest doubt. Nor can there be any doubt of the *desires* of the Chamberlains, representing as they do the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie, to direct fascist aggression against the land of socialism. But what is happening meanwhile? And it is the outcome of the "meanwhile" that will be decisive for what will happen later.

Meanwhile, international fascism is waging war against Spain and China. Of course, these two wars are directed mainly against the freedom and national independence of the peoples of these two countries; but they are also directed against the bourgeois-democracies, against the national interests and positions of England, France and the United States. One should also remember Ethiopia in this connection,

Hitler says he is out to smash "world Bolshevism." He would undoubtedly like to do it. In the vain hope that this is what Hitler will accomplish, and in the wishful thought that this will save England from fascist aggression, Chamberlain concedes to fascism and bargains with it. Out of this policy came the Munich betrayal. And what is this betrayal accomplishing meanwhile? The dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, the break-up of a bourgeois-democratic state, *which opens to Hitler the road to Southeastern Europe and to the Near and Middle East.* This again hits foremost the well-being and national independence of the numerous peoples inhabiting these regions of Europe and Asia. But it also hits the national interests and positions of England and France and to a considerable degree—the national positions of the United States.

Is this too "comforting" to the Wall Street sharks whose thoughts General Johnson is putting on paper? If so, there are several more things that should comfort them. With the Munich "agreement," the order of things established by Anglo-French imperialism in 1919, with the assistance of American imperialism, has come to an end. German imperialism, helped by the Chamberlain policies, is now putting into effect the very same plans for the blocking of which the Anglo-French entente went to war in 1914, namely, to prevent the creation of a "Middle Europe" under German domination, penetration of Asia Minor (Berlin to Bagdad) and eventually—world domination. For Hitler fascism, all that has transpired thus far, including the dismemberment of

Czechoslovakia, are only stepping stones to a fascist conquest of Southeastern Europe and the Near East; and with these new positions as a broadened base, German fascism seeks to establish its domination not only over capitalist Europe *but plans to renew the fight for the world hegemony of German finance capital.* In other words, it is the second imperialist war which is thus moving upon us and which the Munich betrayal has made so much more imminent. Clearly, Hitler is preparing to fight (in the first instance, against British imperialism) for a redivision of colonies and domination of the seas.

This threatens the peoples of all countries with unheard of destruction and barbarism. It threatens the destruction of democracy and the progressive social conquests of the people in England, France and the United States. It threatens the existence of every small nation. It threatens France, whom international fascism wants to destroy. Most immediately it threatens Spain with another Munich. It threatens the security, well-being and progress of the United States. It threatens the Soviet Union.

It is, of course, true that there exist deep contradictions and rivalries within international fascism. One can mention the contradictions between German and Italian imperialism in Southeastern Europe. Also the contradictions between German and Japanese imperialism in China. Our synthetic general, caught on Chamberlain's hook, comforts himself therefore with the thought that maybe Hitler will fight Mussolini instead of France, England or the United States. Yet it is a fact that the Chamberlain

policy of concessions to the aggressors has solidified the unstable relations between Germany, Italy and Japan instead of weakening them. And for the very simple reason that *the policy of concessions makes it profitable for the aggressors to hang together*, even though they have serious contradictions among themselves. While therefore the Munich betrayal tends to sharpen the rivalries between the fascist aggressors, as well as all other rivalries inherent in the imperialist system, the *predominating effect of Munich is to hold the fascist aggressors together*. That is why—

“The Munich betrayal has not saved peace but, on the contrary, has endangered it by striking a blow against the unity of the peace forces of all lands, by encouraging the fascists to increase their demands, *since they believe they are supported by the reactionary circles in the different lands.*” (From the appeal of the Communist Parties, October 9.)

When sticking together *pays*, why shouldn't the fascist aggressors continue to stand together, increasing their demands with each new concession, thus strengthening themselves for the second imperialist war into which the aggressors are drawing the world as well as against one another? Why shouldn't they? How can one expect anything else from the continuing Chamberlain policy of concessions to the aggressors which is supported by the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie in all the other capitalist countries?

If there is any one single conclusion from the Munich betrayal that should imprint itself on the minds of the people it is that the policy of concession to and bargaining with the ag-

gressors is leading the world to catastrophe; that this treacherous policy must be stopped by the combined efforts of all democratic, anti-fascist, patriotic and peace-loving forces; that the only way to check and quarantine the aggressors is by specific action to that effect, demonstrating full readiness to meet force by force, as the people of China and Spain are doing today.

Here is a “little” incident which throws a glaring light on the “appeasement” resulting from Munich. On October 9, Hitler made a speech at Saarbruecken which *The New York Times* and *The New York Herald Tribune* evaluate as follows:

“In other words, Hitler is now declaring in effect, that he would regard any one of these three men [Cooper, Eden or Churchill] in the position of Prime Minister [of England] as an unfriendly gesture towards Germany. He is beginning to tell the British what sort of government they must have to meet his approval.” (*The New York Times*, October 10.)

And from the *Herald Tribune* of the same date:

“It is almost contemptuously empty of any specific reassurance to France; it raps the British smartly over the knuckles, rather ominously informs them that continued freedom of speech about Germany is now ‘out of order’ and comes startlingly near to hinting that they must not replace Mr. Chamberlain with the Churchill faction on the pain of war.”

Over a year ago at Nuremberg, Hitler served notice on the world that any country which chooses to be governed by a democratic and People's Front government becomes by this very token the enemy of Germany and subject to the intervention of the

"anti-Comintern" bloc of Germany, Italy and Japan. Now, after he has been "appeased" by the seizure of Austria and the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, he serves additional notice that any country which puts men like Eden or Churchill into its government incurs his displeasure and, by inference, becomes subject to the intervention of the same bloc. Well, the world has moved a bit.

Seeing this menace clearly (and we must try to see it clearly and soberly), we say, against the defeatism spread by reaction: *Fascism will not pass*. The masses are learning from the Munich betrayal. The forces of peace, democracy and true patriotism are stronger than the forces of war. And they will now begin to assert themselves stronger than before. Together with the manifesto of the Communist Parties, we can say that:

"The war forces will not triumph over the peace forces. The people of France, Britain and the United States, supporting the Soviet Union, constitute a force for peace which can draw in the little states and give confidence to Czechoslovakia and the martyred peoples of Germany and Italy."

* * *

PRO-FASCIST reaction in this country is evidently seeking to turn the revulsion of the people with the Munich betrayal into channels of passivity and defeatism. The trend of argument is that, much as we may dislike the Munich agreement, there is nothing we in America can do about it. In this fashion, reaction (sailing under the flag of isolationism) seeks not only to escape responsibility for its share in the Munich betrayal, but also aims to block the further trend

of the masses to resistance against fascist aggression.

And the Trotsky-Lovestone agents of fascism, trying to shield the fascists and the capitulators from the anger of the masses, are intensifying their wrecking activities by distorting the peace policies of the Soviet Union, slandering the policies of the democratic People's Front, aiming to sow confusion, passivity and defeatism.

This must be counteracted energetically and effectively. And to do it means to bring to the widest masses a correct understanding of the true source of the Munich betrayal and how best to combat its consequences.

It is clear that the Munich betrayal could have been blocked and averted. Its coming we have foreseen and foretold, pointing out practical ways and means to forestall Munich and similar developments. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International (August, 1935), had warned the peoples that:

"... the adventurist plans of the German fascists ... count on a war of revenge against France, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, annexation of Austria, destruction of the independence of the Baltic states which they are striving to convert into a base for attack on the Soviet Union." *

Soon after the annexation of Austria (which also could have been averted), Comrade Dimitroff signalized the maturing immediate danger of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. In his May Day statement this year, he said:

"... the British Tories and French reactionaries are arriving at an agreement with

* *Resolutions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International*, p. 41, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 10c.

the fascist aggressors to strangle the Spanish people, are betraying Austria and Czechoslovakia, are making a bagatelle of the interests and independence of the small peoples, and are striving to direct the aggression of fascism against the . . . great land of socialism, the powerful buttress of the liberty and peace of the world."*

He then proceeded to show that it was possible *to avert* these dangers and *to defeat* the conspiracies of the British Tories, French reactionaries and their counterparts in other capitalist countries. He showed that:

"Forces exist in the world which are capable of preventing this, and are in a position to break the back of fascism once and for all."**

He pointed especially to the fact that:

"The working class—the master of the fate of millions—has not yet said its final word. Nor have the peoples who desire neither fascism nor war."**

And from this he concluded:

". . . that even at the present stage of growing aggression of the fascist states, *it is still not too late* to thwart the blood-thirsty plans of fascism. The fascist warmongers can still be strait-jacketed."**

But, he said, this requires that certain things be done *at once*, without delay and with all possible energy. And he listed specifically four closely connected lines of action.

1. The fascist aggressors must be isolated internationally.

2. A consistent peace policy must be put into effect by all states interested in the maintenance of peace.

3. United action by the international proletariat must be under-

taken, both as regards immediate struggle against the aggression of the fascist states and as regards pressure on the governments of the bourgeois-democratic states to insure that these governments pursue a firm policy toward the aggressors.

4. A firm indissoluble alliance must be established between a united international working class and the great Soviet people.

These can be no doubt that the execution of this program, even the honest fulfillment of the declarations of the Labor and Socialist International itself, between May and September this year, would have averted the Munich betrayal. But what happened? Many of the forces of peace and democracy, while moving in the general direction of this four-point program, have been doing so slowly and inconsistently. The labor movement did not manage to break decisively the opposition of the reactionary leaders to the united and people's front, and this couldn't but encourage the fascist aggressors and the Chamberlain capitulators.

Nobody can successfully deny the tremendous strides toward labor unity and people's unity against fascism and war made since the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. These were historic successes achieved in all countries with the help of the strategic line of the Seventh Congress, most outstandingly in Spain and China. This process cannot and will not be stopped, no matter what the Chamberlains may do. But the process proceeded too slowly, too leisurely, too inconsistently. And that is one of the chief lessons to be learned. This means that "the

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The Guarantee of Victory*, Workers Library Publishers, New York. 2c.

** *Ibid.*

working class, the master of the fate of millions, and the peoples who desire neither fascism nor war," must say their decisive and final word, which they haven't yet done. It means that more, infinitely more, use must be made of the lessons of the heroic struggles in Spain and China to build more rapidly the united and people's front nationally and internationally.

It is therefore clear that the Munich betrayal was made possible largely because the policy of concessions to the fascist aggressors on the part of the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie in the democratic countries was not blocked in time; and that this, in its turn, resulted largely from the fact that the opposition of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy to the united and people's front was not broken in time, either. The conclusions from this are obvious.

There may have been ideas prevailing that it was the personal blunderings and cowardice of the statesmen in the bourgeois-democratic countries which are responsible for the policy of capitulation to the aggressors. No doubt, there was a good deal of that. But the foundations of the capitulation policies lie much deeper. As we pointed out time and again, the basis of the Chamberlain policies lies in the narrow and selfish class interests of the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie in the democratic countries. Their fear and hatred of democracy and of the people. Their fear of doing anything that might hasten the defeat of fascism which they consider as the "last stand" of capitalism, their main "savior" from the rising democratic

movements of their own people and working class. It should be noted, however, that there are other representatives of the bourgeoisie who appreciate realistically the menace of increasing fascist aggression, the impossibility of buying it off, and the illusory nature of the hope that fascism can be relied on to stop the growth of the working class and people's forces.

These forces are growing, despite everything, which means the growth of the united and people's front. The masses are disgusted with the sell-out artists. They are now more ready to see that the reactionaries at home are so willing to sell out to fascism, even betraying their own countries, because they are pro-fascist, accomplices and collaborators of Hitler and Mussolini. The masses will now better grasp *the major truth of our time* that the true and dependable defenders of peace, democracy and progress, *of the national interests of their peoples*, are the genuine forces of democracy and progress—the workers, the farmers, the middle classes. The masses will now also appreciate more fully *that they need the Soviet Union*, that they must have "the firm, indissoluble alliance with the great people of the Soviet Union" to block the advance of the fascist enemy.

It is our vital task to make that clear to the widest masses of our people, especially to the working class.

* * *

ON THIS, the twenty-first anniversary of the great socialist October Revolution, out of which came the Soviet Union, there is perhaps

nothing so important as to take up in full earnest the struggle for the great Stalin principle, formulated by Comrade Dimitroff in the slogan: *For a firm, indissoluble alliance between a united international working class and the great Soviet people.*

The reader will recall the much commented-on letter of Comrade Stalin to the young Russian Communist, Ivanov, about the final victory of socialism in one country, in February of this year. Summing up the position on the question of the victory of socialism in one country, Stalin wrote:

"It follows that this question contains two different problems:

"(a) The problem of the internal relations in our country, that is, the problem of overcoming our bourgeoisie and building complete socialism, and

"(b) The problem of the external relations of our country, that is, the problem of completely insuring our country against the dangers of military intervention and restoration.

"We have already solved the first problem, for our bourgeoisie has already been liquidated and socialism has already been built in the main. This is what we call the victory of socialism or, to be more exact, the victory of socialist construction in one country. We could say that this victory was final if our country were situated on an island and if it were not surrounded by numerous other capitalist countries. But as we are living not on an island, but 'in a system of states,' a considerable number of which are hostile to the land of socialism and create the danger of intervention and restoration, we say openly and honestly that the victory of socialism in our country is not yet final.

"But from this it follows that the second problem is not yet solved and that it has yet to be solved. More than that, the second problem cannot be solved in the way that we solved the first problem, that is, solely by the efforts of our country. *The second problem can be solved only by combining the serious efforts of the international proletariat with the still more serious efforts of*

the whole of our Soviet people. The international proletarian ties between the working class of the U.S.S.R. and the working class of bourgeois countries must be increased and strengthened; the political assistance of the working class in bourgeois countries for the working class of our country must be organized in the event of a military attack on our country; and also every assistance of the working class of our country for the working class in bourgeois countries must be organized." * (Our emphasis—A. B.)

The content of the above quotation contains the essence of a major phase of our work at the present time. The Munich betrayal makes it actual and alive to the highest degree because never before did the masses realize as clearly as they must now the acute need of the firm, indissoluble alliance with the great people of the Soviet Union.

It is precisely to block the trend of the masses in the direction of such an alliance that pro-fascist reaction, aided by the Trotsky-Lovestoneites, is seeking to distort the role of the Soviet Union in the recent international crisis. These reactionary efforts seek to spread defeatism among the masses by making them believe that the Soviet Union, admittedly the greatest single force for world peace, is abandoning the fight against fascist aggression or is hesitating in the pursuance of it. In these slanders against the Soviet Union, there is also the further attempt to shield the criminal purposes of the Chamberlains to direct the aggression of fascism against the Soviet Union.

To combat these vicious slanders and lies, it is necessary to place before the masses *the record of facts.*

* Joseph Stalin, *A Letter to Ivanov*, pp. 12-13. International Publishers, New York. 5c.

In his speech before the League of Nations Council on September 21, broadcast also to the United States, Comrade Litvinov stated the facts plainly, giving dates, places and names. From these it is fully evident that the Soviet government had made it clear, in time and repeatedly, to all governments concerned, not only that it opposes Hitler's designs on the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia, but that it is fully ready to fulfill all its treaty obligations in connection with it.

Furthermore, it also is clear from the factual record that the Soviet government had tried during the days of the crisis to move England and France to *collective action* to impress Hitler with the existence of a united front of these three countries able and willing to prevent the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. It also has to be recalled that, when the Polish government made its threat to invade Czechoslovakia, it was reported, the Soviet government informed the Polish that, in such an event, the non-aggression pact between the two countries would become invalid.

What does this factual record of deeds show? It shows the Soviet government as the only government fighting from beginning to end for the application of the principles of collective security against the aggressor. It shows it as the only government ready and willing to throw in the immense weight of its power in the *collective execution* of these principles—the principles of halting the fascist aggressor by the collective actions of all states interested in the maintenance of peace. It shows it finally as the only government that

stood ready at all times to fulfill all its treaty obligations (to Czechoslovakia, to France, to the League of Nations).

All this, of course, is no accident. It flows from the very nature of the socialist state, from its consistent peace policy. Comrade Litvinov restated that policy in his well-known speech before his electorate in Leningrad on June 23, 1938.

The Soviet government, he said, had joined the League of Nations (in the creation of which it had no part and no responsibility) "to defend peace as a common interest of the nations." Since then, it has utilized every opportunity in the League to bring about action that will halt the aggressors and protect their victims. Remember Ethiopia and remember Spain.

Advocating consistently international collective action against aggressors, the Soviet government nevertheless agreed to join mutual assistance pacts by regions. Why? Says Litvinov:

"In our efforts to render all-round assistance in preserving peace by *collective international cooperation*, and knowing that without the Soviet Union there could not be created any balance of power in Europe and the world which would force the aggressors to give way, the Soviet government agreed to join regional mutual assistance pacts."

We must remind the masses of all these facts so they will understand better the origin of the Franco-Soviet and Czecho-Soviet pacts. From this they will see that:

"When the proposed Eastern regional pact was broken up by Germany and Poland, the Soviet Union concluded mutual assistance pacts with France and Czechoslovakia. These pacts, besides providing for aid in event of

war, also have the aim of averting or lessening the very threat of war in certain parts of Europe."

And can there be any doubt that these acts of the Soviet government did play a decisive role in averting and lessening the threat of war in certain parts of Europe and, hence, in the world? None whatever.

Continuing, Comrade Litvinov said:

"Only recently the U.S.S.R. reminded the peace-seeking powers of the necessity of urgent collective measures to save mankind from the menacing new bloody war."

That was way before the Czechoslovakian crisis broke out. And what happened to the offer of the Soviet government to avert the maturing Munich betrayal?

"This call remained unanswered, but the Soviet government at any rate has cast off responsibility for the further development of events."

This call remained unanswered. Let us brand that upon the capitulators in the Munich betrayal to whom this timely call was addressed. Let us also brand it upon Citrine and his like who were sabotaging labor and people's unity, nationally and internationally, thus directly encouraging the Chamberlains in all bourgeois-democratic countries to leave this call unanswered. And let us also make clear that there would have been no Munich, that the offer of the Soviet government *would have been accepted*, if the labor movement had broken the sabotage of the Citrines. The governments in the bourgeois-democratic countries felt safe in leaving the Soviet offer unanswered because the camp of peace and democ-

racy has not *pressed* upon these governments with the required *unity, determination and timeliness*.

And, finally, concluding on this point, Comrade Litvinov said:

"It must, however, be noted, that the Soviet Union does not ask this for itself, it does not impose itself upon anyone as a partner or ally, but only agrees to collective action."

Agrees to *collective* action and stands ready to do its full share in such action for peace and against fascist aggression.

Now we will ask: is this a correct policy for a socialist state to pursue, a single working class state surrounded by hostile capitalist states? What honest worker, or progressive generally, will say it is not? None will. And has the Soviet government fulfilled honestly and consistently this international peace policy? Fully and consistently. It is precisely this policy of the Soviet Union, supported by the masses everywhere, that averted a world war thus far. And in his latest speech in Geneva, Comrade Litvinov restated this policy of the Soviet Union, and the continued adherence of the Soviet government to it, the policy of *collective action*, action that can bring results, to check the aggressor and preserve peace.

The working class of the world, and all democratic and peace forces, can be proud of the role of the Soviet Union in the fight for peace as well as of its proved ability to protect the frontiers of the socialist fatherland from the aggressors. And to remember also that this was achieved in no small measure because of the effective destruction of the Trotsky-Bukharin treacherous nests.

On this, the twenty-first anniversary of the October Revolution, the Soviet Union stands more than ever before as the greatest bulwark of peace and democracy; its world authority heightened; the ally that all peace-loving peoples need to combat the menacing consequences of the Munich betrayal, to halt the aggressors in Central Europe, in Spain, in China, and to fight effectively pro-fascist reaction at home.

Hail the firm, indissoluble alliance between a united international working class and the great Soviet people!

Hail the collaboration and friendship between the American and Soviet peoples for progress, democracy and peace!

* * *

AMERICAN orientation in foreign affairs, as formulated by the President on several occasions, notably in the Chicago speech calling for the quarantining of the aggressor, *has to be made into a policy*. This is one of the chief conclusions to be drawn from the Munich betrayal and its consequences. This means, first, that every act of the State Department, big or little, must be grounded upon and squared with the President's declarations. It means, secondly, that the American government must display more initiative and leadership in the world situation.

In saying so, we are particularly mindful of two handicaps and weaknesses in the actual working out of American foreign policy. One is the tendency to do nothing that may displease Chamberlain, in fact, to seek to accommodate Chamberlain. This sort of tendency, quite influential in

the State Department, is as far from the policy of collaboration with the peace forces of other countries, including England, as heaven is from earth. The second is the obvious timidity and reluctance to assert America's position in foreign affairs in a truly independent and leading way. With the result that on the crucial Spanish question, this country, by its unneutral embargo, has placed itself in a position of helping Chamberlain to strangle the Spanish Republic; and in the Czechoslovakian crisis, the President's wishes to block aggression and to bring about a truly international peace conference were turned, in practice, to accommodate the engineers of the Munich betrayal.

Why is it that a good *general orientation* of opposition to aggression and for the maintenance of world peace by collective efforts produces *in practice* actions or lack of actions which are comforting to the Chamberlains? The answer is: the general orientation has not been incorporated into policy; and in order for such a policy to come into being, the American government must appear as a truly independent and leading factor on the world arena. This has become absolutely imperative as a result of the Munich betrayal. There can be no independence in so-called isolation. On the contrary, isolation is the sure road to foreign entanglements in imperialist conspiracies and imperialist war. Nor can there be independence in trailing behind the Chamberlains. True independence for this country and freedom from entanglements lie in assuming a leading role in the pursuance of its own policy of peace whose general principles the Presi-

dent has stated a number of times. *The way to American collaboration with other governments desiring peace lies through a course of American initiative and leadership.*

The people must demand such a policy. *They must organize and fight for this policy.* The forthcoming Congress of the American League for Peace and Democracy can contribute greatly towards this end.

The peace movements of this country are beginning to realize the importance of American initiative and leadership. Yet certain sections of these movements seem somewhat disorientated on the nature of the Munich "agreement" and its consequences. The *Memorandum on the International Crisis*, issued by the National Peace Conference, is an example of such disorientation. On the one hand, this Memorandum says, "The agreement reached at Munich may prove to be only an armed truce with each nation fortifying itself with ever increasing armaments in expectation of war." And this is generally correct, although it touches only slightly the heart of the betrayal. But the Memorandum does not stop here. It proceeds to say that "on the other hand the Munich Conference may lead to a complete new deal in international relations." How? Why? This is not explained. And, what is even worse, the Memorandum goes on to outline a specific program on foreign policy for America, based on this illusory and harmful expectation that the Munich betrayal "may lead to a complete new deal in international relations."

Only three things were overlooked by the authors of this document:

1. The Munich agreement is an imperialist bargain at the expense of a small nation, to the advantage of the fascist aggressor.

2. England and France, through Chamberlain and Daladier, took part in this imperialist bargain, sacrificing in the process the interests of their own countries.

3. The imperialist bargain incorporated in the Munich agreement opens to Hitler fascism (German imperialism) the road to the conquest of Southeastern Europe and the near East which, in the fascist plans, is one more stage towards the second imperialist war for colonies and world hegemony.

We have not listed, in this connection, the fascist plans against the Soviet Union, which are inseparable from fascism. Nor have we listed here the general sharpening of all contradictions inherent in the imperialist system, including the contradictions between the fascist powers themselves, which must result from the Munich betrayal and are already evident everywhere.

How then, in the face of all this, can the Munich agreement lead to a "new deal" in international relations? Why, the mere intensification of universal armaments and war preparations, which started at the same moment that the Munich agreement was signed, should dispel any such harmful illusions as those expressed in the Memorandum. No, the Munich betrayal helps the fascist aggressors to draw the world into a second imperialist war, threatening the national existence of all small states, threatening the colonial peoples, endangering France and men-

acing the national positions of England and the United States. Internally, the Munich betrayal leads to an intensified reactionary and pro-fascist drive in the bourgeois-democratic countries against the liberties and economic standards of the masses. One must be blind not to see all that. There can be no doubt that the Munich betrayal served also as a direct encouragement to the Japanese to start their drive into South China.

It is clear, therefore, that if the United States wants to avoid being drawn into the second imperialist war, if the people of this country are to prevent an advance of pro-fascist reaction at home, both of these dangers flowing from the Munich betrayal, then the American foreign policies must be more consistently determined by the President's orientation to quarantine the aggressors. *Now more than before.* And the struggle for the building up of the democratic people's front in this country to combat reaction and fascism—for security, jobs, democracy and peace—must be pursued with infinitely more energy and determination. *Hence, the tremendous importance of defeating reaction in the elections this month.*

In passing, it is necessary to take note of the fact that the Pan-American Conference to be held in Lima, Peru, next month, presents this country with new opportunities to lead in the fight for peace, as well as confronting it with new dangers. It is being stressed from all sides that the American government must aim to "make a success" of this conference because of the acute international situation (made more acute by Munich). Yes,

but how? By giving the good neighbor policy more sincerity, more consistency. By proceeding from the principle that the nations of Latin America are our friends *and allies*, allies in the common task of developing peace and democracy in the Americas, of participating actively and in capacity of leadership, in collaboration with the peoples of England and France, *supporting the peace policy and efforts of the Soviet Union*, to check the aggressors and preserve world peace.

This, and not the new cries for "armed isolation," is the road for this country to take.

* * *

"THE Popular Front Is Dead," says the *Herald Tribune*. Whereupon it proceeds to write an epitaph in its editorial of October 8. Knowing this mouthpiece of reaction, we can safely assume that wish rather than reality was father of the thought. "Wishful thinkers," said Dorothy Thompson of the Chamberlains. She can also find this brand closer home.

Interesting, however, are certain curious admissions and reasonings in this editorial of the *Tribune*. It never liked the people's front policies, and does not like them now. And that is O.K. with us. Yet it makes the admission that the people's front policies:

"... did sustain what is still essentially a democratic government in Spain against an essentially totalitarian attack, and in practice it did make parliamentary government a continuously working possibility in France."

This is an important admission. It says in plain words that the people's fronts were helpful (to say no more) in maintaining democratic government in Spain and France against the

fascist and reactionary enemies of democratic government. Was this good or bad, in the opinion of the *Herald Tribune*? The editorial in question says nothing explicitly. It remains on this question suspiciously "objective." We recall, however, that in days past (and not so very much past) this same paper was making one of its main attacks against the Roosevelt administration on the ground, so it claimed, that the government's policies were leading to a sort of "popular front" in the United States. Now, aside from the validity of such claims, this question can be asked legitimately of the *Herald Tribune*:

If it is true that the popular front "did sustain" a democratic government in Spain against fascist attack, and if the popular front "did make parliamentary government [democracy] a continuously working possibility in France," then why should one oppose the popular front, if one genuinely believes in democracy? And doesn't it follow then that he who opposes the policies of the popular front, or rushes with epitaphs on a living and fighting people's front which is still under "totalitarian attack," isn't really in favor of democratic and parliamentary government?

Now, as to the people's front being dead. Is it dead in Spain? We know that Hitler and Mussolini want to make it dead, and that Chamberlain is willing to help by a Spanish Munich. But the popular front itself was never more alive. Does the *Herald Tribune* wish to kill it and with it, the democratic government and national independence of Spain?

Or take China, which the *Herald Tribune* somehow overlooked. Surely,

the national anti-Japanese people's front there is very much alive. There too it "sustains" the struggle for national freedom against Japanese totalitarian imperialism. Which should be good, according to the *Tribune's* editorial of October 8. But, inferentially, this same editorial says that the popular national front in China is dead. Is this again a case of wish being father to thought? And if so, why so? Doesn't the *Herald Tribune* editorial room know (what was reported in its news columns) that Hitler and Chamberlain are planning a Munich for China and that this would hit also the United States? Or is the *Herald Tribune* indifferent to the interests of the United States?

And as to the popular front in France, who says it was dead there? The Munich betrayal, signed also by Daladier under Hitler's dictate, no doubt delivered a heavy blow against the French popular front as well as against the unity of the peace forces of the world. No doubt also about the attempts of the 200 families of France to exploit the present situation to break the people's front and to open the way for a fascist advance in France itself. But the forces of the people's front—the workers, farmers and middle classes—the *real people of France*, will just now begin to come into their own, precisely as a result of the Munich betrayal and to combat its menacing consequences. And this they will do *through a broader and stronger people's front*, a real people's front, in which the French working class will be more firmly united with its allies than heretofore, *leading the people*, against its internal and external enemies.

Wasn't the epitaph therefore a bit premature? And didn't it expose some hidden wishes and desires which ordinarily the *Herald Tribune* wouldn't want the world to know about?

We could say to the *Herald Tribune* like this:

You see, the people's front policies of the Communists, which they formulated at their Seventh World Congress in 1935, were the result of very sober and scientific analysis of the forces at work in the world and in strict accord with their fundamental principles. It was no wishful thinking on their part, or temporary maneuver. It was a fundamental strategic line. Everything that has happened in the world since then, including Munich, has fully confirmed the correctness of that line which has scored historic successes. This the *Herald Tribune* itself has to admit when it points to Spain and France. It could also have pointed to China and to all other countries where the peoples have to fight against the offensive of fascism and war.

What the blow of the Munich betrayal did (by sharpening all existing contradictions) was to set forces at work which will immeasurably deepen the chasm between the peoples in the bourgeois-democratic countries and the reactionary, pro-fascist circles of their bourgeoisie. This means that the social base of the people's front will become broader by the access of new forces; that the ties between the various social groups in the people's front will grow firmer by the impact of the great menace of fascist attack from outside and pro-fascist attacks from the inside; that the more conscious anti-fascist forces in the people's fronts, notably the working class, will seek greater proletarian unity, displaying more initiative and leadership in the movements of the people's front.

Perhaps an epitaph has to be prepared. Not yet to be published, to be sure, but just held in readiness. An epitaph not for the people's front but for the policies of those who bargain with and capitulate to fascism.

A. B.

"Precisely because we love and would protect the achievements of American democracy, we love and protect that higher form of democracy which is being surely and firmly established in the Soviet Union, showing the way to the whole world of the twentieth century, just as the United States was showing the way to the whole world in the eighteenth century."—Earl Browder, *Traitors in American History*.

TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

BY EARL BROWDER

THE Soviet Union stands out in world affairs today as the only firm support of peace against the fascist aggressors. This position is the consistent development of the entire history of the Soviet Union. On the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of the rise of the Soviet power, which we observe on November 7, it is particularly appropriate to remind ourselves of this long and sustained struggle for peace, and to study again some of its main lessons.

It was in the midst of the World War, and in the first place as a struggle for peace, liberty and bread, that the Soviet Union was born. Its first utterance to the world was an appeal for peace—for peace without annexations and without indemnities.

Old Russia, of the barbarous tyranny of tsarism, had long been one of the chief forces threatening the world with war. Before the war it was the main support of reaction throughout the world. It was above all the position of tsarism in the line-up of the Allied powers that destroyed all their pretenses of representing democracy as against the despotism of the Central European Entente, which placed the brand of imperialist aggression equally upon both camps. Old Russia was the summation of every-

thing backward, everything despotic, everything oppressive, everything reactionary, in the pre-War world.

The World War brought indescribable catastrophe to the peoples of old Russia. Russian casualties were equal to those of all the rest of the world combined. Russian economy completely collapsed. And, finally, the ancient structure of tsarist autocracy broke and crumbled under the blows of a rising of the people in search of bread and peace.

Between March and November, of 1917, the peoples of Russia learned through their own bitter experience that only one party led the way, fearlessly and realistically, to the achievement of bread and peace—the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the Bolsheviks, the Communist Party. They learned that to gain the two most simple, most elementary, demands of life, it was not only necessary to smash the old tsarist autocracy, but that it was also necessary to go beyond the limitations of capitalism, to establish their Soviet government, and to step onto the path toward socialism. And the overwhelming majority of the people went forward with the Communists in a great people's movement for bread and peace.

Reactionary newspapers in America

today are trotting out their hired writers to cry: "Don't trust the Soviet Union in the defense of world democracy, because the Soviets betrayed democracy in 1918 at Brest-Litovsk!" Such conscienceless slanders are quite necessary for those who wish to defend Chamberlain in the most shameful betrayal ever attempted in the history of the modern world. Brest-Litovsk has its lessons for us today, but they point in the opposite direction to that of the defenders of Chamberlain's treason.

The first act of the Soviet government had been to repudiate the imperialist war aims of tsarism, and to appeal to the world for peace without annexations or indemnities. *But the Soviet power did not abandon the Allies*; it called for a general peace, to be negotiated on a non-imperialist basis; and in the meantime declared its readiness to maintain the front against German imperialism, until the German people overthrew it from within, *provided the Allies would give the necessary help and cooperation and also renounce annexations and indemnities.*

But the Allied powers abandoned the Soviet Union. They ignored its communications, and refused to deal with it. Instead of help and cooperation, they launched a war of their own against their former ally. They inspired and financed uprisings against the Soviet power by all the remnants of tsarism; they sent their own expeditionary forces into Russia from all directions to help overthrow the Soviets.

The new government of bread and peace for the people was invaded by both Germany and its own former allies. Under the leadership of Lenin, the Soviet power made a separate

peace with Germany at Brest-Litovsk, only after the betrayal of the Allies left this as the only alternative to destruction at the hands of both Germany and the Allies.

It was the Soviet's appeal for peace without annexations or indemnities, and the robber's peace forced upon her by Germany at Brest-Litovsk, that more than any other factor destroyed the war spirit of the German people, and led to the German revolution of 1918, which ended the war. True, the German revolution was soon crushed, but not before it had made its contribution to restoring world peace. Lenin's policy was justified a thousand times before the peoples of the whole world.

It is well for us to remember today, when Trotskyites and Bukharinites are desperately trying to use false Communist banners in the service of the fascist war-makers, that at the time of Brest-Litovsk it was Trotsky and Bukharin who tried to assassinate Lenin and to overthrow the Soviet power from within—then also at the behest of powers trying to overthrow the Soviets from without by military means.

* * *

The World War came to an end largely as a result of the Russian and German Revolutions. But the Allied imperialists dictated the peace terms at Versailles on the example Germany had set at Brest-Litovsk, a peace of vengeance, of annexations and indemnities, only slightly tempered by the idealism of Woodrow Wilson, who was helpless in the hands of the tough realists of European imperialism. One of the few victories of Wilson was the establishment of the Republic of

Czechoslovakia. On the whole it was a robber's peace, unworkable, and containing the guarantee of new wars if not revised. It was so denounced by the Soviet Union, and by the Communist International.

The Soviet Union, having firmly established its power over most of the territory of the former tsarist empire, on the basis of a free federation of peoples, turned its attention to reconstruction, and the building of its new socialist society. At the same time, it began to develop its active peace policy in world affairs, upon the principle of self-determination of nations, of peaceful and orderly adjustment of international relations.

It was the Soviet Union, alone among great powers, which officially and formally placed on the order of the day the proposal for complete disarmament of the world as the only sure road to peace, as the only guarantee of the outlawing of war. But the Western democracies replied only by questioning the good faith of the proposal, although that good faith might have been quickly and thoroughly tested by a simple acceptance of the proposal. When complete disarmament was rejected, the Soviet Union proposed a program of partial and progressive disarmament, but again it was rebuffed.

It was left to the Soviet Union to take the first steps to bring the democratic republic of Germany back into the family of nations through the treaty of friendship signed at Rapallo. If this example had been followed by the Western democracies, the ground for the later rise of the Nazi barbarism would have been cut away, and the path would have been opened to a

real world appeasement. For years, the Soviet Union stood forth as the only and true friend of the German people and their democratic republic.

Then as the world crisis sharpened all international and social tensions, as fascism and fascist aggression began to take hold of the world, the Soviet Union accepted the invitation—the first it had ever received—to enter the League of Nations.

Within the League of Nations the Soviet Union has consistently fought to strengthen that body and all forms of international collaboration for peace. Every step that has been taken to weaken and dismember the League has been opposed by it. Every step to carry out the League principles has found the Soviet Union in the front ranks in full and energetic support. The voice of the Soviet Union in the councils of the League has come to represent the conscience of the world—the only consistent and unchanging champion of peace through international collaboration.

Upon the basis of the League, the Soviet Union has consistently pressed upon its neighbors the establishment of Pacts of Non-Aggression, and has signed such pacts with most of them; the only exceptions are those aggressive nations which have refused.

Upon the basis of the League, and with League approval, the Soviet Union entered into a Pact of Mutual Defense with France and with Czechoslovakia. The terms of this Pact were offered to all other European nations, a guarantee that it was not directed against any other nation.

The Soviet Union was among the first to sign the Kellogg-Briand Pact, outlawing resort to war as an instru-

ment of national policy, and has been among the most consistent upholders of the principles of this treaty, which has been subscribed to by most of the nations of the world.

The Soviet Union is the only great power which voluntarily renounced all privileges at the expense of weaker nations (as China) acquired through unequal treaties.

During all its history, not one nation, large or small, has ever had reason to fear any aggression from the Soviet Union, and not one effort at world peace and appeasement has failed to find staunch support from the Soviet Union.

* * *

From the beginning of systematic aggressions by Germany, Italy and Japan, which have brought chaos into international relations and threaten the whole world with catastrophe, it has been the Soviet Union alone which has consistently lived up to its obligations in letter and spirit. In the councils of the League of Nations, Ethiopia and China and Spain heard only the voice of Litvinov raised consistently in their behalf. Only the Soviet Union has seriously helped China protect her national integrity, although the League has established that this is the duty of all nations. Only the Soviet Union helped the Spanish Republic, when the Western democracies turned their backs to pretend not to see the fascist invasion. And now only the Soviet Union stood steadfastly by Czechoslovakia, while its supposed "protectors" joined the bandit Hitler to force that democratic nation to commit suicide—in the name of "peace."

The record is complete.

A few months ago, the well-known Dorothy Thompson—and Congressman Dies should be warned not to class her with Shirley Temple—wrote the following significant words:

"If it becomes clear that Russia is the only country on earth that will defend small democracies while great democracies are prepared to bargain them away, then heaven help the great democracies!"

This cry of despair comes from a spokesman for the reactionary camp in the United States. Dorothy Thompson was the darling of Park Avenue and Wall Street. She is reputed to be the best-paid newspaper writer in America. Doubtless she was worth the money to her employers, because she seemed really to believe what she wrote in their behalf; that is a very rare thing, indeed, these days. It will be interesting to watch what conclusions Miss Thompson draws from the necessity finally to file her appeal to heaven. Will she speak up for the Soviet Union, the only power that stood firm for the "small democracies" or will she continue as spokesman for the forces of the "Anti-Communist Alliance" in America? Whatever she has or has not learned, one thing is sure; the American people have learned a deep political lesson in the latest events. America wants world peace; but there is only one other government in the world that can be depended upon to work with America to that end, and that is the Soviet Union.

* * *

What is the reason that England and France betrayed Czechoslovakia, while the Soviet Union stood firm in her support? Is there some deep dif-

ference in the interests, the sympathies, or the desires of the peoples of the three countries?

No, there is not the slightest doubt that the overwhelming majority of Englishmen and Frenchmen agreed with the people of the Soviet Union, that Czechoslovakia must be supported to the end, as the frontline defenses of all peoples of Europe. But the people were betrayed by their governments. The governments did not consult the wishes of the people, but only the wishes of their capitalists and aristocrats, who are not so secretly in league with Hitler.

But the government in the Soviet Union could not betray the people to the capitalists and aristocrats, because the Soviet Union has no such animals.

The people of the Soviet Union own and control their country, from top to bottom, including their economy and their government; they have socialism. The Western democracies were betrayed, because they were either in possession of, or surrendered to, their capitalists, their economic royalists. Democracy can be protected only in uncompromising struggle against all the powers of monopoly capital.

Profound and epoch-making is this lesson for the world and for the American people. We must study it ever more deeply. We must make it fully understood by the millions of the American workers, farmers, and middle classes who want peace, and who want our country to be in the forefront in the organization of peace.

“The international proletarian ties between the working class of the U.S.S.R. and the working class in bourgeois countries must be increased and strengthened; the political assistance of the working class in the bourgeois countries for the working class of our country must be organized in the event of military attack on our country; and also every assistance of the working class of our country for the working class in bourgeois countries must be organized. . . .”—Joseph Stalin, *A Letter to Ivanov*.

PANACEA MASS MOVEMENTS

A PROBLEM IN BUILDING THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

PART I

RECENT EXPERIENCE SUMMARIZED

THE fundamental social process now going on in the United States is a far-reaching class differentiation and political realignment. Under the heavy pressure of the prolonged economic crises, the workers, poorer farmers and lower city middle class are rapidly becoming conscious of the interests of their classes and, in a series of sharp mass struggles, are breaking from beneath the ideological and political hegemony of big capital, expressed for so long by capitalist illusions among the masses and by capitalist control of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. They are moving towards the establishment of a political viewpoint, program and organization of their own—a great democratic front of the toiling masses. And the foundation issue around which this profound political process develops is the broad question of progress versus reaction, of democracy versus fascism.

In carrying through this basic class differentiation and political realignment, the masses are largely blazing their own trail, with no definite program or well-thought-out goal in mind. They have no great farmer-

labor party; nor has the Communist Party sufficient mass strength and prestige to lead the broad movement. Hence, without a powerful political organization, and established leadership, or an extended independent political experience, a firm discipline, and a cultivated Socialist perspective, these masses, driven on by an urgent need for action, naturally are making many errors in their forward march. It is not strange, therefore, that during the past several years, in their militant attempts to strike blows at their oppressors and to shield themselves from intolerable hardships, the masses, in addition to carrying through such well-executed movements as the Roosevelt campaign, the C.I.O. drives, the struggle of the unemployed, the American Youth Congress, etc., have also spontaneously developed many broad mass movements, motivated by sound aspirations, but with incorrect and even fantastic panacea programs and dangerous demagogic leaders.

What Engels wrote to Sorge in 1887, dealing with the mass movement of that period and criticizing Henry George, still rings true of our period:

“Affairs are on the move over there at last, and I must know my Americans badly if they do not astonish us all by the vastness of their movement, but also by the gigantic

nature of the mistakes they make, through which they will finally work out their way to clarity."*

Let us now briefly review and analyze the more important of the panacea movements that have been such a striking feature of the past several years.

CONFUSIONISM AND DEMAGOGY

a. *Technocracy*: This movement, headed by Howard Scott of New York, swept swiftly through the whole press of the country in 1932-33, during the midst of the great economic crisis, creating something of a national sensation. It was an adaptation of the ideas of Thorstein Veblen and of I.W.W. syndicalism. The Technocrats saw the industrial crisis as developing because "the price system" had grown obsolete in the face of the great technological advances of recent years. In a nutshell, their panacea provided for the adoption of "ergs," or energy units, to serve as a system of exchange in place of the "price system" and also that the direction of society be turned over to the engineers, whom they considered the basic source of all social progress. The intelligentsia were especially intrigued by this movement.

Technocracy was founded upon the elementary fallacy of ascribing the cause of industrial crises with all their profound political consequences, merely to the capitalist method of exchange, instead of to the basic contradictions of capitalist production—namely the private ownership of the social means of production and distribution, with the resultant production for profit instead of for use.

Linked with this profound error was a whole series of other gross misconceptions, including the denial that the workers are an exploited class, the rejection of the class struggle and the revolutionary role of the proletariat, the notion of the liquidation of the working class through the development of automatic machinery, the naive assumption that the capitalists would turn over the control of society to the engineers, etc. The general tendency of technocracy was to confuse the intellectuals, to create defeatism among the masses and to weaken the mass struggle for practical measures of immediate relief and for socialism as the ultimate solution.

The technocracy movement, after its brief splurge of publicity, was overwhelmed by the great industrial and political struggles of its period, as well as by the growth of more alluring and less technically complicated panaceas. Now only traces of it remain. An analysis of this movement is contained in the pamphlet *Technocracy and Marxism*, by Earl Browder and William Z. Foster, and also in the article, "Technocracy, a Reactionary Utopia," by V. J. Jerome, in *THE COMMUNIST* for February, 1933.

b. *Epic*: The Epic (End-Poverty-In-California) movement, headed by Upton Sinclair, centered in California, although it also produced substantial repercussions in many Western states. It developed very swiftly, following the publication of Sinclair's book, *I, Governor of California*, in October, 1933. The basis of the Epic movement was the principle of self-help by the unemployed. It had its roots in the fact that up until that time the huge

* *Science and Society*, Vol. II, No. 3.

masses of unemployed, verging into actual starvation conditions, were receiving little or no assistance from the local, state and national governments, and in many localities were trying to help themselves by various small productive and bartering enterprises. Sinclair seized upon this tendency and proposed the taking over of idle factories and land by the state and setting up of a system of production and barter by the unemployed that would not only abolish unemployment, but also open the doors to a growth of general prosperity.

This utopia had the basic flaw of assuming that a separate, non-profit-making production and exchange regime could be built within the framework of the capitalist system, which is based upon private ownership and production for profit. It overlooked the fact that while capitalists—hostile to any production-for-use project—owned the great natural resources, industries and transportation systems, they could and would (and they did) block the growth of Sinclair's barter system. The Epic had the practical disadvantage for the masses of thrusting itself athwart the unemployed workers' intense struggle for government relief. Sinclair put forth his Epic plan as a substitute for the more realistic program of state aid, one of his major arguments being that self-help by the unemployed would relieve the taxpayers of the huge sums otherwise necessary for a system of social insurance.

Despite its glaring fallacies, Epic caught the imagination of the starving Californian masses and it ran like wildfire among them. The movement expressed itself politically through the

Democratic Party, which fell largely under the control of the Epics. The big capitalist interests of California fought Epic ruthlessly, and in the elections of 1934, Sinclair, candidate for governor on the Democratic ticket, was beaten by Merriam by a vote of 1,138,000 to 879,000, with the third party candidate, Haight, polling 304,000. After this defeat the Epic movement gradually declined, until now there are only vestiges of it left. Analyses of Epic are to be found in an article by Robert Minor in *THE COMMUNIST*, of December, 1934, and in the pamphlet, *Sinclair, Will His Epic Work?* by Sam Darcy.

c. *The Utopian Society*: This movement was initiated by Eugene J. Reed in the fall of 1933 in Southern California. Amazing its leaders and everyone else, it grew like a mushroom and soon claimed a million members at its maximum. Its following was largely middle class. The Utopians declared themselves for the "Brotherhood of Man" and Plenty for All," and they proposed, through exercise on the "Right of Eminent Domain by the Government," to establish the "Cooperative Commonwealth" through government ownership. The movement was educational and, copying from fraternal orders, had an elaborate ritual. The Utopians—well-named—failed to recognize the class struggle, had no practical program of day-to-day demands, and collapsed in confusion in 1934, in the face of the more solid Epic and Townsend movements. Now only a few grouplets are left of the Utopians.

d. *The Townsend National Recovery Plan*: This great mass movement, which, like several others of its

type originated in Southern California, was formally launched by Dr. Francis E. Townsend in Long Beach, in April, 1934. Its cure-all consisted of maximum pensions of \$200 per month for the aged, to be financed primarily by a 2 per cent transactions tax. The money—some twenty billion dollars annually—put into circulation by the pension payments, was supposed, not only to provide care for the old and jobs for the unemployed, but especially to raise generally the purchasing power of the masses and thus to establish a broad and expanding prosperity. The movement dubbed itself a “permanent national cure for depression.”

As a self-sufficient solution for the capitalist crisis, the Townsend Plan was altogether naive. It failed utterly to note that while the land and great industries remained in the hands of private owners the latter would have the capacity, through raising prices, lowering wages, etc., to cancel out, largely if not wholly, the increased mass purchasing power brought about by Townsend's old-age pensions. Hence, the plan did not realize that to protect and extend mass purchasing power, a great political struggle of the exploited classes is necessary on many fronts, which eventually culminates in the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. As an immediate project of old-age pensions, the Townsend Plan had two major weaknesses: (1) of setting an impractical pension figure, \$200 per month, for an old person, amounting to double the present average wage of an able-bodied employed worker, or four times as much where both the man and his wife should draw pensions; and (2) of throwing the burden of

financing the pensions upon the masses themselves, through the transactions, or sales tax, instead of upon the wealthy. The plus and minus features of the plan are analyzed in Alex Bittelman's pamphlet, *The Townsend Plan*.

The Townsend movement ran swiftly all over California and then throughout the nation. It was animated by a religious-like enthusiasm and its leaders soon claimed several million members, especially among the older strata of the population. The movement suffered a serious crash during the Presidential elections of 1936, when its reactionary leadership, in an ill-fated attempt to defeat Roosevelt and the New Deal, tried to line up its following behind the third party candidate, Lemke. Notwithstanding heavy losses, the movement still retains considerable force and vitality in many states and is now showing a decided tendency to revive.

e. *The National Union for Social Justice*: The organizer of this vast national movement, Father Charles E. Coughlin, Catholic priest of Detroit, began speaking on the radio in 1926; but it was only during the great industrial crisis that he secured his huge audience and finally developed his program. In February, 1934, *Fortune* estimated his Sunday radio listeners at 10,000,000. On November 11, of that year, Coughlin launched his Union for Social Justice. He had a cure-all program, including the issuance of ten billion dollars in unsupported currency, a central bank of issue, the “nationalization of banking, credit and currency, power, light, oil, natural gas and all natural resources.” For the farmers he offered “production at a profit”; for the workers “a just living

wage": for the aged, liberal pensions; and for the unemployed, jobs.

Coughlin's program was based upon the traditional American illusion of cheap money, inflation. It was vague, and full of contradictions and demagoguery. His proposals to issue an ocean of fiat money, by sending living costs sky-rocketing, would have drastically worsened instead of bettered the conditions of the masses. His demands for nationalization of "all public necessities," were just so much wind. His violent attacks upon "the international bankers" were rank demagoguery, since he, himself, a silver speculator, was closely allied with some of the biggest banking concerns. He and his agitation constitute one of the most dangerous manifestations of growing fascism that this country has yet seen.

Coughlin's organization, which was especially strong among Middlewest farmers, city middle class elements, and Catholic industrial workers, became so widespread and powerful that he was credited with defeating several important progressive bills pending before Congress. But his movement, like Townsend's, suffered a rude setback when, true to his fascist character, he undertook to line it up against Roosevelt in the 1936 elections. But its remnants still remain a potentially malignant danger. Important pamphlets dealing with Coughlin's movement are, *How to Win Social Justice*, by Alex Bittelman, and *The Truth About Father Coughlin*, by A. B. Magil.

f. *Share-the-Wealth*: The leader of this remarkable mass movement was United States Senator Huey P. Long of Louisiana. Long's movement first took on definiteness and an epidemic

character early in 1935. With his slogans of "Share the Wealth" and "Every Man a King," Long had as the basis of his utopia a gigantic capital levy. He proposed to take away from the capitalists all their wealth "in excess of three or four million dollars apiece." The 165 billions thus acquired, Long declared he would share among the people, each family receiving some \$5,000. The "Kingfish" also promised to guarantee every worker's and farmer's family a minimum yearly income of \$2,500, besides old-age pensions "without stint or unreasonable limit" for the aged, and an elaborate educational program for the youth.

The Share-the-Wealth agitation was the most fantastic panacea, and its leader, Long, the most dangerous demagogue this country has yet seen. They were fascism in the making. They went to evidence the bizarre illusions that starving, unorganized and despairing masses can fall victims to. The demagogic character of Long's program was exposed by the fact that whereas, obviously, to carry through the great capital levy he advocated, the socialist revolution would be necessary, he nevertheless was a violent enemy of socialism and proposed virtually to expropriate the capitalists painlessly, without changing the present system, and even "without removing the capitalists from the ownership and management of industry." Long's crass demagoguery was further shown by the fact that in Louisiana, where he had set up the tightest and most ruthless political dictatorship in American history, he was allied with big capitalist interests and he had done precisely nothing to relieve the desperate conditions of the crisis-stricken masses,

The backwoods Hitler, Huey P. Long, mixed his panacea-mongering with circus antics and fundamentalist religion. His movement ran like a contagion through the sharecroppers and poor farmers of Louisiana, and spread swiftly to several other Southern states. So powerful did the "Kingfish" become almost overnight that he was openly laying plans to capture the Presidency of the United States, when he was shot and killed in September, 1935. Long's successor, the notorious fascist Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith, led the Share-the-Wealth movement to a debacle by joining up with the Coughlin and Townsend movements in their ill-fated Lemke third party attempt to defeat Roosevelt in the 1936 elections. Analyses of the Share-the-Wealth movement are to be found in *How Can We Share the Wealth?* by Alex Bittelman, and *The Real Huey P. Long*, by Sender Garlin. The Long and Coughlin movements are also dealt with in *The Peril of Fascism*, by A. B. Magil and Henry Stevens.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The foregoing movements had one quality in common, which was fundamental in characterizing them—they were all based upon burning grievances and hardships of the masses. This explains their broad extension, high degree of spontaneity, and prairie fire-like spread. Thus, it was no accident that the Share-the-Wealth movement sprang up among the half-starved sharecroppers in the South; that the Union of Social Justice originated in Detroit, one of the communities hardest hit by the industrial crisis; and that several other of these movements (Epic, Utopians, Town-

send, etc) spontaneously generated in Southern California, where crisis conditions were especially acute. Despite their usually demagogic leadership, these broad movements were at bottom attempts of the impoverished masses to correct unbearable conditions. Also, although they had different approaches—"erg" money system, education, inflation, "purchasing certificates," capital levy, old-age pension, unemployed self-help, etc., they all had far-reaching social programs, amounting to cure-all panaceas, that definitely reflected the wavering faith of the masses in the capitalist system. Basically, in so far as the popular aspirations were concerned, the panacea movements were blood relations to the great organizing campaigns and strikes of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., the big struggles of the unemployed led by the Communist Party, the widespread farmers' strikes, the broad youth movement, the great Roosevelt election campaign, etc., of the same period.

In the confused mass panacea there lurked a serious fascist danger, varying in degree in each case according to the character of its leadership. Most of them were led by reactionary demagogues—notably Coughlin, Long, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Townsend—who were the agents of fascist-minded finance capital and who did all possible to steer their broad movements into anti-democratic, anti-progressive channels. They poisoned them with anti-Negro, anti-trade union, anti-Jew, anti-New Deal, anti-foreign-born, and anti-Communist sentiment, and made them breeding nests of fascism generally. Nascent fascism at the time secured its strongest following among the masses through these movements.

Many powerful capitalists, not at all deceived or alarmed by the demagogues' pseudo-radicalism and their attacks upon the "international bankers" and Wall Street, gave them active support. Thus, Long had the backing of Standard Oil and of many banking, railroad and other capitalist interests in Louisiana; Coughlin was definitely tied up with Hearst, Macfadden, the big Detroit auto manufacturers and powerful financial interests; Townsend became a darling of the Republican Party bosses. The only one of all these movements combatted by a solid capitalist opposition was the Epic, led by the honestly confused Upton Sinclair.

Bad effects were produced among the masses by the reactionary activities of Coughlin, Long and Townsend, and also by the widespread disillusionment provoked by the collapse of the various utopian bubbles. Nevertheless, the general result of the several movements in question was to deepen and strengthen the struggle of the masses for practical demands. Thus, Technocracy undoubtedly did much to expose the needlessness of mass starvation in the midst of potential plenty and it thereby encouraged intelligent mass discontent; Epic helped to dramatize the fight of the unemployed; the Townsend movement definitely made a burning national issue of old-age pensions; and even such reactionary-led movements as those of Coughlin and Long, left-handedly, by raising grave dangers of fascism, probably stimulated the New Deal, as a precaution against them, to provide more adequate mass relief.

The several mass movements dealt with, above all, bore characteristic ear-

marks of the urban petty bourgeoisie. While huge numbers of poor farmers and workers (especially the unorganized, the unemployed, and white-collar elements, and in the case of the Coughlin movement—Catholic workers) participated in these panacea movements (even approximate statistics are not to be had), nevertheless the immediate hegemony over them all was definitely in the hands of the city petty bourgeoisie. This is shown, not only by the typical middle-class confusion of their programs, but also by the makeup of their leadership. Thus, the movements under consideration had as their outstanding leaders Howard Scott (engineer), Upton Sinclair (writer), Eugene J. Reed (small broker), Francis E. Townsend (doctor), Charles E. Coughlin (priest), Huey P. Long (salesman-politician), Gerald K. Smith (preacher), Willis Allen (lawyer), etc. There were hardly any proletarians or trade union officials among the key leaders and initiators.

It was very significant also that, although large numbers of workers participated in these various confused mass movements, the trade unions as such, except in local instances (notably Epic), took little part in them. Neither the A. F. of L. nor, later, the C.I.O., nationally endorsed any of their vagaries. Characteristically, the great movement of the proletariat in this stormy period, in so far as it was independently expressed, followed trade union lines, but with the advancements over conservative A. F. of L. unionism that we all know of—industrial unionism in the basic industries, more conscious political action, more militant strike action, etc. This steadiness of the trade

union movement in the midst of so many surging and alluring utopian mass movements was a testimonial to the naturally greater clear-sightedness of the working class and the superiority of its organizations, in contrast with the confused and unorganized petty bourgeoisie.

Another highly important phenomenon, in connection with the panacea mass movements, was their failure to draw the organized youth of the country into their orbits. This was largely due to the intelligent leadership, constructive program and widespread activities of the American Youth Congress. The significance of this whole development is realized when one recalls the big role of the youth in fascist movements usually.

All the mass movements under discussion displayed a common ephemeral character. They spontaneously generated, spread with lightning rapidity, and then rapidly declined. The major causes for their subsidence were the successful mobilization of millions of workers and other toilers into the trade unions and generally around the banners of the New Deal; the easing of the industrial crisis, and the measure of mass relief achieved through the partial realization, by legislation and otherwise, of the New Deal program.

As we have already seen, the Technocracy movement, after being "a seven-days' wonder," subsided in the face of the advancing Roosevelt 1932 election campaign; the Utopians were absorbed by the aggressive Epic and Townsend movements; Epic met its nemesis in a head-on collision with the forces of reaction in the California elections of 1934; and the Long, Coughlin and Townsend movements

were badly mangled by the great Roosevelt sweep of 1936. The fascist-minded demagogues at the head of these latter movements thought the Presidential elections would be closely contested and that it would be possible for them to defeat Roosevelt. Not daring to swing their hosts openly behind Landon, they launched their Lemke third party candidacy. But the masses were able to see through this election maneuver and to understand that the real issue at stake was between Roosevelt and Landon, between progress and reaction. Their sense of realism triumphed, they deserted their fascist-like leaders in millions, to the discomfiture of Coughlin, Townsend, Gerald K. Smith & Co., and consequently the heavy weakening of their movements became a matter of history.

But if the mass movements in question displayed a lack of stability and permanency, we must not draw the conclusion therefrom that their type presents no present danger. This would be a serious error. The cause of the relative decline of these movements was that the conditions were not ripe for them to be given definite fascist organization and consolidation.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party played an important part in preventing the many panacea mass movements here analyzed from becoming fascist instruments of reaction, and aided in directing their vast elemental force towards the achievement of constructive ends for the masses. In many articles, pamphlets, and speeches our Party carried through a thorough-going Marxian analysis of the various current cure-alls and panaceas, exposing their falla-

cies, and setting over against them practical immediate demands and the ultimate socialist goal. Our Party also took an active part in building up the great progressive mass movements that are at once the preventative and the cure for such confusionist movements as Technocracy, Epic, Share-the-Wealth, the Townsend Plan, etc.; namely, the big fight of the unemployed for relief, the great organizing campaigns and strikes of the trade unions, the extension of the huge masses in the Roosevelt New Deal election campaigns and legislative struggles—in short, the building of a great democratic front.

At the first outcropping of the panacea mass movements during the depth of the crisis we made some mistakes of a sectarian character. There was a tendency to see only their features of incipient fascism, and to ignore the legitimate demands of the great masses that formed their base. This was especially the case with regard to the Epic movement in California. But our Party soon grasped the significance of the whole development and adopted a policy of penetrating these movements with the objective of at once exposing their fallacies and directing their struggles to practical ends in concert with the struggling masses in other fields. At the Ninth Convention of our Party, in June, 1936, the situation was summed up in a resolution as follows:

"In the absence of a strong, independent political party of the working class, with the still prevailing political immaturity of the wide masses and aided by the belief that the tremendous productive capacities and natural riches of this country by themselves offer a way out, these mass yearnings for a new social order become diverted into various utopian, reformist and even reactionary channels. Common to all these tendencies is the old petty-bourgeois illusion that poverty and insecurity can be abolished by certain changes in the sphere of credit, money circulation and distribution without abolishing the capitalist mode of production. Bourgeois radicalism and social reformism try to build upon this basis such movements as 'Epic' and 'Townsend'; on the other hand, fascist and semi-fascist adventurers (Long, Coughlin, Talmadge), exploiting brazenly the yearnings of the masses for a new social order and their petty bourgeois illusions, seek to build up breastworks of fascism and reaction with the backing of powerful sections of the most reactionary monopolies. . . .

"It is, therefore, the task of the Communists to establish firm contacts with the masses in these movements, to work within them, to develop common struggles for immediate demands on issues that are most vital to these masses, and, on the basis of such common work and struggles, to overcome their petty-bourgeois illusions and to lead them in the direction of the revolutionary struggle against capitalism, which alone will realize their yearnings for a social order of security and plenty." *

(To be concluded in the December issue.)

* *Resolutions of the Ninth Convention of the Communist Party*, pp. 10-11. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

PREPARING FOR THE OPENING OF CONGRESS

NEXT STEPS OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

By GENE DENNIS

[We are publishing here the concluding section of the report of Comrade Dennis to the enlarged meeting of the Political Committee, C.P.U.S.A., held on September 24, analyzing the results of the primary elections and the tasks ahead. This part of the report not only deals with the central problems in the election campaign, but likewise outlines the next tasks confronting the Communists and the entire labor movement for strengthening the struggle for social, labor, and peace legislation and for broadening and consolidating the democratic front in the conditions of accelerated political realignments.—The Editors.]

Now more than ever, *maximum unity of all labor and democratic forces must be achieved if reaction is to be defeated.*

Labor, particularly, must consolidate its ranks and broaden its reserves. It must strengthen the weak links in its chain of defense and improve its tactical operations. Labor must mobilize all of its forces in united action for a vigorous offensive on the decisive fronts of political struggle. *This means that the struggle for political*

unity of action of labor should be developed more consistently and energetically on all fronts and issues. Of great importance is the need to crystallize wider mass support within the A. F. of L. for the program of the New Deal. On this basis, it will be possible to develop common action of all sections of the labor movement to protect, improve and extend existing New Deal social and labor legislation.

Likewise, Labor's Non-Partisan League, the American Labor Party, and the new political organizations of labor, such as the various state committees for progressive political action, need to be further extended and consolidated. Greater inner democracy needs to be established within these organizations and a firmer base laid within the unions, precincts, wards, towns and municipalities. Constantly on guard against all attempts to isolate it from its allies, labor must overcome all tendencies directed towards the premature formation of narrow labor parties. *At the same time, labor should continue to combine the extension of its independent political organizational base and activities, as around Labor's Non-Partisan League, with a more consistent policy of influ-*

encing and collaborating with the progressives and the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party for further crystallizing and developing the main trend of national progressive alignments. For, as the developments in the primaries show, in Washington, California and Michigan, the struggle for converting the Democratic Party into a liberal New Deal party is reaching a more advanced stage. If labor unites and continues to extend its independent political organizations and increases its influence amongst the liberal New Dealers and the progressives, around one progressive for each elect—the possibility now exists for converting the Democratic Parties in these states into movements assuming the character of democratic front organizations, of people's parties.

THE SCOPE OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT
MUST BE WIDENED

A fresh approach needs to be made to the problem of broadening the base of the democratic front, especially for achieving wider unity of action in every office. While the main lines of division between the camps of democracy and reaction are becoming more clearly crystallized, there are big sections of the working class, farmers, city middle class, Negroes, and other progressives which must yet be *actively* drawn into election activity and the march of political realignment. They must be won to the movement for a united labor-pro-New Deal election front in each locality, district and state.

In this connection, the labor movement and the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party should avoid any tendency to abandon the middle-of-the

road and the conservative New Dealers to the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party. Systematic efforts should be undertaken to draw in these sections of the Democratic Party into the liberal-New Deal camp by clarifying the program and objectives of the New Deal. On this basis there can be developed a broader mass movement for this program and these objectives. Also, more stubborn efforts need to be made to reach and influence the growing liberal sections among the followers of the Republican Party, increasing numbers of whom are moving in a progressive direction but are still confused and misled by the demagoguery and "liberal" masks employed by the reactionaries. Similarly, more attention needs to be focused on bringing the unorganized masses, both labor and farmers, large numbers of whom are traditionally non-partisan, into the democratic camp, on the basis of their common needs and interests with the organized labor and progressive movements. One of the most effective mediums of achieving this—of building the democratic front—is through the creation of a wider network of permanent legislative conferences and committees. For, as experience has demonstrated, the movement to liberalize the Democratic Party and to organize the democratic front is being crystallized not only through such developments as Labor's Non-Partisan League, but more so today through and around the convening and establishment of broad progressive legislative congresses and permanent united committees of action.

In order to achieve these objects and to harness fully the energy and forces of labor and the progressives,

everything should be done to improve and extend the political activities and organization not only of labor, but also of the liberal New Dealers, farmers, Negro people, women, and youth. For, if the primary elections have shown anything, they have emphasized that neither the endorsement nor the prestige alone of either the President, Labor's Non-Partisan League, or any political group is sufficient by itself to win nominations, let alone elections. The outcome of the Texas and Idaho primaries, especially, drive this fact home. Therefore, in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and elsewhere, the greatest efforts must be made really to activate the committees, clubs, and supporters of the New Deal Democrats, of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., of the youth and women's movements, of the national groups and important fraternal organizations, and the organizations of the farmers and of the Negro people. Only the most intense organizational activity and aggressive political campaigning by these groups and forces can rout the reactionary Republicans and Tory Democrats.

**GREATER ATTENTION TO THE NEEDS
OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE**

At this point it is important to stress the urgency of effecting a decisive improvement in the work of the Communists and of all other progressives for mobilizing not only the farmers, but also the Negro people in the elections and for the democratic front. Republican reaction is leaving no stone unturned in order to deceive and mislead the Negro people and to draw them into the anti-New Deal fold. In Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and

Illinois, especially, the Republican betrayers of the great tradition of Lincoln are attempting to brand the New Deal wing of the Democratic Party with the stigma of the "white supremacy" chauvinism which is advanced by the Tory Garners, Georges, and Bilbos. They are endeavoring to exploit for reactionary purposes the just grievances of the Negro people and are resorting to bribery and wild demagoguery as a means of pitting the Negro people against labor and the progressives, and thereby to betray their common interests. The National Negro Congress, Labor's Non-Partisan League, the Committee for Industrial Organization and the American Federation of Labor, the Communists and liberals must face this challenge. They must more systematically champion the demands of the Negro people, especially for jobs, adequate relief, equal rights, and a federal Anti-Lynching Bill. They must boldly draw into all election activities and leadership the spokesmen and representatives of the Negro people.

**THE "LIBERAL" DEMAGOGUES MUST BE
UNMASKED**

A big job which yet remains to be effectively tackled is really to clarify and popularize the program and objectives of the New Deal as well as the program and aims of labor. This is essential if the "liberal" demagoguery and gestures of the Republicans are to be unmasked and if the tactics of the "yes, but" Democrats are to be thoroughly exposed. One of the principal and most effective weapons used by the reactionary Democrats and Republicans in the primaries was precisely the almost universal policy of

pretending to support the "social objectives" of the New Deal and the "humanitarian aims" of President Roosevelt.

Recognizing the steadfast and in many sections of the country, the mounting popularity of the President and the New Deal, the reactionaries strive to avoid an open and direct fight on the basic issues of the New Deal. In the main, they give lip-service to the aims and ideals of the New Deal but resort to flank attacks and rear-guard actions. The Landon Republicans and Garner Democrats are now endeavoring to utilize more extensively the tactics of pledging "allegiance" to New Deal objectives while differing with the "methods" and "separate" legislative policies of the liberal New Dealers. And so far, with few exceptions, the labor and pro-New Deal candidates and spokesmen have not squarely met the issue, nor completely torn from the hands of the enemies of the people the banners of the New Deal which the reactionaries demagogically exploit and desecrate.

To face and solve this important problem, three things are required: First, the progressives need to show, point by point, concretely what the New Deal policy is in terms of the Wagner Labor Act, the Social Security Act, Supreme Court Reform, farm legislation, the Anti-Lynching Bill, anti-monopoly taxation and regulation, and the declarations of the President and Secretary of State Hull favoring a foreign policy for promoting and maintaining world peace. With this as a standard, the progressives should show the American people what is the *real* position of the reactionaries on each specific question, and should

point out the difference between their words and deeds. Likewise, the progressives should make clear that the opposition of the "yes, but" Democrats and "anti-method" Republicans to the "specific" measures and proposals of the Roosevelt administration are designed primarily to defeat the *whole* program and the basic objectives of the New Deal.

THE LIMITATIONS OF THE NEW DEAL LEGISLATION MUST BE OVERCOME

Secondly, it is incumbent upon labor and the liberal New Dealers candidly and honestly to examine the limitations and shortcomings of existing New Deal legislation. It is their responsibility to help overcome the discrepancy between the social objectives of the New Deal and the slowness with which many of these policies are realized in governmental action. The reactionaries, as well as the progressives, fully realize that the majority of the American people want and support the social objectives of the New Deal. The reactionaries, perhaps better than the progressives, also realize that large sections of the working people are dissatisfied with the inadequacies of such measures as the Social Security Act and the administration's farm program. The reactionaries seize upon this legitimate discontent of the masses to foster an anti-New Deal farm movement, just as they seek to exploit the movement for adequate old-age pensions for reactionary and anti-labor purposes.

The progressives should frankly face these and similar issues. They should support and give leadership to the old-age pension movement, and much more vigorously champion all

progressive proposals to extend and liberalize the Social Security Act. In cooperation with the Farmers' Union, the Grange and Farm Bureau, labor and the progressives should likewise cooperate in working out immediate steps for democratizing the federal farm program and agencies, for working out a practical plan of government price-fixing of farm products based upon cost of production, for refinancing the farmers' debts with long-term government loans, and for freeing the family-sized farms from crop control restrictions. At the same time, labor and the progressives should make clear to the farmers and the supporters of adequate old-age pensions that the main responsibility for the limitations and inadequacies of such measures as the Social Security Act and the federal farm program rests primarily upon the shoulders of the Republicans and copperhead Democrats. For it is they who work in unison to limit the appropriations and to restrict the scope of these measures, just as they have obstructed and hamstrung all New Deal labor and social legislation.

FOR A COMMON DEMOCRATIC AND
PEACE PROGRAM OF ACTION

Third, labor, including the Communists, needs to give a clearer answer, regarding that policy and program which can realize within the framework of existing social conditions, the social objectives of the New Deal. Labor needs to bring forward the perspectives for tomorrow. In line with this, the National Congressional Election Platform, which the Communist Party has submitted as a draft program for the democratic front, should be more extensively popularized and

discussed. This program can help equip the whole progressive camp for working out a common program of action to limit drastically the powers of monopoly capital, to preserve and extend American democracy, to utilize the prestige and power of America to promote and safeguard the national safety of our country and the peace of the world. By making this program the property of the broad masses, the American people will acquire a clear perspective of what must be done to achieve progress and a happier life; to protect our democratic institutions; and to prepare eventually for a fundamental, socialist solution of our social problems and needs.

In mapping out the next steps ahead to mobilize the democratic and progressive forces for victory in November, great attention should be focused on preparing *now*, and immediately after the elections, for the opening of Congress and the legislatures. As is well known, Congress will convene in the midst of a threatening war situation. Vital problems of foreign policy will come up for action in the first days of Congress: pro-fascist reaction will press for amending the present Neutrality Act to provide for mandatory "neutrality" and stricter isolation. The progressive forces will have before them the task of pressing for the adoption of a peace policy in accord with invoking and implementing the Kellogg Pact; with enforcing Section 338 of the Tariff Act; with placing an embargo against fascist Germany, Japan, and Italy, and lifting the embargo on Spain; with granting credits, loans, and surplus farm commodities to the victims of fascist aggression, combined with other meas-

ures to promote concerted action in collaboration with the Soviet Union and the other democratic peoples of the world to quarantine the fascist aggressors.

Congress and the state legislatures will also be faced with the responsibility of making immediate decisions on burning domestic problems. Action will be taken in the first weeks of Congress on the new budget for relief, Works Progress Administration, Public Works Administration, National Youth Administration, etc. The Social Security Act will come up for amendment. Anti-labor revisions to the Wagner Act will be pushed. Efforts will be made to broaden the tax base among lower income groups. Revisions to the farm program will be submitted. The Anti-Lynching Bill and measures to curb the monopolies will be brought forward.

Therefore, the broad progressive movement that is being crystallized in the elections must concern itself as never before with making its voice heard on Capitol Hill, with organizing public pressure to enforce its election mandates. The people must be rallied, not only to place their demands before Congress and the legislatures, but to organize, unite, and fight to see that these demands are carried out in domestic and foreign policy. In this connection, as already emphasized, the organization of permanent labor, farm and people's legislative conferences and committees on a district and state scale should be further encouraged and developed. Similarly, the proposal of certain labor leaders for convening a great national progressive legislative conference around the opening of Congress in January should meet with

the sympathetic response and cooperation of every responsible progressive, labor, farm, Negro, cultural and peace group and movement. Just as in the elections, where labor is called upon to display greater initiative in the organization of the democratic front, so here, too, labor's initiative is of paramount importance.

THE SPECIAL TASKS THAT FACE THE COMMUNIST PARTY

In solving these tasks, the Communist Party, in common with the rest of the progressive and labor movement, is confronted with the most serious responsibilities. Our obligations are especially heavy precisely because of the growing political influence of our Party and the contributions we are now in a position to make on all sectors of the developing democratic front.

During the primary elections, as at all times, the Communist Party has constructively participated in advancing the great social process of progressive political realignment now maturing. Applying the decisions of our Tenth National Convention, we have used every ounce of energy and the full power of our political authority to promote unity of action of labor on the political and economic fields, to unify the progressives and all lovers of democracy and peace. Pursuing an uncompromising election policy to defeat reaction and fascism at all costs, we have worked tirelessly and effectively to secure victory for the camp of progress in the primaries. Towards this end we will work still more energetically and resolutely for the triumph of progress in November.

To fulfill our tasks, much yet re-

mains to be done, improved and corrected. Remnants of the old disease of sectarianism still hamper our activity in many states and localities. The changing political situation and line-ups demand greater flexibility in the application of our correct policy and tactical line. Today, especially, when the reactionaries of all shades strive to disorganize and divide the democratic front by Red-baiting and attempt to give a "Communist" label to everything progressive, we must work more effectively, though more modestly.

We must create a clearer understanding everywhere, even within our own ranks, concerning the historic significance and problems of present-day political regroupings and alignments. Once and for all we must dispel all slanders and misconceptions to the effect that this great national process is a "Communist maneuver" or of "Moscow origin." We openly state and show by our deeds that in the crystallization of the two main political camps of American social life we unhesitatingly and consistently take our position and place our influence squarely on the side of democracy and peace.

Precisely because of this we must not allow ourselves to be goaded by the slanders of our enemies, nor by the confusion and vacillations of some of our allies. *We must not be provoked into hasty moves which would in any way narrow down the progressive alignments.* We must be particularly vigilant against all tendencies, such as probably will be manifested, after the November elections, *e.g.*, by

the National Progressives, Inc., to precipitate or encourage the formation of abortive third party movements. We must maintain a realistic sense of balance and not overestimate our strength and influence, or the level of development of the labor and progressive movements. Neither can we minimize the activities and the power of reaction.

At the same time we devote greater attention in all states to the organization of our independent Communist election campaign, irrespective of whether or not there is a Party ticket in the field. For this is an indispensable guarantee of raising the key issues in the elections. This is one of the most effective means of building and extending the democratic front. This is vital to broaden the base and influence of our Party and to strengthen the whole labor movement.

At all times we must combine Party building and the extension of our independent mass work with greater consideration of the effect of every move we make and word we utter. Similarly, we must master more thoroughly the fact that our joint participation in united labor actions and the democratic front movement requires greater political initiative and alertness on our part. At the same time we must learn better how to collaborate and consult with the leaders and members of the labor and progressive movements. We must work still more steadfastly for the continued improvement of harmonious relations between and among all the component parts of the great democratic front in which we are participating.

FROM THE TRIBUNES OF THE SOCIALIST FATHERLAND

BY ANNE BENTLEY

"Of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people."—STALIN.

NOVEMBER, 1917! November, 1938! Twenty-one years of Soviet power! Twenty-one years since the Russian workers, at the head of the people in city and village, overthrew their capitalist and landlord oppressors and, under the leadership of Lenin, Stalin, and the Bolshevik Party, created a new state—the dictatorship of the proletariat. Twenty-one years of magnificent advance—through difficulties almost insurmountable—from civil war, to reconstruction, to the victorious building of the socialist society!

From a country of industrial backwardness, of primitive agriculture, of illiteracy, superstition and race prejudice, the Soviet Union is today in the forefront of industrial and agricultural progress, of cultural and scientific advance, a model of the equality of nationalities, and the greatest champion of the cause of peace.

THE SOVIET UNION—CONSISTENT FIGHTER
FOR PEACE

The Soviet Union has been since its founding the only country in the world that has stood uncompromis-

ingly for a consistent policy for world peace. Because of its socialist system, it is the only power in the world which is non-imperialist. For this reason its foreign policy is motivated by a genuine and unshakable urge for peace. The peace policy of the Soviet Union is not a temporary affair, but an organic outcome of the socialist character of the U.S.S.R.

That is why it was the Soviet Union which could say, in its appeal for the defense of Czechoslovakia against the Nazi aggressors:

“. . . at a moment when there is being drawn up a further list of sacrifices to the god of aggression and the line is being drawn under the annals of all post-war international history with the sole conclusion that nothing succeeds like aggression—at such a moment, every state must define its moral responsibility before its contemporaries and before history. . . .

“To grant bonuses for saber-rattling and resort to arms for the solution of national problems, in other words, to reward and encourage aggressive super-imperialism, is not to act in the spirit of the Briand-Kellogg Pact.” *

This was Litvinov, speaking in the name of the Soviet people, of all the

* Maxim Litvinov, *Czechoslovakia and the World Crisis*, International Publishers, New York, 1c.

peace-pursuing people the world over. There is but one country today—the socialist state, there is but one people—the Soviet citizenry, that could produce such masterly statesmen, possessed at once of Leninist political foresight and political integrity, such true tribunes of the people, as Comrade Litvinov. His ringing appeal to the world for collective action against the aggressors, his clear and unwavering stand in the midst of backsliding, compromise and betrayal, are indisputable proof of the fact that only in a socialist democracy, which by its very nature abhors intrigue and double-dealing, can the peace desires of a nation be truly expressed; are proof of the fact that only in collaboration with the U.S.S.R. lies the security of the nations against war.

We may well recall here the words of Comrade Stalin, *written in 1917*:

“. . . the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is a secret, concealed, behind-the-scenes dictatorship, which needs a plausible screen for the purpose of deceiving the masses. The dictatorship of the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry, however, is the open dictatorship of the masses which need not resort to deception in home affairs and to secret diplomacy in foreign affairs. But from this it follows that our bourgeois dictators will strive to solve the most vital problems of the life of the country, for example, the question of war and peace, behind the backs of the masses and without the masses, by means of a conspiracy against the masses.”*

The masses of the Soviet Union are constantly alert to the dangers of a surrounding hostile capitalism. They are prepared to guard every inch of Soviet soil at all costs. They demonstrated that preparedness in repelling

the Japanese militarists from the Chengkufeng Hill. Comrade Voroshilov voiced the determination of all the Soviet people, 1700,000,000 strong:

“I know . . . that all of us like one man are convinced, not only that we will defend our Far Eastern territory, but also that we will come out victorious from *any* war, if it is forced upon us.”*

Voroshilov expressed the sentiments of the international working class, of progressive humanity, who see in the Soviet Union the greatest force for world peace, and who, through that conviction, must before long bring into life such a strong alliance, such firm ties, between themselves and the Soviet people that the aggression of fascism will decisively be checked.

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

Reactionaries, and those under their influence, allege that Communists are not interested in democracy, that they aim to destroy democracy and set up in its place a dictatorship that would abolish human freedom. Such people, of course, proceed to lump the Soviet Union with the totalitarian states.

But Soviet life, in every one of its aspects, suffices to refute utterly such allegations.

Let us view this life against the background of the struggle that democracy is waging against the fascist offensive in the capitalist world today.

In Germany, Italy, and Japan, the monster that is fascism directs the entire economy of the country toward one objective—a new and horrible

* Joseph Stalin, *The Road to Power*, International Publishers, 5c.

* K. E. Voroshilov, *Ready for Defense*, International Publishers, 5c.

world carnage. And the peoples of these fascist countries, victims of the monstrous war machine, are ground under the iron heel of brute despotism.

In the non-fascist capitalist countries fascist-minded reaction seeks to despoil the people of their hard-won economic gains and democratic rights. Against this drive of reaction, gigantic popular fronts are being consolidated to preserve and extend the people's liberties and democratic rights. In the United States the workers, farmers and city middle classes are of necessity marshalling the columns for a nationwide democratic front for security, democracy, and peace.

In the struggle for democracy, the peoples of the world have in the Soviet Union the greatest bulwark and inspiration. Against the world forces of reaction stand the epoch-making achievements of the Soviet masses in the full realization of socialist democracy, embodied in the new Stalin Constitution.

Having abolished the exploitation of man by man, the Soviet masses have succeeded, under difficulties, yet at a rate unparalleled in the history of mankind, in building a new society based on the social ownership of the means of production and of the country's wealth. In this society of a new type the democratic liberty, happiness and welfare of the people are the foremost considerations, since there is no economic monopolist class to appropriate also the social and political rights and liberties.

In establishing the Stalin Constitution, the peoples of the U.S.S.R. have proudly proclaimed the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, evi-

denced, notably, by the following articles:

"ARTICLE 118: Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to work, *i.e.*, the right to guaranteed employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality.

"The right to work is ensured by the socialist organization of national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the preclusion of the possibility of economic crises, and the abolition of unemployment.

"ARTICLE 119: Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to rest and leisure.

"The right to rest and leisure is ensured by the reduction of the working day to seven hours for the overwhelming majority of the workers, the institution of annual vacations with pay for workers and other employees and the provision of a wide network of sanatoria, rest homes and clubs for the accommodation of the toilers.

"ARTICLE 120: Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work.

"This right is ensured by the wide development of social insurance of workers and other employees at state expense, free medical service, and the provision of a wide network of health resorts for the accommodation of the toilers.

"ARTICLE 121: Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to education.

"This right is ensured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by the fact that education, including higher (university) education is free of charge; by the system of state scholarships for the overwhelming majority of students in the higher schools; by instruction in school being conducted in the native language, and by the organization of free vocational, technical and agronomic training for the toilers in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms.

"ARTICLE 122: Women in the U.S.S.R. are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres

of economic, state, cultural, social and political life.

"The possibility of exercising these rights of women is ensured by affording women equally with men the right to work, payment for work, rest and leisure, social insurance and education, and by state protection of the interests of mother and child, maternity leave with pay, and the provision of a wide network of maternity homes, nurseries and kindergartens.

"ARTICLE 123: The equality of the rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an infeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, the establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as the advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law." *

The masses of the Soviet Union, under a workers' and farmers' government, have proved the correctness of Lenin's teaching that "in the Soviet system democracy and dictatorship are not contradictory."

The thoroughly consistent nature of socialist democracy is evidenced in the organic, indivisible interconnection between the socialist democracy in the Soviet Union and the democratic strivings, struggles and victories of the peoples in all lands:

"Not only do the fascists today refuse to tolerate any survivals of democracy in *their own countries*, where, as it is, the people are 'silent, for they prosper,' but it is characteristic that they regard the very existence of democracy, even democracy in *other countries*, as a danger to themselves. . . .

"Our attitude toward democracy as one of the most precious boons to the toilers is well known. The successes of democracy in

any country are near and dear to us. We rejoice when democratic rights are won, no matter where the masses of the people are marching forward along this road." *

The international significance of Soviet democracy is inherent in its socialist character. In speaking of the new Constitution, Comrade Stalin declared:

"It will be a document testifying to the fact that what millions of honest people in capitalist countries have dreamed and continued to dream has already been achieved in the U.S.S.R. It will be a document proving that what has been achieved in the U.S.S.R. can be achieved in other countries. . . . At the present time, when the foul wave of fascism is besmirching the socialist movement of the working class and trampling in the mud the democratic strivings of the best people of the civilized world, the new Constitution of the U.S.S.R. will be an indictment of fascism, testifying that socialism and democracy are invincible." **

NATIONALITIES IN THE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The question of democracy is inextricably bound up with that of the national question. The Soviet Union has proved in the economic, social and cultural life of its component republics that only through the achievement of socialism can the problems of racial and national groups finally be resolved. Today the world beholds nation after nation falling prey to the depredations of fascism—national integrities violated, weaker countries invaded, subjugated—Manchuria, Ethiopia, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia. Against this scene of fascist pillage and spoliation, there rises in

* *Molotov on the New Soviet Constitution*, International Publishers, 5c.

** *Stalin on the New Soviet Constitution*, International Publishers, 2c.

* *The Constitution of the U.S.S.R.*, International Publishers, 10c.

magnificent contrast the union of free and equal Soviet Socialist Republics—in the land that was but yesterday “the prison house of the nations”—the classic land of pogroms and national devastation. The masses in the Soviet Union are giving the world a glorious example of full equality and fraternity of peoples, all sharing in the fruits of socialist victory, in the economic prosperity and cultural advance of the country.

The solution of the national question has from the outset constituted an integral part of the great task of socialist construction:

“The Soviet government would not have existed today had it not in fact displayed the greatest solicitude for the needs of all the peoples of the country, for their economic development, for the improvement of the material well-being of the toilers, and for the growth of their national culture. Moreover, the U.S.S.R. is pursuing a policy of rendering increased assistance to the more backward nationalities who were most oppressed under capitalism, and in this way it is helping to raise them to the common level more quickly.” *

When the new Constitution was being discussed by the people of the Soviet Union, it was Comrade Stalin who spoke against abolishing the Council of Nationalities. He pointed out the desirability of a dual chamber system to meet the needs of a multi-national state:

“In addition to their common interests, the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. have their special and specific interests connected with their specific national features. Can these specific interests be ignored? No, they cannot. Is it necessary to have a special supreme body that would reflect precisely these spe-

cific interests? Undoubtedly, it is necessary. There cannot be any doubt that without such a body it would be impossible to administer such a multi-national state as the U.S.S.R.” *

Overcoming the seemingly insurmountable obstacles presented by the problem of numerous nationalities, with their different social backgrounds and cultures, the Soviet Union, basing itself on the teachings and policies of Lenin and Stalin, serves as a brilliant example of harmony and friendship among peoples, such as mankind has never before witnessed.

CULTURAL ADVANCE IN THE SOVIET UNION

Hand in hand with the decay of the world capitalist system go cultural decline and scientific stagnation. Fascism, especially, stifles cultural growth and seeks to stem the current of cultural tradition that is the heritage of whole peoples. Fascism is impelled toward such barbarism because its thought-stream is obscurantism; its cultural methodology, book-burning.

How different the attitude of the Soviet Union, where the very basis of society is a thinking people, where the people have come into their own culturally as well as economically and politically, where the past concepts of cultural aristocracies and castles have given way to the release and promotion of the people's cultural aspirations and faculties. The cultural revolution is a necessary phase of the entire social revolution that has brought the vast Russian people out of capitalism into socialism.

* Molotov, cited place.

* Stalin, cited place.

The desire of the Soviet people for knowledge, scientific training and creative attainment, their deep concern for everything that will raise them to new and greater heights, that will consummate them into *socialist people*, are reflected in Comrade Stalin's famous "toast to science":

"To the flourishing of science! Of such science as does not segregate itself from the people, does not keep aloof from the people, but which is ready to serve the people, to place all its achievements at the disposal of the people; of the science which serves the people, not under constraint, but voluntarily, willingly.

"To the flourishing of science! Of such science as does not let its old and recognized leaders smugly retire into their shells as pontiffs of science, as monopolists of science; of the science which appreciates the meaning, significance, and omnipotence of a union of the old scientists with the young scientists; which voluntarily and willingly throws open all its gates to the youthful forces of our country, offering them the opportunity to conquer the peaks of science; which recognizes that the future belongs to the youth in science." *

Progressives the world over marvel at the high cultural standards and accomplishments of the Soviet masses. Bourgeois educators study their educational system, scientific experts applaud their exploratory achievements and newly-developed techniques; artists of all spheres attest to the inspiring achievements of the Soviet theatre, film, and allied arts. Everywhere the Soviet people are hailed for the trail-blazing role they are playing in every field of human endeavor.

While marching forward with giant strides—eliminating ignorance and illiteracy—the leaders of the Soviet

masses have demonstrated, from the very earliest days of the Revolution, a constant solicitude for the people's greater development that can be matched nowhere in the world today.

"The shots of October had hardly died away when the Party made a decision in its program, adopted in March, 1918, at the Second Congress of Soviets: 'To give the widest access to the higher schools to all who desire to learn, and primarily to workers; to give material support to the students so that it will be physically possible for proletarians and peasants to attend the higher schools.' On August 2, 1918, the Council of People's Commissars issued a decree signed by Lenin on the right of all toilers to enter all the higher educational institutions." *

It can truly be said that today the Soviet people are leading the world in the development of culture, human knowledge and scientific thought, that:

*"The Soviet Union is the torch of science. . . . The working class in Soviet Russia has liberated science from the capitalist bonds of private property and reactionary obscurantism. The Soviet Union holds high the banner of science, the banner of advanced human culture." ***

The arduous task of economic progress and cultural advance was made more difficult by the spying and wrecking activities of Trotskyite-Bukharinite-fascist agents of foreign powers, who wormed their way into the ranks of the people. Along with the work of building a new society, of socialist construction, the Soviet masses have had to learn how to recognize the enemy who was tearing down, at every opportunity, what had been built up; who was destroying,

* Joseph Stalin and V. M. Molotov, *In Praise of Learning*, International Publishers, 5c.

* V. Chemadanov, *Building a New World*, Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

** *Ibid.*

with every vandalistic method known to the enemies of socialism, what the people had achieved.

The struggle of the Soviet people against the Trotskyite-Bukharinite-fascist wreckers and spies was crowned with victory through the stalwart guidance of the Communist Party and its leader, Comrade Stalin. It was Stalin who warned the people not to be complacent and unvigilant; he taught them to place their rich store of experience to the fullest use in rooting out the enemies within; he reminded the people that, while forging ahead economically and culturally, they must ever be on guard.

Political carelessness, Comrade Stalin taught the Soviet masses, must be replaced by the greatest vigilance—because the work of a small number of wreckers can do much harm to the progress and culture of an entire country.

Through all these twenty-one years, the Soviet people have seen in the Communist Party and in their beloved leaders, Lenin and Stalin, the great guiding and stimulating force in every sphere of Soviet life—teaching the workers and peasants at every step, activating their potentialities, rearing their best forces to leadership, and setting the best example of socialist citizenship and of revolutionary vigilance against all elements hostile to the U.S.S.R.

And, while *teaching the people*, the Soviet leaders themselves have emphasized the great lessons to be *learned from the people*:

“... we leaders must not become conceited; and we must understand that if we are members of the Central Committee or are People's Commissars, this does not mean

that we possess all the knowledge necessary for giving correct leadership. . . . This means . . . that our experience alone, the experience of leaders, is insufficient to give correct leadership; that, consequently, it is necessary that one's experience, the experience of leaders, be supplemented by the experience of the masses, by the experience of the rank-and-file Party members, by the experience of the working class, by the experience of the people.” *

The great lesson of mastering Bolshevism is not only for the Communist Party and the whole people of the Soviet Union, but for Communists and all workers and progressives in every land.

The high peak in the technical attainment of the Soviet Union is Stakhanovism—an extraordinary movement of historical significance among the working people of the Soviet Union to surpass incomparably the established standards of output in production. Comrade Stalin, in paying tribute to the Stakhanovite men and women, spoke of the movement as one “which will go down in the history of our socialist construction as one of its most glorious pages”:

“It is destined to produce a revolution in our industry. . . . The Stakhanov movement as an expression of new and higher standards of output, is a model of that high productivity of labor which socialism alone can give and which capitalism cannot give. . . . The significance of the Stakhanov movement lies in the fact that it . . . is creating the practical possibility of further consolidating socialism in our country, the possibility of converting our country into the most prosperous of all countries.” **

This movement, which sprang from the ranks of the Soviet working

* Joseph Stalin, *Mastering Bolshevism*, Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

** Joseph Stalin, *The Stakhanov Movement in the Soviet Union*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 3c.

class masses, has become a leading, vitalizing force in the building of socialism, giving impetus, not only to high productivity of labor in industry, but finding expression in socialist agriculture, in higher harvest yields. Moreover, this spirit that animates the workers and collective farmers is bound up with the process of eliminating the distinction between working people and intellectuals as a separate group, between manual and mental labor:

"Marxism teaches us that the best test of theory is practice, and that practice enriches science. And, indeed, if it is true that the scientists help working people, and by transmitting their knowledge enlarge the heroism of the toilers in many ways, why cannot the workers, who are many, and whose practical experience is enormous, help the scientists. . . . At the same time the victorious working class is doing everything necessary to ensure the cultural growth and the full blossoming of the forces of the new intellectuals, the intellectuals from among the working class and collective farm peasants." *

The development of Stakhanovism is a reflection of the cultural growth of the Soviet people, an indication of the new potentialities they have created toward the realization of the classless socialist society. In this respect, the greatness of the role of the Communist Party in guiding the Soviet masses on the path of victory is to be seen in the fact that:

"The Bolshevik Party has done everything to instil Lenin's ideas of socialist competition into the people. The faithful successor to the work of Lenin—Comrade Stalin—became the genuine inspirer and leader of socialist competition, the highest stage of which is represented by the Stakhanov movement." **

* V. M. Molotov, *What Is Stakhanovism?* International Publishers, 5c.

** *Ibid.*

THE NEW MAN IN THE NEW SOCIETY

Profound and life-transmuting are the advances in the political, economic, and cultural progress of a vast people that these twenty-one years of Soviet power have wrought!

" . . . we inherited from the old days a technically backward, impoverished and ruined country. Ruined by four years of imperialist war, and ruined again by three years of civil war, a country with a semi-literate population, with a low technical level, with isolated industrial oases lost in a welter of minute peasant farms—such was the country we inherited from the past." *

In the place of a people weighted down by oppression and ignorance, the masses of the Soviet Union are building a new society, a new humanity. They are imbued with a passionate love for the socialist land they have reared, with a profound devotion to the Party of Lenin-Stalin, the Communist Party, in whom they behold their historic guide, their valiant leader, armed with the weapon of Marxism-Leninism, leading the people to greater and still greater victories.

The Soviet individual is confident of the future, as no reporter on Soviet life can deny. The Soviet government is constantly providing new opportunities for further social improvement and advancement. That is why the love of the Soviet people for their country is "just one of the component parts of a quality which distinguishes the new man." **

Maxim Gorky once said, in his re-

* Joseph Stalin, *The Soviets and the Individual*, International Publishers, 2 cents.

** *Chemadanov*, cited place.

ply to a letter from American intellectuals:

"Just try to think . . . like . . . those who are beginning to understand that the theory of Marx and Lenin is the highest pinnacle yet reached by scientific thought honestly investigating all social phenomena, and that only from the heights of this theory may the straight road leading towards social justice and new forms of culture be clearly seen." *

Today, people everywhere, like

* Maxim Gorky, *To American Intellectuals*, International Publishers, 10 cents.

many of the American intellectuals to whom Gorky addressed himself, can see that the path of which he spoke was not a dream, but has become a glorious reality—a reality that shines as a beacon light for all humanity:

"Our fatherland arouses such a supreme feeling of love because it is the fatherland of all who have no fatherland, of all the oppressed and exploited. It is a torch of hope in the struggle for the liberation of the toilers of the whole world." *

* Chemadanov, *Cited Place*.

FOR THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET UNION READ

THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

edited by Stalin, Molotov, Voroshilov, Gorky, Zhdanov, and Kirov

Price \$1.25

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

By V. I. LENIN and JOSEPH STALIN

Writings and speeches from the February Revolution to the
October Revolution

Price \$2.00

THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN CHINA'S WAR FOR LIBERATION

BY RUDY BAKER

FOR people who have recently become interested in China it is difficult to understand the nature of the national united front which ended the separate existence of the Chinese Red Army and the Soviet government. Only a few years back it appeared that the civil war between the Chinese Communists and the Nanking government would rage on until either side was finally victorious. Now the former bitter enemies loyally fight side by side against Japan and there is much talk of continuing the newly re-established collaboration even after the war is won. These profound changes can only be explained by examining the recent history of the great Chinese Revolution, the role of the Communist Party of China in this revolution, and the recent developments in the international situation.

THE BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION

The Chinese Revolution began in 1911, when the tottering Manchu dynasty was overthrown through the efforts of the upper circles of patriotic and progressive intellectuals, government functionaries, and army officers representing the interests of the bourgeoisie, under the leadership of Dr.

Sun Yat-sen. This revolution was bourgeois-democratic in character; but, aside from replacing the Manchu monarchy with a formal republic, it made no profound social or class changes in China and did not involve the masses of its common people in active revolutionary struggle.

It was soon betrayed by the corrupt elements, notably Yuan Shih-kai, spokesman of the feudal forces. China remained a republic, but in name only. The sincere, though somewhat naive, revolutionists, together with Dr. Sun Yat-sen, were outlawed and persecuted, and China remained at the mercy of foreign imperialists and feudal war lords. Not until ten years later did the revolutionary movement begin gathering forces once again under the leadership of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who was inspired by, and learned much from, the great Russian Revolution of 1917.

In 1921, new social forces, the proletariat and the peasantry, actively entered the revolutionary arena with the founding of the Communist Party of China. The Party proceeded to organize the proletariat into China's first trade unions. Peasant unions were set up in the countryside. In

view of the maturing revolutionary situation negotiations were conducted with Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary People's Party (Kuomintang), with the object of establishing a revolutionary alliance. Dr. Sun, it should be noted, was an admirer and a warm friend of the Communist Party as well as of Lenin and the Soviet Union.

In 1924, the revolutionary alliance between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang was formed. This alliance was based on the Three People's Principles enunciated by Sun Yat-sen: National Independence, Freedom and Democracy, Well-Being of the People, which contained the essential tasks of the unfinished bourgeois-democratic revolution. The alliance assumed the form of a close collaboration between the two parties and resulted in the phenomenal growth of the mass revolutionary movement. The Communist Party and its influence grew rapidly. The All-China Federation of Labor embraced over four million members organized into modern industrial unions. Tens of millions of peasants joined the Peasant Union. Revolutionary students' organizations sprang up in all centers of learning.

In view of the subsequent development of the Soviet phase of the revolution, it must be stated that the Communists entered the revolutionary alliance with the Kuomintang in good faith and with a clear understanding that the revolution was to be a bourgeois-democratic one, the completion of the unfinished revolution of 1911, that its tasks were to achieve independence from imperialist domination, sweep aside feudal

survivals, and establish a democratic republic.

China then occupied (and still occupies) the position of a semi-colonial nation. Its historic progress from feudalism toward capitalist development and democracy was forcibly retarded by the political and economic domination of foreign imperialist powers which supported and utilized the corrupt and reactionary feudal war lords. In addition, the imperialist powers kept large armed forces on Chinese soil and in Chinese waters.

At this time (1924-25) all imperialist states were actively interested in subduing and dismembering China. Therefore, the main blow of the revolution was directed against all foreign imperialists, especially Britain, and their lackeys inside China, the feudal war lords.

The Communists worked loyally and effectively together with the Kuomintang to prepare the revolution. Workers, peasants, students, and all sections of the people were organized in mass organizations all over the country. The revolutionary base was in the south (Canton), where a republican revolutionary government functioned. The National Revolutionary Army was formed and prepared for the northward campaign to dethrone the feudal war lords. Sun Yat-sen died in March, 1925. In the spring of 1926 the great victorious northward march of the National Revolutionary Army began. In province after province the revolutionary army triumphed. The secret of the amazing military successes lay in the complete support and participation of the awakening and organized

people manifested in revolutionary strikes against the war lords and in peasant uprisings in their rear.

THE SOVIET STAGE OF THE REVOLUTION

However, in this revolutionary alliance there was a very vacillating ally, the rising bourgeoisie of China. As all Marxists know, a bourgeois-democratic revolution must free the peasantry from the yoke of feudal survivals, and achieve national independence in order to clear the social ground for the development of capitalism and bourgeois-democracy. This immature and unstable native bourgeoisie wished independence from foreign domination and the retarding influence of feudalism, but feared the mounting revolutionary movement of the people which demanded economic improvements and democratic rights. As the revolutionary movement spread, deepened and gathered force, and as the revolutionary goal came in sight (1927), this bourgeoisie of China, which, together with important sections of the landlords, dominated the Kuomintang and held commanding posts in the government and the army, *deserted the revolution* and formed an alliance with the feudal warlords and foreign imperialist powers against the revolution.

The national revolution was arrested and disrupted. Chiang Kai-shek, foremost spokesman of the bourgeoisie and commander-in-chief of the armies, organized a cruel counter-revolution against the Communist, labor, and peasant movements, which were the spirit and the backbone of the revolution. It was the passing of the bourgeoisie and, subsequently, the middle classes, from

the side of the revolution to counter-revolution that disrupted the almost victorious Chinese revolution and opened the ten-year period of civil war.

It was in this period and under these new circumstances and changes in class alignments that the Communist Party of China was compelled to organize the Red Army and set up Soviets in China. The Communists undertook the responsibility of continuing the revolution. Launching of Soviets was a measure to set up new state organs of the revolution in order to preserve the first gains of the revolution, to combat the counter-revolution, to rally the aroused masses of people to continue the revolution and raise it to the next higher stage. The earlier stage was directed mainly against the imperialist powers and took on the form of a national front embracing the proletariat, peasantry, bourgeoisie, middle classes and patriotic sections of the landlords. The new stage was directed mainly against the internal enemies, the counter-revolutionary bourgeois-landlord alliance. Its main content was the agrarian revolution, including the confiscation of lands of feudal landlords.

The organization of Soviets and the Red Army in China did not change the basic character of the revolution. It did not become a socialist or proletarian revolution. Some confusion still exists on this point, because the name Red Army and the Soviet form of government are associated with the land of socialism, the Soviet Union. But when it is recalled that Soviets were set up in Russia during the 1905 bourgeois-democratic

revolution and that Soviets existed as partial organs of power during the eight months of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the 1917 revolution, it becomes clear that Soviets are not synonymous with socialism. Not until the socialist revolution of November 7 took place did the Soviets become the state organs of power of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia.

In China the Soviets were organs of power of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. They represented the democratic rule (dictatorship) of two classes, the proletariat and peasantry. The main content of Chinese Soviets was the agrarian revolution and liquidation of feudal landlordism.

During the ten bitter years of civil war the best revolutionary forces and the living center of the great Chinese Revolution were preserved, steeled, and consolidated. The historic struggle to realize the revolutionary essence of the Three People's Principles of Sun Yat-sen was maintained with limited forces, in limited but growing territory, and under extraordinarily difficult conditions. During these ten years the most advanced revolutionary forces matured and gathered invaluable experience and wisdom. The proletarian vanguard, especially, expanded and prepared itself for the great historic trials and the national crisis maturing in the country.

THE NATIONAL ANTI-JAPANESE FRONT

Japan's large-scale invasion of China created once again the basis for renewed collaboration of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party in the struggle for national liberation. Abetted by its fascist allies,

Japan threatened the national existence of China. Its victory would mean the enslavement of China's people and the destruction of its ancient culture and civilization. In the face of Japan's invasion the central need of China was national anti-Japanese unity. In the new historic situation the unity of the nation was an imperative prerequisite for the salvation of its national existence.

The Communist Party foresaw the coming events years before the crisis faced the nation. It foresaw that the fate of the Chinese Revolution was historically and organically linked with the national existence of the country. It understood that the war for national liberation was an integral part of the Chinese Revolution. The Party began its efforts to form the national anti-Japanese united front.

As far back as 1931, after the loss of Manchuria, the Communists proposed a united front to stop Japanese aggression. Continued Japanese aggression, lack of resistance by the Nanking government, and the persistent proposals and agitation of the Communist Party for united resistance, created profound nation-wide mass sentiment for a united anti-Japanese front and for the renewal of Communist-Kuomintang collaboration. The famous Sian incident of December, 1936, in which Chiang Kai-shek was arrested by his own troops as a protest at his failure to organize united resistance to Japan, dramatically raised the need of a nationwide anti-Japanese front. The Sian incident marked a turning point in the history of China.

One of the most brilliant illustra-

tions of the Communist Party's correct tactics was seen in its role during the critical days of the Sian events when Chiang was held captive by his Northeastern (former Manchurian) and Northwestern armies.

These armies had already concluded an agreement with the Red Army for a united anti-Japanese war. The patriotic bitterness of the Northeastern troops against Chiang's failure to fight Japan in Manchuria (their former home) was being utilized by Trotskyites and Japanese agents to demand his execution. The pro-Japanese elements in Nanking provocatively massed troops and planes against the 200,000 mutineers.

Civil war on a large scale once again threatened China. It seemed that Japan was going to profit anew from China's internal troubles. Communist leaders from the adjacent Soviet territory rushed to the scene and brought their full influence to bear on the responsible leaders of the Northern armies to release Chiang Kai-shek, despite the fact that for ten years he had actively conducted civil war against them. The Communists did not permit their just hatred and bitterness to stand in the way of preventing a new civil war. Instead, they seized this tense and dangerous situation, when all eyes in China were fixed on Sian, to point to Japan as the main enemy facing the country and to the central need of the hour, the national united anti-Japanese front. This act had far-reaching effects.

Following the Sian events negotiations were begun between the government and the Communist Party for a program of cooperation to prepare

the country to resist Japan. The new Japanese invasion of China accelerated the processes of unity. In the course of the life-and-death struggle against Japan, to preserve the integrity and independence of China, the collaboration between the Communists and the Kuomintang reached a higher stage. Through their joint efforts the country is now being unified for the first time in many centuries. The people of China are being organized and mobilized for resistance to the end. Some elementary forms of democracy are being introduced in China as essential features of defense. The initiative and the vast potential powers of the people are being awakened and set into motion. People are being armed as guerilla fighters, however at present only in Japanese-seized territories, by the government and its armies. All classes, all sections of the population, all sincere anti-Japanese parties and political groups are gradually being welded into a single fighting unit.

THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR FOR LIBERATION

Due to the loss of port cities and industrial centers, the problem of reconstruction has become a major task of the war. Steps are being taken to improve the economic livelihood of the people as an essential measure for the defense of the country.

A single unified army, the National Revolutionary Army, and a single, central military command have been set up. In this critical period of China's existence, the unity of the nation is being achieved on the basis of resistance to Japan, which embraces

the revolutionary essence of Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles.

The unification of China is a process definitely progressing under the impact of Japanese invasion. The process is slow, uneven and painful. In the first place, the collaboration of the Kuomintang and Communist Party is far from satisfactory or complete. The terrible wounds of the ten years of civil war have not been fully healed. Remnants of old bitterness and distrust still linger here and there, and especially in the Right-wing circles of the Kuomintang. There are concealed pro-Japanese elements and Trotskyites who deliberately revive and magnify the bitterness and distrust and organize provocations that hinder the united front.

It must be remembered that classes and class antagonisms remain in China. While the mass organizations are once more permitted to function legally, there is still a great deal of fear of the masses, there is considerable resistance and even sabotage of the measures adopted by the government for the mobilization of the people and the introduction of democracy. There is also the terrible pressure of age-old feudal habits, inefficiency, bureaucracy, disregard for the welfare of the people, incompetency in military affairs, unequal distribution of military supplies, etc. There are still cases where the Communist Party is denied legal existence by local authorities.

The Communist Party clearly recognizes these weaknesses and persistently proposes their elimination. But it correctly emphasizes the achievements in the direction of unification, democracy, and collaboration with

the Kuomintang. It points out the weaknesses as barriers that can, will, and must be overcome. And they are being overcome. The responsible leadership of both parties and the great masses of members and adherents have risen above the past bitter conflicts and memories and are discharging their great duty and responsibility in this historic hour.

One must appreciate the full social and historic significance of the national unification process, the introduction of democracy, and the unleashing of the initiative and potential powers of a nation of four hundred and fifty million people. Among other things, it means sweeping aside centuries-old feudal restrictions, relations, and habits. The growth of democracy in a semi-feudal country like China proceeds at the expense of age-long feudal, bureaucratic and absolutist privileges, forms, and practices. The feudal remnants that act as a barrier to the successful defense of the nation must be swept aside. This is one of the most significant social aspects of the war in China. This is one important reason that we can characterize it as a *revolutionary* war of defense.

The Communist Party of China carried on a campaign for national anti-Japanese unity for six years. As the campaign for this policy began taking deep roots in the nation and the new Japanese invasion grew imminent, the Party issued its concrete proposals for the anti-Japanese united front to the Nanking government in August, 1935. These proposals called for a firm policy of resistance to Japan and the formation of a National Defense government composed of all

anti-Japanese parties and groups. In the event of adoption of a clear anti-Japanese policy by the Nanking government and its readiness to set up a defense government, the Communist Party of China was prepared to make serious concessions involving the modifications of its agrarian policy and incorporation of the Red Army and Soviet territories into the National Army and the National government respectively.

The nature of the concessions proposed and actually carried into effect can best be summarized now after sixteen months of war.

THE EIGHTH ARMY AND SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS

The Red Army has been incorporated in the national army and is subject to central military command. It is now known as the Eighth National Revolutionary Army. *Its original political and military commanders remain.* The Eighth Army receives a subsidy from the National government. It is officially authorized to expand its regular armed forces and guerilla troops in the Japanese-occupied territory.

Early in 1938 the Communist Party was authorized to organize a new army—the Fourth Army of 40,000 men, which carries on its regular operations in the Yangtse Valley and is likewise engaged in large-scale organization of guerilla troops behind Japanese lines on the central front.

The former Soviet territory has been transformed into the Special Administrative Districts of the Chinese People's Republic. The Communist Party remains the political guide and leader in the district. The confiscated

lands remain in the hands of the peasantry. The expropriated landlords who support the anti-Japanese war are permitted to return, are given a quantity of land which they are able to till, and are permitted to vote. In the recent elections practically all the functionaries, who were elected under the old Soviet elections, were re-elected. Soviet currency was replaced with National currency. Taxes and laws remain substantially unchanged.

The Eighth Army, in cooperation with other government armies in North China, has been charged by the National government to set up National government organs in the provinces of Hopei, Chahar and Shansi, on territories wrested from the Japanese embracing scores of millions of people. These are territories in which Japan occupies the railroads and main cities. However, between the railroads, in the rear of Japanese lines, 600,000 partisan troops operate.

The third concession, dealing with the agreement that the Communists shall cease *further* confiscation of land in new territories, has been adhered to. Confiscation of land is the higher stage of the agrarian revolution and implies continuation of civil war in the country in the period when national unity and internal solidarity are imperative to save the nation from colonial slavery. However, the interests of the war demand substantial improvement of political and economic conditions of the peasantry, which is being carried out.

The essence of the Communist Party's new policy, however, is not to be found in concessions. The conces-

sions, retreats, and sacrifices flow from the estimate of the new situation in China and the new strategic policy of the Party to meet the basic problems of this situation created by Japanese aggression.

Comrade Chen Shao-yui (Wang Ming) member of the Secretariat of the Party, summarizes the new policy as follows:

"As is well known, the Communist Party of China at the present stage of the struggle gave up on its own initiative the slogan of the sovietization of China. And this is no temporary move, no temporary maneuver or game; it is a serious turn in policy and tactics of the Communist Party of China, a turn called for by the change in the situation in China connected with Japanese aggression." *

THE NEW POLICY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Comrade Chen continues to sum up the new policy as follows:

"The Communist Party of China advances the slogan of a democratic republic, the character of which will be distinct from the bourgeois-democratic republics of Europe and America; however, it will not be a republic of the Soviet type, it will be a new type of republic born in the period of the victory of the policy of the united anti-Japanese national front, it will be the republic of all who participate to the very end in the struggle against Japan." **

These statements of its new policy clearly show that the Party has modified its tactics as well as its strategy. *While during the period of internal civil war the main enemy of the Chinese revolution was within the*

country and the main blow of the revolution was against the internal enemy, today the situation has fundamentally changed. The main enemy of the revolution, of the people, and of the entire country is Japan. Therefore, the strategy of the Party is changed in order to mobilize all the forces of the country against the main enemy. This national liberation war, however, must and does embrace the revolutionary essence of Dr. Sun's Three People's Principles, which are accepted by the Communist Party. Comrade Chen Shao-yui declares:

"The Chinese Communists not only wish to collaborate with the Kuomintang in the period of the anti-Japanese war but are ready to join with all honest members of the Kuomintang, loyal disciples of Sun Yat-sen, in fighting for an independent, free and happy future for the great Chinese people."*

It is, however, necessary to understand the relationship of the Three People's Principles to the basic program of the Communist Party to achieve Communism in China. Comrade Mao Tse-tung, one of the secretaries of the Communist Party, states in this connection:

"We Communists have declared our desire to wage a struggle together with members of the Kuomintang for the cause Sun Yat-sen did not succeed in achieving, namely, to fight for the international, political and economic equality of China. But at the same time we do not abandon our old, unswerving faith in Communism for which we have fought and sacrificed for many years." **

Comrade Mao declares further:

"From the theoretical point of view, the basic content of Sun Yat-sen's Three Princi-

* "For the Consolidation of the Anti-Japanese National United Front," *Masses* (Chinese), Hankow, January, 1938.

** *Ibid.*

* *Ibid.*

** Interview given to the daily newspaper *Sin-Jung Hua-Pao*, Hankow; see *The Communist International*, May, 1938.

ples, which consist of nationalism, democracy, and the well-being of the people, is quite compatible with the idea of Communism."*

Mao continues to show that the compatibility of communism and the Three People's Principles create a very good basis for establishing closer contact and greater collaboration between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang. He quotes Sun Yat-sen on this vital point:

"The teaching regarding the well-being of the people is in fact communism, socialism. Therefore, not only can we not say that communism and the teaching regarding the well-being of the people contradict one another, but, on the contrary, they are good friends. And those who stand for the teaching of the well-being of the people should make a careful study of communism."*

Mao Tse-tung's comment on the above quotation follows:

"This is a clear and correct position. We Communists are in absolute agreement with this position of Sun Yat-sen. We are honestly desirous of fighting for the realization of Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles, and also greet all and primarily Kuomintang comrades who, following Sun Yat-sen's behest, begin to make a careful study of communism."*

The Communist Party makes plain its attitude towards the National government, toward Chiang Kai-shek, and toward the problems of the People's Front and fascism in China. The Manifesto of its Central Committee puts forward the following main slogan: "For sincere collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party; for continuation of armed resistance to Japan; for final victory." This, together with the slogan: "Resistance to Japan is

above all else; everything must be subordinated to resistance to Japan," vividly expresses the immediate tasks of the Party.

It should be said that many of the vital proposals of the Communist Party have been adopted and put into effect by the National government. The sincere attitude and improving collaboration of both parties can best be seen in the display of miracles of heroism and self-sacrifice of all the Chinese armies. Despite the fact that Communists do not yet participate in the central organs of the National government, the Party recognizes the full and complete authority of the government. This wholehearted recognition of the government is based, in the first place, on the imperative need of a single, united authoritative state power for the successful organization of the national war of resistance. Secondly, the government has, on the whole, demonstrated in actions that it is determined to resist Japan to the end.

Comrade Chen Shao-yui answers those Communists who still doubt the wisdom of the new policy, who fail to understand the new situation and to grasp the difficulties in the process of unification, who attribute fascist motives to the slowness and hesitation of the Kuomintang:

"... There are people who persist in calling one of the units of the Kuomintang participating in the anti-Japanese war a 'fascist grouping.' It should be said there are no such groupings in China now, as is confirmed by the specific facts and special conditions of the historic development in China. At the present moment in China there can only be a united anti-Japanese national front to resist the aggression of the Japanese invaders, and no People's Front directed against ene-

* *Ibid.*

mies within the country. The united anti-Japanese National Front is considerably wider than that of the People's Front, and its edge is directed against foreign enemies and their myrmidons."*

The Communist Party and its leading spokesmen place the central emphasis on the development of a wide and stable united anti-Japanese national front based on the two major political parties. The Kuomintang, through the National government, has not only given recognition to the efforts of the Communists, but has already appointed a number of Communists in responsible posts in the civil and military organs of the government. The Communist Party is now legal in all important centers of China. Its daily newspapers are by far the largest in the country. Communists enjoy more and more the right to participate in the mass organizations of the people, and recently seven leading Communists have been appointed to the National Political Council which can be considered the first forerunner of the future parliament of China. The Communist members of the Council have made the following statement evaluating the significance of the Council:

* Cited place.

"Although by its formation and composition the Council is not yet the representative organ of the people's will, it nevertheless shows by its prestige and the role it plays in uniting all forces for armed resistance against the enemy that China's political life is developing effectively towards democracy. We Communists, who want to see the Council develop into an organ truly representative of the people, take part in its work with enthusiasm and sincerity."*

Finally, it is only proper to quote Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek on the subject of the all important problem of the Communist-Kuomintang collaboration.

In a recent interview in Hankow, Chiang Kai-shek said:

"Unity and determination are today more than ever necessary in China. A united leading force is still more necessary. Facts show that the Communist Party understands perfectly the tasks facing the nation, and bear witness to its sincerity in the questions of unity and the country's salvation.

"Of late our adversaries have been spreading malicious rumors and committing provocations, which are not of course surprising. We must reply to the enemy in closing our ranks and so showing them the futility of their efforts."**

* "Opening of the National Political Council," *World News and Views*, July 16, 1938. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

** "Interview with Chiang Kai-shek," *World News and Views*, July 16, 1938.

In Praise of Learning

By JOSEPH STALIN and V. M. MOLOTOV

Two recent speeches delivered by Stalin and Molotov at a reception in the Kremlin in honor of Soviet scientists and members of university and college staffs. The differences in the aims, work and lives of scientists in the Soviet Union and those of the capitalist countries are clearly portrayed by Stalin and Molotov.

Price 5 cents

THE LOS ANGELES MAYORALTY RECALL ELECTION

BY PAUL CLINE,

*Secretary, Los Angeles County,
Communist Party, U.S.A.*

THE Los Angeles mayoralty recall election of September 16, which resulted in the overwhelming defeat of the reactionary incumbent, Frank L. Shaw, and the election of a people's coalition candidate, Judge Fletcher Bowron, was a political event of definite national significance. In one respect it was something unprecedented in the history of American municipal government. For the first time the people of a large city have succeeded, by means of a signature and petition campaign, in forcing a special recall election against their Mayor and *in voting him out of office!* The Los Angeles recall election was a significant demonstration of the American democratic process at its best. It was "democracy in action."

The recall ouster of Mayor Shaw (after five and a half years of his tenure of office) was a remarkable victory for the people of Los Angeles against a strongly entrenched, corrupt and reactionary political machine. Traditional open-shop domination of the political life of Los Angeles has been dealt a powerful

blow. America's fifth largest city, birthplace of spontaneous mass movements for social reform—Utopians, Epic, Townsend, California Pension Plan—has in this recall election properly registered the progressive sentiment of its people. However, within the dominantly progressive trend of the election there was a serious element of weakness and defeat in that the reactionaries were able to secure passage of a drastic anti-picketing ordinance which, if allowed to stand, would hamstring the activities of organized labor and the progressive movement.

The seeming contradiction of the Los Angeles election results arises out of the complex interplay of social, political, and class forces in this election struggle of a special type which was initiated and led by middle class and church forces, and which started as a narrow reform movement and broadened into a people's movement against corruption and *reaction*.

The experiences of the Los Angeles recall election confirm an important lesson brought out in the successful struggle against Tammany Hall in

New York, the lesson that civic reform movements today play a role entirely different from that of the anti-corruption, "muckraking" crusades of pre-war days, described by Lincoln Steffens in his autobiography. These reform movements were led by isolated groups of petty-bourgeois reformers, whose activities, for the most part, were regarded with passive indifference by the labor and Socialist movement. These anti-corruption crusades petered out and were spent in futile attacks upon the machine politics of an expanding capitalist system.

But today, in the new setting of a rapidly growing democratic front movement that sharply challenges the political rule of the economic royalists, the issue of civic reform assumes a dynamic and progressive potentiality. On this issue large sections of the middle-class, conservative, and church-going masses can be set into motion against the reactionary municipal political machines which are inevitably tied up with the underworld of vice, gambling and racketeering. In both New York and Los Angeles it was precisely such alliances of "good government" forces with the liberal-labor movement (brought about, of course, by widely divergent conditions and forces) that defeated the reactionaries. It will be necessary to work along similar lines to defeat and oust the Rossi machine in San Francisco, the Kelly machine in Chicago, the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, and the Hague machine in Jersey City.

The fight against reaction and corruption in municipal government is an important phase of the complex and far-flung struggle to build a vic-

torious democratic front in the United States.

In this light the lessons of the Los Angeles recall election are of interest and value to our Party and to all forces working for progress and democracy.

ORIGIN OF THE RECALL

The recall election in Los Angeles originated as a movement on the part of middle-class and church groups to clean out rampant conditions of vice and gambling in the city. Led by a local business man, a former member of the County Grand Jury, Clifford E. Clinton, and a group of influential Methodist ministers, this reform movement operated under the name, Citizen's Independent Vice Investigation Committee (C.I.V.I.C.). Many sensational charges of corruption were leveled by C.I.V.I.C., in the course of its activities against Mayor Shaw and Chief of Police Davis.

This situation was brought to a head on January 14, when Harry Raymond, a hired investigator for C.I.V.I.C., was dangerously wounded by a bomb placed under the hood of his automobile. Intense public indignation and the uncovering of strong circumstantial evidence by the C.I.V.I.C. forced the District Attorney to arrest Earl Kynette, Captain of the Police Intelligence Squad, and confidential aid to Mayor Shaw and Chief Davis.

During the course of the long, drawn-out trial that followed it was amply proved that Kynette was guilty of the Raymond bombing. It was also revealed that the Kynette squad, operating in conjunction with the infamous Hynes' Red squad, had been

used by the Shaw administration as a political espionage agency. Evidence was introduced showing that dictaphones had been installed by Kynette and his men in the homes and offices of scores of prominent citizens and that recordings had been made of private conversations for purposes of political blackmail. After a trial lasting many weeks Kynette and one of his aides were found guilty and sentenced to long prison terms.

The entire city was aroused by the revelations of corruption and political intimidation brought out in the Kynette trial. The labor and progressive forces saw that bigger issues were involved than the question of vice clean-up. The Communist Party, through radio broadcasts, meetings, and leaflets, pointed out that "the Raymond bombing has exposed the unholy alliance of the underworld and the open-shop as the power behind the throne of the Shaw-Davis administration." The Party urged a coalition of all labor and progressive forces with all groups interested in clean, honest government, in order to oust Mayor Shaw. A meeting of C.I.V.I.C., together with prominent liberals and labor leaders, was held to discuss ways and means of meeting the situation. As a result, it was decided to call a general conference on the crisis in civic affairs. Several hundred organizations responded to the conference call and it was unanimously decided to launch the "Federation for Civic Betterment."

Within the brief space of two months the Federation was able to secure the affiliation of over 400 organizations and groups with an aggregate membership of nearly 300,000 people.

Participating in the Federation were the biggest Methodist churches in the city, C.I.V.I.C., Labor's Non-Partisan League, the Federation for Political Unity, the Motion Picture Democratic Committee, scores of A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions, large numbers of women's groups, Negro groups, and youth organizations. In composition the Federation represented a true cross section of the people of Los Angeles. Most significant was the fact that high-ranking Methodist church leaders and conservative business men like Clinton were ready and able to find a common ground of action with representatives of Left-wing groups like the I.L.D. and the I.W.O. Despite the predictions of the *Los Angeles Times* that the "conflicting groups in the Federation will soon be clawing at each other," these organizations were able to work in complete harmony within the framework of the Federation for Civic Betterment.

To meet the legal requirements for a special recall election it was necessary to collect a minimum of 70,000 signatures. Petition lists were issued and circulated by the thousands. Within a few days after the Kynette conviction a total of over 114,000 signatures had been secured. The date of the recall election was set for September 16.

SELECTION OF A CANDIDATE

With the first phase of the recall battle won, the Federation for Civic Betterment tackled the crucial and difficult task of picking an electable candidate around whom all forces would rally. Clinton and the Methodist ministers put forward Judge Fletcher Bowron, a man with long

years of distinguished bench service, but with no political record to speak of. The liberal and labor elements opposed Bowron on the grounds that he was a man of conservative leanings and a registered Republican, and countered with the nomination of Samuel Yorty, militant New Deal state assemblyman. In the negotiations that followed, the Clinton group adopted an intransigent position in favor of Bowron and in opposition to Yorty. A disastrous split seemed imminent. The Shaw forces came out with a statement that "the fight between the blue-nose fanatics and the radical extremists means the end of the recall racket."

The leaders of Labor's Non-Partisan League and of the Federation for Political Unity—the most active and advanced elements within the labor-progressive wing of the Federation—on discussing and analyzing the situation, were convinced that the Left-winger Yorty could not possibly defeat Shaw. It was clear that Bowron must be accepted as the candidate of the Federation for Civic Betterment, if the anti-Shaw forces were to remain united, if the conservative masses behind Clinton and the Methodist church were to be rallied for the recall.

In a tense nominating conference of the Federation for Civic Betterment the progressive spokesmen took the lead in fighting for unity behind Bowron and against a liberal *vs.* conservative split. The conference voted overwhelmingly for unity at all costs. Thus, a broad, flexible approach—a —and for Bowron as the candidate. democratic front approach—on the part of the most advanced elements

saved the recall movement from a fatal split.

THE POSITION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN LOS ANGELES

In a radio broadcast devoted to the recall situation the Communist Party made the following characterization of Bowron:

"He is not a liberal or progressive in the ordinary political meaning of these words. He can best be characterized as an honest conservative, a man of unquestionable personal integrity and principles. Certainly Judge Bowron's labor and social viewpoint is not as advanced as that of the New Deal candidates who have been nominated in the recent state primaries. Nevertheless, Judge Bowron typifies in his person the social and political character of the recall movement which is comprised in the main of middle class conservative-minded people and of religious, reform and good government groups. The people are primarily motivated by the desire for clean, honest government, a desire which we Communists fully share with them. . . . All honest, civic-minded people who want to have clean municipal government in Los Angeles, who want to rid our city of the discredited Mayor Shaw, have only one practical course open to them—and that is to rally behind the candidate of the Federation for Civic Betterment. Only in this way can Shaw be defeated."

While the progressive forces were busy collecting signatures for the recall election, the reactionaries were also busy circulating petitions to put their anti-picketing ordinance on the ballot. The ordinance, next to the question of clean government, became the most important issue in the campaign. Mayor Shaw, playing for A. F. of L. support, pretended to be neutral on the ordinance, refusing to take a stand for or against it. Bowron, pushed along by swiftly moving events and upon honestly weighing

the right and wrong of the issue, took a clear-cut stand on the question. He came out with the following statement:

"I believe thoroughly in the right of collective bargaining.

"I believe in the right of workers to organize in unions of their own choosing.

"It is time that big business recognizes that collective bargaining is the order of the day and that no longer can working men and women be beaten and intimidated by such organizations as the Red Squad.

"As an individual voter I am going to vote 'No' on Proposition No. 1 [the anti-picketing ordinance]."

This declaration by Judge Bowron greatly strengthened his campaign within the ranks of labor, both A. F. of L., C.I.O., and among the New Deal Democrats. It won for him the endorsement of the C.I.O. industrial council and many A. F. of L. unions, including the big musicians' local of over 7,000 members. But the statement also provoked a savage attack by the *Los Angeles Times*, which declared that "the election of Bowron means turning the city over to amateurs, carpetbaggers, radicals and C.I.O. spoilsmen."

THE POSITION OF THE A. F. OF L.

The A. F. of L. Central Labor Council leadership, headed by J. W. Buzzell, adopted a reactionary and splitting position on the recall, by supporting Shaw, on the grounds that he had proved himself to be a friend of labor. Despite Shaw's long record of service to the open-shoppers, despite his refusal to come out against the anti-picketing ordinance—the Buzzell leadership carried on an active campaign in support of the mayor. The A. F. of L. indorsement was ex-

ploited as a trump card by the reactionaries, who plastered up the town with billboards saying, "Organized Labor say: Vote 'No' on the Recall!"

The Trotskyites also were called into service by the open-shoppers in their campaign against the recall. The local leader of the Trotskyites was hired by the Shaw forces to get out a spurious sheet called the *Allied Democrat*—purporting to be the organ of New Deal Democrats. A quarter of a million copies of this paper were distributed throughout the city. It featured a vicious attack, in the characteristic Trotskyite manner, upon Judge Bowron—painting Bowron as a Republican reactionary and a tool of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association. At the same time, it attacked the Communist Party for an alleged alliance with the Merchants and Manufacturers on behalf of Bowron and for secretly directing his campaign.

But no amount of Trotskyite slander and misrepresentation could cover up the fact that the open-shop organ, the *Los Angeles Times*, carried on a vicious campaign against Bowron and gave all possible support to Shaw. The slogan used by the *Times* and the open-shoppers was, "Defeat Bowron and preserve industrial freedom. Smash the recall racket!" The Trotskyite attempt to inject Red-baiting into the campaign rode right off the broad back of the recall movement, the secretary of the Federation for Civic Betterment declaring, "We're not going to stand for any Red-baiting in this movement. We've learned our lesson from the Sinclair and Roosevelt campaigns."

RESULTS OF THE ELECTION

The tremendous power developed by the recall movement was registered at the polls. Of the 361,000 votes cast—a record number for Los Angeles municipal elections—232,000 were for Bowron and 122,000 for Shaw. The remaining 7,000 votes were given to two minor candidates placed in the field in a vain effort to split the anti-administration vote. It should be pointed out that in many precincts with a preponderant Republican registration Judge Bowron polled a majority of the votes. This indicates that tens of thousands of Republicans aligned themselves with the New Deal Democrats for the defeat of Shaw. The broad sweep of the recall movement is proved by the fact that Bowron got over 35,000 more votes in Los Angeles than Culbert L. Olson, the Democratic gubernatorial nominee, received in the primary election. Of course, the fact that Los Angeles municipal elections are non-partisan helped to swell Bowron's plurality.

The vote on the anti-picketing ordinance was 198,000 for and 152,000 against. It is estimated that only about half of Bowron's 232,000 supporters followed his advice to vote against this reactionary measure. How is it to be explained that the other half, while voting against the open-shop candidate, voted for the open-shop ordinance? The answer is that the middle-class and church supporters of Bowron were repelled and antagonized by the action of the A. F. of L. leadership in supporting Shaw. To these people it appeared that all Shaw supporters were aligned with the racketeers and the underworld, and this went for the A. F. of L.

leadership too. As a result, they were easily taken in by the propaganda of the open-shoppers that enactment of the anti-picketing ordinance would curb labor racketeering.

Another reason for the carrying of the anti-picketing ordinance was the good-squad tactics resorted to by local A. F. of L. leaders, especially in their fight against the C.I.O. For several weeks prior to the election the newspapers headlined a trial of high officials of the teamsters' union on charges of goon squad beatings and labor violence.

A third factor responsible for the enactment of the ordinance was the fact that the campaign against it was carried through on a very narrow basis—simply placing the question as one of labor's rights rather than as an issue of the civil and constitutional rights of the people generally and as a fight against a reactionary measure that was contrary to the New Deal and the national law of the land as embodied in the Wagner Relations Act. It was not made clear to the people that the anti-picketing ordinance was part of the wage-cutting drive of the employers, which, if successful, would reduce the living standards of the middle-class also.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ORDINANCE

The adoption of the anti-picketing ordinance was a severe blow to the labor and progressive movement—a blow directly attributable to the splitting tactics of the A. F. of L. leadership in opposing the recall movement. It will be necessary to challenge this unconstitutional ordinance by legal means as well as by mass opposition. However, the utmost

care will have to be exercised that this struggle does not create a rift between labor, on the one hand, and Bowron and his "good-government" supporters on the other.

On the contrary, it should be possible, on the basis of the people's election victory against an open-shop administration, and on the basis of Bowron's pro-labor declaration, to develop a broad movement to repeal and nullify the anti-picketing ordinance. It should be possible to win the support of the Federation for Civic Betterment for this movement. Already the California Pension Plan movement has gone on record against anti-picketing laws.

Labor and its progressive allies throughout California must profit by the lessons of this setback in Los Angeles if they are to defeat a state anti-picketing ordinance which will be voted upon in the November 8 general election. Unless organized labor unites its ranks solidly behind the New Deal candidates, unless the Democratic Party in its turn makes a strong campaign against the measure, unless everything possible is done to win over the city middle-class elements and the farmers, then labor and the progressive movement in California will receive a serious setback. Los Angeles has nearly 43 per cent of the state's registered voters. It will be of decisive importance in the outcome of the November vote on the state anti-picketing law that Los Angeles be swung against the proposition. This can be done if the Bowron victory is properly followed up.

AFTER THE VICTORY

The ousting of Shaw and the elec-

tion of Bowron gave rise to a great wave of enthusiasm and confidence among the people. On the night of the election, when it became evident that Bowron had won, the people swarmed into the City Hall en masse and took it over. The council chamber was packed and people congregated in the long corridors excitedly discussing the results. "Now this really is our City Hall," was the jubilant comment on all sides. Signs were hung up outside the City Hall with the inscription: "Under changed management." The inauguration of Bowron as Mayor turned out to be a mass demonstration with thousands of people overrunning the council chambers and touring the various municipal departments with the police and City Hall attendants making no effort whatever to restrict the movement of the people.

Among the Negro people the recall struggle and its aftermath were particularly sharp. The Shaw machine had resorted to the most extreme measure of police terrorism, corruption and bribery in order to control the Negro votes; but a large Negro committee for the support of Bowron was formed. Functioning as an arm of the Federation for Civic Betterment, this committee included prominent Negro ministers, attorneys, and community leaders from all walks of life. Following up on the election victory, an unprecedented unity movement for Negro community organization is being developed. Unlimited possibilities for building a progressive mass movement among the Negro people have been opened up. The Communist Party forces are awake to this situation and are plunging into

the work with new confidence and enthusiasm.

In his few weeks in office Mayor Bowron has launched out on a sound program of action. He has worked in close cooperation with the executive committee of the Federation for Political Unity. He has demanded and secured the resignation of practically all city commissions, including the important civil service, public works, and police commissions which were the former strongholds of the Shaw machine. He has laid the basis for ousting Chief of Police Davis; and with Davis there will undoubtedly go the infamous Hynes "Red Squad," thus ending its fifteen years of terrorist activities against the workers. Bowron has shown that he intends to smash the spoils system by staffing the city commissions with honest, competent people representing all sections of the population, including representatives of labor and the Negro people. Immediately after his inauguration into office Bowron engaged in a series of consultations with Mayor LaGuardia of New York City (who happened to be attending the American Legion Convention in Los Angeles at the time). Bowron publicly stated that he needed advice and guidance and that he looked for these to New York's progressive mayor. Together with LaGuardia the mayor addressed a mass meeting of 5,000 people and pledged to model his administration after that of New York's. Declaring himself on the question of national political alignments, Bowron made the following statement:

"Although I am a Republican, I am a New Deal Republican and have supported Presi-

dent Roosevelt. I am going to try to give Los Angeles a new deal."

Bowron has repeatedly declared that his election was in no sense a personal triumph, but, rather, a victory for the people, and that only to the extent to which the people back him up will he be able to carry out their mandate.

THE STRATEGY OF REACTION

The open-shop and reactionary forces, temporarily stunned by their unexpected defeat, have adopted a conciliatory attitude. The *Los Angeles Times* and the reactionary city council are going along with the mayor, trying to "roll with the punches." But, of course, the big business interests are preparing to unleash a powerful attack on Bowron if he persists in opposing them. They will sabotage every constructive and progressive move made. Their main strategy is directed toward breaking up and dispersing the unity movement of the people. For this purpose they are trying to infiltrate the Federation for Civic Betterment by moving in their stooge organizations and agents to disrupt it from within. In order to counter this it will be of decisive importance that the unity achieved between the progressive elements in the Federation and the reform and church groups be strengthened. The experience in this recall campaign shows that everything Comrade Browder said in his Tenth Convention report about developing fraternal cooperation with the Catholic masses applies fully to the Methodists and other religious denominations.

A very urgent task facing our Party and the progressives in the coming

period is that of winning trade union support, especially within the A. F. of L., for the Federation for Civic Betterment and for every forward step taken by Mayor Bowron. Solid labor support for Bowron will be a strong guarantee that he will continue to move in a progressive direction—against open-shop reaction as well as civic corruption.

Facing the post-election problems and tasks, labor and the progressive forces must have clearly in mind that the Bowron administration is based on a broad and heterogeneous coalition of forces *and that some elements in this coalition may not be ready to move as fast as others*. This means that the unfolding of the people's program must be adjusted to the prevailing level of understanding, strength, and readiness of the recall movement as a whole and must be so timed and developed as constantly to broaden the mass base of the administration. The liberal and progressive forces which played such an exemplary role in building the Federation for Civic Betterment must show that they orientate on the needs of the movement as a whole and that they seek no special concessions for themselves at the expense of the recall coalition.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party was a definite factor in the recall election. This is recognized by all groups in the recall movement. Outstanding conservative leaders in the Federation for

Civic Betterment have stated that the Communists were a constructive and helpful force in the recall campaign. The Party, through its many members active in the trade unions and mass organizations and through its own pronouncements of policy by means of four special radio broadcasts and a series of leaflets and mass meetings, helped the recall movement in solving the various problems and difficulties that arose. A valuable contribution of the Party was the bringing forward of the lessons of the New York municipal campaign against Tammany Hall. The Communist Party in Los Angeles is on the way toward being recognized as a legitimate force in the community—as a force striving for civic betterment and for progress.

Facing the important state elections in November the Party in Los Angeles recognizes its central task to be the channelizing of the enthusiasm and momentum of the recall victory into support of the New Deal local and state candidates. A victory for the New Deal ticket and the defeat of the state anti-picketing ordinance would further open up the way for rapid unionization of Los Angeles. Just as New York is the stronghold of progressivism in the East, so Los Angeles can become the stronghold of progressivism on the West Coast. The Communist Party, as a vital element in the great democratic front movement that is rapidly surging forward in California, will continue to devote itself unreservedly toward this end.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LATIN AMERICA TRADE UNION UNITY CONGRESS

BY R. A. MARTINEZ

DELEGATES from thirteen Latin American countries answered the call of the Mexican Confederation of Workers and its foremost leader Vicente Lombardo Toledano to hold a congress * in Mexico to discuss the question of the unification of the Latin American trade unions. Besides the Latin American delegates, representing the majority of the existing trade unions, there were fraternal delegates from the Committee for Industrial Organization, U. S. A.; from the General Confederation of Labor, France; from the General Confederation of Labor, Spain; from India, Switzerland, Sweden, Trinidad, and from the International Labor Office.

On the evening of September 8, after three days of intense discussion, Francisco Perez Leiros, representing the powerful Confederation of Workers of Argentina (C.G.T.), announced the approval of the Constitution. He declared the Latin American Confederation of Workers, with Vicente Lombardo Toledano as its first President, formally constituted, and he invited "the official and fraternal delegates, and all those that were inter-

ested in the congress to work for the greatest success of the newly-born organization."

John L. Lewis, Chairman of the C.I.O., who attended the congress as a fraternal delegate, declared that he thought the "formation of this organization one of the most significant events that has happened in a long time in respect to all countries from Capricorn to Cancer." *

The congress dealt exhaustively with the problems confronting the Latin American workers, both in relation to their national economic and political struggles, and to the task that the present threatening international situation places upon them. Concrete resolutions and decisions were unanimously adopted establishing the obligations of the Latin American working class in relation to all basic national and international problems.

It is obviously impossible to deal here with all the many-sided achievements of the congress. We shall limit

* Due to the fact that Lewis' address to the Latin American Trade Union Congress was incompletely reported in the press of U. S. A., the citations in this article have had to be retranslated from the comprehensive reports in the Mexican press.—*The Editors.*

* Held in Mexico City, September 5 to 8, 1938.

ourselves to an evaluation of the congress from the point of view of its significance to the further strengthening of the trade union movement, its role in the anti-fascist struggle, and the strengthening of the People's Front throughout Latin America, from the point of view of its significance to the future relations of the Latin American workers to the workers in the United States, and its bearing on President Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy"; and, finally, from the point of view of the role of the congress and the organization it brought to life in relation to the struggle for international trade union unity.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTH OF THE
LATIN AMERICAN CONFEDERATION
OF WORKERS

The organization of the Latin American Confederation of Workers is the third attempt made to establish trade union unity in Latin America. The two previous attempts to unify the workers represented limited and narrow forces.

The Pan-American Federation of Labor, the creature of Samuel Gompers, held its last Congress in Washington in 1927, representing besides the American Federation of Labor and the Regional Confederation of Labor (C.R.O.M.) of Mexico, only small reformist groups, led by "yes men" to the imperialist designs of Gompers, Matthew Woll, Green, Morones and Co.

The Latin American Confederation of Workers, organized in Montevideo in May, 1929, for eight years carried out an important work of agitation and class education; but, with the ex-

ception of the Federation of Labor of Chile and the National Confederation of Labor of Cuba, it did not represent the broad masses of Latin American workers. At the First Regional Conference of the International Labor Office, held in Santiago, Chile, in January, 1936, the Latin American Confederation of Labor openly declared its intention to give way to a new organization. It was instrumental in having a pact signed by the labor delegates, including Perez Leiros of the Argentinian C.G.T. This pact was the forerunner of the new Latin American organization.

The new Latin American Confederation of Workers represents the most powerful trade union forces that have ever existed in the history of Latin America. It rests upon four powerful and strategically located trade union centers, which radiate great influence to four widely separated important zones in Latin America, and which will play a great role in organizing and strengthening the trade union movement where it is not so strong or where it is suppressed by dictatorial regimes.

The Confederation of Workers of Mexico (C.T.M.), which has within its ranks the majority of the Mexican working class, will act as a center of activities for the Central American countries, as well as for those in the Caribbean Sea. The Confederation of Workers of Colombia, together with the Chilean Confederation of Workers, will exert great influence and render help to the trade union movement in the countries of the South Pacific, and in Bolivia and Venezuela. The C.G.T. of Argentina, the oldest and one of the most solidly

established trade union centers in Latin America, will be a center of activities and render help to the labor movement in Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay, where no unified trade union movement exists. The Cuban trade unions, which were amply represented at the congress, form another powerful bulwark of the new Confederation. Because of the conditions of reactionary dictatorship from which they are just emerging, they have not yet created a national trade union center; but all evidences are that it will not be long before the Cuban trade union movement achieves national unity.

UNITY WELDED IN THE STRUGGLE
AGAINST REACTION

Besides the broad representative strength of the new organization, it is important to emphasize that the steps toward achieving unity which have characterized the situation in Latin America, and culminated in the Mexican Congress, were the result of the fiercest struggles against fascist attempts to get a foothold in their respective countries, and of fierce struggles for improving the conditions of the workers.

In a speech delivered in February, 1936, dealing with the question of trade union unity Lombardo Tolodano said:

"In the face of national and international fascism, our strength is unity. The only sure means to preserve the trade union rights of the working class is the unity of the exploited. Only the unity of the proletariat can maintain the democratic liberties which the bourgeoisie wants to destroy. Unity, unity must be our slogan, in Mexico, in America, and throughout the world."

This passionate appeal by Tole-

dano has permeated all trade union developments in Latin America. Never in the history of Latin America has the need for unity been so keenly felt. Never have the economic conditions of the working class and the popular liberties been so threatened as by the beasts who have brought hunger, oppression and national ruin to the German and Italian people; who have brought destruction and desolation to the Spanish people, the kin of Latin Americans in blood and in democratic endeavors; who have set China and Ethiopia afire, brutally conquered Austria, and trampled the noble and democratic people of Czechoslovakia.

Examples of their brutal and criminal endeavors have been felt already in the flesh and blood of the Brazilian people; in their attempts to kindle the flames of civil war in Chile, as the first attempt towards the destruction of the Chilean People's Front; in their attempt to undermine the path of freedom and well-being that the Mexican people are treading, with their courageous and far-sighted President at their head; and in their many attempts in every other Latin American country to place in power the most reactionary forces, who would dutifully welcome and carry out the dictates of Berlin, Rome, and the most reactionary sections of the U. S. and British imperialist enterprises.

The Mexican C.T.M. came to life in answer to the fascist attempts of former President Calles to cut short the resolute efforts of President Cardenas to set the march of the Mexican democratic revolution in motion again. It has consolidated itself by being in the forefront of the struggle

against every reactionary fascist attempt directed at the economic interests of the workers of the democratic rights of the people. In Chile, the unity of the workers in the Confederation of Labor was achieved through partial united struggles, among which figured a national railway strike, and a national solidarity strike movement; in Argentina, the C.G.T. gathered renewed strength on the basis of great mass struggles for the improvement of the workers' conditions. In Cuba, the trade unions have given examples of the greatest tactical skill, taking advantage of every developing contradiction within the realignment of forces, supporting the recently manifested democratic trend within the Batista government, concentrating their attack on the most reactionary sections, and succeeding in completely re-establishing the right of the trade unions to organize.

THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE PEOPLE'S UNITY

The participation of the Latin American workers in the anti-fascist struggle does not limit itself to the immediate class interests of the workers. It expresses itself also in growing participation of the working class in the general struggles of the people, in contributing to shaping the course of the People's Front movement. In Mexico, the C.T.M. has played a decisive role in the realization of the unity of the people within the Party of the Mexican Revolution, a bloc party, which is the Mexican form of the People's Front.

In Chile, the People's Front was organized against the wave of terror unleashed after the railroad workers'

strike, and the Chilean Confederation of Labor is one of its bedrock foundations. In Cuba, the great democratic mass developments have been, in part, possible because of the united action of the workers, who only recently held a gigantic demonstration of more than 80,000, demanding the application of all existing social legislation.

In formulating the principles of the new organization, the Congress declared:

"Fascism is contrary to the objectives and actions of the proletariat, to the progress of the people and the development of culture, for which reasons it should be combatted in all its forms."

It thus gave expression to the anti-fascist sentiment of the organized workers of Latin America.

But it would be misleading to assume from the anti-fascist developments in Latin America that there is full understanding of the question of the struggle against fascism. On the contrary, there is still considerable confusion. This confusion arises from the semi-colonial status of Latin America. The U. S. and England have over ten billion dollars invested in the Latin American countries, while the fascist powers have comparatively nothing. In the past the governments of the U. S. and England exercised the greatest political influence, giving rise to a deep anti-imperialist hatred and to broad and powerful anti-imperialist movements, especially against the U. S.

The Trotskyite agents of fascism try to play on the anti-imperialist sentiments of the masses in an endeavor to cover fascist penetration and plots for conquest. They seek to

divert the popular movements from struggle against the fascist offensive and its preparations for coups d'etat to opposition to the Roosevelt Good Neighbor Policy and the developing Pan-American democratic front.

The strengthening of the Latin American trade union movement which will result from the creation of the L.A.C.W., will undoubtedly accelerate the unity of the people in every country, and will serve as the backbone of the future Pan-American democratic front that is maturing in our hemisphere.

But the Latin American Trade Union Congress is not only of great significance for what it accomplished in relation to Latin America itself, but for what it achieved internationally. It can be stated that finally the Latin American workers have found their international allies, found above all for the first time in their history, their most coveted friend, the working class of the United States.

LABOR'S GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

John L. Lewis has long been known to the Latin American workers. The struggles of the C.I.O. against the most rapacious and aggressive corporations in the United States, against the same imperialist trusts that also live on the sweat and blood of the Latin American workers, have been looked upon by the Latin American workers, not only with great sympathy, but also as someone much closer to them, as part of their own struggles. The anti-fascist and anti-imperialist significance of the rise of the C.I.O. has been sensed by the Latin American people. Its influence in weakening the hold of the great

monopolies on the government of the United States is one of the basic factors underlying President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy, and is at the bottom of the growing mass understanding in Latin America of the changes that have taken place in the United States. This process of rapprochement will be greatly accelerated due to Lewis' trip to Mexico.

Lewis denounced the interference of greedy foreign corporations. In speaking of the conditions of the workers, he said that "they show conclusively that large foreign corporations in the various countries are exercising influence on several governments to impose and maintain miserable wage structures and degraded working and social conditions on the workers." He went further and stated what amounts to a declaration of "Labor's Good Neighbor Policy," when he declared:

"The C.I.O. is in favor of improving the conditions of the working population in all these countries and feels that in doing so it is acting in support of President Roosevelt's good neighbor policy and making a great contribution for increased prosperity."

At the same time, he added to it a clearer democratic content:

"Labor must organize to give support to liberal statesmen of all nations who are working for the welfare of their people."

By this he clearly meant that a true democratic good neighbor policy cannot be based on relations with the Vargas, Benavides, Trujillos, Alessandris, and other Latin American reactionaries who are opening wide the door to the fascist invaders. He gave an example of what he meant when he compared President Roosevelt to President Cardenas.

Realizing the offensive of the fascist incendiaries in Latin America, as well as in the U. S. A., Lewis declared at a mass meeting organized by the C.T.M.:

"We meet here to give common expression to our purpose of preservation of democratic institutions against the menace of interests which want to destroy them. Democracy has always had its enemies. Now they have organized themselves under the black flag of fascism.

"Between us and fascism there can be no peace. We join hands with all other workers in this hemisphere and the whole world to fight against the common enemy."

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION UNITY
MUST BE ACHIEVED

In Mexico, Latin American labor has not only come closer to the United States, it has come closer also to the international trade union movement. It can be stated that the great leaders of European labor—Leon Jouhaux, leader of the French C.G.T.; Ramon Gonzalez Pena, Minister of Justice in the Spanish government, and a leader of the Spanish C.G.T.; and many others who attended, are conscious of the problems of Latin American labor and have pledged solidarity to their struggles. Jouhaux declared:

"The French Confederation of Labor with its five million members assures Lombardo Toledano and President Cardenas of its complete support in their struggle for the economic independence of Mexico."

He was expressing as well the sentiments of millions of organized workers in Europe.

Latin American labor, strengthened by its unity, and with its new international standing, is bound to play a greater role in the struggle for international trade union unity. The

congress called upon all trade unions to affiliate with the International (Amsterdam) Trade Union Federation, "so that the great ideal of all workers, complete international trade union unity, can be realized."

The affiliation of the Latin American trade unions to Amsterdam will strengthen tremendously the struggle for international trade union unity, which, because of the incensement at the Munich betrayal, will undoubtedly gain greater momentum.

In regard to the United States, it will serve to correct one of the greatest weaknesses of the congress: it will have the effect of establishing relations with the American Federation of Labor. The A. F. of L. sent no delegates to the congress; its leadership denounced it as a "Communist maneuver"; but it is clear that this attitude does not express the sentiments of the membership of the A. F. of L., which is for greater collaboration both in respect to international trade union unity and to the Latin American workers.

The C.T.M. of Mexico and the C.G.T. of Argentina are already affiliated to Amsterdam, and it is to be expected that soon other important trade union centers will affiliate, and be enabled thereby to find a common ground for collaboration with the American Federation of Labor.

The true sentiment of the A. F. of L. to the Latin American workers is expressed in its cooperative relations with the National Confederation of Labor of Cuba. It is to be hoped that these relations will be extended to the whole continent, and that all these trade unions will find ample opportunities for common actions, not only

for the solution of the great problems that confront the labor and democratic movement in this hemisphere, but throughout the world.

It is also to be hoped that the Latin American trade unions will be a factor in healing the existing split in the trade union movement in the United States, which is one of the biggest impediments to the further strengthening of U. S. labor, and to a more consistent and democratic application of President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.

Latin American labor, strengthened because of its unity and with its new international standing, is destined to play an important role in the struggle for international trade union unity, especially for unity with the Soviet

trade unions. The courageous voice of Lombardo Toledano will be heard again, as it was at the recent Oslo meeting of the Amsterdam leadership, but this time with the added strength of the whole trade union movement of Latin America.

These are the most significant features of the recent Mexican Trade Union Congress. Tremendous tasks and difficulties are ahead. The fascists and their Trotskyite agents will redouble their efforts to destroy the all-important work begun in Mexico. But the tasks of the Latin American workers will be much easier if U. S. labor translates into action the progressive declarations made by John L. Lewis in his historical addresses while in Mexico.

“. . . People in our country do not work for exploiters, for the enrichment of parasites, but for themselves, for their own class, for their own, Soviet society, where government is wielded by the best members of the working class. That is why labor in our country has social significance and is a matter of honor and glory. . . .

“Here the man who labors is held in esteem. Here he works not for the exploiters, but for himself, for his class, for society. Here the man who labors cannot feel neglected and solitary. On the contrary, the man who labors feels himself a free citizen of his country, in a way a public figure. And if he works well and gives society all he can—he is a hero of labor and is covered with glory.”—Joseph Stalin, *The Stakhanov Movement in the Soviet Union*.

THE PEOPLE OF CHILE UNITE TO SAVE DEMOCRACY

BY CARLOS CONTRERAS LABARCA

General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile

[We present the second and concluding section of the contribution by Comrade Carlos Contreras Labarca. The first part, published in the October issue, discussed the history, national composition, and purposes of the People's Front of Chile, against the background of the fascist penetration and the main developments that brought about the people's unity. Notwithstanding the fact that the swift-moving events have relegated to the past some of the situations and personalities here discussed, Comrade Labarca's analysis of the Chilean scene is rich in basic values, and deserves serious study.—The Editors.]

TOWARD THE VICTORY OF THE PEOPLE OVER FASCISM

THE task of saving Chile from fascism requires the application of a realistic, scientific policy, which draws its inspiration from the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The Tenth National Congress of the Communist Party of Chile, held in April, 1938, stated:

"The Communist points of departure are:

"Analysis of the character and objectives of the Chilean revolution in its present anti-

imperialist stage, and the correlation of class forces.

"The fact of the existence and onward march of the People's Front which poses as its tasks national liberation and the anti-fascist struggle, leading to new social combinations.

"The fact of the strengthening of the positions of the proletariat and its party, the Communist Party, and the role they play in national politics.

"Finally, the fact that it is not enough to base the struggle on the most politicized masses, that is, on the vanguard; it must be based also on the immense multitude who until now have been prisoners of reaction, deceived or passive and inert, who must be aroused, organized, and mobilized around the People's Front program."

The axis and motor of the anti-fascist struggle must be, evidently, the proletariat as the class consistently revolutionary, democratic and anti-imperialist.

But in order that the Chilean working class may be able to carry out successfully its historic mission of saving Chile from fascism it is necessary (1) to secure its complete unification as a class, and (2) to secure allies for it, uniting around it all the other democratic forces.

Such decisive problems, posed by our Party, have encountered the sabo-

tage of the Trotskyites. If we do not succeed in overcoming this wrecking activity, the prospects of the victory of reaction are multiplied enormously and the People's Front is exposed to the danger of having to pay with blood for the splitting work of these agents of fascism. The isolation of the working class would mean the rout of the Chilean revolutionary and anti-fascist forces.

The fight against Trotskyism must be reinforced by a mass campaign to educate the workers concerning the problems which arise in the struggle for national emancipation. This is all the more necessary, since our own Party at its Ninth Congress, in 1932, adopted a sectarian, "Leftist" position that expressed itself in an incorrect attitude to the democratic allies of the proletariat, in premature slogans that attempted to leap over the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution and brought about the putschist building of Soviets in 1933. This non-Leninist line was subjected to scathing self-criticism at the Tenth Congress but has not yet been entirely stamped out in its ranks, since it is constantly receiving strength and stimulus from without.

TRADE UNION UNITY

Favored by the existence and growth of the People's Front, the working class has created the single central union, the C.T.C. (*Confederacion de Trabajadores de Chile*, Chilean Confederation of Labor), which has joined the People's Front. This is a step of tremendous importance, but is only a first step. Despite this achievement, however, serious weaknesses are to be noted in the

Chilean trade union movement. The most outstanding of these are:

1. About 50 per cent of the workers are unorganized, particularly the agricultural laborers and tenants (semi-serfs), and the workshop and small factory workers; and there is no real policy of organization and recruiting.

2. Insufficient organized action by the C.T.C. in defense of the day-to-day demands.

3. The great weakness of the National Federations for Industry and the insufficient application of trade union democracy.

4. Unwillingness to utilize fully the legal possibilities, which permit the trade union movement to grow on the basis of chartered unions, and to take advantage of the labor laws, of participation in the fruits of industry, of intervention in the labor tribunals, etc.

Another serious weakening of the trade unions arises from the pernicious influence of the Trotskyites. Through key positions they hold within the unions, they are instrumental to a considerable extent in holding back the workers' organizations from effecting their alliance with the peasantry. Because of their general attitude to the peasant masses, they endeavor to prevent the organization of the 300,000 agricultural workers. They try to impose upon the C.T.C. irresponsible slogans such as "*All Power to the Socialist Party*," with the aim of bringing the unions into conflict with the People's Front.

The greatest energies must be devoted to the solution of these great and dangerous defects of the C.T.C.

to transform it into one organization of all the proletariat.

ONE PARTY OF THE PROLETARIAT

But trade union unity is not enough. The working class needs to be united politically. The Communist and Socialist Parties are under obligation to satisfy this aspiration and necessity of the proletariat and all the people, by forming one party. The Tenth Congress of the Communist Party resolved:

1. To ratify completely and firmly the orientation of struggle for the rapid creation of one party as one of the most important and far-reaching of the objectives of the Chilean revolutionary movement.

2. To deplore the obstinate and intransigent resistance of the Socialist Party to this political problem and express the most earnest desire that this resistance cease and open the way to the inevitable process of the political unification of the Chilean working class.

3. And, meanwhile, to intensify the struggle for joint Communist-Socialist action.

STRENGTHENING AND BROADENING THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

But the unity of the working class is not enough, either. Allies must be secured for it.

The People's Front constitutes the structure of a broad alliance of classes which has been proved effective by reality. The Trotskyite slanders that this alliance is a betrayal of the revolution have demonstrated once again Trotskyism's role as servant of fascism.

Who can doubt that the existence

and struggle of the People's Front prevent reaction from destroying all the democratic liberties? It is evident that the government has been able to adopt various reactionary measures and that it will be able to do so as long as it remains in power.

Would it have been possible to prevent a great many of these measures? Yes, if the People's Front had been strengthened and widened as the Communist Party has urged insistently.

The sectarian conceptions, the maneuvers of the Trotskyites to undermine the People's Front, and their influence on certain sections of the Socialist Party, constitute a serious obstacle to the accomplishment of these tasks.

The extreme and alarming dilatoriness of the work in rural districts, which is one of the most notorious weaknesses of the People's Front, shows a typically Trotskyite influence.

The agrarian program, recently elaborated, contemplates the satisfaction of the demands not only of the poorest, but of the broadest sections of the agricultural population, and aims to rehabilitate agriculture and bring prosperity and well-being to the farms. It tries to combat, above all, the great feudal landlords, to isolate them and prevent them from utilizing the peons, tenants, semi-proprietors, etc., against the popular movement. It seeks at the same time to link up the interests of the farmers with the purchasing power of the working class and of the toiling masses.

The obstinate resistance to carrying on a resolute work of winning

over the toiling masses of Catholics is likewise of Trotskyite origin. While the Communist Party works with the slogan, "Catholic workers, we offer the out-stretched hand," the Trotskyites find space in the Socialist press to pile up the counter-revolutionary arguments intended to impede the expansion of the anti-fascist front.

Because of the semi-colonial character of the country, with its economy crushed and deformed by imperialism, its national industry carried on under very difficult and precarious conditions, there are certain sections of the Chilean bourgeoisie which can and must be won for national liberation by a progressive and democratic policy.

Important sections of the political parties of the Right have had moments of vacillation, offering opportunities, which should have been seized, of inviting them to come into the popular movement, with assurances of the satisfaction of their desires for order, progress, and democracy.

The armed forces, by means of an intense mass campaign, must be attracted into the sphere of influence of the anti-fascist movement, not for the purposes of conspiracy, but so that they may perform their duty of guaranteeing the validity of the constitutional rights.

The possibilities of extending the bounds of the People's Front are still immense. Yet the Trotskyites say, "All who ought to be in the People's Front are already there." This attitude of arrogance and self-sufficiency and overestimation of the capacity of the People's Front must be opposed with a realistic and active policy

which will lead to these objectives:

1. Unite 95 per cent of the population around the democratic program of the People's Front and the candidacy of Senor Aguirre,* utilizing every little possibility of strengthening and broadening the struggle against Gustavo Ross** and fascism and eliminating any motive of discord or division which may separate allies;

2. Divide and disperse the enemy, utilizing without fear the contradictions and difficulties which rage in their midst, until the fifty families of the oligarchy are completely isolated;

3. Discipline the forces of the people, accumulating their energies for joint attacks on the enemy, avoiding premature and divided efforts and acts of impatience and provocation.

To the Communist Party belongs the lofty mission of making the whole country understand the tremendous gravity of the situation, the real magnitude of the dangers lying in wait, and the road which must be followed, warning the people that there is yet time to save democracy and the very life of the Republic, but that tomorrow may be too late.

ONE CANDIDATE OF THE ANTI-FASCIST PEOPLE

To choose the candidate for the presidency of the republic the Communist Party proposed the only

* Dr. Pedro Aguirre Cerda, an outstanding leader of the Radical Party, who, in the past, held Cabinet posts on several occasions. Within his party he represents the Center.—*The Editors*.

** Former Minister of Finance in the present government, from which post he resigned to enter his candidacy, in the current presidential elections, on the united Conservative-Liberal ticket—the platform of fascism.—*The Editors*.

democratic procedure: a convention broader than the People's Front, of all the democratic and anti-fascist forces. The Radicals* proposed that they be recognized at once as having the "best right" to provide the candidate from their ranks and that the People's Front should select the candidate from a list of those names; the Socialists proposed a plebiscite. After a long contest the idea of the convention prevailed; but it was not to be so broad as we wished.

In the "Convention of the Left" two candidates were presented: Senor Pedro Aguirre, by the Radical Party, and Senor Marmodrique Grove, by the Socialist Party. They locked horns in a dangerously intransigent battle; but neither of them could be elected, in conformity with the pact, without the agreement of the other. Both solicited the support of the Communist Party. In view of the many ballots that were taken without result, and the danger of breaking up the convention and destroying the People's Front, the Communist Party publicly addressed both parties, urging them, in the name of the people, to lay aside their partisan and selfish interests and seek jointly the one candidate who would unite all the democratic forces of the country.

The situation took on extraordinary complications as the anti-People's Front elements actually made a united front against the convention. The Right of the Radical Party speculated with the "danger" of Commu-

nist-Socialist alliance in favor of candidate Grove, defrauding the Radical Party of what it expected as the majority party. The Socialist Party thought itself entitled to the candidacy because of the great popularity of its leader, Grove; but, unfortunately, it launched the slogan "Grove to power," under the influence of the Trotskyites. This false slogan aroused grave misgivings, created dangers by its Leftist character, did not unite the People's Front, and tended to the isolation of the proletariat.

It then became necessary for the Communist Party to make them hear the voice of the people demanding anti-fascist unity and one democratic candidate. The Tenth National Congress of our Party meeting at this time pointed out the necessity of taking into consideration:

"1. The real level of the Chilean revolutionary movement, that is, making an exact appraisal of the correlation of the class forces in the present stage of the revolution;

"2. The degree of political experience and revolutionary education of our working class and of the people;

"3. The vital necessity of maintaining and developing the combative unity of all the democratic and anti-fascist forces around the proletariat, that is, of translating into acts the slogan: 'All Chile against Ross and fascism!'"

Fortunately, under the tremendous pressure of the people, the Convention came to an agreement, on the basis of the withdrawal of the Grove candidacy and the unanimous election of Senor Aguirre.

Senor Aguirre expressed the applause and jubilation of the country when, a few hours after his election, he attended the closing session of the

* The most powerful democratic party in Chile, representative of the urban petty bourgeoisie, with influence among the peasantry and sections of the working class; also representative of certain progressive landowners.
—The Editors.

Tenth Congress of the Communist Party and extolled the unshakable and consistent unity policy of our Party.

THE CANDIDACY OF IBANEZ*

General Carlos Ibanez was dictator from 1927 to 1931; anti-worker and anti-people, he persecuted the labor movement and the Communist Party implacably, served Yankee imperialism, even when he castigated spectacularly some elevated personages of the oligarchy (Alessandri, Ross, Edwards, etc.), and liquidated the English monopoly on nitrate.

Returning from exile, he made declarations of a democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-fascist character and in favor of the People's Front. His friends were in the Radical Party and in some parties of the Right. His candidacy has been proclaimed by the "Popular Liberation Alliance" formed by the Nazi party and the Socialist Union, a little nucleus split off from the Socialist Party.

In its famous "Message to the People of Chile," in November, 1937, the Communist Party called for the unification of all the democratic forces. Regarding Ibanez, it stated, after criticizing his past, that if he severed all connections with the Nazis and adhered to the anti-fascist movement, the entrance of the democratic forces supporting him, and of himself, into the People's Front, must be facilitated, if his acts were in accordance with his words.

* Since the writing of this article, events have confirmed Comrade Labarca's prediction that Ibanez would resort to open betrayal. Ibanez led the recent Nazi putsch, in consequence of which he has been condemned to ten years' exile.—*The Editors.*

After months of intense discussion, in which reaction and the Trotskyites wanted to divide the country into "Ibanists" and "anti-Ibanists" and not into fascists and anti-fascists, the People's Front accepted the attitude of the Communists as correct. But then Ibanez, inspired by his most reactionary friends and the Nazis, refused any agreement and accepted the presidential candidacy, though it is notorious that he has no possibility of being elected. All efforts to persuade him to withdraw have been fruitless. His objective is to try to weaken and even to divide the People's Front, to disseminate confusion and discouragement, to excite the tendencies toward adventures and, consequently, to facilitate the enemy's provocation.

Though the Ibanists say they hate the Trotskyites, in reality none lends them such valuable services; they resemble each other more every day in their common hatred of the People's Front. Though the Ibanists say they desire only the defeat of Ross, their practical activity demonstrates that they aid the victory of Ross; their common hatred of the popular movement brings them close together.

The ungoverned and irresponsible demagogy which the Ibanists employ makes them extremely dangerous. The ultra-Left phraseology, the attacks on the Rightism of Senor Aguirre, the unscrupulous exploitation of the petty-bourgeois desperation of some impatient elements out of touch with the masses, are summed up in their expression that they want to "go further than the People's Front." But "to go further than the People's Front" can only land them

in reaction and fascism. Allied to the Nazi party and to inconsistent elements of other parties, the Ibanists drift more and more toward the camp of open betrayal, and the damage they have already done deserves condemnation by the people.

In the first place, it is necessary to make a clear differentiation between the genuinely democratic elements which are still leagued with Ibanez and the adventurous and unprincipled elements which, moved by petty interests, adopt a personalist position. The former must be subjected to an active criticism which will help them out of the abyss they have got into; the latter must be attacked as irreconcilable enemies.

In the second place, it is necessary to create a powerful sentiment and a mass pressure which will compel Ibanez to withdraw his candidacy and add his forces to those of the people who desire the victory of Senor Aguirre.

If these forces wreck themselves, the fight against Ibanez must be carried on to his complete isolation and condemnation as an agent of Ross and fascism.

FOREIGN ALLIES

We have spoken of the necessity of winning allies within the country for the victory of the people over fascism. But this is not enough. It is necessary to win allies on the international scale as the patriots of 1810 conceived it. It must be recalled that notable foreigners then contributed their knowledge and gave their blood and their lives for the cause of our emancipation.

The People's Front establishes the

necessity that the working class of the world and the other democratic forces lend it due collaboration and aid. The help of the proletariat and the people of North America is particularly valuable.

The Trotskyites are trying to obscure this grave problem. They utilize the legitimate popular feeling of hatred toward imperialism to concentrate the attack on Yankee and English imperialism which has the greatest volume of investments in Chile. It is a way of helping the penetration and domination of the fascist governments.

It is a political monstrosity to identify the people of the United States with the Yankee imperialist enterprises which oppress our country. Wall Street is the ruthless enemy of democracy, not only in Chile, but in the United States as well. The enemies of the North American people are the enemies of the Chilean people.

The realignment of the democratic and progressive forces in the United States favors notably the creation of correct relations between our countries.

GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

On the basis of the good neighbor policy and its consistent application, relations can and must be established with the Roosevelt administration, which is attacked so violently by Wall Street. The good neighbor policy, according to a strictly realistic criterion, is a useful instrument for the purposes of the struggle for peace and democracy.

As for foreign capital invested in Chile, the people have always re-

spected and always will respect the provisions of the Political Constitution of the State which guarantee the property of foreign capital and, in general, of all capital, requiring at the same time that the capitalists, national and foreign, respect them on their side. The people have never ceased to recognize the need for the cooperation of foreign capital and are still disposed to solicit this cooperation in the future, if the national interest requires it. The riches of Chile form an integral and inseparable part of its right of existence as an independent and free nation and must be allocated to the service of maintaining and extending democracy and safeguarding peace among the people, on the basis of concerted action.

Consequently, the People's Front has the mission of defending, above all, the national sovereignty, applying the Chilean law to all equally, and enforcing the strict observance of the social legislation in all its integrity; it will not permit the existence of monopolies, concessions or privileges, of any kind whatever, which can endanger the well-being and security of the country. It will consider an act of hostility to the national sovereignty any attempt of the foreign enterprises to intervene in domestic policy with the purpose of stimulating, directly or indirectly, the rebellion of the reactionary and fascist forces, whether by lending them economic or financial cooperation, by creating clandestine deposits of arms in its properties; or by utilizing the flags of foreign states to effect or facilitate contraband, espionage, or conspiracies.

Such are, therefore, the conditions for a "new deal," or for a people's treatment of the foreign capitalist enterprises, in accordance with which the government of Chile shall no longer be a vassal but a government of the people, by the people, for the people of Chile. Manifestly, Chile reserves the right to throw full light on the relations which have existed hitherto between the foreign capitalists and the Chilean governments and politicians.

DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE AROUND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

The conditions of the development of the anti-fascist struggle in Chile may bring new possibilities for broadening the People's Front.

The People's Front is an alliance of permanent character, but not eternal, and it has a determined organic structure. Some democratic elements may not be ready to accept all the content and the program of the People's Front, but they would be ready to defend the authority of the Constitution and electoral freedom, menaced by fascism, and to work for the victory of Senor Aguirre.

The Communist Party considers it necessary to facilitate the formation of such a democratic alliance, around the People's Front.

The scandalous offensive of the government against the people's rights, its open intervention in favor of Ross and against Aguirre, its intrigues to induce the armed forces to overthrow the sovereign verdict of the people; the clandestine creation of illegal armed troops; finally, its preparations for civil war, facilitate the creation of the democratic alliance

and at the same time impose the obligation of struggle for it.

CHARACTER OF THE PEOPLE'S
FRONT GOVERNMENT

If the People's Front is victorious in the elections of October 25, what will it do at the end of December when Alessandri's term expires?

The dangers of a rising of reaction will increase. Reaction will try to transform the enthusiasm of the masses into anarchy; it will resort to sabotage and provocation in order to create conditions permitting it to justify at least apparently, on the pretext of defending law and order, its refusal to let the People's Front take power.

There is no other method so sure as the immediate general mobilization of the masses to protect the victory of the People's Front and assure the peaceful transfer of power into its hands. But at the same time it is necessary that the democratic will of the people, manifested at the polls, be reflected immediately in the composition of the government and in its democratic, anti-fascist orientation.

If the People's Front takes power in December, what character will the government have? Will it be socialistic, will it be revolutionary? Will it continue its present policy and methods? Will it seek conciliation with the oligarchy? The People's Front government will have to be a democratic, clearly anti-fascist, constitutional government of peace, order, progress and liberty, interpreting and satisfying the aspirations of the people and carrying out the promised program and, by a democratic inspiration, vitalize the public administration and

the armed forces, and purify them of any germ of decomposition.

No excess, no obstruction, no betrayal of the People's Front. Efficiency and honesty. Permanent living contact with the people.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY TOWARD A PEOPLE'S
FRONT GOVERNMENT

Will the Communist Party support a People's Front government? Will it pass to the opposition? Will it remain neutral or in abeyance?

Our Party has already declared that it will fully support the government which is organized after the victory of the People's Front in carrying out the promised program, and crushing definitely the enemies of the people.

Would the Communist Party be willing to enter this government? The Communist Party declares that its inviolable and exemplary fidelity to the People's Front, to its unity and extension, has never been inspired by the wish to obtain any participation in the government and that it has never had any interest but that of satisfying our people's noble desires crystallized in the People's Front program. The Communist Party considers that its responsibility in carrying out this program can be fulfilled outside the government. On the other hand, its entrance into the government might create, at home and abroad, difficult situations which it earnestly wishes to avoid for the general welfare.

Consequently it leaves the People's Front entirely free to decide, in the best interests of the people, what

executive tasks may devolve upon the Communist Party.

In accordance with the same considerations the Communist Party is of the opinion that at present the participation of the Chilean Confederation of Labor in the government would be equally inexpedient.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN NATIONAL POLITICS

The Communist Party of Chile has the honor of having been the promoter of the People's Front and of being its mainstay. Applying the magnificent teachings of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, it has gone on to play an important role in the national political life. Its spirit of unity, its capacity for sacrifice, its ideologic and organic cohesion, its serene firmness in fighting for the correct line, and its aptitude for adapting the political orientation to the changes of situa-

tion, have created for our Party a prestige which permits it to show its true independent face at the same time that it struggles for the People's Front.

The Communist Party works indefatigably to draw, for the benefit of our people, upon all the experiences of the world anti-fascist struggle.

Above all, from the peoples of the Soviet Union, who under the direction of the Bolshevik Party and the genius of its leader, Comrade Stalin, have won the glory of being the vanguard of advanced and progressive humanity.

The heroic struggle of these brother peoples inspires and stimulates the action of the Chilean people, who wish to cooperate with them, every day more energetically, in the world front for the defense of peace and democracy, crushing in our own land the terrible menace of the fascist monster.

"He who desires the victory of socialism all over the world, he who desires fraternity and peace among the nations, he who desires to see an end of exploitation, fascism and imperialist oppression, cannot but be on the side of the U.S.S.R. Defense of the U.S.S.R., assisting it to achieve victory over all its enemies, should determine the activities of every revolutionary organization, of every Communist, of every Socialist, of every honest democrat, of every non-party worker, of every peasant, of every urban toiler and of every intellectual."—
D. Z. Manuilsky, Report to the Seventh World Congress, 1935.

PRIMITIVE NEGRO SOLIDARITY: NEW LIGHT FROM BRAZIL

BY SAMUEL PUTNAM

WITH human liberties being widely trampled underfoot, and with various fascist groups, inspired and backed by Hitler and Mussolini, making a desperate bid for power, one naturally expects in a country like present-day Brazil to meet with that cultural strangulation and suppression of free thought which is characteristic of Nazi Germany and Black-Shirt Italy. To a large extent this has happened in Brazil; and Brazilian literature, the cinema, and other cultural forms have somewhat since begun to show the effects, with the prohibition of a book like *Tom Sawyer*, the exclusion of a film like Mickey Mouse, etc., as "subversive" productions. But while theater owners and publishers may have to bow to the censor, there is a notable group among the Brazilian intelligentsia that is carrying on valiantly, in the face of a reactionary opposition which violently denounces them and calls for an *auto da fé*. That group is made up of the scientists, and chief among them, the ethnologists and anthropologists, social psychologists, and others, men like Gilberto Freyre, Arthur Ramos, Edison Carneiro and Josué de Castro.

The researches of the Brazilian eth-

nologists in recent years have been particularly fruitful; and as it happens, a major share of attention has been devoted to the subject of Negro origins and Negro culture, with results that have a bearing and significance for the Negro race as a whole, including the Negro in the United States. Arthur Ramos, professor of social psychology in the Federal District University at Rio de Janeiro, is one of the world's foremost authorities in this field. The author of a work on *The Brazilian Negro* and of one on *Negro Folk-Lore*, Ramos in the May, 1938, number of the *Archival Review*, published by the Department of Education of Sao Paulo, makes a fresh and extremely stimulating contribution in the form of an article on "The Associative Spirit of the Brazilian Negro." In this article, the author shows that, from the earliest slave-ship days down to the present time, the Negro has not adopted, as some would make out, a submissive attitude toward slavery, but on the contrary has been unceasingly animated by a spirit of revolt against *all forms* of servitude and oppression, and has, moreover, possessed from the start a truly *democratic*, not narrowly racial, sense of economic and social

solidarity—an attitude which found expression, now in primitive communal-republican, now in syndical or trade union, forms of organization, and which today comes out in such associations as the Brazilian Negro Front, the Brazilian Negro Union, the Afro-Brazilian Cultural Center, etc.

Incidentally, Brazil is this year observing the semi-centennial of the abolition of chattel slavery, in 1888; it was in connection with this observance that the article by Ramos was published, along with a number of others on Negro subjects.

In the course of his discussion, Professor Ramos remarks:

"It has been repeatedly but erroneously asserted, by Brazilian historians and sociologists, that the Negro in Brazil . . . was a passive element, resigned to a state of slavery. . . . According to these historians, the African Negro, a humble, docile creature, permitted himself to be taken, and submitted without protest to slave labor. This is a view which is categorically refuted by a study of history and sociology. Such a study shows us, on the contrary, that the Negro was never this docile, submissive type, incapable of reacting to conditions. . . . He was a good worker, but a bad slave. Several centuries of slavery and slave revolts, not only in Brazil but in other parts of the Americas as well, show us what his true reactions were. Those reactions ranged all the way from flight to suicide, from individual flight to great collective uprisings, in which we are able to perceive his qualities of leadership and organization, his ability as a fighter, and his feeling of personal dignity and desire to assert that dignity."

The sociologist then goes on to point out that, even on the slave-ship, en route from Africa to South America, the Negroes, although they came from different regions and brought with them varying cultures, were none the less closely bound together in

a "solidarity of suffering," by "mutual comprehension of their common lot," and were in the habit of calling one another *malungo* or "comrade." In America they formed a "new and primitive group conditioned by slavery," and it was slavery which molded "their common attitudes, opinions, and behavior." The associative tendency, to employ the sociological term, early manifested itself in the new environment, one of the first forms of manifestation being the religious confraternity, or brotherhood, of Negroes.

"These associations grew out of the slave regime. They represented a collective effort on the part of the Negroes against the system that oppressed them."

In other words, the Negro was seeking an other-worldly, spiritual comfort and way out of his miseries. This longing is reflected in his songs, the "spirituals" of the North American Negro. But he was not long satisfied with this; he wanted his earthly freedom, and the result was what Professor Ramos sees as an "economic reaction," taking the form of "emancipation associations" and "freedom funds." Brotherhoods and confraternities with this end in view now began to be organized, each member contributing a quota of his earnings towards the purchase of an emancipation certificate. These organizations also served for purposes of mutual protection, and loan funds were established. At the head of each was a chieftain on the African model, while another Negro had the duty of going about and making the collections. On Sundays, the members would meet and hear a report of the amount of funds on hand, and would

discuss the question of loans, the advancement of money for emancipation certificates, and similar topics. Inasmuch as reading and writing were unknown, the treasurer would keep a record by cutting notches in the wooden stick which each member carried.

It was, of course, the peculiar conditions of Brazilian slavery, making it possible for the chattel under certain circumstances to earn a little money and eventually buy his liberty, that gave rise to such a form of association. The point to be noted, however, is that the Negro, true to primitive-communal instincts, undertook the procuring of his liberty not as an individual, but as a collective task. This instinct on his part is illustrated by the well-known Brazilian legend of Chico Rei, or King Chico, the scene of which is laid in what is now the province of Minas Gerais, at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

In his native Africa, King Chico had been a respected chieftain. He and his entire tribe, including his wife and children, had been captured and put abroad a slaver. All of his family, with the exception of one son, died on the crossing, the survivors being sent to the mines of Vila Rica, which later became the present city of Ouro Preto. The flame of liberty burned high in Chico's breast, and he and his son proceeded to lay a carefully thought-out plan. First the son managed to obtain his freedom, then the father was redeemed, whereupon the two of them set to work to liberate a third, and so on until the entire tribe, or what was left of it, was free. This tribe set to work to free other tribes, and the upshot was

a freedman's colony, a "veritable state within a state," as one Brazilian historian has described it, which eventually grew prosperous enough to buy one of the richest mines in the district; but all the profits of the mine went to the liberation of other slaves.

In this tale, we undoubtedly have a mingling of history and legend; but Professor Ramos is led to observe that:

"... King Chico was Brazil's first Negro abolitionist leader, and his example was followed by many of his racial brothers, in the form of a conscious, deliberate struggle for emancipation."

It was when the hundreds and even thousands of runaway slaves began banding themselves into organizations known as *quilombos* that, the real fight began. The *quilombos* were especially active in the seventeenth, and again in the nineteenth, century; but an organized movement of the slaves was visible for nearly three hundred years prior to the emancipation act of 1888. The *quilombos* resisted capture by force, and succeeded in giving the authorities so much trouble that the queen of Portugal, in colonial days, issues special orders providing for the punishment and branding of the fugitives.

In the eighteenth century, the Negroes of Minas Gerais formed exceptionally large *quilombos*, the members of which spread out through the valleys of Rio Grande and the Rio das Mortes. The membership was made up chiefly of fugitives from the mines and from the *fazendas*, or large estates. A highly perfected vigilance service was maintained, with spies and sentries on all sides; and the runaways obtained food and provisions

by a secret barter system, in which animal hides and similar commodities were exchanged for food and ammunition. The struggle against the masters became a real warfare, with well planned, decisive campaigns.

The most famous of these *quilombos* was that of Palmares, in Alagoas, which existed in the seventeenth century. This is described by Professor Ramos as "a great Negro attempt to found a state, a state with African traditions inside the state of Brazil"; and further on he adds:

"The republic of Palmares was a Negro state founded by slaves in Brazil, in the mid-seventeenth century. Situated in North-eastern Brazil, in the heart of the present state of Alagoas, this extraordinary undertaking lasted from 1630 to 1697, or more than half a century."

The population of this state, amounting to 20,000, consisted of fugitives from the farms and cities, who had taken refuge in the jungles of Alagoas, in the valley of the Rio Mundau, as is attested by historical documents of the period. The location was near the present city of Porto Calvo.

It is as "an example of political and economic organization" that the *quilombo* of Palmares stands out in the view of the sociologist:

"The economic organization was perfect. The Negroes maintained commercial relations with the neighboring city dwellers, bringing in the products of their labor, sugar cane, bananas, beans, etc., to exchange for the articles they needed, such as woven cloth, implements, arms and ammunition. The city dwellers had no hesitation in dealing with them, and the merchants bore witness to the uprightness with which the Negroes conducted themselves. The latter, when an effort was afoot to capture them,

took greater precautions and dispatched secret agents to act as their intermediaries."

Palmares, in short, was described by the historian, Rocha Pitta, as "a rustic republic, well ordered after its fashion." Others think the term, "elective monarchy," would be more appropriate, since there was a chieftain at the head with captains under him to carry out his orders, who were at the same time trained military leaders. In any event, the *quilombo* was "a political and social unit," being made up of small dwellings built within a fortified enclosure.

"In this 'republic,'" says Ramos, "a high moral code prevailed, and the spirit of discipline was absolute. There were tribunals of justice for cases that went beyond the limits of ordinary offenses, and robbery, murder, adultery, and desertion were punishable by death."

After pointing out that the manners and customs were of African Bantu origin, with New World modifications, the sociologist concludes:

". . . but it was really a Negro state which Brazilian slaves thus set up in the seventeenth century, thereby displaying their capacity for leadership, administration, and military tactics, their spirit of solidarity, and their talent for economic and legal organization."

The spirit of solidarity continued to be manifested by the Negro after he had won his freedom from the Brazilian government, half a century ago.

"In the mills and on the big estates, in the mines as in the cities, the Negro associated himself with his fellows in connection with his work."

There had been labor groups and associations even under slavery, and with emancipation, numbers of them

sprang up in town and country, but especially in the cities, by reason of the great migration of agricultural workers which occurred; for, possessing no regular employment, the ex-slaves saw nothing to do but go to the city and become—wage slaves. They found work chiefly as wine-porters, furniture-movers, etc. It was the custom for them to meet at certain places and wait there until their services were called for. Around these *cantos*, as they were known, a rude form of organization arose, with a "captain" at the head, who was duly elected and installed with great ceremony. For it is to be noted throughout that the Negro instinctively takes to a democratic form of association.

Back on the farms and *fazendas*, meanwhile, another form of organization was appearing, with Negroes and whites, men and women alike, banding themselves into sometimes permanent and sometimes migratory agricultural labor communities, which according to Professor Ramos were "truly of a trade union character," though it might be more correct to say that they were guilds rather than trade unions.

The post-emancipation development of the Negro in Brazil, owing to the fact that the Jim-Crow color line is not drawn there as it is in the United States, has been a freer one in certain social aspects than that of the North American Negro; but it is, possibly, through the somewhat too roseate spectacles of the well-intentioned liberal that Professor Ramos is inclined to view things, when he says:

"In religious groupings there is no distinction between Negroes, whites, and mulattoes . . . and the same goes for political and

cultural groups. The Negro has a part in the social and family life of Brazil. There is no need today for him to adopt attitudes of extreme self-defense, in absolute separation from the white community. In Brazil, cultural and racial contacts go together. We have no blood code with respect to inter-marriage. Negroes, mulattoes and whites participate in community life, with equal political rights."

In the next breath, the admission is made:

"There are, nevertheless, certain demands of an economic and cultural character which the Negro has to make. . . . He feels that certain opportunities are refused him."

And these opportunities are refused him, true enough, in Brazil as in other capitalist countries. The Negro inevitably suffers from the unspeakable oppression of the Brazilian working class as a whole, at the hands of the native *latifundistas*, or big land-owners, the native capitalists, and, above all, the foreign imperialist, while the overhanging threat of fascism holds for him a still deeper degradation. He suffers, as always, still more intensely by reason of the fact that he is a minority group. Already, in the case of the Jews (the Dutch, too, in certain provinces), the Nazi-instigated Brazilian reactionaries have launched a campaign upon such groups. Is it any wonder, then, if the Negro feels that his turn may come next? In the economic stress of a decaying capitalist system, he, like the Jew, provides a convenient and sadistic outlet for the Hitlers great and small.

It was seven years ago that the Brazilian Negro Front was organized, as "a political and social union of the National Negro People, for the assertion of their historic right, by virtue of their material and moral

contributions in the past, and for the demanding of social and political rights today, in the Brazilian community." The "*Frente Negra Brasileira*" was dissolved by Vargas last year, along with other political groups. Its place has been taken by the Brazilian Negro Union (*Uniao Negra Brasileira*), whose announced program is practically the same, with the exception of the political demands. At Recife recently there was founded an Afro-Brazilian Cultural Center (*Centro de Cultra Afro-Brasileiro*), which declares:

"We shall indulge in no inter-racial warfare, but rather shall teach our brother Negroes that there is no such thing as a superior or inferior race, but merely a difference in the level of cultural development."

"These are legitimate concerns," says Professor Ramos, "and no person of good faith could withhold his cooperation." He adds: "Meanwhile, the Negro's spirit of solidarity remains, with all the intensity of former times."

We have had occasion to see, above, how very old and deeply rooted that spirit of solidarity is. Social psychologists draw attention to the fact that even the Negro's "work songs" (some of the chain-gang songs in North America, for instance) are an expression of this solidarity in toil and suffering. In his work and in his play, the Negro has made important musical and cultural contributions, in Brazil as in the United States. The Negro recreation societies and carnival clubs are one of the forms in which his "associative tendency" is expressed. The Brazilian carnival is

in good part a Negro institution. Today—

"New problems arise for the Negro community on the threshold of liberty, and these problems but increase its potentialities for cooperation with the rest of humanity. The peoples of the new world are in the large majority colored peoples, of pure or mixed blood. They cannot confine social problems to the old molds of white communities. An intensive mixture of peoples and of races, bringing unlooked for cultural contacts, is impelling the Americas to a new civilization. The process of cultural adaptation goes on; and in connection with this process, we cannot dispense with the cooperation of the Negro, the common denominator of all the Americas."

In summing up what we have learned from this brief excursion into the Negro's past, we may note:

1. The Negro, since the day he left the shores of his native Africa, has been a passionate lover of freedom; he has by no means been submissive, but has been prepared to struggle and to fight for freedom whenever occasion offered;
2. He has displayed a sense of solidarity with his brother Negroes and with his white brothers of the working class;
3. He has exhibited a high degree of social consciousness, a sense of social obligation and of his place in the community;
4. He has manifested his abilities in social, economic, political, military and legal forms of organization;
5. His tendency has been, always, to *democratic forms* of association.

All this means that the Negro is eminently fitted to become a part—he must become a part—of the growing people's front in Brazil, the democratic front in the United States.

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

AGAINST THE RACE FIGHT OF FASCISM AND FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

DECLARATION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ITALY

From *Lo Stato Operaio*, fortnightly, Paris,
August 15, 1938.

The fascist regime, whose war policy is aggravating daily the misery of the masses of the people and bringing the country to ruin, has recently launched a racial theory which has started a campaign of attacks on the Jews.

The introduction of the barbarous racial theory into Italy is a symptom of the exasperation of the aggressive war policy of the fascist government.

The fascist government, which has demonstrated its absolute incapacity to give an answer to the elementary demands of the masses of the people and to solve the problems of the country, confronted by the increasing difficulties piling up in its path, especially in consequence of its disastrous adventures in Ethiopia and Spain, and compelled by its preoccupation with the defense of the interests of the restricted groups of big capitalists who find a vast source of profits in "war in permanence," can see no other way out but to "blaze away" on the road of international provocation, and, in agreement with its German and Japanese accomplices, to hurl the world into the shambles of a new war.

To develop this criminal plan, the fascist government pushes into the background the demagogic motives with which it has attempted hitherto to justify to the masses its expansionist policy ("to have a place in the sun," "to conquer new soil for Italians to work," etc.), admitting that the results of three years of war have exposed the fascist lies and aggravated the conditions of the masses of the people. Fascism introduces,

therefore, into its war ideology new motives, like that of the superior, elect, privileged race, with the intention of creating an aggressive brigand mentality among the Italian people, of arousing in them bestial hate toward other peoples and thus preparing them for the integral, totalitarian war against the peaceful peoples.

The anti-Semitic campaign is a detail in the vast war mobilization of fascism. It is also a clumsy attempt to divert the growing anxieties and discontent of the masses of the people over the consequences of the fascist government policy into a fight against the Jews.

The Communist Party of Italy voices its protest against the race theories which are repudiated by the elementary principles of human association, by science not servile to the spoilers and oppressors, and by Italian tradition.

The racial theories, which pretend to establish the natural supremacy of certain races over certain others, are false and arbitrary, invented by "scientists" in the employ of imperialism to justify aggression and rapine against other nations and other peoples.

This is the fitting occasion to point out that the racial theories have never taken root in our soil, from antiquity to the present.

The Communist Party of Italy calls upon the working class, upon all the Italian people, to erect a barrier against the diffusion of such theories, to reply to the anti-Semitic attack of fascism by uniting in action against the fascist regime of hunger, war, political and racial oppression, and to defend the Italian Jews persecuted by fascism and maintain the right of exile for the Jews of other countries whom racial persecution had compelled to find refuge in Italy.

2. The Communist Party of Italy sees in the opposition of the Italian people to the

imperialist racist theories a reaction against the catastrophic policy of the fascist government.

The opposition of the Italian people is motivated, not only by the sentiment for the defense of the human personality outraged by fascism, but also by the fact that among the masses of the people there is a great and growing dissatisfaction with the policy of war in permanence, which increases the want, the privations, the sufferings, the sorrows of the people, and with the injustices and corruption of the government and its heads.

The Communist Party of Italy salutes the protest of the Catholic masses, reflected in the words of the Pope, against racism and anti-Semitism.

The Catholic masses have demonstrated their aversion to the war policy of the fascist government, to the policy of the Berlin-Rome axis, on the occasion of Hitler's visit to Italy, by deserting the official manifestations. The Catholic masses are beginning to understand the betrayal into which they were led when they were called to support the shameful Ethiopian adventure which had turned out to be a disaster for our country. They are beginning to understand that they have been the dupes of a plot in supporting, even to the extent of furnishing many volunteers, the cause of the rebel generals in Spain, agents of the most reactionary forces of that country, in the service of Hitler and Mussolini who wish to suppress the liberty and the national independence of Spain and of the people. They are beginning to understand that behind the pretense of a fight against Communism the aggressor government of Rome, Berlin and Tokio attack and threaten the countries which are the objectives of their cupidity. Ethiopia, China, Spain, Austria—not one was under a Communist regime.

The fascist threats, at first, against "wavering Catholics," and now against the Catholic organizations and press, are the answer of the fascist regime to the growing opposition of the Catholic masses to its policy.

Fascism is driven to start an open fight against the Catholic religion and organizations, which represent an obstacle to its war delirium and the diffusion of its false and dangerous theories.

The Communist Party of Italy reaffirms that absolute respect for the religious convictions of the masses and defense of liberty a conscience constitute for it a matter of principle. Therefore the Italian Communists will defend by all means the right of workers, of toilers, of all the Catholic masses, of the clergy, to profess their own faith and to organize for that purpose.

The threats to dissolve the Catholic associations are an assault on the last remnant of liberty existing in Italy, religious liberty. The defense of the Catholic associations by the Communists and all true democrats will mean an important step of the union of the masses of the people in their action to win political liberties, without which no other liberty is guaranteed.

3. The Communist Party calls the Communist, Socialist, democratic workers, and the fascist workers who suffer from the evils of the situation as do all their fellow-workers and neighbors, to establish active solidarity with the Catholic workers in defense of the Catholic masses and of the religious associations.

The fascist government wishes to obstruct the urges of unity which are manifesting themselves in the working class and the masses of the people and sidetrack them by an anti-clerical campaign. The success of this fascist maneuver will be a victory for the enemies and spoilers of labor, for the war-makers, for those who hold the people under the heel of the dictatorship.

The workers must unite in the factories, in the labor, sport, and cultural organizations and circles, everywhere, and formulate the plans of common struggle for the urgently necessary improvement of their living conditions, for the immediate withdrawal of the Italian troops from Spain, for the abandonment of the Ethiopian adventure, for putting an end to the war policy of the fascist government, for enjoining an international policy of peace, the establishment of peaceful relations with all the countries which want peace, and especially with the People's Front of France and with the resolute vanguard of the struggle for peace, the Soviet Union—for the liberty of organization, of the press, of conscience, for a regime of social justice, a popular government, the democratic republic of Italy.

BOOK REVIEWS

AN INSPIRING WORK ON LENIN

THE LIFE OF LENIN. By P. Kerzhentsev, 336 pp., International Publishers, New York, 1938, \$1.75.

IN THE years since 1917, much has been published in this country about Lenin and his role in the Russian Revolution. Despite this, the American reading public remains surprisingly ignorant of the real Lenin and even more so of the true history of the Russian Bolshevik Party. While this observation is especially valid of the general public, it is also in a measure true of that portion of the masses which is seriously interested in studying and assimilating the lessons and teachings of Lenin and his Party. Reactionary journalists and historians have been able with a certain degree of success to confuse large numbers of people by distorting Bolshevik history, by peddling Trotskyite slander about Lenin and his best disciples, and by portraying Lenin with bias and calumny.

The particular importance of Comrade Kerzhentsev's book, *The Life of Lenin*, is that it provides the American readers, and first of all our Party, with an inspiring picture of Lenin woven into the background of an enlightening short history of the Russian Revolution and its Bolshevik Party. Lenin emerges from the pages of this book, not only as political genius—but as man, comrade, student, and fighter. For Kerzhentsev had sharply focused something of the fiery spirit and warm personality of the man, Lenin.

The author traces Lenin's influence upon the Bolshevik Party from its formative period to that of the first years of Soviet power. Lenin stands forth as a towering giant: a man characterized by an iron will and steadfastness of purpose which could not be

shaken by any number of setbacks or defeats. His was an inextinguishable faith in the masses, in their revolutionary urge, in their creative powers. That is why he never gave way to despair, never suffered moods of despondency, never became affected by the vacillations which so typified the petty-bourgeois intellectuals of his day. When the difficulties were greatest, when the struggle was most intense, that was when Lenin was calmest, surest. The Russian democratic and revolutionary movements met many obstacles, passed through many heart-breaking days. The bold, clear policies of Lenin were not always victorious even within the revolutionary camp. At every grave disappointment, there were those who lost faith and wanted to give up the struggle; their disillusionment was sometimes disguised by ultra-Left phrases.

In 1906, after the defeat of the first revolution, despair and defeatism set in. At the April unity congress, the Bolsheviks led a stubborn struggle against such views held by the Mensheviks. Lenin insisted that the defeat of 1905 was only temporary; that it was necessary to learn the lessons of that setback and to prepare the masses for a new upsurge. But the Mensheviks carried the congress. Discouragement also began to creep into the ranks of the Bolsheviks. In this connection, Kerzhentsev cites an account given by Stalin of a conversation of a group of Bolshevik delegates, which vividly illustrates Lenin's supreme confidence:

"In the conversation of some of the delegates one detected a note of weariness and depression. I remember Lenin, in reply to such talk, sharply saying through clenched fists: 'No snivelling, comrades, we shall certainly win, because we are right.' Hatred for snivelling intellectuals, confidence in one's own strength, confidence in victory—that is what Lenin talked about at that time.

"No snivelling in the event of defeat.' This is the peculiar feature in the activities of Lenin that helped him to rally around

himself an army that was faithful to the last and had confidence in its own strength." (P. 108.)

These lines assume particular significance at the present moment, in the wake of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. The perfidy of Chamberlain-Daladier has brought some individuals to despair in the peace forces, to doubt in the possibility of stopping fascism. But how narrow is the vision of such people. The Soviet Union stands as a mighty bulwark, unswervingly loyal to the interests of world peace. The people of Spain and China continue their heroic armed resistance to the fascist invaders. In France, England and throughout the world the masses are learning from this latest betrayal. As Comrade Browder stated in his recent speech on the international situation, the present moment is not only characterized by betrayal, but also by the growing intervention of the masses. Today the policy of betrayal seems victorious; but this policy carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. The last word has yet to be spoken by the forces of peace.

That Lenin's faith in victory did not come from an abstract sentimental love for the masses, or from personal egotism, is made clear by Kerzhentsev. It arose from a profound understanding of revolutionary theory; it was rooted in Marxist reality. His was the ability properly to estimate the relationship of class forces at every stage of development, to foresee events, to grasp those concrete elements of a given situation which make possible a change in the entire course of events. At every turning point, because of his stability to "study history afresh," Lenin put forth new slogans and tasks corresponding to the new situation. Consequently, Lenin never made a fetish of slogans or tactics.

The ability to think dialectically, to see events and problems in their manysidedness, to be ready to change or modify tactics or policies with every change in objective conditions made Lenin the great Marxist strategist that he was and transformed his small revolutionary group into the mass Party destined to lead the first proletarian state.

Without understanding this essential quality of Lenin and Leninism, one cannot ex-

plain why, for example, in 1906, Lenin opposed Bolshevik participation in the tsarist Duma and why only a year later, when it became clear that the rising revolutionary tide had given way to a period of ebb, he fought just as hard for participation, for the need to utilize every legal possibility, no matter how slim, in order to advance the interests of the masses.

Of great practical importance at this moment is an understanding of how Lenin applied this concrete historical approach to the struggle against war, to the fight for peace. Kerzhentsev's book demonstrates how Lenin enriched Marxist thought by his exhaustive analysis of imperialism as the final, monopolistic stage of capitalism. It also shows how Lenin, on the basis of this study, worked out the tactics and objectives of the proletariat in the period of the last World War and later in the period of the existence of Soviet Power.

In 1914-18, recognizing that both warring camps were conducting a reactionary imperialist war for plunder, that both sides were equally aggressors, Lenin rallied the proletariat around the slogan: "Turn the Imperialist War Into a Civil War!" With the ending of the World War, following the victory of the working class in Russia, Lenin realized that the existence of Soviet Power on one-sixth of the world was a new and most important factor on the international political scene, a new force in the struggle for the preservation of world peace. Under the new conditions, he advocated a policy of utilizing the contradictions between the imperialist powers in order, at every given moment, to block the road of the most rapacious, most imperialist forces driving towards war. It was this new tactic which helped the Soviet state in defeating the interventionists in 1918-20 and played no small part in maintaining world peace these last twenty years.

It was Stalin who, basing himself on the teachings of Lenin, developed this policy for the present period, the period of fascist aggression, the period when only the unity of the whole democratic world around the peace program of the Soviet Union can stop the further advance of fascism and the precipitation of a new world slaughter.

The story of Lenin's struggle also teaches

us that in the course of bringing about such necessary changes in policy, there are always individuals who fail to measure up to the needs of the new situation and fall by the wayside. History in this respect is ruthless, respecting neither former service nor title. Those who stand in its path are brushed aside. Thus, Kerzhentsev quotes Stalin in connection with the sharp turn made by the revolutionary movement under the guidance of Lenin in 1903:

"The Party at that time was headed by six people, Plekhanov, Zasulich, Martov, Lenin, Axelrod, and Potresov. The turn proved fatal for five of the six. They fell out of the cart. Lenin remained alone. . . . It is clear now to every Bolshevik that if Lenin had not determinedly fought the five—if the five had not been beaten off, our Party could not have been welded as the Party of the Bolsheviks capable of leading the proletarians to victory." (P. 74.)

As Kerzhentsev shows, these were not the only people who fought their way out of the Party and into the camp of the enemy. Later, the Trotskyites-Bukharinites, who at every crucial turn in the revolution had been at loggerheads with Lenin and the Party, found themselves outside its ranks and in the camp of counter-revolutionary fascism. This book, giving the background of the whole Russian Revolution, helps one better to understand the treachery of these scoundrels. One sees recent events in their process of development and not as some unexpected "sudden" happenings. Upon this same background of history one also sees Stalin in his true stature—the best disciple of Lenin. Throughout the history of the Bolshevik Party, Comrade Stalin stood unflinchingly at the side of Lenin, supporting him and his policies even when the majority of the Party leadership were in opposition.

Some of the best chapters of Kerzhentsev's book deal with Lenin as a human being, a comrade. Ruthless towards enemies of the Party, towards vacillators within the Party, Lenin was most patient and considerate to Party comrades and workers. Never was he too busy to concern himself with the welfare of others. A number of examples are given of how Lenin, who never spared himself, demanded that proper attention be given to comrades who were ill, referring to this as

his interest in "safeguarding Party property."

Of great interest was also the section dealing with Lenin's method of work. He was a strict taskmaster, but first of all towards himself. His time was never wasted, but always highly organized. From early youth he disciplined himself, and no matter how crowded with tasks, he demanded strict adherence to plan. The insistence upon proper utilization of time is illustrated by Lenin's loss of patience with those who came late to meetings. Even when head of the Soviet state, Lenin started the meetings of the Party leading committee punctually, and himself came on the minute. Under no circumstances would he tolerate long-winded speeches, but demanded concreteness and brevity.

Every assignment or task Lenin undertook was handled with meticulous care. When still in school he learned to draft outlines for every composition, and this habit was continued in later life in preparing his articles and speeches. Sloppy, careless work was alien to his very training and nature. Kerzhentsev, for example, shows with what care Lenin prepared his book *Imperialism*.

"For this work he consulted hundreds of books in all languages, and made copious notes. His preparatory work and rough drafts comprised three volumes. He did not overlook a single book or article of any importance on the subject of imperialism which had appeared in the European press." (P. 158.)

Above all else, the book shows Lenin as a modest, unpretentious man. He loved to mix with people and spent many hours talking and especially listening to workers. As one of his acquaintances remarked: "There was only one thing that Vladimir Ilyich, like Marx, could not endure: humbug, pretense, and phrasemongering."

The Life of Lenin should be read by all Party members in order better to absorb the great lessons of the Russian Bolshevik Party and in order to invigorate themselves by drinking from an inspiring fountain of Lenin's personality. The book is written in a clear, lucid style. Its only drawback, if we can call it that, from the point of view of the American scene, is that it was written in

the first place for a Soviet public. The author, therefore, takes many things for granted, starting with the premise that the reader is already a follower of Lenin, or at least, a Communist sympathizer. Kerzhentsev has made a serious contribution to our

literature on the subject; but the job still remains to be done of providing a history of Lenin and his Party written primarily to meet the needs of a wider American audience.

GIL GREEN.

LATEST BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

- SON OF THE PEOPLE, by *Maurice Thorez*. An autobiography. International Publishers, New York.....\$1.50
- THE NEGRO AND THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT, by *James W. Ford*, International Publishers, New York..\$1.75
- LABOR FACT BOOK IV, Labor Research Association, New York\$1.00
- HOPE IN AMERICA, by *John Strachey*, Modern Age Books, New York..... 50c
- HALT THE RAILROAD WAGE CUT, by *William Z. Foster*, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 3c
- THE MUNICH BETRAYAL, by *Harry Gannes*, Workers Library Publishers, New York 1c
- CATHOLICS AND COMMUNISTS, by *Maurice Thorez*, Workers Library Publishers, New York..... 3c
- THE STORY OF SOVIET PROGRESS, by *Corliss Lamont*, *Soviet Russia Today*, New York 5c
- TELL IT TO MILLIONS! by the Communist Party, New York.
- DEMOCRACY IN DANGER by *Mary Collins*, Workers Library Publishers, New York 1c
- THE FIGHT FOR RECOVERY, by *Mary Collins*, Workers Library Publishers, New York 3c
- A SQUARE DEAL FOR THE FARMER by *Jerry Coleman*, Workers Library Publishers, New York 3c
- CHINESE COMMUNIST LEADERS SPEAK TO THE WORLD STUDENT DELEGATION, Information Committee *Hsin Hua Jih Pao*, Hankow (Address by Wang Ming; Interview with Mao Tse-tung) 15c
- YOUTH DEMANDS A PEACEFUL WORLD. Report of the Second World Youth Congress. World Youth Congress, New York, Geneva.

New



Books

Now Ready!

LABOR FACT BOOK

VOLUME IV

Prepared by Labor Research Association

Contains all the latest facts and figures—on the trade union movement, the economic situation, political realignments, civil rights, legislation, war, fascism, etc. Note: this volume does not in any way duplicate previous Labor Fact Books but rather supplements them.

\$1.00

SON OF THE PEOPLE

MAURICE THOREZ

The autobiography of the leader of the French Communist Party. Simple and stirring account of a life devoted to the cause of progress. With an introduction by Harry Pollitt.

\$1.50

RED PLANES FLY EAST

P. PAVLENKO

A breath-taking, swift-moving story of the Eastern Red Army.

\$2.00

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.