

W 8 A L

The

# COMMUNIST

OCTOBER



## HOW TO KEEP AMERICA OUT OF THE IMPERIALIST WAR

ALEX BITTELMAN  
*(Review of the Month)*

MANIFESTO OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A.

THE PATH OF LABOR'S UNITED ACTION  
ROY HUDSON



TWENTY CENTS

# **THE LAND OF SOCIALISM TODAY AND TOMORROW**

REPORTS AND SPEECHES AT THE 18th CONGRESS OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION (BOLSHEVIKS)

By

Joseph Stalin	D. Z. Manuilsky	V. M. Molotov
A. A. Zhdanov	K. Voroshilov	A. Andreyev
L. Kaganovich	Mikhail Kalinin	L. Beria
N. Shvernik	A. Mikoyan	N. Krushchev

The full record of the great congress of the transition from socialism to communism in the U.S.S.R., together with the Resolutions, Amendments to the Rules of the C.P.S.U., etc.

Cloth, 488 pages

Price 75 cents

●

## **THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**

SPEECHES AND REPORTS

By

Dimitroff	Thorez	Gottwald
Ercoli	Wang Ming	Pieck
Pollitt	Marty	Okano
Browder	Cachin	Kuusinen
Varga	and many others	

Cloth, 600 pages

Price \$1.00

●

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

# 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

Keep America Out of the Imperialist War!	NATIONAL COMMITTEE, C.P.U.S.A. . . . .	899
Review of the Month . . . . .	A. B. . . . .	905
Letter of the National Committee to the President and Congress of the U.S.A. . . . .	. . . . .	923
Earl Browder on President Roosevelt's Message to the Special Session of Con- gress . . . . .	. . . . .	925
The Path of Labor's United Action . . . . .	ROY HUDSON . . . . .	927
Specific Organizational Features of the Democratic Front in the United States . . . . .	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER . . . . .	939
The Place of Venezuela Among the Demo- cratic Nations of Latin America . . . . .	JUAN PIRELA . . . . .	951
The Plunder of Austria . . . . .	ALFRED L. WEISS . . . . .	963
Markoff's Contribution to the Study of Marxism . . . . .	MOISSAYE J. OLGIN . . . . .	967
An Encyclopedia of the Basic Knowledge of Marxism-Leninism . . . . .	EMILIAN YAROSLAVSKY . . . . .	972
Philosophical Precursors of Marxism . . . . .	S. KOLESNIKOV . . . . .	980
From the World Communist Press . . . . .	. . . . .	984

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.

# **UNITY for PEACE and DEMOCRACY**

By EARL BROWDER

96 pages

Price 10 cents

What are the tasks confronting the American people to insure unity around policies which will guarantee that our country will keep out of the imperialist war and go forward toward greater democracy, social and national security? What are the tactics of the reactionaries? What is the outlook for the crucial 1940 elections? What are the tasks of the Communist Party in promoting unity, democracy and peace?

These questions are answered in the report of Earl Browder, General Secretary, to the National Committee of the Communist Party, meeting at the moment of outbreak of the imperialist war. They are a clear analysis and guide for every progressive American.



## **THE MEANING OF THE SOVIET-GERMAN NON-AGGRESSION PACT**

By V. M. MOLOTOV

16 pages

Price 1 cent

The historic message of the Premier and Commissar for Foreign Affairs to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., suppressed by the whole capitalist press of America, demonstrates with irrefutable facts the responsibility of Chamberlain, Daladier and the Polish government for the breakdown of the great effort to establish a peace front in Europe. It demonstrates the responsibility of the Chamberlain-Daladier gang for the outbreak of war, and the consistent peace role of the U.S.S.R. in signing the pact which broke up the fascist Axis and preserved peace for hundreds of millions.



**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

---

## KEEP AMERICA OUT OF THE IMPERIALIST WAR!

DECLARATION OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST  
PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, SEPTEMBER 19, 1939

**T**O THE American people—workers, toiling farmers, middle classes and youth:

The war that has broken out in Europe is the Second Imperialist War. The ruling capitalist and landlord classes of all the belligerent countries are equally guilty for this war.

This war, therefore, cannot be supported by the workers. It is not a war against fascism, not a war to protect small nations from aggression, not a war with any of the character of a just war, not a war that workers can or should support. It is a war between rival imperialisms for world domination. The workers must be against this war. It is a war that threatens the American people as well as the peoples of the whole world.

The Nazi imperialists brazenly try to cover up their aggressive war and designs by claiming that Poland rejected their "peace terms" and provoked war. This is a monstrous fascist deception and fraud.

The British-French warmongers and their apologists, on the other hand, cry out that Poland, martyred Poland, is the justification of this war, and the proof that their war must be supported by all lovers of peace, that they make war "to destroy Hitlerism."

This is a hypocritical lie, one of those great historic lies which seek credence entirely on the grounds of their arrogance and their colossal dimensions.

This war is not being fought in defense of Poland. On the contrary, Poland was deliberately sacrificed by the British and French statesmen in order to provide the occasion for their predatory, robber, imperialist war.

The Polish government followed Chamberlain's dictation when it rejected the proposal of the Soviet Union for a joint British-French-Soviet guarantee to all victims of aggression, behind which guarantee the Red Army and Air Fleet would go into operation when necessary in the logical fields for such action—in those adjacent countries which might be invaded, including Poland. When Chamberlain rejected the only plan that could have saved the independence of Poland, he demonstrated for all men and for history that Britain cared nothing for Poland except as an occasion for war, and a possible opportunity to turn Nazi military aggression against the Soviet borders.

German fascism — Nazism — the bloody dictatorship of monopoly capital, was nurtured and ushered into power by Chamberlain and his class.

For years Chamberlain had been speculating upon a German-Soviet war; for this he helped Hitler to power and to rearm Germany; for this he accepted the fortification of the Rhineland; for this he approved the rape of Austria; for this he sacrificed Czechoslovakia; for this he helped strangle the Spanish republic; for this he handed Ethiopia and Albania to Mussolini; for this he destroyed the League of Nations; for this he meekly accepted humiliation and injury from the Japanese imperialists in the Far East and abandoned China to their mercies; and finally for this he threw Poland to the fascist wolves.

Why did the Polish government lend itself to this scheme which results in its own destruction? Because this Polish government was itself fascist in character; because for years it has been involved in all plots for the destruction of the Soviet Union; because up until a few months ago it was itself in closest communion with the Nazi government, and participated with it in the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia; because it followed the Nazi policy of persecution of the Jews; because it was a government of corrupt and tyrannous landlords and bourgeoisie, not only oppressing and robbing the Polish people, but also oppressing subject nationalities within its own borders numbering more than one-third of the total population. Such a government could not defend Poland.

This government of the Polish "colonels" and landlords has broken up and fled the country at the first impact of war, abandoning the peoples to helplessness and destruction.

In this situation the Soviet Union has met its responsibility to its own security, to its immediate neighbors connected by territory and nationality, and to the cause of world peace, by moving the Red Army into Western Ukrainia and Byelo-Russia, while proclaiming its neutrality in the war, and its aim in securing peace and protection for the peoples abandoned by their former rulers.

We Communists, of America and all countries, wanted and did everything in our power to bring about the formation of a real anti-fascist front, with the participation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States. Not only we, but all serious advocates of the peace front, knew and declared that without the U.S.S.R. any self-styled peace front would be only a huge fraud, a mask for a new predatory imperialist war. But the Tory coalition in the United States blocked American support, and the British and French statesmen rejected the U.S.S.R. participation just because they wanted, not a peace front, but a new predatory war to achieve a new Versailles and a new Munich.

The U.S.S.R., the only great nation with a consistent peace record, the only nation which kept faith with China, Spain and Czechoslovakia, strong in its magnificently-growing socialist economy, its solid inner unity based upon abolition of classes and free cooperation of its component family of nations, and its powerful Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet, repulsed from its desired role of helping organize world peace, in which for years it fought alone without a single great power coming to its sup-

port, demonstrated that it was entirely capable of protecting its own peace, thereby making a contribution to the peace of the world. The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, whereby the Nazi government renounced its long-standing agreement with Chamberlain under which they promised to destroy the U.S.S.R. in return for British help in rearmament and destruction of other nations, exposed the final debacle of Chamberlain's "appeasement" policy.

This victory for peace of the Soviet Union, now being followed by cessation of hostilities on her Eastern borders, tremendously improved the international position of the U.S.S.R. itself and also strengthened the position of the working class and all true democratic forces everywhere. It created the conditions for the people of the United States to keep America out of the Imperialist War, and to promote in a new way the aim of a peaceful and orderly world. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., despite their contrasting economic and political systems, are now in a position, more than ever before, to collaborate for the common interests of their peoples, which are the interests of the masses of all countries.

The outbreak of the Second Imperialist War, which for years has been developing as a one-sided war, fundamentally changes the situation hitherto existing. All issues and alignments are being re-examined and re-evaluated in the light of these changes. The previous alignment into democratic and fascist camps loses its former meaning. The democratic camp today consists, first of all, of those who fight against the imperialist war. The pre-

conditions have been created for the destruction of fascism by the German people themselves. The Axis is broken, and British imperialism works feverishly to incorporate its disconnected parts into her war system, trying to transform the war into a general anti-Soviet war. Democracy in Britain and France, long in eclipse, suffers a "blackout" which can be lifted only when the working class, leading the nation, defeats the predatory aims of their ruling classes.

Communists in all the belligerent countries are exposing the imperialist and predatory character of the war, they will vote against war credits, they go among the soldiers at the fronts and the masses at home explaining that this war will bring the people nothing but misery, burdens, destruction and death.

The United States must keep out of any involvement in this imperialist war, or in the rivalries and antagonisms from which it arose. The people must demand that the President's promise that this country will not be involved shall be kept inviolate, and they must be constantly on guard against the powerful forces at work in our land toward such involvement.

Equally must we be on guard against the hidden enemies of peace, who hide themselves behind loud protestations that we must "keep out of war" while advancing policies that prepare to get us in war. Such, for example, are Coughlin, Hearst and Lindbergh, decorated by Hitler for his services in bringing Munich to its disastrous consummation a year ago, who now comes forward as spokesman for that section of the reactionary camp which, demanding

the retention of the Neutrality Act, has other plans for profiting from and finally involving America in the war. Such, on the other hand, are those spokesmen of the same camp who demand the repeal or revision of the Act for the purpose of U.S. help to British and French imperialism, and thereby drawing America into the war. Such are the gentlemen who have been piling up profits by supplying to Japan more than half of all the materials for her war against China, one of the most shameful pages in American history.

In the United States Congress, as it meets in special session September 21, the issue of keeping our country out of the imperialist war will be presented in a most distorted form. Enormous efforts will be made to convince that 90 per cent of the people who demand at all costs that America keep out of the war that retaining the Neutrality Act will do the job for them, or else, on the contrary, that repealing or revising the Act will do it.

Both claims are lies and hypocrisy. On both sides of this issue are warmongers and their agents, with plans carefully laid out to utilize the decision, whichever way it goes, as the starting point for dragging America into the war. And also on both sides of the issue are masses of workers, farmers and middle classes, who are of one deep and fervent desire and opinion, that American can and must keep out of this disastrous and fruitless war, but who are divided and set to fighting one another over the false issue of whether to keep the Neutrality Act, revise it, or repeal it. But not this one position or the other will help keep

America out of this war, while the divisions upon these unreal questions will help no one but the war-makers.

The task of the day in the United States is to overcome the artificial divisions among the peace forces that set them fighting among themselves, and to bring them into a united front against the war-makers who stand on all sides of these confused issues. The Neutrality Act, which in the past played the reactionary role of helping strangle the Spanish republic, and of keeping America's influence from helping realize that real peace front for which we fought so long and so hard, is now, with the destruction of the peace front possibility, and the outbreak of the imperialist war, no longer an important or decisive issue. It serves only to distort the real issues, to clutter up the political scene, and bring confusion instead of a clear program to the masses of the people who seek the road to peace.

Hammering out a real peace program for the United States, one that will really guarantee keeping America from involvement, we must keep two guiding thoughts in mind; first, allow no single measure to be taken for purposes of giving American help to either side of the imperialist conflict; second, find the most effective means of keeping out of the war, without any regard to whether these means incidentally happen to confer some small advantage to one side or the other. These two guiding thoughts are inseparable; in every concrete issue, they will help us decide what is best for the American people; neglect of one would soon destroy the effectiveness of the other.

In an entirely different category



must be considered the question of aid to China. The great Chinese people are fighting a war of national liberation, a just war, in which not only American sympathy but its national interests demand all possible aid be given.

Especially must we beware of the war propaganda which is being spread by the Social-Democrats, Trotskyites and Lovestoneites of this and every other country, who helped prepare the war by disrupting working class unity, nationally and internationally. These Judas creatures talk in the name of socialism, but have begun openly to agitate for war against the Soviet Union, the land where socialism has been realized for the first time in history. Their whole course has been one of assistance to Chamberlain, for whose crimes they are jointly responsible, and which they have defended. They are among the most dangerous enemies of American peace, they are among the most vicious and insidious who would drag our country into the imperialist war.

American national and social security today requires, first of all, to keep our country out of the imperialist war. Only the people's fight to keep America out of the imperialist war will make possible to maintain and improve such measure of social security as we now have; only the fight for greater social security and democracy can strengthen the security of our nation and save us from the horrors of fascism and war.

This is a period of great social convulsions and catastrophes, sudden changes and transformations, when history is running with the speed of the airplane and radio instead of the

old seven-league boots. The workers and all toilers must be prepared to meet and adjust themselves to sudden changes in their situation and problems, to unite their forces on the broadest scale, to promote the democratic alliance of workers, farmers and middle classes with labor's initiative in this alliance, to make sharp changes in demands, alignments and tactics that may be required by the social convulsions that a rotten and dying capitalist system inflicts upon the people. A determined struggle will be necessary to preserve civil liberties and living standards against reactionary attacks already launched.

On the road of struggle against the imperialist war, the struggle for the maintenance of national and social security, for jobs, security, democracy and peace, the working class and toiling masses of America will begin to advance seriously and on a mass scale toward the establishment of a new system, without classes and without exploitation, in which the economy of the country is the common property of all and used for the common good, that is, a socialist system—which alone will abolish forever exploitation, oppression, unemployment, poverty, fascism and war, and realize all the best dreams of mankind for a happy world.

In this grave hour of crisis, when American peace and democracy are at stake, the Communist Party of the United States of America, now as in the past, pledges all of its efforts and strength to promote unity of action of labor and the working people to:

Keep America Out of the Imperialist War! For America's National and Social Security!

Build the Democratic Unity of the American People Against Imperialist War, Fascism and Monopoly Capitalist Reaction!

Forge the Democratic Alliance of the Workers, Toiling Farmers and Middle Classes Against the Economic Royalists and Imperialist Warmakers! Protect and Improve Living Standards, Democratic Liberties, and the Right to Organize and to Strike!

Unite Labor as the Bulwark of the Nation, Democracy and Peace!

Strengthen the Unity of the Democratic Forces of the Americas for

Peace, National Freedom and Real Good-Neighbor Relations!

Give Maximum Support to China and to all Oppressed Peoples in Their Struggle Against Imperialism and Fascism, for Freedom and National Independence!

Support the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union—the Land of Socialist Democracy, Progress, Peace and National Liberation!

**NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.**

**WM. Z. FOSTER, *National Chairman***  
**EARL BROWDER, *General Secretary***

---

## REVIEW OF THE MONTH

*America in Danger of Being Dragged Into War. Wall Street Imperialism Constructs a War "Ideology." What Kind of War Is It? Continuation of Imperialist Politics. Belligerents and Neutrals. An Independent Line of the American Working Class. What Is the Meaning of Congressional Debate? Class Alignments and the Administration's Policy. Imperialist Concentration Versus the Democratic Unity of the People. Economic Outlook and Social Security. On the Treacherous Policies of the Social-Democrats. Responsibilities for Fascism and War. The Soviet Union Leads Anti-Imperialist Democratic Camp. A Changed World Situation Requires a Change of Tactics. Basic Divisions at Home and Abroad. Guarding Against Two Dangers in Application of Changed Tactics. Winning Masses to Correct Position*

THE greatest danger facing the American people at the present time is the danger of the United States being drawn into the imperialist war now waged by Germany, England and France. The working class of America and all toiling people are vitally interested in keeping this country out of the predatory imperialist war. And it is only through the democratic unity of the toiling people—workers, toiling farmers and exploited middle classes—built around a united and politically active working class that a successful struggle can be carried on in the present world situation for keeping America out of the imperialist war.

In saying this, the major and basic thing, we have not said all. For the question immediately arises as to where this danger comes from and the best ways to combat it. In fact, only by finding where it comes from can we gain a true understanding of the magnitude and nature of the danger of involvement.

Judging merely by the *appearance* of things, there shouldn't really be a serious danger of America becoming involved in the imperialist war. Why? Because all of the important political parties and groupings in the country have expressed themselves, through their spokesmen, as being opposed to American involvement. And if that were all that was needed, the American people could feel more or less safe. But we must not judge only by appearances and expressions of opinion. What spokesmen of certain political parties *say* they will do is *one* thing; what they will *actually* do (or are doing) with the political power in their hands may be *another* thing. It is not alone sincerity of intentions that is decisive here, although very important. It is the fundamental class and group interests that have the final say. And these must be examined searchingly.

Take, for example, that section of finance capital in the United States which finds its most consistent spokes-

man in *The New York Times*. This paper says that it is against American involvement. But, at the same time, it tries to picture England and France as carrying on a war for democracy and liberty. Now, if that were true, England and France would be carrying on a just war and would then be entitled, not only to platonic sympathy but to material support from the American people and from all peoples. If it were true, as *The New York Times* says, that—

“The world will now understand that the only real ‘ideological’ issue is one between democracy, liberty and peace on the one hand and despotism, terror and war on the other.”

If that were true, then the American people—and the working class, first of all—would have no choice but render all possible support to that side in the conflict which fights for democracy, liberty and peace. In other words, the American people would be *interested* in becoming involved on the side of England and France who, according to the *Times*, are fighting a just war.

Assuming for the moment that *The New York Times* is right on the “ideological” issue (which it is not), the true meaning of its position would be this: It does want American involvement in the imperialist war. It does want American support for England and France even to the point of entering the conflict on their side. But it does not dare to say so *now*. It follows a policy of drawing America into the war by stages, step by step. It seeks to bring this country into such a situation as will make *inevitable* America’s entrance into the

imperialist war on the side of England and France.

Another significant example is offered by such spokesmen of Big Business as Walter Lippmann, Mark Sullivan and the *New York Herald Tribune*. According to Mark Sullivan who also wants to be known as one opposed to American involvement, it would be very bad to assume “that this war is . . . a war of rival aspirations toward empire between Britain and Germany.” This, he says, is:

“. . . fundamentally a war between ideas—ideas about man’s relation to government, his relation to society, his conduct of life. Indeed, the contrasting sets of ideas, the ‘ideologies’ between which this war is fought, include religion.”

Here, you see, the issue is already “broadened” out a bit. It is not only, as in the case of *The New York Times*, a war for democracy and liberty and peace but also for religion. Moreover, Sullivan proceeds to place the Soviet Union in the camp of believers, despite the clear declaration of that country that it remains neutral in the imperialist war. Sullivan is evidently in a hurry. He needs a certain “ideological” lineup in order to drag America into the war. And so, in violation of all known facts, he constructs the following “two sides.”

“The ideology on one side, the German-Russian side—that is, the Nazi-Communist side—includes the extermination of religion, as in Russia, or the substitution of a pagan religion instead of an orthodox one, as in Germany. The ideology on the other side, the side of the democracies, includes freedom of man to follow what religion he chooses.” (September 19.)

Again we have a peculiar sort of

contradiction. First, a case is made out of the Anglo-French war against Germany that demands imperatively American intervention on the side of these two countries. But instead of coming out honestly and openly with a proposal for such intervention—and this is second—the conclusion is arrived at that America must “do something” about it but must keep out of the war. This is a position which is suspicious on the face of it. And a deeper probing of the matter discloses that this is merely a roundabout way of dragging America into the imperialist war on the side of England and France. The idea probably is that, if the people could be misled into believing that England and France are waging a just war, the masses would favor American support for these two countries and, with this assured, *war profits would be forthcoming immediately and a path would be opened for eventually bringing America into the war as a belligerent on the side of England.*

We must note the conversion of these spokesmen of finance capital to the importance of “ideology.” This was not always so. It will be remembered that through the entire period when the Soviet Union and all true peace forces of the world had been fighting for the achievement of collective security, the Chamberlains and their apologists were emphatic in declaring their *opposition* to “ideological” fronts and “ideological” wars.

In fact, this was their main argument against the idea of collective security. They used to charge the Soviet Union, and the supporters of its peace policy, with seeking to split the world into ideological camps, with aiming

to bring about an ideological war between communism and fascism and to draw the “democracies” into it on the side of communism. Because we fought for collective security, which could have saved England and France from the war, they—the Chamberlains—called us ideological warmongers. And this was supposed to be the justification for abandoning collective security and for adopting the infamous policy of “non-intervention.”

It was the policy—let us remember that well—which enabled Germany, Italy and Japan to unfold the second imperialist war (up till September first—a one-sided war), resulting in the destruction of Austria and Czechoslovakia as independent countries; the policy which brought on the Japanese war against China; the policy which helped defeat the Spanish republic; the policy which finally led England and France into the war as imperialist opponents of Germany.

Of course, the Chamberlain “argument” in the “non-intervention” period that collective security meant “ideological war” between fascism and communism was sheer nonsense and hypocrisy. Collective security was, under the conditions then prevailing, a policy of peace, democracy and anti-fascism. A policy to prevent war and to check aggression. This policy was attacked, maligned and obstructed, not only by the Chamberlains in England and France, but also by *The New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune* in the United States. It was opposed “on the ground” of leading to ideological divisions and ideological wars favorable to communism. But now, when this opposition to and abandonment of collective security

has led England and France into war as imperialist opponents of Germany for world domination, now these same gentlemen turn around and begin to prattle about this war being an ideological war of democracy against despotism. A very crude maneuver. But a dangerous one *because its purpose is to drag America into the imperialist war to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire.*

It is an imperialist and predatory war on both sides. When Chamberlain says that England is fighting fascism, that it is fighting for peace and decency, he is deceiving the world as well as his own people. Because the following questions must be answered at once. If he wanted to fight fascism and aggression, why did he abandon collective security? Why did he sabotage to death the negotiations with the Soviet Union? Why did he permit the war on China? Why did he conspire in Munich with German fascism to bring about the destruction of Czechoslovakia? Why did he strangle the Spanish republic? Why did he seek to direct German fascism against the Soviet Union? And, finally, *why did he follow a policy of antagonism to the United States?*

The answer is relatively plain. Ever since the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and the Italian attack on Ethiopia, the ruling circles of British imperialism had been following a contradictory course. They were fearful of any accession of strength to the fascist states—their imperialist rivals—and wanted to do something about it; but they were even more fearful of the working class movement in Europe and of the movement for national emancipation in Asia and re-

garded fascism as an “excellent antidote” to these “dangerous” movements. That’s why they connived with fascism and conspired with it.

Up until the last days of August, this was the contradictory course of the ruling circles of the reactionary bourgeoisie, especially in England. This it was that helped the fascist states to unfold the second imperialist war as a “one-sided” war. And when, at the end of August, it became finally evident to the ruling circles of England and France that acceptance of the Soviet Union’s proposals for a mutual assistance pact meant also a strengthening of the Soviet Union; that it meant a real fight for collective security and not an imperialist alliance for aggression; that it meant, if need be, the carrying on of an anti-fascist war of liberation against the fascist states and not a predatory imperialist war; when the ruling circles of England and France realized that joining with the Soviet Union meant commitment to a real anti-fascist struggle for peace and national liberation, and not just the simple protection of British imperialist aggrandizement and domination, these ruling circles decided to go it alone and, when forced by the fascist states to fight, to carry on that fight *in the old imperialist style.* And that was what happened when England and France entered the war against Germany.

We repeat: the second imperialist war has been going on practically since 1935 but it was a “one-sided” war—the fascist states attacking and England and France pleading, retreating and conniving with the aggressors. With the entrance of England and France into the war, it be-

came a two-sided war, imperialist and predatory on both sides, an unjust war, carrying for the masses of all belligerent countries misery, suffering and incalculable burdens, a war which they cannot support. They must be against this war.

\* \* \*

**B**UT, the argument is made, what is the difference between this war and the war which England and France might have been forced to engage in against Germany even if they had accepted in August the proposals of the Soviet Union for a mutual assistance pact? A world of difference—is the answer.

First, the acceptance of the Soviet Union's proposals may have *obviated* the war, immensely difficult though it was and already very late. Second, if despite everything, England, France and the Soviet Union would have had to resort to the force of arms, this would have *resulted from* a struggle for peace and collective security; this would have *resulted from* an anti-fascist fight for the liberty of small and weak nations, for their liberty and independence; this would have resulted from *the continuation of* the world struggle of the working class and all democratic and peace forces against fascism and fascist aggression, a struggle that has been on for the last four years and in which the Soviet Union was the strongest and leading factor. *Such a war* would have been a just war, a democratic war, a liberating war. In such a war, the working class, its allies, and all democratic forces would have had to fight in the front ranks.

On the other hand, *this* war, which

England and France are now fighting, resulted from none of these progressive anti-fascist policies and struggles. On the contrary, it resulted from the abandonment of and opposition to collective security; it resulted from connivance with fascist aggression; it resulted from betrayal of small and weak nations and the sacrifice of their national independence; it resulted from *Munichism*, from a whole complex of anti-democratic and reactionary and pro-fascist policies and attitudes of the ruling imperialist circles of England and France, especially England. Hence, *this* war of England and France is an imperialist war, an unjust war, a predatory war. This war cannot therefore be supported by the working class and its allies.

*War is the continuation of politics by other means.* The second imperialist war now in progress is a product of capitalism in its decaying stage. This war arose directly from the policies of the bourgeoisie to find a capitalist way out of the economic crisis of 1929-33. As analyzed and foretold at the time by Stalin in his report to the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,

“. . . the bourgeoisie would seek a way out of the economic crisis, on the one hand, by crushing the working class through the establishment of fascist dictatorship, *i.e.*, the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most imperialistic capitalist elements, and, on the other hand, by fomenting war for the redivision of colonies and spheres of influence at the expense of the poorly defended countries.”\*

The contradictions between the im-

\* *History of C.P.S.U.*, pp. 300-01, International Publishers, New York.

perialist countries, as well as between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, grew still more acute, especially with the new economic crisis that began in 1937. Japan, followed later by Germany and Italy, began to help themselves at the expense of countries poorly defended. The imperialist circles of England and France (also in the United States) responded with the policy of Munichism, a policy full of howling contradictions, because, while seeking to prevent the aggrandizement of the fascist imperialist rivals of England and France, it was directed more exclusively against the democratic anti-fascist camp and against its main bulwark—the Soviet Union.

The struggles of the anti-fascist camp were successful in checking the advance of the fascists within the bourgeois-democratic countries and in delaying the expansion of the war for several years. This enabled the working class and its allies in these countries to become stronger and more politically mature for the continuation of the struggle against imperialism, fascism and capitalist reaction under war conditions, if such should come about nevertheless.

These conditions have now come about for the peoples of England and France. The working class and its allies in these countries have now to continue the struggle for peace and democracy in a radically changed world situation. They cannot support this war. They must be against this war. They can find the sure guide out of the present situation only by wholeheartedly supporting the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

Our country is not yet a belligerent.

But it is in grave danger of being drawn into the imperialist war *because of the powerful capitalist imperialist interests working towards that end.* Whether these interests support the repeal of the Neutrality Act or its revision or its maintenance intact, they seek to drive this country into the imperialist war.

Especially dangerous at the present moment are those tendencies within the American imperialist bourgeoisie which seek to give a progressive “ideological” coloration to the imperialist war waged by Britain. It is the tendencies represented by *The New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, the Lippmanns and the Sullivans. Exploiting the anti-fascist and democratic sentiments of the American people, these “ideologists” hope to draw America into the war on the side of England by falsely picturing the latter as waging a war against fascism and for democracy. *To expose this fraud before the masses is the greatest contribution to peace and democracy, to the national security of the American people, that can be made at the present time.*

But this is not all. There are other spokesmen of the imperialist bourgeoisie, representing different tendencies, which are nevertheless just as imperialist. We refer to such as Hearst, Coughlin and Lindbergh. The latter especially, and the meaning of his sudden appearance on the political scene, require serious analysis. His position would seem to be—despite his declaration in favor of keeping America out of the war—that America should make itself ready *to enter the war*, not now but later, and to try *to give the war a different direction.*



What direction? His broadcast speech (who sponsored it? who supports it?) indicates that direction. He said:

"These wars in Europe are not wars in which our civilization is defending itself against some Asiatic intruder. There is no Genghis Khan nor Xerxes marching against our Western nations. This is not a question of banding together to defend the white race against foreign invasion. This is one more of those age-old struggle within our family of nations—a quarrel arising from the errors of the last war—from the failure of the victors of that war to follow a consistent policy either of fairness or of force."

Study and remember this quotation. Briefly, it embodies fascism, Munichism and unrestrained reactionary chauvinism. It dreams of a merger of all three. It looks forward to a "banding together" of what he calls the "family of nations" or the "white race" to resist "some Asiatic intruder." It seeks to make America the instrument whereby the present imperialist war between Germany, on the one hand, and the Anglo-French combination, on the other, could be transformed into a joint imperialist and counter-revolutionary war against the colonial peoples and against the Soviet Union. That is quite obvious. And so the flag under which Lindbergh is marching is not the one of keeping America out of the imperialist war but of preparing America to become the organizer of a more criminal, more reactionary, more predatory war.

It is perhaps fitting that the person who is at the same time the friend of German fascism and of Chamberlain's Munichers, and who is closely connected with the House of Morgan, should appear as the spokesman of

this imperialist tendency in American Big Business. It is also revealing of the intricate conspiracies of the House of Morgan itself, which works with one hand for immediate American assistance to England, having the *Times* and *Tribune* agitate for this "line," and with the other hand puts forth Lindbergh to help keep us out of any involvement but who in reality works for bringing us into a bigger and more criminal war.

From the standpoint of domestic affairs and inner political developments, the House of Morgan probably figures that the building up of Lindbergh as a great champion of keeping America out of war may serve as an effective reactionary and fascist channel to drain off the anti-imperialist and anti-war sentiments of the masses. At an appropriate moment, Lindbergh could then be brought forward as a candidate for the Presidency (that is not excluded), on a platform of keeping America out of war, and, if successful proceed to use the power of this country for transforming the present war into a defense of the "white race" and against "some Asiatic intruder."

From all of which follows that the American working class and its allies, the toiling farmers and exploited middle classes, can support none of these imperialist tendencies of the capitalist class. The people of America are vitally interested in keeping this country out of the imperialist war, for which the bourgeoisie of all belligerents is equally guilty, and which brings to the masses only suffering and additional burdens. The American working class and its allies have to follow an independent line for

*keeping America out of the imperialist war, for defending and extending the democratic rights and liberties of the masses, for developing and strengthening the social security of the people.* Thus and only thus can the working class fight successfully in the present, radically changed world situation, to promote the social and national security of America and to achieve that democratic unity of the people which alone can realize these objectives.

\* \* \*

AS THE extraordinary session of Congress debates the President's recommendation for the repeal of the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act, several important things will become clearer. First, that Wall Street, the dominating sections of finance capital, is exerting terrific pressure upon Congress and the Administration, not only on the question of the embargo for the sake of larger war profits, but mainly to steer American foreign policy on a course of active participation in the imperialist struggle and, as a first stage, for a "neutrality" benevolent to England and France. This is the nearest and shortest road of involving America in the imperialist war.

Second, that large sections of the American bourgeoisie—manufacturers, merchants, rich farmers—want neutrality, neutrality without preferences. They distrust England, the chief imperialist rival of the United States, and are fearful that the adoption of Wall Street's line may spell the sacrifice of American interests. But they also want war profits. They

therefore want the opportunity to trade freely with all belligerents. They want the same sort of neutrality towards the European war as America has practised towards the Far Eastern war where, though "sympathizing" with China, it was continuing to supply Japan with all the means of warfare. This road also may involve America in the imperialist war. By and large, this tendency in the American bourgeoisie would seem to be reflected most closely in Congress by Senators Borah and LaFollette.

Third, that the overwhelming majority of the American people—labor, the farmers, the exploited middle classes—do not want America to become involved in the war. They want this country to keep out of the imperialist struggle, even though large numbers of them sympathize with England and France in the mistaken belief (cultivated by Wall Street) that these two countries are fighting against fascism and for democracy.

Fourth, that the Administration's present course, as embodied in the President's message to Congress, reflects the pressure of all of these three main currents and attitudes *but in very unequal degrees*. Wall Street's pressure is very evident, especially in the practical measures proposed (repeal of the arms embargo) and in the general emphasis on the need of an "active" policy by the United States towards the imperialist war.

In the previous period, an active and positive policy meant support for collective security and peace. Now, pressure of Wall Street seeks to impose upon America a "positive" policy which means a course leading to

American participation in the imperialist war. The danger is that the Administration will be swung to such a course, even though it is also influenced by the attitudes of those sections of the bourgeoisie which want a neutrality without preferences.

As to the position of the majority of the people, which is determined to keep America out of the imperialist war, this is today reflected more in the *declarations* of the Administration (we must keep out of war) rather than in its *actual course*. And the two, as is known, are not the same. The logic of the Administration's present position, the ever-increasing pressure of the decisive sections of finance capital, and the so-called "national" unity (which is not national at all) that is forming itself around the Administration—all of these developments may tend to widen *the gap* between the Administration's declarations to keep America out of war and its actual course which tends to lead into it.

What is this "national" unity that is now crystallizing around the Administration? An objective analysis, a mere truthful description, will show at once that it is a getting together of several political groupings in American life representing *only one major current* on the decisive issue of the present war.

It is that current which is promoted and fed by Wall Street, by those sections of imperialist finance capital which are orientated on American involvement in the war. *The New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*, Landon, Knox, Garner, Baruch, etc.—these are the forces that are grouping themselves around the Administration in

the so-called "national" unity. This grouping indicates trends of "reconciliation" between the Administration and the Garner forces in the Democratic Party, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, trends towards a certain temporary working agreement between the Administration and those sections of the Republican Party which favor Wall Street's imperialist conceptions of an "active" foreign policy.

It is clear that this kind of "national" unity is not national. The real nation is not there. The workers, toiling farmers and exploited middle classes—the nation—cannot be there because this grouping around the Administration *will be, objectively, and couldn't be anything else, but an instrument for the promotion of Wall Street's imperialist orientation in the war*. It may also become an instrument for the promotion of Wall Street's reactionary, anti-democratic, anti-labor and anti-farmer orientation *in domestic affairs*. A "national" unity, which contains all these potentialities for hurting the overwhelming majority of the American people, cannot be considered national in any sense of the word.

Therefore: what is needed today more than ever is the democratic unity of the American people; the promotion, in the new world situation, of the democratic alliance of labor, the toiling farmers and the exploited middle classes, with the initiative of a *united* working class as the backbone of the nation; a democratic unity of the people to keep America out of the imperialist war, to promote most energetically the struggle for the social security of the masses,

to combat all attacks of the imperialist bourgeoisie and monopolists upon the standards and well being of the masses, and to preserve and extend democracy. For jobs, democracy, security and peace—these are the major slogans of the democratic unity of the people.

More immediately and concretely this means the exertion of the utmost political activity by the masses to oppose the imperialist pressure of Wall Street upon the Administration, to keep America on a course that will keep America out of the war and that will continue the progressive development of social security and democracy.

In this connection, attention should be paid to the economic outlook. The pick-up in business which started in May is continuing, having received considerable impetus from rising agricultural prices, from large war orders by England and France, and from improved business prospects in Latin America.

The outlook seems to be for a continued rise of the business indices, increasing employment and more full-time employment in most industries. One should not expect in the immediate future any considerable investments for expansion but rather a fuller utilization of existing production capacities which may involve replacement and renovations.

In this outlook, certain dangers are already visible. First, the rise in the cost of living. So far, we have had only a brief spurt with great fluctuations. But the worst may yet come. To the extent that American agriculture and industry become the suppliers of commodities for the war requirements of the belligerents, not

only will prices tend to rise and skyrocket, thus immediately and directly worsening the conditions of all working people, but we will be running the danger of an actual shortage of certain basic commodities of consumption.

The first and immediate danger raises at once the question of the protection and improvement of wage standards, relief and social security standards, salaries and fixed small incomes generally of the middle classes and white-collar workers, and the standards of the small and medium farmers. The trade unions, the farm organizations and the middle class organizations have the immediate job of formulating adequate protective measures for their respective memberships and to confer on united political actions for these purposes. It is evident that greater and more complete organization of the unorganized is a fundamental job in this connection.

A second question raised immediately is the one of warding off and combatting *war profiteering*. This is a complex question and will have to be tackled from many ends and by many means. But the central thing to remember is: (a) that the *source* of this danger lies in the monopolies and Big Business. Hence, efforts must be directed largely at curbing this particular source. And, (b), the struggle against war profiteering is the vital interest of labor, the toiling farmer and exploited middle classes—the mass of consumers. Hence, efforts must be directed towards securing united action of all these basic groups, including the small shopkeepers.

Yet this is not all. We must con-

template the possibility of the rise of an actual shortage of certain basic articles of consumption. *Today there are no such shortages.* But if the war is prolonged, and we continue war exports on a large scale, such a situation may arise. To keep this in mind, and to be prepared to counteract such tendencies *in time*, is already an important necessity. A special Congressional investigation, with public hearings, into the whole question of war profiteering and prices, would be helpful. Similarly, the people could make use of the United States Conference of Mayors for the same purpose. Above all, the united political self-activity of the masses themselves is the main requisite in this struggle. Especially, in the relatively more remote perspective, when the people will be confronted with a virtual war economy, its burdensome consequences and the difficult problems of transforming it into a peace economy.

From this follows *that the struggle for the economic and political needs of the masses, for the protection and improvement of their standards and rights, is a major task of the period.* It is inseparable from the struggle for keeping America out of the imperialist war. This is the content today of the fight for American national and social security.

This being the case, it is evidently advantageous to the people to have this extraordinary session of Congress take up some of these problems. A few of them are already before Congress in certain legislative forms, such as, the Anti-Lynching Bill, the proposals to rectify the wrong against the unemployed and W.P.A., etc. The important thing is for Congress to begin

now to tackle all these burning problems of the people.

\* \* \*

**T**HE treacherous policies of the Social-Democrats, abroad and here, have contributed to the coming of fascism to power in Germany, to the outbreak and development of the second imperialist war to its present stage, to the growth of Munichism and all its consequences. These facts are already known in broad circles and should be made known to all. These same treacherous policies of the Social-Democrats in England and France are today directed towards supporting the imperialist war. Here, in accordance with the wishes of Wall Street, the Social-Democrats (Waldman, Lee & Co., the *New Leader* and *Forward* gangs) are especially exerting themselves to drag America into the war on "ideological" grounds and primarily into war against the Soviet Union. On the latter point, Norman Thomas is bidding for special recognition.

Generally speaking, therefore, the main obstacle in the labor movement towards an effective struggle by the masses to keep America out of the imperialist war are these treacherous policies of the Social-Democrats. Major attention has to be paid to the exposure and defeat of these policies.

We have already discussed the imperialist nature of this war. We must now take up the slanderous and lying assertions of the Social-Democrats, Norman Thomas, and their Wall Street masters that the Soviet Union is engaging in "imperialist aggression" and that it is seeking "to im-

pose communism by force" upon the unwilling peoples of Europe.

It should be clear, from all that has transpired thus far, that what maddens Wall Street and its Social-Democratic flunkies is *not* that the Soviet Union is engaging in "imperialist aggression" but *the contrary*; that the socialist state *has refused* to help England to realize its imperialist and predatory interests. Instead, the Soviet Union continues to follow, in a new world situation, *its independent peace policy*, giving help to neither imperialist camp—neither the German, nor the Anglo-French. It is the independent peace policy, *and the added strength with which the U.S.-S.R. carries out this policy*, that angers the imperialists and their Social-Democratic servants.

The added strength is the important point here. It was precisely because the Chamberlains feared the added strength of the Soviet Union that they sabotaged to death the Anglo-Soviet negotiations. Speaking on the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact before the Supreme Soviet, Molotov said:

"This pact not only eliminates the menace of war with Germany, narrows down the zone of possible hostilities in Europe, and serves thereby the cause of universal peace; it must open to us new possibilities for increasing our strength, of further consolidation of our positions, of further growth of the influence of the Soviet Union on international developments."\* (Our emphasis—A.B.)

This is the crux of the situation.

---

\* V. M. Molotov, *The Meaning of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact*, p. 15, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

Not "aggression"—that charge is ridiculous on the face of it. Not "imposition of communism"—that is equally ridiculous. The Red Army crossed its frontiers, when it became clear that there was no longer any Polish state or Polish government; when the situation in that part of the world was full of dangers of all kinds of adventures against the Soviet Union and against the Western Ukrainians and White Russians. The entry of the Red Army was a mission of peace and liberation, and thus it was greeted by the people—liberation from national oppression and from the yoke of the Polish landed gentry.

As to the "imposition of communism by force," here too the leaders of the Soviet Union are Marxists-Leninists. They stand on the position, many times expressed, that peoples and nations must themselves become ready for a socialist system of society which can be realized only by their organized struggles under the leadership of the working class.

So it is not these things that are now bothering Wall Street and the Social-Democrats but the growing "influence of the Soviet Union in international developments." Why are they bothered by that? *Because that cramps their imperialist style; because it makes more certain the final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the Soviet Union and thus encourages the confidence of the working class in all capitalist countries of the eventual triumph of its own liberating mission; because it creates one of the major guarantees that the peace, which will arise in the world as a result of the struggle of the working class and its allies against the imperialist war, will*

*be a true and just peace, such as the peoples of all countries will be able to support and feel happy about.*

This is what worries the imperialists everywhere. This is what excites their flunkys, the Social-Democrats. This is why they are inciting war against the Soviet Union, seeking to drag America into a war on the side of England and France. This treacherous and criminal game must therefore be exposed and combatted in a major way.

We must also unroll the record and consequences of the treacherous policies of the Social-Democrats since the coming of fascism to power in Germany. We must once more establish clearly their responsibility for that and for the consequent unfolding of the second imperialist war which they now support.

First, the record of German Social-Democracy on the *national* question. There *was* such a question, and a big one, and Social-Democracy has been a ruling party in Germany, by itself and in coalition with parties of the bourgeoisie, practically from the birth of the Weimar Republic in 1918 until its destruction by fascism in 1933. What did this party do to solve in a *democratic* way the national question in Germany? The solution of this question demanded the unification of Germany, the liquidation of all survivals of feudalism, the destruction of all counter-revolutionary nests and conspiracies, the breaking up of the estates of the Prussian Junkers and the distribution of the land to the agrarian masses, the development of true democracy, and the liquidation of the Versailles Treaty in peaceful collaboration with the peoples of the

victorious countries and in alliance with the Soviet Union.

We ask again: what did German Social-Democracy do, as a ruling party, to solve these fundamental questions? The answer is: nothing. Has this anything to do with the rise of fascism and its coming to power? Has this something to do with the subsequent unfolding of the imperialist war and with the coming of England and France into it? It has *everything* to do with it.

Because German Social-Democracy had not solved the national question in a *democratic* way, the fascists were able to exploit the nationalist feelings of the masses, especially the petty bourgeoisie which hungered for revenge against the victorious allies, and to hitch these masses onto the wagon of the German imperialist bourgeoisie, undertaking an *imperialist, war-making anti-democratic and fascist solution* of the national question. This is one of the main sources of the second imperialist war. And the responsibility for failure to prevent it is that of reactionary Social-Democracy, not only in Germany but everywhere.

Let us recall again the analysis of the coming of fascism to power in Germany as given by Stalin and splendidly formulated in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. It says:

"The German bourgeoisie perceived that the bourgeois-democratic liberties preserved in Germany might play them an evil trick, that the working class might use these liberties to extend the revolutionary movement. They therefore decided that there was only one way of maintaining the power of the bourgeoisie in Germany, and that was to abolish the bourgeois liberties, to reduce the

Reichstag to a cipher, and to establish a terrorist *bourgeois-nationalist* dictatorship, which would be able to suppress the working class and base itself on the petty-bourgeois masses who wanted to revenge Germany's defeat in the war."\* (Our emphasis—A.B.)

Remember it was a terrorist dictatorship of the most imperialist and reactionary circles of monopoly capital of a "bourgeois-nationalist" character. That's why these circles of Germany monopoly capital—

"... called to power the fascist party—which in order to hoodwink the people calls itself the National-Socialist Party—well knowing that the fascist party, first, represents that section of the imperialist bourgeoisie which is the most reactionary and most hostile to the working class, and, secondly, that it is the most pronounced party of revenge, one capable of beguiling the millions of the nationalistically-minded petty bourgeoisie. In this they were assisted by the traitors to the working class, the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, who paved the way for fascism by their policy of compromise."\*

In brief: the leaders of German Social-Democracy paved the way for fascism, and for the second imperialist war, by their policy of compromise, by their failure to solve in a *democratic* way Germany's national question. Let the Thomases and Waldmans undertake to answer this point to the satisfaction of workers and anti-fascists generally.

Second, the record of the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy *against the united front and anti-fascist people's front* ever since the coming of fascism to power.

What is that record? A criminal record of opposition and sabotage of every move and effort to unite the

working class and the peoples against fascism and fascist aggression. Nothing less than that. If dates, names, places and documents are required, these are easily obtainable. They are on public record.

Space here permits only mention of one important episode. It is this:

On May Day this year, in its Manifesto to the working class and peoples of the world, the Communist International made another in a series of offers for working class unity against fascism and fascist aggression. It is worth reprinting parts of that offer. It says:

"Expressing the will of the working class of all countries, the Communist International proposes to the Executives of the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions immediately to commence negotiations regarding the establishment of a united front for struggle against the instigators and incendiaries of war.

"The Communist International proposes to the Labor and Socialist International a platform for unity of action—defense of peace on the basis of a determined repulse to the fascist aggressors, the organization of collective security, the struggle in each capitalist country against the treacherous policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie, who seek agreement with the fascist aggressors, to the detriment of the liberty and independence of their own nation.

"The Communist International proposes that a conference of labor organizations of the whole world be convened to draw up a concrete plan of action, to map out the ways and means of struggle, to devise a single organ for the coordination of joint action."\*

Study that carefully. And remember that it was proposed in May—May First—the day of international working class solidarity. It was proposed at

\* Cited Works, p. 302.

\* See *The Communist International*, No. 4, p. 294.



a time when the Chamberlains were openly maneuvering to prevent the consummation of the Anglo-French-Soviet Pact of mutual assistance and when, consequently, it was evident that the world was facing another expansion of the war.

What was the answer of the Socialist and Trade Union Internationals to the proposal of the Communist International for united action to prevent the pending extension of the second imperialist war? *No answer.*

Examine further the specific items of the proposal regarding the *platform* for unity of action. It had three points: (1) "defense of peace on the basis of a determined repulse to the fascist aggressors"; (2) "the organization of collective security"; and (3) "the struggle in each capitalist country against the treacherous policy of the reactionary bourgeoisie who seek agreement with the fascist aggressors to the detriment of the liberty and independence of their own nation."

Was that a good basis for a platform? Let the Waldmans and Thomases answer that. Would a united working class, *through a world conference*, have been able by the exertion of its tremendous power to alter materially the relation of forces favorably to the anti-fascist and peace camp?

We say: Yes. That's why the Communist International made the proposal. And had it been accepted, and honestly carried out, there might not have been an extension of the second imperialist war. Since the British Labor Party and the French Socialist Party are the strongest parties in the Second International, these two had

it in their power to help bring about a world front for peace of the working class and, through it, force their governments to join the peace front with the Soviet Union. But the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy chose to support their imperialist bourgeoisie which chose to engage in an imperialist war. The results are before us now, with the United States being in danger of becoming involved in this war.

The treacherous policies of the Social-Democrats, of the Waldmans & Co., have helped bring on the war. These same policies are now seeking to drag the working class into support of this predatory war and to drag America into it. These treacherous policies are also directed towards incitement for war against the Soviet Union, which incitement is now the main business of the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite agents of imperialism.

To expose these criminal Social-Democratic policies and to defeat them is task number one in the struggle of the masses to keep America out of the imperialist war. And in this we will be helped also by those Social-Democratic and Socialist workers who are now seeing more clearly the treachery of these Social-Democratic policies and the need of following *an independent working class policy.*

\* \* \*

EVERY new day confirms the correctness of our opinion that the war has changed the situation *radically.* The division into a democratic camp and fascist camp loses its former meaning. From which follows the necessity for a change of tactics.

The decisive thing in the new situa-

tion is the imperialist war between Germany, on the one hand, and the Anglo-French combination, on the other. This war is here. It is therefore no longer a question of fighting to prevent it, postpone it, or delay it. It is no longer the old struggle for collective security in the former sense; in the sense of combatting fascist aggression by an anti-fascist peace front which could base itself not only on the working class and its allies in every capitalist country and on the Soviet Union—the chief forces—but also on whole nations and peoples, including England and France.

England and France are themselves in the war as imperialist opponents of Germany. As far as these countries are concerned, the former division between aggressor states and non-aggressor states no longer holds good. Communists have been fighting against Munich and Munichism because they wanted a real anti-fascist front with the participation of the Soviet Union. But the English and French bourgeoisie rejected this policy in order to launch a predatory war. This war they have launched, bringing about a radical change in the world situation.

From these decisive facts, internal changes are taking place in the bourgeois-democratic countries, most particularly among the belligerents but also among the neutrals. The main division and line-up of social forces now inevitably occurs not on the issue of democracy versus fascism in the former sense but on the new major issue of: against or for the imperialist war. Consequently, the division between the democratic camp and the fascist camp assumes *a new meaning*. The camp of democracy in the present

period is the camp of those who cannot and do not support the imperialist war, whose fundamental class interests are in opposition to this war, and who follow policies which expose its imperialist character. Furthermore, the *struggle* for democracy in the present period and against the fascist danger is possible only *through* the struggle against the imperialist war and, in the United States (a neutral country), through the struggle to keep America out of the imperialist war. This is now the new meaning of the democratic camp and the new way of struggle for democracy.

On the other hand, the anti-democratic camp, the camp of capitalist reaction from which the fascist danger stems, is today the camp of the imperialists, the supporters of the imperialist war, those social groups and classes whose fundamental interests are in agreement with the imperialist war. In that camp there are always great contradictions and conflicts. The war tends to sharpen these contradictions, not only in the belligerent countries but also (and for the moment, more particularly) in the neutral capitalist countries, such as the United States. Of these contradictions, the anti-imperialist and democratic camp must know how to *make full political use* to advance the cause of the working class and its allies.

But in order to achieve this aim, the following must be considered as fundamental in the situation:

1. The basic division is now crystallizing between the democratic, anti-imperialist camp of the workers, toiling farmers and exploited middle classes, who cannot support the imperialist war and who seek to keep

America out of the imperialist war, the camp in which the working class must strive to assume leadership; and the other camp, the anti-democratic, imperialist and reactionary camp which wants war profits and imperialist aggrandizement and follows policies that tend to drag the United States into the imperialist war.

Only by following *an independent line* in the present major struggle between these two main camps will the American working class and its allies create the democratic unity of the people for keeping America out of war, utilizing all the contradictions in the opposing camp, and for promoting democracy and social security.

2. Unlike the first imperialist war of 1914-18, the second imperialist war is taking place in a situation when the world is divided into two diametrically opposed systems: the world of capitalism and the world of socialism. This means that the Soviet Union not only continues to be the chief bulwark and inspiration of the anti-imperialist and democratic camp but, due to the growth of its influence on international affairs, is able materially to affect the course of these affairs. Consequently, the perspective of peace, resulting from the struggle of the masses against the imperialist war, is inseparably bound up with the leadership of the Soviet Union in the anti-imperialist camp *and with the further development of its peace policy*. Therefore, support for the peace policy of the Soviet Union *and for its leadership in the anti-imperialist camp*, is bound up just as inseparably with the struggle to keep America out of the imperialist war.

Responding to the needs of the

radically changed world situation, we are changing our tactics: our slogans, our forms and methods of struggle. We are doing so in order to assist the American working class and its allies to continue to promote, in the new situation, the fundamental aims and objectives—the building of the alliance of the working class with the toiling farmers and exploited middle classes, with working class leadership; the building in this manner of the democratic unity of the American people to keep this country out of the war and, *in this new way*, to further American national and social security.

In doing so, we are marching under the banner of socialism. The inevitability and desirability of this superior social system is being learned by the American masses day by day. And in the present period of rapid developments and changes, the advance of the American working class and its allies towards socialism will be immeasurably hastened.

Communists will be on guard against two dangers facing them. One is reluctance to make the necessary change in tactics; the other is sectarian distortions of the new tactics.

Habit and inertia, as well as insufficient mastery of Marxism-Leninism, contribute to reluctance. Moreover, this may be aggravated by certain tendencies of a Right-opportunist character which have shown themselves in some of the Communist Parties in the application of the tactics of the united working class front and the anti-fascist people's front. Such tendencies as minimizing the importance of the struggle against the capitulators, idealizing the role of the so-called

democratic states and glossing over their imperialist character, will very likely tend to create waverings or mistakes in our ranks in the present war situation. This may be so because the bourgeoisie (especially in the belligerent countries but also among the neutrals) will strive to exert the greatest influence on the working class, and the Communist vanguard will encounter a number of great difficulties.

But we can state confidently that, unlike 1914-18, there are in all countries, not a few isolated comrades, but a solid and disciplined vanguard which will remain loyal to the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism and will undertake with all its power to apply these teachings in practice by following the example of the Bolsheviks.

The disciplined vanguard will do so most effectively by guarding also against sectarian slips. Such danger is real. To fall into it would make it immensely difficult to win the masses to our position even though many circumstances are favorable for it. *We must win the masses to our position, not only ourselves.* And the way to do it, at the present initial stages of the struggle, is to realize fully that, not only in England and France, but also in our own country there are broad masses of people who believe that England and France are waging a war for democracy, who accept the war as a necessity only and not as a

means of conquest because they are being deceived by the imperialists.

This is a major factor in the situation which must not be overlooked. And from this follows that *it is necessary to explain to the masses their error, very thoroughly, persistently and patiently.* To explain the inseparable connection between capitalism and the imperialist war, the fact that it resulted both from fascist aggression and Chamberlain Munichism, that it resulted from failure of the French and English bourgeoisie to join with the Soviet Union in an anti-fascist peace front. It is necessary to explain that:

"The present war, on the part of both belligerent groups, is an imperialist war, *i.e.*, it is waged by capitalists for the division of the benefits derived from the domination of the world, for markets, for finance (bank) capital, for the subjection of weak nationalities, etc. Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and saps the strength of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, as well as of the neutral countries." (Lenin, "On the War," May 16, 1917.)\*

If we fulfil well this task of explanation among the masses, we shall be helping them most effectively in the struggle to keep America out of the war and thus assist them to reach the next and higher stages of the struggle.

A. B.

---

\* See *The Russian Revolution* by Lenin and Stalin, International Publishers, New York.

---

# LETTER OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE U. S. A.

September 11, 1939

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,  
President of the United States,  
MEMBERS OF CONGRESS  
of the United States,

Dear Mr. President and Congressmen:

In this hour of world crisis, when the most horrible catastrophe is descending upon tens of millions of men, women and children in other lands, and is threatening our own country, American thought turns to the question of national unity, to the unity of the great majority of the American people, in protection of the national interests, in furthering the cause of peace, and in finding guarantees for American social and national security.

We address this letter to you, on behalf of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., which has spoken unanimously at a National Conference of six hundred and fifty of its representatives from all states, held in Chicago, September 1, 2 and 3, 1939. We place before those who are responsible for the welfare of our people and nation the firm solidarity of our Party with the hopes, aspirations and desires of the great majority of the American people, and the ardent wish of our

Party and all its members to work harmoniously with this majority and its elected representatives for the common interest and common welfare.

This is all the more necessary since the Communist Party of the U.S.A., although a relatively small minority party, is the most stable and rapidly-growing of such minorities, and exerts an influence upon public thought far beyond the confines of its membership. It is also made especially necessary by the persistent and highly-organized campaign of misrepresentation which tries to picture our Party as un-American, as an agency of some foreign principal directed against the interests and unity of the American people—misrepresentation which pictures our loyalty to the principles of socialism as disloyalty to our own country and people. These slanders are refuted by our political views and our work, and by our position in the present crisis.

We are Americans who love our country and would serve it by our best thought and most energetic action. As we understand the American tradition and Constitution, all persons, parties and groups have the

responsibility and duty to make clear, beyond doubt, their firm and unconditional defense of American social and national security; with this established, we believe that all, including the Communists, have the full right to participate in the democratic public life of our nation and to participate in its common tasks, without discrimination on account of creed or political affiliation.

We wish to place on record our firm accord with the stand of the President of our country against American involvement in the war, or in the rivalries and antagonisms which have led much of Europe into chaos. We support the President's expressed determination to exert our country's influence against extension of the warfare, especially as it involves the Americas, and to bring it to the speediest possible end in a way to abolish forever the practice of violent settlement of disputes between nations.

At this moment the hope for firm national unity lies in rallying all Americans in support of this policy, and in support of the President who has best expressed the hearts and minds of the people.

We add our voices to the popular condemnation of all who are attempting to find personal profit or narrow partisan advantage in the conditions of world crisis which press upon our people; we pledge our Party to co-

operation with those who subordinate their personal, partisan, or class interests in order to serve the interests of the nation—which can only be the interest of that vast majority of the people who labor, in whatever field, for the common good.

We call attention to the fact that our country, most powerful in the world, occupies a position toward the world menace of war, similar in most important respects to that occupied by the second most powerful nation, the Soviet Union. Both are neutral toward the rival imperialist ambitions and interests, both are deeply sympathetic to the peoples whose national independence is in jeopardy, both ardently desire and strive for an ordered and peaceful world, both wish to make the world safe for human culture, science, work and happiness. This common attitude of the two greatest world powers reflects profound common national interests which must, sooner or later, and preferably sooner, result in common policy and action, together with all like-minded peoples and governments, to banish the forces of destruction from the earth, to establish orderly international relations, to secure world peace.

Very truly yours,

For the National Committee,  
Communist Party of the U.S.A.

WM. Z. FOSTER, *Chairman*

EARL BROWDER, *General Secretary*

---

## EARL BROWDER ON PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS

*(Excerpts from a speech delivered  
at the Public Auditorium, Cleveland,  
Ohio, September 21, 1939.)*

“WE JOIN wholeheartedly with the vast majority of the American people whose hearts and minds were well expressed today in President Roosevelt's unequivocal declarations that the best interests of world peace and of America demand that we keep out of this war and out of the rivalries from which it arose. We emphatically support him in finding that the only correct foundation of America's foreign policy lies in considerations for keeping out of this war, and not at all in considerations of incidental advantages to one or another of the belligerents. . . .

“We consider especially important the President's firm declaration against American credits to belligerents, which should put an end to existing schemes for throwing American financial resources in support of the British empire, the most serious menace for involving our country in the war.

“We welcome his recognition of the immediate rise of the menace of profiteering, which also means the rise of pressure to break American neutrality when that promises greater

profits. The fight to curb profiteers and Wall Street monopolists and to divest them of their booty must be well planned and have the force of the people behind it. It is therefore best handled as the President proposes, at the regular session.

“The President's declaration that no new laws are needed to handle the emergency should help halt the Tory drive against civil liberties and labor rights, while his unequivocal demand for freedom of expression was a rebuke to the rising repressions against the Bill of Rights as typified by several examples of the breaking up of Communist meetings in the Middle West, and the cancellation of the hall for my meeting in Cincinnati by decision of a federal judge. The action of the radio station in that city today in refusing to sell time to me unless I agreed to talk only on local politics, without discussion of the President's message, is similar violation of civil liberties.

“While agreeing with the President's rejection of a wholesale blanket embargo policy as being not effective to keep America out of this war, we cannot follow him entirely in his judgment of its role in Jefferson's time, nor in the implied rejection of an embargo against the Jap-

anese imperialists, an act which we believe valuable and necessary for peace in the Far East, to protect American interests and to aid the Chinese people who are fighting a purely defensive and national liberation war.

“Regarding the issues of the Neutrality Act, we repeat the position expressed by the Communist Party declaration of September 18, that the uniting of all the peace forces on both sides of this issue is much more important than the particular decision whether to retain, repeal, or revise the Neutrality Act, none of which will

guarantee America against involvement.

“The best guarantee against war is an aroused, vigilant, united people determined to suppress profiteering and the monopolists in both domestic and foreign fields, determined to tolerate no taking of sides in this imperialist conflict, determined to maintain their living standards and democratic rights, to improve and extend them, determined to organize the people, workers, farmers and middle classes, in a more effective democratic intervention in the life of our country and the whole world.”



---

# THE PATH OF LABOR'S UNITED ACTION

BY ROY HUDSON

**L**ABOR, more than any other group in American life, understands the issues before the American people; no other group has so much at stake in the outcome of the struggle. Labor, more than any other section, is in a position to play a leading role in helping unite all progressive and democratic people to bring about the defeat of reaction.

Labor is not only the strongest organized force in America; it is playing a new role in the affairs of the nation—this, in spite of the division in its ranks. Can anyone fail to see the tremendous role that labor could play if it were united? This does not mean, however, that we should favor unity at any price. Unity on the basis of Green and Company's policy of collaboration with finance capital would have made impossible the recent advances and would have prevented labor from playing its new role. Unity that will preserve the principles of the C.I.O., which made possible these advances, alone will serve the interests of labor and democracy. To fight for unity, therefore, means to struggle for a united labor movement which will safeguard the policies of the C.I.O.

We must recognize, without in any manner giving up the efforts to establish organic trade union unity, that

the central task is to promote common action of labor on all matters affecting it, to insure the defeat of reaction in 1940, and to block the policies of the imperialist warmongers.

## 1940 AND THE STRUGGLE FOR LABOR UNITY

Every day its anti-New Deal tendencies bring the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. into more direct conflict with the overwhelming majority of its membership—the great numbers who take no active part in the struggle to bring about organic unity, but who are the strongest supporters of the New Deal labor and social measures and are alarmed at the growing threat of reaction. It is around the issue of support for these progressive measures that common action is being developed. Increased support for the progressive policies of the New Deal is being registered within the A. F. of L., even though all these forces do not exert sufficient pressure to compel the Executive Council to abandon those policies which deadlocked unity negotiations. An examination of recent developments shows that New Deal support in the A. F. of L. is so great that, if it is organized, not only will the A. F. of L. membership stand united in the elections behind candidates com-

mitted to keeping America out of the imperialist war and to carry forward the progressive measures of the New Deal, but the pressure will be so powerful that even anti-New Deal top leaders of the A. F. of L. will either go along with the progressive majority or, as Comrade Browder has remarked, will break their necks.

Thus, even though labor unity has not been achieved, the splitting policies of the anti-New Deal majority in the Executive Council have been dealt serious blows. What has taken place?

The fond hopes of the reactionaries on the Executive Council that, by collaborating with the employers, and making use of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, they would be able to disintegrate and split the C.I.O., have come to nought. Even some confirmed bureaucrats within the A. F. of L. no doubt question the ability to destroy the C.I.O. and are unwilling to support the policies of the Executive Council. There can be no doubt that the successful resistance of the auto, marine and textile workers to the employer-inspired campaign of disruption, openly aided by Mr. Green, was one of the most decisive blows struck in behalf of labor unity. Further, events prove that the reactionary policies of the Executive Council are being challenged by a movement that is daily becoming broader and more effective. A brief review of these events show the following:

First, in the states of Ohio, Illinois and Pennsylvania, the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. have engaged in official joint action for the purpose of resisting anti-labor legislation and of supporting legislation favored by labor. In

Illinois, the Railroad Brotherhoods have also participated in this joint action. It goes without saying that, in these states, the organizations of the A. F. of L. have not the blessing of Mr. Green. However, he has not dared to condemn them, even though they have not acted in accordance with the Executive Council's attempts to incite the A. F. of L. membership against the C.I.O.

Secondly, incomplete reports show that on thirty-three occasions, state bodies of the A. F. of L. have followed a common policy on vital state issues with the C.I.O. Whether this parallel action was arrived at through agreements, as a result of consultation between A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders, or whether the labor bodies determined their policies without consultation, these experiences show that the Executive Council's orders to its state bodies to oppose anything supported by the C.I.O. are not making the headway expected.

Incomplete reports also show that joint or parallel action between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. has been achieved on eighty different occasions, in cities scattered throughout the nation.

In regard to cooperation among local unions on issues that are not common to the whole labor movement, or where common action has not been achieved on a state or city-wide scale, reports are so meager that it is not possible to give an adequate picture. This does not mean that such cases are not widespread, but that their importance is not full appreciated.

In order to have a complete picture of the situation, we must also note the significance of those cases

where the Executive Council is openly and directly challenged. Outstanding among these, and reflecting the extent to which even conservative A. F. of L. leaders are taking issue with the Tories, is the attitude toward the Wagner Act. Eight or nine powerful international unions, as well as hundreds of individual local unions, are officially on record opposing amendments to the Act. In addition, the Executive Council has only recently had to suffer exposure of its arbitrary policies at the hands of the 4 A's (the Associated Actors and Artists of America) and the Typographical Union. When the actors defended their organization and its rights, when the typographical workers refused to give aid to a "war" on the C.I.O., they registered a strengthening of the progressive forces throughout the A. F. of L.

Indicative, too, is the fact that at this early date, incomplete reports show that fourteen A. F. of L. organizations, including four state bodies and two international unions, have registered their support for a third term for Roosevelt—as a means of continuing and strengthening the progressive measures of the New Deal. In the past few days, the state convention of the A. F. of L. in Vermont proved that this state has *not* left the Union by adopting a resolution favoring a third term.

What are some of the lessons that must be drawn from this brief review?

First, the struggle against those forces blocking unity is growing, and unity of action, on an ever wider scale, is being achieved as a result of struggle in the various localities. This

is important, because the degree to which unity is achieved down below, on a city and state scale, will, to a great extent, determine when unity will be achieved on a national scale.

Secondly, the struggle for unity and against the anti-New Deal forces assumes many forms. In some cases it has been achieved through official action, on a state or city scale. In most localities, however, the relationship of forces has not yet made such action possible. Here, cultivation of personal contacts between the pro-New Deal forces, consultation between leaders of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., make possible a common understanding, leading at the least to a minimum of joint action, and laying the basis for a stronger movement which will make possible higher forms of cooperation. Thus, we see that a blueprint cannot be drawn that would fit the situation in every city, and that whoever wants to advance the fight for unity and support of the New Deal measures must be prepared to work in many fields and on many issues.

Thirdly, the threat of reaction stimulates greater desire for an effort to achieve unity. If the movement for unity advances, it is because ever greater sections of the labor movement recognize that unity alone can defeat reaction's threat to organized labor. Wherever labor recognizes that it is confronted with a common danger, there we witness greater effort to achieve unity, and greater success. The enactment of anti-labor legislation in Pennsylvania led to joint C.I.O.-A. F. of L. action. However, it is better to achieve unity before such legislation is passed, as was the case in Illinois, where such unity pre-

vented passage of an anti-labor bill.

Events now show that labor is not waiting until united support for the New Deal has been achieved on a national scale, or until there is one united labor movement, but is striving to forge this unity now to meet the problems and dangers confronting it today. If the movement for unity advances, it is because ever greater sections of organized labor recognize that unity is essential to defeat reaction's threat to the labor movement. It is of utmost importance to demonstrate that reaction threatens all of organized labor—and not just one wing of it. This is a point that Messrs. Green and Co. try to hide, in order to make it seem that their allies, the Garner Democrats and Tory Republicans are interested in attacking *only* the C.I.O. Finally, there can be no doubt that the threat of involvement of America in the imperialist war will meet with labor's opposition and stimulate the movement for unity.

Finally, while the struggle against the reactionary forces within the Executive Council and for unity of action develops on many issues, the denominator common to all these struggles and which is capable of arousing all constructive and progressive forces, is that of keeping America out of the imperialist war and of defending and extending the New Deal.

#### UNITY OF ACTION AND ORGANIC UNITY

Defense and extension of the progressive measures of the New Deal and the struggle to keep America uninvolved in the imperialist war is the key to defeating reaction in 1940; the

cited experiences also show that it is, at the same time, the key to advancing the fight for labor unity. The struggle to achieve political solidarity strengthens the fight for a united labor movement. Without understanding this, one cannot understand *how* labor unity can be advanced at the present time, one cannot understand how to deliver a decisive blow against the resistance of Mr. Green and his cohorts to labor unity. Do not Green and Co. block unity because they wish to bring about a defeat of the New Deal? For this reason, do they not intensify their attacks on the C.I.O. and on the New Deal? Is this not the source of many of the specific problems concerning the relationship of the various unions now confronting the progressive forces? If these plans are blocked, if the A. F. of L. membership unites with the C.I.O. in opposing the imperialist war, and in 1940 stands behind candidates pledged to carry forward and extend the New Deal, will not this help guarantee victory and at the same time be a staggering blow to the A. F. of L. reactionaries?

Would not such a defeat weaken the bureaucratic control of the A. F. of L., speed up the realignment of forces, isolate the reactionaries even from the conservative forces, and create the most favorable conditions for re-establishing a united labor movement?

Only this understanding of the situation will enable the progressives to avoid the blind alley of the belief that political unity can be achieved *only* if organic unity is already in existence; or the assumption that neither political unity nor organic

unity can be achieved until all the foes of the New Deal and labor unity are ousted from high offices in the A. F. of L. Considering the existing bureaucratic control of the A. F. of L., there would be no hope either for a united labor movement or a progressive victory in 1940, if these views were to prevail. That is why we must approach every aspect of the struggle for labor unity upon the basis of promoting political solidarity in 1940 and of endeavoring to instill the same understanding throughout the entire labor movement. This is the road to victory in the 1940 elections and towards achieving a united labor movement! This offers the approach to the solution of practical problems of trade union work in the day-to-day struggle, as well as in the coming conventions of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., which will be focal points in the immediate struggle and which can and should serve to help rally and further to stimulate and strengthen the movement for unity of labor and all progressives in 1940, and bring the goal of organic unity much nearer.

#### THE COMING C.I.O. AND A. F. OF L. CONVENTIONS

The fact alone that the C.I.O. convention will register a stronger, a more unified and consolidated organization will make that gathering an important event. It will be in a position to make contributions of enormous importance to the struggle against reaction and for labor unity. The established policies of the organization and the record of its leaders leave little doubt that this contribution will be made by the convention—

by registering its approval of the objectives of the New Deal; by registering its condemnation of the imperialist war; by voicing its criticism of weaknesses and its desire that the New Deal program be improved and extended, the better to meet the problems of labor and the common people; and by registering its willingness to collaborate with other progressive forces in support of candidates that will carry forward such a program. In the eyes of every honest progressive, the C.I.O. cannot, without compromising the interests of all labor, do otherwise than reaffirm its established policy for trade union unity. However, such actions as will encourage and stimulate all those in the A. F. of L. who join the C.I.O. membership in their support of the New Deal progressive measures and desire for labor unity, and opposition to American involvement in the war, who understand the need for common action to promote the interests of all labor and secure the defeat of reaction in 1940, will be a major contribution towards breaking the resistance to unity.

One of the important signs of progress in the labor movement will be the fact that the C.I.O. convention will provide the means for millions of organized workers, through democratic procedure, to give expression to their sentiment and to adopt policies that will meet the present situation and advance the interests of labor. Although the A. F. of L. convention will not offer as adequate an expression of the sentiments of the A. F. of L. membership, this does not negate the importance of the convention and its possibilities for stimulating and

strengthening the struggle for a progressive victory in 1940, and for the advancement of labor unity.

The developments throughout the country seem to indicate that reactionary policies will meet at this A. F. of L. convention greater resistance than ever, and it may safely be said that a majority of the delegates will not be in agreement with the anti-New Deal policies of Green and Co. Undoubtedly, the main issues at this convention will be to help prevent America from being dragged into the imperialist blood bath and to defeat all attempts by the reactionary leadership to drag the A. F. of L. in the direction of support for the Republican-Garner coalition. This can be accomplished if the issues are clear and the broadest possible collaboration of New Deal forces is established. No doubt, attempts will be made to prevent this majority from uniting, by use of the false charge that Roosevelt is responsible for the reduction in W.P.A. and the elimination of the prevailing wage. Undoubtedly, the constructive forces will understand this maneuver and reply, "Yes, we disagree with Roosevelt's position on the prevailing wage, but this does not remove responsibility from where it belongs, on the shoulders of the Executive Council. Does not your secret and open collaboration with the Garner-Republican coalition explain why you were silent while these people were destroying the President's W.P.A. recommendations? Were you fighting for the prevailing wage then? And if you had raised your voice in support of the President's recommendations, would it not have helped secure their passage and at the same

time have obtained favorable consideration for our demands for the prevailing wage?

"No, gentlemen, our disagreement on this question with Roosevelt is not in our eyes an argument for denouncing all the New Deal measures and supporting the Hoovers and Garners who wish to destroy organized labor!"

The New Deal supporters, to be successful, must also be prepared to defeat any concealed plot to aid the Republicans through lining the A. F. of L. up behind the Garner Democrats; or, under cover of "non-partisanship," to prevent New Deal support from being registered. The extent to which the New Deal forces at this convention establish effective collaboration against the pro-Republican-Garner maneuvers of the Tory bloc in the Executive Council will also serve to strengthen the fight for labor unity, for support of an effective peace policy, and for the adoption of progressive policies on other issues.

The two conventions this year will be of decisive importance, because they will mark an important milestone in the struggle for unity of all progressive forces and for a united labor movement. Although they will not mark the end of this struggle, they should register a strengthening of the progressive forces, and lead to more intensified daily efforts to achieve unity by the further strengthening of the C.I.O.; by the development of its initiative as the main force fighting for unity of labor in the 1940 elections, and for a united labor movement; by more determined efforts to win the A. F. of L. member-

ship for support of the New Deal policies; and by extending the growing movement for cooperation and unity among all wings of the labor movement, seeking at all times to find the concrete form of bringing this about on the basis of the issues and conditions prevailing in each locality. These are tasks before the entire labor and democratic movement. We Communists must be prepared to accept more than our share, because we understand the question better and are in a position to render valuable help.

One hears occasionally the argument that the policies of the C.I.O. sometimes hurt and hinder the A. F. of L. people who are fighting for unity. Unfortunately, even some progressives give support to this argument, though usually when they do so it is to justify their own inactivity and failure to struggle against the splitting policies of Green & Co. The building trades situation offers us a fine example for combatting such arguments. Is it not a fact that the A. F. of L. building trades unions after many years of existence have failed to organize hundreds of thousands of workers? Will it be a crime if the C.I.O. accomplishes what the A. F. of L. has failed to do? Will not the organization of the unorganized strengthen those workers organized in the A. F. of L. and perhaps even stimulate some of the A. F. of L. leaders to go out and organize? Is it not a tribute to the patience and sincerity of the C.I.O. that it is confining its activities mainly to the localities where the industry is largely unorganized and not to the big cities where the A. F. of L. has its main strength?

Is it not clear that the C.I.O. is not pursuing the same policy as that followed by Green & Co. in their scandalous — fortunately, unsuccessful — drive, to “organize” hundreds of thousands of workers in industries such as mining and auto which are organized solidly in the C.I.O.? Is it not clear that, instead of hurting the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. campaign in the building trades provides the progressive forces within the building trades additional arguments and weapons with which to demand that their leadership work to unite the labor movement.

#### ROLE OF COMMUNISTS IN THE UNIONS

On our twentieth anniversary, we can register that the work of the Party has won thousands of trade unionists into our ranks, and that these Communists are winning ever greater recognition as part of the progressive labor movement. If it was possible to influence such people, then those who have devoted their energies toward “destroying Communist influence in the labor movement” might well say that these facts show the futility of their efforts. To those who, in spite of prejudices, are still open to reason, these facts present the question: What is the basis of the growth of the Communists and their increased influence in the labor movement? The record shows that the Party prospered because our work proved our loyalty to the working class and the trade union movement; it proved that we are a constructive force, militantly and consistently fighting for progressive policies aimed at strengthening the ranks of labor and advancing its interests;

and that we have therefore won the allegiance of some of the best forces in the labor movement.

The record shows that Communists are good trade unionists, because they are Communists, because their socialist principles and their knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, based upon the experience of the world working class, equip them better to help find the answer to the main problems confronting the labor movement. For us Communists these facts also afford the lesson that we can maintain and increase our friends and influence only if we continue to be helpful and to contribute to the solution of problems, only if we stand ready and find the means to collaborate with all who have the interests of the trade union movement at heart, and if we constantly increase our capacity to serve and lead by building the Party and mastering Communist theory and practice.

We have always been able to examine our work critically and to learn from our mistakes, thereby improving our work. It may be well worth while to examine some of the recent setbacks suffered by progressive groups in trade unions in which Communists were a factor. Let us take, for instance, the allegation that the progressives were defeated because they were bad, because there was no difference between them and the reactionaries they had routed. This Trotskyite argument is aimed at hiding the fact that the masses made a mistake in electing into office reactionary officials. In other unions, the masses made similar mistakes, but soon corrected them. For instance, the restaurant workers in Pittsburgh recently

re-elected an entire slate of progressives who were defeated by reactionaries in the elections a year ago. In the maritime union the seamen soon recognized their mistake and ousted reactionary officials who, only a short time before, had won their offices with the use of demagoguery and red-baiting. These and many other experiences show that the masses are quick to recognize and correct mistakes. This, of course, does not mean that it is the rank and file who are to be blamed for these mistakes; it is the shortcomings and mistakes of the progressive forces which made it possible for the reactionaries to confuse and mislead the membership.

Usually these weaknesses and mistakes of the progressive forces have the same general background and characteristic. In electing progressives to office, the workers rightly expect an improvement and a solution of their problems, while frequently certain weaknesses tend to arise in the approach of the progressives to their solution. On some questions, such as providing jobs, they endeavor to accomplish what is within their power to solve immediately, but tend to neglect to educate their membership as to what the fundamental solution is to the question, thus failing to give them a long-range perspective around which to organize activities.

The result is that there is only a partial improvement; the workers have not been educated as to how their full expectations can be realized, and the reactionaries demagogically use this fact to stir up resentment and distrust. Therefore, the progressives must appreciate the necessity for combining the narrow immediate activity



with a broader and more rounded-out program of activities. The problems confronting any group of workers cannot be solved by their efforts alone but in alliance with the rest of the labor and democratic movement.

Secondly, there are two ways of leading a union—the bureaucratic way, and through methods that are based upon involving the mass of workers. While the progressives do not rely upon the methods of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats, they have not yet mastered the method of actively involving the membership in democratic fashion in the solution of problems. The result is that the reactionary forces are able to misuse democracy for the purpose of confusing and dividing the ranks of the workers.

Finally, and most important, sometimes progressives, upon winning a victory, do not unify and consolidate the union and their position. They interpret the defeat of the reactionaries to mean that the membership has confidence only in the Left leaders. They fail to see that the workers expect the more advanced leaders to create a united leadership out of *all* constructive elements. They frequently forget that unity of all constructive forces is the best guarantee for a powerful union. Few efforts are made to involve conservatives and middle-of-the-roaders in the life of the union and to find a basis for cooperation with them. With all the good intentions in the world, and there is no doubt that these progressives are most loyal and capable, they nevertheless create a condition where only the most advanced trade unionists are active in the affairs of the union. Their sectarianism antagonizes many

people and makes it possible for the reactionaries to win a certain mass following. As a result, when elections come around, the reactionaries, although a small minority, have a following entirely out of proportion to their actual strength.

These are some of the reasons why setbacks have been suffered by the progressives; they are weaknesses which must be overcome if the progressive forces are to advance.

At this time we can also note with satisfaction that the decision to abolish organized fraction methods of work, which in the past served to strengthen the struggle for democracy and progressive policies, has led to improved relationship with other progressive forces, and more effective work upon our part. Any notion that this decision was but "a maneuver" has been dissipated by our actual work, such as the public statement of policy in connection with the auto workers' convention, as well as the work of Communist auto workers who were delegates at that important event. We can say that, to the extent to which this decision has been carried through, it has led to improving and strengthening our work. Therefore, the need is present to insure that this decision is applied concretely to all of our work. However, it must be noted that more than a mere formal abolition of fractions is necessary.

If individuals continue to pursue narrow sectarian methods of work, particularly in their approach to other forces, no real improvement can take place. Likewise, unless all Communists, especially those occupying leading posts in the trade union

movement, constantly increase their knowledge of the basic Party policies, they will soon be unable to provide the same high quality of leadership that they were able to give in the days of organized fraction work.

Thus, not only a change in form, but an improvement in the quality of work is absolutely necessary. There have been some wrong interpretations and unjustified fears that have arisen as a result of our policy on these matters. There is the fear that the Communist Party is indifferent as to whether its members in trade unions contribute to the solution of the problems before the labor and progressive movement. The decision to abolish fractions was aimed at creating more favorable conditions to enable its members to be more effective factors in and for the labor movement. The Party expects its members to be in a position to become more effective by acquiring greater understanding of the Party's teachings, through individual study, schools, activity in the Party organizations, and participation in the work of the Party.

If there be any Communist who believes that abolition of fractions means that individual Communists no longer have any responsibility to the Party for their activities in the trade union movement, then such a person has been misinformed and may expect a rude awakening. Anyone who, for instance, would violate the democratic decisions of his union, or who would associate with and make alliances with reactionary anti-union forces, would certainly find himself called to account. The Party expects that its members will exercise common sense, cooperating at all

times with all other progressive forces. Finally, the Party cannot and will not undertake to decide what its members shall do in their unions, but it will always reserve the right to decide who is worthy of membership in the Communist Party.

Now, on some questions regarding the unity of Communists. Occasionally we hear fears expressed that if differences of opinion on trade union questions exist among Party members, it will hurt the prestige of the Communists and make it harder to convince non-Party trade unionists. But experience has shown that, where these differences are settled in open discussion together with other union members, that this eliminates distrust, increases the prestige of the Party, and makes it easier to unify all constructive forces in the union. Thus, abolition of fractions is not aimed at weakening the unity of Communists, but of providing a more suitable means for achieving this unity.

There is a certain resistance to the abolition of fractions which arises on the part of leaders who are not sure of themselves and who have not established their prestige and authority. To such comrades we must say, "Your authority and prestige cannot be established by the mechanical support of a fraction, but on the basis of improving your own abilities as a leader. As a leader you must sink or swim, on the basis, first of all, of your own abilities." No one, of course, should be encouraged to believe that, because we favor settlement of differences, and hammering out policies through frank and open discussions in a trade union manner, it is therefore a healthy situation if the Communists

always have differences and difficulties in arriving at agreement. On the contrary, we must say that, where regularly clarity on any question cannot be arrived at as a result of honest debate, and differences cannot be settled before the taking of a vote, this is a sign of immaturity, that the comrades are lacking in understanding of our basic policies which would make it easier for them to analyze each question, to understand it, and convince others. Also, where such difficulties appear chronically, we must begin to suspect the existence of people who do not want to agree and who desire to prevent others from reaching agreement.

Guarding against such incorrect ideas will help us to accomplish the results that we desire. However, it must be stressed again that while generally we have made real headway as a result of abolishing fractions, with the result that our relations with other progressives have improved and we now have more favorable conditions in which to work, there is at the same time the weakness that the political level of our work is not improving rapidly enough. We are lagging behind in helping the labor movement to understand and solve its problems. A few years ago the Communists stood out because of their understanding of how to organize the unorganized, to lead strikes, to conduct an effective struggle against those forces and policies standing in the way of progress. At that time our understanding was far in advance of many other forces, who have since, as a result of experience and to a certain extent of our work, measured up to the same level of understanding

and ability. But, at the same time, we must note that some of our forces have not made corresponding advances, that they do not everywhere continue to manifest the same superior knowledge in relation to the problems of today that they had in connection with the problems of yesterday.

Can our trade union forces say that they always display the same understanding and ability in connection with the struggle for trade union unity, the fight for peace, the building of the democratic front—as they do in organizing the unorganized or leading a strike? Are not these the vital, the major questions of today before labor? Cannot and should not we Communists play the same role in educating and winning the trade union movement on these issues as we did in connection with other issues? If we do not do this, does it not mean that we are not helping in the solution of the practical trade union problems of today, that we are not being practical trade unionists? And is it not clear that this cannot be accomplished unless there is the most determined effort on the part of every Communist systematically to improve his understanding, to master the basic principles of Communism, to keep abreast with the Party's policies on every question, and participate in the collective thinking of the Party as a whole, and not just relegate the "thinking" to Party functionaries? Lifting the political level of our trade union work, in other words, closing the gap between the policies of the Party and the bringing of these policies to the masses, is the key, not only towards helping defeat reaction in 1940, but towards maintaining and

increasing the influence of the Party, towards maintaining the leadership of each individual Communist in relation to non-Party workers.

This is a central task we must set for ourselves. It requires that assistance, guidance and help to our trade union people must continue to be one of the main concerns of every Party committee. It means finding the proper forms that will assure a more thorough understanding of the policies of the Party on current questions, and will insure a systematic review and clarification of developments and provide exchange of experiences.

Knowledge, experience and advice must constantly be made available,

whenever needed, to enable our comrades in the trade unions to face difficult practical questions. Greater efforts must be made to encourage trade union forces to participate in the discussion and work of the entire Party. This also means that there must be greater efforts on the part of all trade union forces, especially leading comrades, to become not just trade union comrades willing to fight for the realization of the line of the Party in their daily work, but people who contribute to the shaping and formulation of our general policies, people who help share the responsibilities of leading and guiding the whole Party in its work and struggles.

---

# SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT IN THE UNITED STATES

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

**I**N THE various industrialized countries the democratic front, or people's front, assumes the same general form—an anti-fascist alliance of workers, farmers, professionals and small business people. (In colonial and semi-colonial countries, where it becomes a national front, it includes decisive sections of the native bourgeoisie and landlords.) Despite this basic common characteristic of the democratic front movement everywhere, however, it displays in each country specific characteristics in ideology, class composition, organizational structure, and tactics and program which arise out of the different objective conditions and traditions. Only if these special features are carefully taken into consideration can the movement be built successfully.

The developing democratic front in the United States, like that in all other countries, has its own peculiarities in make-up, outlook and modes of activity. These peculiarities grow naturally from the particular American economic, political and social situation, as well as out of the history of our people. Such specific features are of both objective and subjective

character, and they exert a very important influence on the building of the movement. In this article, corresponding to the theme of the present series, I shall deal only with three of these American special features, primarily from an organizational standpoint. These three phases are of a key character and upon a clear understanding of them depends the success of our work in the respective spheres of mass agitation, mass organization and mass struggle.

## 1. THE SPECIAL ROLE OF THE MASS AGITATOR IN THE UNITED STATES

The first specific American feature derives from the fact that for many years past the mass agitator has played a role relatively much greater in the United States than in other comparable countries—England and pre-Hitler Germany, for example. Ever since the days of the American Revolution our history has been studded with mass upheavals led by popular champions ably exercising tongue and pen. Among these, in the field of religion, were the many sectarian and revivalist movements iden-

tified with such typical figures as William Miller, Joseph Smith, Moody, Sankey and "Billy" Sunday. In politics also vast surging movements of the people have followed one another, with able mass orators and organizers at their head: from "Sam" Adams, Patrick Henry, "Tom" Paine, and Thomas Jefferson, down through Andrew Jackson, Fanny Wright, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Abraham Lincoln, Horace Greeley, Peter Cooper, Susan B. Anthony, Henry George, and William Jennings Bryan, to Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the labor movement, too, there has been the same general phenomenon of great succeeding waves of organization and struggle, led by such eloquent spokesmen of the workers as Thomas Skidmore, W. H. Sylvis, Ira Stewart, Albert R. Parsons, Eugene V. Debs, William D. Haywood, and John L. Lewis. Similar tendencies are to be seen in other mass phases of American life, with the popular agitator playing a very prominent role.

The marked responsiveness of the people of the United States to the mass agitator, especially during periods of economic crisis and political tension, originates in a number of peculiarly American conditions, all closely interrelated. These several conditions sum up to a general weakness historically of established institutional controls over the masses strong enough to command their opinions and allegiance. The relative lack of such controls has given the masses the opportunity and necessity largely to shape their own opinions, a fact which has opened the door wide for the mass agitator and the sweeping

popular movements so characteristic of American history.

Thus, the absence of a great state church or other dominant religious body in the United States, such as exist in many European countries, left the way clear for the mass revivalists and sect builders. Likewise, in politics, the decentralized nature of the state, the nebulous character of the political parties, and the existence of a relatively high degree of democracy, made the typical American political mass agitator both necessary and inevitable as a shaper of mass opinion. In the labor movement, also, the failure of the workers for historical reasons to build up a Socialist perspective, a strong party of their own, broad trade unions and a powerful proletarian discipline, made them peculiarly susceptible to the mass agitator during periods of economic and political stress. The dynamic force which gave great power to all such popular movements in the various spheres was the extreme rapidity and ruthlessness of American capitalist expansion, with its swift destruction of remnants of feudal traditions, fierce exploitation of the masses, periodic deep industrial crises and booms, wholesale shifting of the people geographically and industrially, etc.

In the main the outstanding American mass agitators through the years have been democrats; that is, progressives and radicals who came forward in critical days to mobilize the people for struggle against exploitation, autocracy and oppression in various forms. The capitalists and great landowners, for their part, in order to dominate the masses relied chiefly upon their ownership of industry

and the land as well as their pretty general control of the state, the press, the schools, the churches and other institutions for molding the mass mind. Nevertheless, to combat the recurrent surging movements of the masses, they have always understood quite well how to develop reactionary mass agitators, as exemplified, among many other instances, by the notoriously demagogic "log cabin and hard cider" in the Harrison presidential campaign of 1840, the McKinley "full dinner pail" trickery in the middle nineties, and the demagogy of those reactionary tools, the Coughlins, Townsends and Longs of our days. And as the capitalist crisis deepens, American reactionaries, like the fascists abroad, necessarily have more and more recourse to the use of demagogues in order to confuse and mislead the masses.

The traditional susceptibility of the American people to the mass agitator persists and is much accentuated nowadays by the present critical economic, political and military situation. Many of the historical factors creating this susceptibility to agitation still continue to operate, such as the workers' lack of a socialist perspective and a strong political party. These are supplemented by a number of new factors tending to increase this susceptibility, namely, the confusion of the masses' perspective by the economic crisis and the war, the great democratic ferment among the people, and the insidiousness of the new type of red baiting, demagogic promises and war propaganda of the reactionaries—all of which sharpen the ears of the masses to agitators, both progressive and re-

actionary, who come among them. Characteristically, extra sensitiveness of the American people to agitation was an important factor, not only in the great mass sweep of New Deal sentiment, but also in the lightning-like spread in recent years of various panacea movements—Technocracy, Epic, Utopians, Share-the-Wealth, Townsend Old-Age Pension Plan, Coughlinism, etc.—many of them of a fascist or semi-fascist character.

Obviously, the acute responsiveness of the American people to the agitator makes the whole question of mass agitation doubly vital in the building of the democratic front. Therefore, the utmost attention must be given to the matter not only because of the positive need to win the people for the democratic cause by good agitational work, but also in realization of the urgent necessity to protect the susceptible masses from the intense, widespread and dangerous campaign of demagogy and war propaganda now being carried on by the reactionaries.

While building great mass organizations to develop a firm discipline, clear thinking and united action among the people—the only sure bulwark against reactionary demagogy—it is for the democratic forces a most vital question to secure a much greater influence than they now have over the basic means of shaping the popular mind, especially the press, the radio, and the motion picture. At present these three great mediums of public education (and mis-education), which are far more extensively developed in the United States than in any other country, are almost entirely in the hands of the reactionaries and are being assiduously used by them to

poison the minds of the people. Wartime censorship tendencies add to the danger. Reactionary control over these vital channels of popular information must be resolutely challenged and broken by the democratic and peace forces. To this end a program to democratize them should be formulated and followed out.

First, regarding the press: it is necessary that the official press of all parts of the growing democratic front, including that of the progressive sections of the Democratic Party, the trade unions, the farmers' organizations, etc., should be greatly extended and improved. Also, in every important city, by organizing their purchasing power, the democratic forces can get a hearing through at least one privately-owned daily paper. More than this, the progressive movement should boldly challenge the right of the great reactionary newspaper owners to continue to monopolize and misuse their vital quasi-public institution, the press; it should insist by boycott, by legislation, and by other forms of pressure, upon the right to present its cause, free of charge, in the columns of these enemy papers; the great press of the country must be democratized.

Secondly, the question of the radio also should be tackled boldly from several points. The present virtual monopoly of the reactionaries must be broken and the radio opened to freer use by the people. To begin with, the organizations of the democratic front should become more radio-conscious and should send their message out over the air upon all possible occasions, increasing their budgets for this purpose. They should also demand

stations of their own and the establishment of municipally-owned stations in all important cities. They should likewise insist upon a democratization of the Federal Communications Commission and the development of a broadcasting code which will effectively prohibit commercial programs from carrying reactionary propaganda and which will also provide ample and equal free radio time for the people's organizations for the discussion of political questions.

Third, in democratizing the motion pictures, which have long been an important vehicle for reactionary agitation, the most effective need is to boycott films of an objectionable character and to give organized support to those which reflect the interests of the people. Already a start has been made in this direction. Certain results recently achieved in improving Hollywood films show the effectiveness of the use of democratic mass purchasing power in this field.

While securing a stronger voice for democracy through the press, the radio and the motion picture, the people's forces also will have to pay closer attention to being better heard through those other powerful molders of public opinion, the universities and schools, the theater and the pulpit; in the first case by fundamentally democratizing the at-present reactionary controlled education boards; in the second, by the mass organizations seriously building up the present weak people's theater movement; and in the third, by thoroughly organizing the growing progressive elements among church leaders.

That the growing American democratic masses possess the very impor-



tant specific feature of an exceptional responsiveness to the agitator is clear. The answer to this characteristic must be for the democratic front forces to pay special attention to the whole question of mass agitation and to see to it that its work in this basic sphere is raised to the highest possible level of effectiveness. To do this is of fundamental importance, if the fascist agitators and warmongers are to be checked and the cause of democracy and peace advanced.

## 2. THE ABSENCE OF A WORKING CLASS POLITICAL PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

The second important specific feature of the developing American democratic front is the fact that—due to the presence of free land during many decades, the relatively more favorable economic and political conditions for workers in the United States, the instability of class lines, the influx of vast numbers of immigrants with varying languages and national backgrounds, etc., all of which combined to check the growth of class consciousness and a Socialist perspective—the workers in this country have not yet built a mass political party of their own, such as has been developed by the working class of many countries. From this fact, as we shall see presently, vital consequences flow. Its importance is stressed by the further fact that the farmers and city petty bourgeoisie also have not organized separate parties of their own. The Socialist Party in this country, and its split-off, the Social-Democratic Federation, are insignificant in size and mass influence and appear destined to

remain so. The Labor (and Farmer-Labor) Party movement still remains small and weak—New York and Minnesota being its sole important strongholds. Nationally it by no means commands the allegiance of the main body of the working class. The Communist Party, although 100,000 strong and steadily growing, does not yet have a decisively broad working class following.

Although they have not yet developed a mass independent class party, the workers of this country are nevertheless breaking gradually from the hegemony of bourgeois political leadership and are moving rapidly to the creation of a real political solidarity. This broader solidarity takes the shape of a political alliance of workers, farmers, professionals and other toilers—a great democratic front. Within the framework of this democratic front the workers are tending to set up their own class political organization through such formations as Labor's Non-Partisan League, the American Labor Party, and the gradual building of the Communist Party into a mass party, which functions ever more effectively as its vanguard.

For the purposes of this article the important thing to note in this general connection is the fact that in those countries where the workers have set up broad mass political parties of their own, this development necessarily implied a sharp break with the ideology, structure and methods of work of the bourgeois parties. Whereas, in the United States, where there is no dominant working class party there has been no such break. Instead, as the democratic front develops, it does so by means of a com-

plex series of transitional steps in ideology, structure and methods of work from those prevailing in the two capitalist parties and out of which the democratic front is being born. The American workers, now disconnecting themselves politically from capitalist party control, have no definite programmatic goals or thought-out organizational patterns in mind to serve them as guides, such as would be the case with Social-Democrats, Communists, or even Farmer-Laborites. On the contrary, as they go along they adapt their movement to the current needs of the masses—regarding points of view, organizational structures and political activities. The same thing is true of the farmers and city petty bourgeois elements as they advance towards independent political action.

The consequent transitional forms in ideology, structure and methods of work, which multiply as the democratic front movement advances from lower to higher political levels, are enormously important. To take these changing forms carefully into consideration is decisive for success or failure in building the democratic front. Here let us briefly look at a few of them:

First, with regard to the workers' evolving ideology: in the main its present transitional stage is represented by a rapid weakening of capitalist illusions and a heavy loss of faith in the capitalist system among the workers; it is also expressed by the growth of vague theories of "production for use," demands for "a new order of society," the springing up of panacea movements, etc. The workers, although undoubtedly moving away

from the capitalist ideology, are still very unclear as to where the capitalist crisis is leading the country and what the ultimate remedies are for their increasing economic and political difficulties. Their old traditions are giving way only gradually to new perspectives. The great mass of workers as yet do not see definitely beyond an immediate defense of their living standards, democracy and peace, within the framework of the present system. This ideological short-sightedness is a grave weakness, since it exposes them to all sorts of reactionary, fascist and Trotskyite demagoguery. The workers, therefore, with their own experiences as the main object lessons, must be taught the basic meaning of the capitalist crisis and the possibilities and limitations of securing relief under the present system. They must be made class conscious and given a socialist perspective.

Ideologically their fight to defend and extend democracy here and now must be linked up with the struggle for eventual socialism. Especially on the basis of explaining the democratic and peace role of the U.S.S.R. and destroying the slander that "fascism and communism are the same," the workers must be shown concretely that socialism provides the only final solution of their problems. This strengthening of the workers' perspective will enable them far better to build the democratic front and to fight for its immediate demands, and it will also give to the working class the necessary hegemony within this broad people's movement. In the carrying out of such fundamental educational work, the great responsibility falls upon the Communist Party, which is *at once*

the party of socialism as well as the most conscious and determined fighter for the immediate needs of the working class and the oppressed masses.

Secondly, with regard to its changing organizational structure, the present transitional stage of the democratic front is expressed by the growth of a whole series of new, diverse and developing forms as the masses acquire clearer viewpoints, greater solidarity and more independent political organization and action. Among these various transitional organization forms are the crystallization of the New Deal wing in the Democratic Party and the progressive elements in the Republican Party, the Labor and Farmer-Labor Parties of the New York and Minnesota types, organizations such as the Washington Commonwealth Federation, Labor's Non-Partisan League and the A. F. of L. and railroad unions' political committees, united front movements of the youth, Negro, women, foreign-born and peace advocates, broad people's legislative conferences, organized pension movements, and various other formations—all of which, loosely cooperating and without any definite, coordinated organizational plan as a guide, constitute the growing democratic front. (Another extremely important but adverse transitional organizational situation in the midst of the growing democratic front is the split between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., provoked by A. F. of L. reactionaries.)

In building the democratic front, the progressive forces must adopt these many transitional organizational forms and shape them to the needs

of the masses for greater solidarity and more united action. Their constructive features must be developed; their conservative hangovers eliminated; and thus the natural path of the movement towards a higher unity of the people smoothed and broadened. Blueprint organizational shortcuts have to be avoided on pain of disaster. The whole loose democratic front movement, now rapidly in transition, tends towards consolidation into a great alliance of workers, farmers, professionals and small business elements. But this trend must not be arbitrarily climaxed into a party on pain of a serious split in the ranks of the masses.

Thirdly, just as the democratic front displays transitional forms in its ideology and structure, so it does also in its methods of political work. Inasmuch as the democratic front is developing largely out of the ranks of the old parties, it naturally starts out pretty much with the standard methods of work developed over a long period of time by these parties. But, confronted with new and urgent tasks, it is rapidly changing these old methods, discarding those unfit for a progressive mass movement (such as the exploitation of crime and vice for political purposes), modifying others (such as patronage, political "fixing" and the "personal touch"), and adopting new methods made necessary by its new needs (popular political education, broad political activation of the masses, etc.). To understand this whole process of the evolving methods of work of the democratic front and to speed it up is vital to the advance of the movement as a whole.

In *The Communist* for February of

this year, in my article entitled: "New Methods of Political Mass Organization," there is presented a more detailed analysis of these transitional forms in ideology, structure and methods of work—developed by the workers as they go on building the democratic front and their own class political formations within it. The whole question, of basic importance, deserves the closest attention.

### 3. THE HIGH MILITANCY OF AMERICAN WORKERS

So far we have indicated two specifically American organizational features of the democratic front: the first of these being the key to mass agitation, namely, the fact that the American people are especially susceptible to the mass agitator, and in consequence the very great importance of good agitational work; and, the second, the key to democratic front organization work, the fact that the American working class has not yet built up a broad mass political party, with the resultant many transitional organizational forms. Now we come to the third specifically American feature of the democratic front—the key to work in the sphere of mass struggle. This is the relatively high degree of militancy possessed by our workers, both native and foreign-born.

Capitalism in this country (for the reasons outlined above) has not yet produced in the great mass of the workers class consciousness and a socialist perspective; but it has nevertheless infused them with a strong fighting spirit and class solidarity. Over a long period of years this keen militancy has been a pronounced

feature of the American class struggle. So much so that up until the development of the post-War revolutionary upheavals in Europe, hardly a working class anywhere, except in Russia, had such a record of prolonged and bitter struggles as had the workers in this country on the economic field.

The high militancy of the American workers has been evidenced historically by such intense struggles as the great national railroad strike of 1877, the Homestead and American Railway Union strikes of 1892 and 1893, the great eight-hour general strike of 1886, the numerous heroic battles of the Western Federation of Miners and the Industrial Workers of the World from 1890 to 1920, the many brave strikes of the United Mine Workers in West Virginia, Colorado, Alabama and other coal fields; the huge post-War strikes of 1919-23 in the steel, coal, textile, meat-packing, marine, lumber, and other industries; the general strikes in Seattle and San Francisco in 1919 and 1934; the recent great C.I.O. sit-down strikes; and a whole series of similar hard-fought struggles. These strikes—scores of which developed into armed clashes with gunmen, police, and troops—were as resolute as they were militant. Thus, characteristically, sometimes miners' strikes—the national bituminous strike of 1927, for example—have lasted more than a year, a record seldom equalled abroad; and during the many bitter American strike struggles, hundreds of workers died through violence caused by the employers.

American workers have also traditionally shown their militancy by periodic, widespread and militant re-

volts directed simultaneously against the brutal employers and their agents, the conservative trade union leadership, who helped provoke such internal revolts by doing all possible to hold the workers inactive in the face of fierce exploitation. Thus, explosive upheavals within the labor movement have occurred in this country with a frequency and on a scale unparalleled anywhere else. Typical were the generation-long dual union struggle of the I.W.W. against the A. F. of L. from 1905 onward; the national switchmen's and railroad "outlaw" strikes of 1919, the T.U.U.L. independent unions of 1929-34, and the broad C.I.O. movement of today.

Many forces have combined to produce this characteristic high militancy of the American workers which has expressed itself by bitter strikes and inner-union revolts. Among the more important are (a) the crass brutality and ruthlessness of American capitalist exploitation in industry and in repressing the workers' strikes, a condition which has inevitably drawn a fighting response from the workers; (b) the frontier and revolutionary traditions of the people, as well as existing democratic institutions, which accustomed the masses to stand up boldly for their rights; (c) the stimulating effect of large numbers of immigrants with revolutionary traditions.

In connection with the high militancy of American workers, it is necessary to note its characteristic of bursting forth explosively in great waves of struggle during periods of severe economic pressure or industrial expansion. The workers in all capitalist countries have exhibited this

tendency in some degree; but nowhere has it shown itself so sharply as in the United States. Our labor movement, historically, has tended to go along quietly until the accumulated economic pressure brought on a big outburst or offensive, after which there resulted another period of relative calm. Examples of these typical offensives were the great strike upheaval in the 1830's, which founded our trade union movement; in the latter 1860's, which launched the National Labor Union; in the 1870-80's, which established both the Knights of Labor and the A. F. of L.; in the World War period; and the wide organizing movement of the C.I.O.; and now, with the outbreak of the imperialist war, we are apparently upon the verge of another such forward movement. It has been during these great waves of struggle that the American labor movement has made its greatest growth; its progress has been rather by a series of great leaps than by a steady advance.

Already in 1886 Engels noted the explosive-like character of the American workers' movement, its tendency to burst forth suddenly into great offensives. Speaking of the big strike wave of that year, he said in a letter to Florence K. Wischnewsky:

"The way in which they (the 'newly fledged proletariat of America') have made their appearance on the scene is quite extraordinary. Six months ago nobody suspected anything, and now they appear all of a sudden in such organized masses as to strike terror into the whole capitalist class. I only wish Marx could have lived to see it." \*

---

\* *The Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, p. 449. International Publishers, New York.

The high militancy of American workers, expressed characteristically by recurring periods of intense struggle followed by long intervals of relative inaction, demonstrates at once both the strength and the weakness of our labor movement. On the one hand, it shows that American workers fight best on the offensive (or counter-offensive), in situations when the emotional factor is strongly at work among them. At such times they are capable of the most spontaneous, rapidly-spreading, tenacious and militant struggles. By the same token, with its recurring offensives and periods of calm, American labor history shows that our workers are weakest in the day-to-day union building work which, for example, was one of the strong points of the Social-Democratic unions in Germany and other countries and which the Communist Parties of today raise to still greater heights.

American workers, lacking in political training, organization and discipline, always have been weak in persistent plugging work and instead of making a relatively steady struggle have tended to go off explosively from time to time in big offensives against the employers and the conservative trade union leaders. It may be added that the workers have been further encouraged in this general direction of big offensives by the "drive" tendency common generally in American life, exemplified, among other things, by religious revivalism, business men's sales drives, "hurricane" recruiting campaigns of fraternal orders, and the like.

To a very considerable extent other sections of the growing demo-

cratic front, especially the farmers, also display these same qualities—great militancy, high spontaneity and periodic waves of struggle. All of which lends the whole phenomenon added importance.

The first great lesson to be learned from the foregoing is the need to cultivate the strong point of our labor movement; that is, the high militancy and spontaneity of the workers. Although the recent wide extension of trade unionism and mass political organization will tend somewhat to steady the working class and other toilers in action and to reduce the role of simple spontaneity, this element remains a powerful factor, especially in times of economic and political tension such as the present. As American workers fight best on the offensive, we must understand how to organize and launch such offensives, without, however, falling into any "putschist" policies of trying artificially to precipitate these movements. We must know how to deepen and extend them when they begin in an organized manner or spontaneously, how to realize all their possibilities, by raising the political level of the struggle, by setting hitherto inactive masses into motion, by directing the movement towards practical and achievable ends, by building up the organization during the struggle, and by effective follow-up work.

The history of the American labor movement is strewn with the wreckage of big offensives, more or less spontaneously launched by the workers, but which were not well-led and which achieved only a fraction of their potentialities. It is very neces-

sary, therefore, to understand thoroughly the strategy and tactics of the offensive. Especially is this the case now when the war situation will rouse the militancy and fighting spirit of the workers and probably start them off upon one of their characteristic counter-offensives. In my article in *The Communist* for May, entitled, "The Technique of the Mass Campaign," I analyzed in detail many of the problems of the offensive as they confront the democratic front.

The second basic lesson emphasized by the analysis of the American workers' high militancy is the need to strengthen the trade union movement in its weakest aspect organizationally; that is, in its inadequate day-to-day work of building. It is not enough that the movement go forward by its characteristic series of recurring sweeping offensive. It must also know how to progress during periods of relatively little struggle, by dint of good administration methods and patient brick-by-brick work and by means of a persistent fight for better leadership in the mass organizations instead of the periodic revolts which have played such a big role in American labor history. The fact that both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. have been going ahead in the recent not very favorable economic situation shows an advance of the trade unions generally in the day-to-day type of work. For the workers to learn this *Kleinarbeit* is no less necessary than for them to know how fully to exploit their characteristic militant wave-like offensives. To help in developing this type of detailed day-to-day work, by precept and example, is a major task of the Communists.

#### THE KEY TO DEMOCRATIC FRONT ORGANIZATION WORK

In the foregoing pages I have pointed out the three most important specifically American features of the democratic front in the spheres of mass agitation, mass organization and mass struggle. In order to build the democratic front most effectively the work in the phases of agitation, organization and struggle must be prosecuted in the light of a clear recognition of these features.

Thus, (a) all questions relating to carrying on general political educational work must take carefully into account the central fact of the relatively great responsiveness of the American people to mass agitation and hence the vast importance of fully utilizing and democratically controlling all major means of influencing the public mind—the press, radio, motion pictures, theatre, universities, pulpit, (b) all questions relating to the point of view, structure and activities of the people's mass organizations must center around the basic fact that the workers in this country have not taken the leap forward of building a great independent working class party but are passing ahead by a complicated evolution whose many unique transitional forms of ideology, structure, and methods of work must be individually cultivated or eliminated as the solidarity needs of the masses require, (c) all questions relating to mass struggle must similarly revolve about the elementary fact of the comparatively high degree of militancy among American workers, with its implications of furthering its positive expressions of aggressive offensives

and of improving its negative aspects of weak day-to-day administrative and organization work.

The progressive forces constitute the great majority of the American people, but they are very weakly organized and have ill-defined perspectives. Herein lies the great danger of defeat in the crucial 1940 elections, and herein also is emphasized the tremendous necessity for more effective political-organizational work. In the great task of building the democratic front there is hardly any phase more important than that of clarifying the

many complicated questions originating in the specific American features of the democratic front, as indicated above, and of drawing the proper conclusions therefrom. This is a broad and vital problem in whose solution the Communists have great responsibility; it is a real test of the Marxist-Leninist qualities of our Party.

*[The next installment of Comrade Foster's series of articles on mass organization, entitled "Lenin and Stalin as Mass Leaders," will appear in the forthcoming issue.—The Editors.]*



---

# THE PLACE OF VENEZUELA AMONG THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONS OF LATIN AMERICA

BY JUAN PIRELA

*General Secretary of the Communist Party of Venezuela*

VENEZUELA has been known in the past as the country of the oldest dictatorship in America, where for over twenty-eight years there were not to be found even the most elemental vestiges of democratic life. It has been a country of the most horrible tortures, the most frightful prison punishments. Venezuela is equally famous for its gigantic production of petroleum. It is a country of which the expeditions of imperialist trusts relate fabulous tales of mineral riches, as though the potentiality of its subsoil were inextinguishable. But the land is almost entirely unknown in its contemporary and most important aspect, the struggle of the masses for a democratic government, for peace and national well-being.

The death of Juan Vicente Gomez, who was in power for twenty-eight years, marks the beginning in Venezuela of great political changes. Since December, 1935, the date of that occurrence of national significance, there have developed great democratic struggles, in which the offensive has passed at periodic intervals from the hands of the people into the hands of

the reactionaries, and vice versa. In general, during this period of struggle, reaction has not been able to gain supremacy. Despite a series of blows suffered by the democratic forces, despite repressive governmental measures against some sections of the democratic movement and its leaders, reaction has not been able completely to exclude at any one moment the progressive forces that in the main have determined the democratic character of the present regime.

President Lopez Contreras and his democratic supporters consequently have been able to vary their position in accordance with the development and the organization of the mass movement. The heroic resistance of the Venezuelan people has created in reality conditions which, if utilized by a united popular movement, will lead to the transformation of Venezuela, in a more or less short period, into one of the columns of continental democracy and into a barrier against the efforts of the fascist powers to conquer the country and use its wealth in their wars of aggression. This fact is significant, not alone for our continent, but

for the anti-fascist struggle throughout the whole world, because Venezuela is the greatest exporter of crude petroleum, and because it is geographically close to the Panama Canal, which Mussolini has called an Italian frontier.

THE POPULAR STRUGGLES WERE ABLE  
TO BREAK GOMEZISM\*

The popular movement, repressed during a period of more than thirty years, now surges against the forces that placed Gomez in the government and which are now trying to maintain intact the repressive machinery created by him during his long regime. The desire of the people to liberate itself from political oppression was confronted with the machine guns of Galavis, Governor of Caracas, when on February 14, 1936, the masses filled the streets in the principal cities of the country, demanding the re-establishment of the constitutional guarantees that had been suspended with the initiation of the new regime. That day will also go down in history because it was then that the successor to Gomez issued his historic February program, which synthesized the most deeply felt desires of the Venezuelan people. The program reflected the democratic will and aspirations for economic well-being that was expressed in many great demonstrations, which in Caracas included more than 60,000 people. The fundamental objective of the mass movement to smash Gomezism, despite its spontaneity, has been basically achieved.

The three and a half years following that February 14 can be character-

\* The oppressive dictatorial regime of Juan Vicente Gomez.

ized as a period in which the democratic forces have tried to consolidate their victory, to create their political parties, to gain positions in the elective organ of the state. Working class sections, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and other democratic forces have organized themselves into the first party of the country's contemporary history, the Progressive Republican Party, which has an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist program that aspires to represent the democratic interests in a national revolutionary sense.

*Orve*, a loose grouping led by bourgeois-democratic elements, reflecting the impetus of the popular movement, has played a progressive role and taken a militant position beginning with the June strike, which will be discussed later. The National Republican Union, genuine representative of sectors of the national bourgeoisie, although it has had connections with imperialist enterprises, has been organized with the aim of struggling against the continuation of Gomezism. Although these organizations have functioned primarily in Caracas, similar organizations have been organized throughout the entire republic.

The working class is organized for the first time in the history of Venezuela into powerful trade unions that play an outstanding role in determining the course of political events in the country. Great strikes have occurred, the majority victorious in achieving important demands—wage increases, union recognition, application of social legislation, etc. The strike movement includes all the sectors of the working class, particularly in the basic industries. The unions have proceeded to create regional fed-

erations, and finally succeeded in achieving national unification of the trade union movement at the congress of workers that created the Venezuelan Federation of Workers in Caracas in December, 1936.

The Communists have all along participated actively in the mass struggles. During that period, the Communists acted in the organizations and political parties that were formed; but they did not act as an independent force, as the Communist Party. They were unable in that period to organize centralized leadership, either in the states or nationally. The reorganization of the Communist Party was achieved in the conference held in August, 1937.

Furthermore, in that period the Student Federation was reorganized and, reviving its historic traditions of struggle against Gomezism, was able to achieve mass proportions and to play a role of the first order in all the political struggles. Also, for the first time, the Venezuelan women participated in the political struggles. Through the Feminine Cultural Center they organized an important campaign of cultural work.

The central weakness of that entire period lay in the fact that popular unity was not achieved, that the working class, lacking sufficient organization and mature leadership, could not exert its leading role in mobilizing sufficiently the peasant masses who desired to participate in the struggle. That desire was demonstrated in spontaneous actions, such as strikes of agricultural workers and the seizure of land in different states, particularly in the states of Lara and Yaracuy.

The efforts of the masses to organize involved the most violent battles

with the forces of reaction. When the congress appointed by Gomez, which had not been changed, attempted to pass a monstrous Law of Social Defense, there took place the general strike of May, which prevented the realization of the reactionary objectives. Once again reaction attempted to pass the same law under another name. The working class responded with another general strike in June, this time with less support of the other democratic sectors. Thus, it was able only to modify the repressive objectives of reaction. None the less, reaction gained posts in the Cabinet.

The struggles culminated in the ore workers' strike, begun on December 14, 1936. The importance of this strike is tremendous. The working class faced its bitterest enemy, the omnipotent petroleum enterprises, the allies of fascism, enemies of President Roosevelt. The broad national sectors of the people recognized the eminently anti-imperialist character of the strike. They recognized that not only were the interests of the petroleum workers at stake, but also the sacred interests of the nation. Hence, they expressed their solidarity in a form without precedent in Venezuela. The strike lasted 43 days. The collections amounted to thousands and thousands of bolivares.\* A great number of farmers contributed considerable quantities of fruits, livestock and funds. The highest sectors of the national bourgeoisie of the most important cities adopted hundreds of workers' children for the period of the strike. After 43 days of heroic struggle, this great con-

---

\* The bolivar was worth  $3\frac{1}{4}$  cents in United States currency in mid-September, 1939.—*The Editors*.

flict of the Venezuelan nation against its oppressors was partially won, since the workers achieved a small increase in wages and the fulfillment of some of the more important obligations which the new labor legislation had won from the new regime.

Following this great struggle, the mass movement entered into a phase of decline. Reaction, basing itself on the existing penal legislation by means of persecution, jailing and a ferocious anti-Communist campaign, inspired by the Rome-Berlin Axis, was able to strengthen its positions. The political parties, which up to now had not been able to consolidate themselves, were dissolved or forced into illegality. Outstanding leaders of the democratic movement were expelled from the country. A new Cabinet with a reactionary majority was organized.

#### REACTION UNABLE TO CONSOLIDATE ITS POSITIONS

Reaction, despite the repressive methods and the numerical preponderance that it achieved in the cabinet, and especially in the state governments, was unable to consolidate its positions. The masses resisted by all methods—strikes, demonstrations and particularly in electoral activity.

In the elections for Councilmen and Deputies to the state assemblies in June and October, 1937, held in four states, reaction suffered a complete defeat in the Federal District and in the states of Zulia and Tachira, obtaining victory only in the small state of Nueva Esparta. This electoral triumph of democracy was lost in the case of Zulia through the annulling of the elections.

In the polls of September, 1938,

the democratic forces showed once again their unquenchable will to save Venezuela from the clutches of reaction and fascism, scoring victories in a series of states and once more in the Federal District.

Reaction tried to provoke the working class, prohibiting the celebration of the First of May and designating July 24, the date of the birth of Simon Bolivar, as a national day of the workers. That day saw in a number of cities powerful demonstrations. In Caracas 50,000 demonstrators demanded the immediate abrogation of the most reactionary regional governments, as well as other important immediate democratic demands. This active resistance of the masses was once more reflected in the Cabinet which was reorganized in August, displacing the most aggressive representatives of reaction, as well as some state presidents. These victories demonstrated the ability of the President of the Republic to reflect the pressure of the popular movement. Another proof to that effect has been the partial abolition of the decree of expulsion, continued in February, 1938.

All this indicates that Venezuela is on the eve of a new upsurge of the democratic movement that must lead the country to take its place in the united stand of the American nations for the defense of our hemisphere from fascist aggression and for the application of the Good-Neighbor policy.

#### THE STRUGGLE FOR UNITY OF THE VENEZUELAN PEOPLE

The Venezuelan democratic movement, in spite of its youth, has made

efforts from the very beginning to achieve unification. This has its origin in the peculiar conditions in which the Venezuelan struggles take place.

The democratic Venezuelan movement was initiated after fascism had been enthroned in Germany and Italy and while it was in the midst of its world war offensive. Mussolini was then engaged in subduing Ethiopia and Italian-German fascism was conducting its brutal invasion against the heroic Spanish republic.

The Venezuelan democratic movement was also launched after the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, at which Comrade Dimitroff summarized the world experiences in the struggle against fascism and outlined in masterful form the central tactic for opposing and defeating fascism.

In addition to the activities of a broad united front character as expressed on February 14, the May and June strikes, and particularly in the oil workers' strike, there were partial, conscious efforts to organize movements of a people's front character. The most important of these was the April bloc, which brought together all the existing democratic parties, the Progressive Republican Party, Orve, and the National Republican Union, in opposition to the advance of reaction. The progressives attempted again at the end of 1936 to organize a single party of all the Left forces, grouping together the Progressive Republican Party, Orve, the Student Federation, the Workers' Fronts, the National Democratic bloc (Regional Party of the Zulia state),

as well as other dispersed democratic forces.

The shortcoming of these efforts lay in the fact that they tended to restrict the unity of the people to the most militant sections of the population, omitting progressive sections decisive in the democratic popular movement. These attempts at unification would perhaps not have failed, if the leadership had not consisted almost entirely of individuals of a very marked revolutionary character.

Among the mistakes making for such restriction were the calling of strikes, without taking into consideration all the factors involved; excesses in the press; and the incorrect struggle against clericalism, including the demand for the expulsion of the Jesuits.

When the democratic movement began to understand the incorrectness of its narrow and sectarian tactics, the reactionary forces had won the preponderance in the government and the democratic movement was declining. Efforts were made to broaden the movement through the Democratic Venezuelan Party under the leadership of General Jose Rafael Gabaldon, a progressive landowner. This attempt continued to suffer, however, from sectarian hangovers.

Even though the creation of this party was the last attempt in the formation of a broad democratic front, the orientation toward such a front has continued to find expression in varied activities, particularly in electoral struggles.

Electoral victories have recently placed some state legislatures in the hands of progressives (Apure, Guarico). Those achieved in Miranda y

Aragua were annulled by the courts. The national congress now includes democratic senators and deputies, the latter to the extent of forty. These gains have been the result of broad people's front activities. It is important to stress the fact that the democratic forces have on every occasion participated in the elections in a united manner.

WE MUST SAVE OUR FATHERLAND FROM  
FASCIST BARBARISM

Venezuela is undeniably, because of its oil wealth and its geographical position, one of the territories most desired by international fascism. Mussolini has stated that the frontiers of Italy are in the Panama Canal, and Hitler holds that Venezuela was the first colony in German history. Bent on splitting the democratic movement and on smashing it by all possible means, reaction is engaging in wholesale bribery and election fraud. It is resorting to reprisals frequently rivalling those of the Gomez period, as in the state of Zulia. Finally, it is feverishly preparing armed insurrections in close alliance with international fascism.

One of the main maneuvers of the fascists has been to surround Lopez Contreras with the aim of inveigling him into turning back from the democratic path, however timidly he has pursued it. Thus, the fascists try to prevent the contact between Lopez Contreras and the popular movement. They are endeavoring to secure the failure of parties like the Agrarian National Party, organized on an anti-fascist basis, with a program of peasant demands for recovering some of the most important wealth of the

nation, a party, moreover, that is aiming to be a government party.

Fascism furthers its aim through its allies in the interior of Venezuela—Elbano Mibelli, Governor of the Federal District; Luis Geronimo Pietri, Minister of the Interior; and Alfonso Mejia, Secretary to the President of the republic. It follows a policy of penetration similar to that conducted in other Latin American countries, namely, securing the largest possible number of public positions for fascist elements, endeavoring to undermine the armed forces of the nation, attempting to win recruits for fascist ideology in the army and navy, securing the sending of officers to Germany and Italy for military study. All these internal activities are coupled with preparations for an insurrection, centering in the Colombian frontier, where the fascists are openly conspiring, creating illegal arsenals in big plantations owned by outstanding reactionaries in Venezuela and Colombia.

Against these efforts to add to the torments already suffered by the Venezuelan people, a fascist regime of terror that will bring division into the land, aligning whites against Negroes, submitting the Negroes and Indians to forms of oppression unknown in the country's history; that will destroy all freedom, including the right to worship; that will ravish the natural wealth of the land, as it has done in Czechoslovakia, Austria, China and Spain—against these efforts, Venezuela must rise united, as one man.

A great national front of resistance to fascism must be the supreme aspiration of all Venezuelans, of all who

cherish the glorious heritage which the country's liberators left the people.

Elements for a minimum program for uniting the democratic forces have been outlined by General Lopez Contreras, under mass pressure, even though carried through in a very inconsequential manner. The democratic front of peace and national well-being must base itself upon the general foundation of the February 14 program, which aims at the re-establishment of democratic rights, the improvement of the economic conditions of the people, and the reconstruction of the national economy, a program that served as a basis for the three-year plan launched by the government of Lopez Contreras in 1936.

This program, accepted in its essentials, must be brought up to date, in order to meet the new problems that have emerged since it was initiated. The Law of Public Order, ever-present reminder of the dark past, must be relegated, together with the shackles, to that historical epoch beyond which we are advancing. Amendments to the electoral law and the constitution must be introduced to revitalize the democratic life of the country. Above all, pressure must be exerted for the repeal of Article 6, which slanders and outlaws from public activities some of Venezuela's best sons who have given the highest proof of patriotism; which divides the popular forces, depriving them of the legal cooperation of the Communists, the most devoted and consistent defenders of democracy.

The question of reconstruction involves, not only the formulation of a plan, such as the former three-year plans, but also the mobilization of

the masses for its realization. The execution of such a plan can be insured only by placing in the government elements that have given proof of their democratic character. In such elements Venezuela is rich.

The Venezuelan people, with recognized international and Pan-American traditions; whose soldiers fought for the freedom of five nations, Peru, Equador, Colombia, Bolivia and Venezuela, aspire to fulfill in this critical hour of history the international role that they have taken over from their ancestors. The idea of Pan-American unity, to combat the attempts at reconquests by European powers, was born in the mind of the most glorious of Venezuela's liberators, Simon Bolivar.

Now that Hitler and Mussolini, through their lackey, Franco, have issued the slogan for re-establishing Spain's colonial empire, over Latin America, of Spain for the Venezuelan people, it is a question of honor for the peoples of Latin America to defend their revolutionary historic heritage by placing themselves in the front of the struggle against fascist barbarism both in the Western hemisphere and throughout the world.

This front assumes in our hemisphere the form of President Roosevelt's Good-Neighbor Policy, which was considerably strengthened by the decisions of the Lima Pan-American Conference, and which found its highest expression in the resolutions of the conference of Pan-American democracy held at Montevideo. To this front, the people of Venezuela must rally with the zeal that has marked all of its struggles for liberty.

On the occasion of the Lima Con-

ference, the Venezuelan government took the first steps in this direction. Nevertheless, the basic guarantee of participation in a democratic policy for the defense of our hemisphere must be a truly *national* democratic policy, which struggles against the voracity of the fascist imperialists who, in alliance with the national reactionaries, seek to destroy internally Venezuela's newly-won freedom. Such a democratic policy must enable the people to obtain greater benefits from their national wealth, especially from the oil resources.

Venezuela needs, besides, an immigration policy. The slogan of Juan Bautista Alberti, "To populate is to govern" must be realized. Venezuela can today carry through this slogan under exceptional conditions, by adopting the best sons of Spain, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Germany, as agricultural and industrial workers; as writers, artists and men of science.

Certain sections of Venezuelan public opinion are discussing the calling of a constituent assembly. Should this demand be put forward at the present moment? We consider it premature. The central task of the anti-fascist struggle today is the unification of the people for the consolidation and extension of democracy. The slogan for the constituent assembly, which is not accepted by sections of the people, will not contribute to this unity. At the present moment the majority of the people should exert their efforts to correct the most anti-democratic features of the constitution. In the process of the struggle for the direct vote, for universal suffrage that should include women and il-

literate, against Article 6, against the Law of Public Order, etc., it will be possible to lay the basis for a definite modification of the fundamental charter.

After indicating the basis and the broad character that the unity movement should have in Venezuela, it is necessary to make use of the experiences of the past in order to work out the slogans and the forms which that movement must utilize.

In the past the democratic movements acted primarily under the slogan of "Struggle against Gomezism." But this slogan, having played an important role in the past, is not specifically applicable to the situation today. The reactionary forces of Venezuela have an entirely different character from that which they had under Gomez. Reaction, as already indicated, is now being led and inspired by international fascism. The relatives and adherents of Gomez are now endeavoring to lead Venezuela through a dark path of another type. They are no longer Gomezists, but national traitors of a new variety, under the service of fascism. Besides handing over Venezuela's wealth to greedy imperialist enterprises, they would make the country an outright colony under the most brutal form of tyranny known to history.

This slogan, furthermore, restricts the broad national unity indispensable for the anti-fascist struggle, maintains the rancors and resentments of the past, and thus places obstacles to the unification of the nation's democratic and progressive forces.

Recent experiences have shown that the forms of the movement must have the utmost flexibility. It has



been this flexibility which has succeeded, despite the persecution of certain democratic leaders, in enabling the people to engage legally in such political activities as elections, demonstrations and press publication. The masses have discarded all those parties whose dogmatic rigidity has placed obstacles in the path to legal action. The combinations that have been formed for electoral purposes are one of the organizational forms that will lead to that great front of national reconstruction to which the Venezuelan people aspire. By creating similar united front organizations to struggle for other economic, political and cultural aims, the people will march toward their common goal.

#### THE ELECTIONS OF 1940 AND THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The congressional and presidential elections which will be held in January are now the central topic in the political life of the country. The presidential election is conducted in Venezuela in a most complex manner. The president is elected in both chambers in joint session. In 1940, half of the chamber that will elect the president will be elected. Consequently, this parliamentary election acquires special significance. The people must win this election to indicate to the members of parliament already elected the aspirations for peace, progress, well being and national unity. There can be no doubt that the overwhelming desire of the people is that the candidates should carry out the program already initiated. To insure this, the democratic forces must, as in past elections, unite at all times

behind one single candidate capable of defeating reaction. The slogan must be: "Not one single seat for the enemies of the people!"

The activities for the presidential election will be intensified after parliament has been elected. The people will have to exert its maximum influence to secure the unity of the democratic forces in the Chamber around one single presidential candidate pledged to a program of democracy, national reconstruction and the people's well being, in order to defeat the candidate of fascism and reaction.

In the present historic conditions, and, above all, in consequence of the development of its policies following the death of Gomez, the Communist Party of Venezuela will support the candidate who responds in a definite and indisputable manner to the most democratic positions that have at times characterized the administration of General Lopez Contreras, and who will make these positions the basis of his administration.

These positions have been practically expressed in a series of measures in the political field, and in economic and international policy. Politically, Lopez Contreras re-established the democratic regime in the country after February 14. Despite a series of concessions to reaction, shown by reprisals against the democratic movement and by maintaining within the governmental apparatus known agents of international fascism and of the Creole reaction, fundamentally the democratic forms of government have been maintained, as evidenced by the existing electoral liberty; freedom of the press and speech, though

restricted; freedom of trade union association and the right to strike.

From the economic point of view, Lopez Contreras, representing fundamentally the interests of the national liberal bourgeoisie, has, because of the growing upsurge of the people's movement, permitted the working class to struggle for economic betterment, and has introduced progressive social legislation, notably, the Law of Labor and the Decree of Division of Profits, and has taken steps for the re-establishment of social security.

To the exploited agricultural masses, agricultural credit has been extended to a certain degree. The government, under pressure, has divided and parcelled out some of the great plantations that belonged to Juan Vicente Gomez, and has permitted the organization of farmers' leagues.

In the sphere of international relations, the government has championed the general principles of the Good-Neighbor Policy of President Roosevelt. It has established better relations with the governments of the United States, Colombia and Mexico. It maintained diplomatic relations with the republican government of Spain until the treason of Casado, Besteiro and Miaja. It has given asylum to a number of German refugees, and is now at the point of admitting a shipment of Basque Spanish refugees.

The reactionaries lack sufficient forces to face the people alone in the next presidential election. Their game is, therefore, to play for time. With their tactic of discrediting General Lopez Contreras and separating him from the democratic forces, they are

occupied with the task of prolonging his presidential period by two years, in contravention of the constitutional provision, which they hope to turn against him. They are also working to strengthen their position in the interim, and they have not lost hope of swinging Lopez to their side.

Lopez Contreras has answered the maneuver by declining to continue in office beyond the term fixed by the constitution. The Communist Party cannot do less than welcome this new proof of his democratic sentiments. If Lopez Contreras is consistent in this attitude, he will pass into history as the first president to give an exceptional example of citizenship, to respect his oath to the people, and to carry out his promises to the whole nation. All the democratic forces of the country must be mobilized to express their approval of the attitude taken by the president.

#### THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND ITS ROLE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

The Communist Party, reorganized under conditions of illegality at its Conference of August, 1937, is transformed more and more each day into an important political factor. It has participated actively in the political life of the country since the death of Gomez. By means of its press and of a concealed radio station, which has been operating for the past fifteen months, it has been able to have its word reach the working masses of the people in general. Its modest successes are indisputably due to the fact that it is the inheritor of the best traditions of struggle within the country, as well as from without, where

there have been exiled hundreds of fighters against tyranny. Among the emigrants, the most militant Venezuelans, those who played an important part in the continental anti-imperialist struggle, have been won over to Communism. Among these are Gustavo Machado and Salvador de La Plaza. The Communist Party was the first party in Venezuela to be organized against the Gomez dictatorship with a program that represented the people's desire for national liberation and social well-being. For long years its members were subjected to the ire of the jailers of that regime which stopped at nothing in its endeavor to destroy their unquenchable loyalty to the working class and to the Venezuelan people.

In the great struggles that followed upon the death of Gomez, the Communists played an important part. They gave political consistency and orientation to the mass movement. They raised the fundamental problems of the masses, defending their interests and placing themselves in positions of struggle which were necessary for the democratic movement. Reaction and fascism unleashed against the Communists all the fury of their campaigns of calumny and infamy. Reaction used chiefly the argument that Communists are elements of disorder—in face of the fact that the position of the Communists, past and present, in Venezuela and in the rest of the world, gives the lie to this slander.

The Communist Party has as one of its fundamental tasks the destruction of this campaign of calumny; the gaining of legality and the right to carry out its constructive program,

in collaboration with all progressive forces, for the unity of the people, for the defense of the economic and political interests of the struggling masses, for the defense of our country against the offensive of fascist penetration and conquest, for the complete realization of the rights which the constitution gives to every Venezuelan.

The Communist Party desires legality, in order to struggle more effectively against all kinds of coups, against all kinds of disorder, which serve today only to create favorable conditions for the plans of reaction and fascism; in order to unmask the provocateurs, the Trotskyites, the splitters and adventurers, who, in one form or another, impede the unification, the strengthening, and the moral elevation of the democratic movement; in order to thwart those who would foment Red-scare and alarm among some sections of the people, whom reaction tries to use in order to carry out its sinister plan of fascist domination.

The Communist Party desires legality in order to give its support in more efficient form to all the popular forces that struggle for the nation's recovery from the consequences of the ruin to which it was led by the past regime.

The struggle for the legal status of the Communist Party is intimately connected with the fight for the complete repeal of the Decree of Expulsion of February, 1937; for a broad amnesty to include all the Venezuelan lovers of democracy, so that those Venezuelans who have dedicated the best part of their lives to the struggle against the tyranny of Gomez, and

who are at present legally prevented from collaborating within Venezuela for the solution of its problems, may be permitted to return to their country.

The Party's growth in numbers and influence, and the achievement of its legality will present new and difficult tasks.

The most urgent is the Marxist-Leninist education of the Party, which is being carried on under the most unusual conditions. Due to the terror which swayed during the entire generation, the labor movement has developed under conditions of complete lack of working class literature and of relations with the international working class movement. In this sense, the government of Lopez Contreras has maintained the policy of its predecessor. The Communist Party of Venezuela, despite its strong efforts, has not been able effectively to assimilate the decisions and resolutions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International or to familiarize itself with the subsequent international experiences. The

indispensable works of Lenin and Stalin are all too insufficiently known to the Party. The Party must, in a very short time, solve this very urgent problem. Particularly, it must make the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* the possession of every one of its members.

The Party has to solve the problem of cadres. The education of the Party, in the spirit of Lenin and Stalin, will forge new forces, and will contribute to the re-education, in the light of specifically Venezuelan conditions, of its present leaders.

In the solution of Venezuela's great problems, the Communist Party counts on the experiences of its brother Parties of Chile, Cuba and Mexico, which, in recent years, have transformed themselves into mass parties, playing a role of recognized importance in the maintenance of democracy within their countries. The Communist Party of Venezuela also counts on its brother Party of the United States of America, and particularly on its leaders, Comrades William Z. Foster and Earl Browder.

---

# THE PLUNDER OF AUSTRIA

BY ALFRED L. WEISS

THE passage of the Austrian economy into foreign Prussian hands, *i.e.*, its systematic plunder by German finance capital, is continuing without abatement.

Hardly a single sector of Austrian economic life has remained unaffected by the rule of the fascist robbers. The apparatus of *Gleichschaltung* (coordination) has in its grip industry and commerce, trade and agriculture, currency and foreign trade, prices, taxes and customs duties, as well as the whole vast field of social insurance. The consequences have been devastating.

The economy of Austria had specific and special characteristics which consisted in the fact that Austrian industry continued after the collapse of the Hapsburg monarchy to supply the states which arose in its place. Vienna, until very recently, played a dominant role in the Balkans and the Near East as a capital market and a capital conversion center, despite a far-reaching decline. Austria was in a position to secure a relatively high living standard for its population because it was largely self-sufficient in agriculture, because its advantageous geographical situation enabled it to function as a transit intermediary, because its production of high-quality industrial products enabled it to

export, and because its scenic beauty brought foreign tourists.

These were the conditions which made the propaganda for the annexation of Austria to Germany so unpopular among all strata of the Austrian people, including wide sections of the industrial groups. Austrian industry could only maintain itself against the overpowering force of German competition by means of high protective tariffs. After the annexation, therefore, transit or inland duties would have been necessary to replace the former protective tariffs if Austrian industry was to be maintained in the face of the sudden flood-tide of German competition. Instead of this, all barriers were dropped. The policy of gradual undermining and dissolution of Austrian commerce from within which was followed with considerable success by German commercial, industrial and banking capital even under the Schuschnigg era, was now given free rein.

Economically the annexation of Austria meant a single and continuous transfer of ownership to Germany. The passage of the *Kreditanstalt*, which controlled more than two-thirds of Austrian industry, into the hands of the *Deutsche Bank*, meant that the sharks had swallowed their first prey. The most efficient enter-

prises were annexed to German concerns; in the others, activity was ruthlessly halted. The Goering Works, acting with the most shameless lack of restraint, is plundering Austria and transforming it into a colony; it has already taken over Alpin-Montan (Austria's greatest steel plant) and in the past few months has also seized the Steyer-Daimler-Puch Company, the Styrian Steel Works, the machinery and car foundry in Simmering, and the Pauker Works. The Leobersdorfer machinery plant also passed into German hands. German firms own almost the entire Austrian cement industry.

An unparalleled robbery was the "Aryanization" of the Austrian textile industry, which predominantly belonged to Jewish industrialists, as, for example, the Schwadorfer, Oberwaltersdorfer and Leibnizer cotton, spinning and weaving mills. German concerns also own the electric power and products industries, the chemical industry, certain railroad lines, newspapers and motion picture producing companies. Germans also have a firm grip on the wholesale trade, as well as on the former tobacco and salt monopolies, which have been liquidated and placed into private hands.

While Austrian economy as a whole has been experiencing a steady decline, the German steel kings Krupp, Thyssen, Henkel, and the Austrian industrial barons, Schoeller-Bleckmann and Boehler, who made common cause with them in looting Austria, have been reaping unprecedented super-profits. Schoeller, for instance, for the first quarter of 1939, showed a clear 33 per cent increase in net profit over the corresponding period

in 1938; the Hirtenberger cartridge plant paid 14 per cent in extra dividends. Also profiting from the feverish armament production are the cement and brick industry, the Allgemeine - Elektrizitaets - Gesellschaft - Union (Electricity trust), the Siemens Works, the Solo Company, the Semperit Rubber Works, as well as most of the sawmills which are cutting the vast timber forests of the Austrian Alps at a destructive pace for fortification construction work.

On the other hand, numerous medium and small business concerns have been in the grip of a severe crisis, most sharply seen in the rapid decline of exports. Within one year under Nazi rule Austrian exports have fallen about 50 per cent. As a result of the violent coordination of Austria into the framework of German trade and clearing agreements, as a result of the forced transition from production of quality goods to mass production methods, as a result of the price increases which followed the transition to the mark standard, Austrian economy has been hit most severely. How devastating this crushing coordination must have been may be seen from the fact that no recent figures have been published concerning Austrian foreign trade.

Especially catastrophic has been the offensive of German monopoly capital on Austrian handicrafts and retail trade. The world famous Vienna handicrafts industry is ruined. Nine thousand four hundred Jewish handicraft establishments were closed—they were "organized," *i.e.*, sucked dry. This has been brought about through the use of compulsory examinations required for master artisans.

As a result, many artisans, mostly the Czech master artisans, of whom there were many in Vienna, have failed. Retail traders too have been swept away; two thousand retail businesses have been "de-Judaized"; 3,500 are at the brink. Those who profit from this are the warehouses and the branches of German commercial firms, which are springing up like mushrooms.

The peasants, particularly those in the Alpine districts, have been hard hit by the plundering Nazis. Misery in the villages is chronic, and the flight from the land is breaking through all restrictions. According to official reports, more than 20 per cent of peasant holdings in Imst (Tyrol) are lying idle; and in Landeck (also in the Tyrol) as many as 25 per cent.

From this general picture, one may imagine the difficult situation of the Austrian worker. The speed-up which, in the Nazi terminology, is called "production increase," is at a killing pace. Although the index for the armament industries stocks is on the increase, requests for increases in wages are rejected on the cynical pretext that the profits are small. Despite the brutal terror, the resistance of the splendid Austrian workers to this slave-driving system is growing. It is epitomized by the slogan: "Produce according to our wages."

Since the Nazis seized power, the real wages of the Austrian workers have declined about one-third. According to the March 2, 1939, report of the Vienna Institute for Business Research, the pay of a machine operator in the paper industry fell about 14 per cent, that of an assistant in the woodworking crafts almost 10 per

cent, bookbinding 8 per cent and of a weaver about 37 per cent. This decline is entirely understandable, because, instead of being paid with the former Austrian schilling currency, the worker receives only its German exchange value of .66 marks, though food and other necessities cost as many marks as schillings, or more.

Previously, it was essential in estimating real wages in Austria to see that rents were low and taxes not too onerous. Tenant protection, which has had considerable importance in Austria, has been for the greater part destroyed by the Nazis. Now, moreover, to the previous taxes has been added the new German tax on wages, ranging from 1 to 4½ per cent. The results are a very marked diminution of real wages. A determining factor of real wages in the past was the cheapness of consumer goods. A striking rise in prices has accompanied the scarcity of goods brought about since the annexation in such articles as meat, butter, eggs, groats, rice, coffee, tea, coal, coke and woolen goods. Even according to the falsified official figures the cost of living rose 9.4 per cent in 1938. The frightfully rapid increase in the cost of living in Austria is especially marked in the price of meats, fruits and vegetables. The supply of calves and hogs in Vienna has declined from 40 per cent to 50 per cent, and that of fruits and vegetables from 25 per cent to 40 per cent.

These facts clearly indicate the degree and the consequences of the plunder of Austria by rapacious German monopoly capital. At the same time, the devastating consequences of the "equalization" Austrian social se-

curity measures to those of Germany must not be forgotten. The riddling of the social laws is particularly evident in the destruction of the eight-hour day and its replacement by 10- and 12-hour shifts. Furthermore, workers have lost their many previous social and political rights.

The results of one and a half years of Nazi rule in Austria have been frightful. All branches of the economic and cultural life bear deep scars of devastation. This systematic spoliation of Austria, which sometimes appears like a senseless rape of

human energy and of the rich natural resources of that country, cannot be entirely explained by the hunger for profit or of raw materials by the German war industries. Rather, it can more easily be explained by the fact that the growing resistance and will to freedom of the Austrian masses does not add to the security of the Nazis. The Nazis feel that sooner or later they will be forced to relinquish their booty. This accounts for their policy of plunder and repression against Austrian economy.



---

# MARKOFF'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF MARXISM

ABRAHAM MARKOFF

May 11, 1887—August 29, 1939

BY MOISSAYE J. OLGIN

ABRAHAM MARKOFF died in the prime of his life, while his work as head of the Workers School and as teacher of Marxism-Leninism was still developing, growing in scope and depth. Although death interrupted his activities, his numerous friends and former students, indeed the Communist Party as a whole, are deeply conscious of the fact that the decade during which he headed the Workers School was a time of unprecedented advance in the influence of Marxism-Leninism in the United States, an advance to which the contributions of Comrade Markoff are incalculable. In this respect, notwithstanding his premature death, Markoff completed a most fruitful chapter in his life.

It was no accident that Markoff's most fruitful work began about 1929. Several circumstances combined to create both the demand for a more earnest study of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice and for agencies capable of satisfying that demand in the United States. The economic debacle of 1929 proved to the thoughtful the utter helplessness of bourgeois economic theory, a seemingly "solid" science, equipped with limitless possibilities of research and taught by

thousands of eminent scholars. Something was wrong with a science, the best among progressives realized, if its profoundest representatives could publish a few months before the crash a volume, *Recent Economic Changes*, the result of years of study, without detecting the inevitability of the coming collapse.

On the other hand, critical minds could not escape the thought that there must be something in the hitherto little-heeded theory of Marxism-Leninism which was able, one year before the crash, to predict, through the words of Joseph Stalin, that the crisis in America would be even deeper and more disastrous than in the European countries. The demand for a more thorough understanding of Marxism-Leninism grew rapidly both among workers and intellectuals.

Another circumstance arousing interest in the teachings of communism was the launching of the First Five-Year Plan in the U.S.S.R. The republic of workers and peasants was undertaking to enlarge and modernize its industrial basis in accordance with the most advanced technical science and to place its small-holding peas-

ant agriculture on the solid foundation of large-scale cooperatives, as necessary preconditions for the building of socialism. The U.S.S.R. was moving with full force "to catch up with and overtake" the most advanced capitalist nations. Thinking America gasped. Socialism was actually being introduced. Unemployment was disappearing. While America with its colossal mass-production industries was stagnating and millions of its workers were starving, backward Russia was raising the standard of living of all her toiling people through the building of a new, socialist economy. The interest of America in the Five-Year Plan was great. This inevitably increased the interest in Marxism-Leninism, the theoretical basis and the guide to action of socialist construction.

While thus the demand for Marxism-Leninism grew, the Communist Party, by ridding itself of the Trotskyites in 1928 and of the Lovestoneites in 1929, became better fitted to satisfy the demand. The Party was guided by Marxism-Leninism ever since its foundation in 1919; but the factional struggle that developed early in its existence, and Lovestoneite opportunism which crystallized into the "theory" of American "exceptionalism" hampered the work of spreading Marxism-Leninism as a living science. How could a Lovestoneite contribute to the understanding of Marxism-Leninism in the United States, when it was a main dogma of Lovestoneism that the United States was exempt from the effects of the general crisis of capitalism (the ill-famed "theory" of "exceptionalism")? How could a Trotskyite teach Marx-

ism-Leninism, when it was a dogma of Trotskyism that socialism could *not* be built in the U.S.S.R., that "the building of socialism in a single country is impossible"?

Only after the expulsion of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, when the Party began to grow in unity, mass activity and numbers, was it possible for it to devote attention to Marxist-Leninist theory to an extent demanded by the growing struggles in the United States and the attendant awakening of mass interest in economic and political theory. The Workers School became one of the major sources of instruction in Marxism-Leninism. As the outstanding leader of the Workers School, Abraham Markoff rose to his full stature as leader in the dissemination of Communist principles, as mentor to teachers of Marxism-Leninism, and as a teacher himself.

Comrade Markoff was deeply loved by all who studied under his guidance, because he typified the ideal qualities of a Bolshevik instructor. His manner of teaching was always warm and friendly. He always approached his students with the utmost sympathy for their problems, their uncertainties or confusion, always trying, through personal attention, to aid them. He enriched his teaching with numerous vivid episodes drawn from the wealth of his own experiences in the working class movement—episodes dating from his boyhood in tsarist Russia. Thus, theory, as taught by him, was never dull or abstract, but vibrant with life. His method was that of a scholar; but because he had thoroughly identified himself with the working class, it was

never academic. He can be described rather as a working class scholar and organizer. He was one of those intellectuals originally coming from the middle class, who, once convinced of the correctness of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, devote all their energies, all their abilities, all their time, all their thoughts and dreams to the Party and its work.

Because of his keen insight and warm sympathy, his students, long after they had completed his courses, continued to consult him for advice. Busy as he was, Comrade Markoff always took time to listen with the utmost patience and attention to those who sought him and to do his best to assist them. In this way, his personal influence extended far beyond the confines of his classrooms. Comrade Markoff was endeared to so many thousands of workers, not only because as a man he embodied the finest qualities, but also because he typified to them so well the attributes of the Party of the working class.

\* \* \*

The Workers School under Abraham Markoff considered Marxism as a "theory that constitutes a living force, that is being continually enriched by the experiences of the class struggle." "Workers' education, based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, becomes an invincible force in the labor movement," said Markoff.

"The materialistic interpretation of history, the dialectic approach to the world and its phenomena, gives the student a means for the clear understanding of world events; it opens up a new vista of the struggles of the past and throws light on many things which seemed obscure. The dialectical-

materialistic philosophy teaches one to see clearly the relation of class forces at a given time, and thus to understand the reasons for the events. Dialectical materialism is the very essence of Marxism-Leninism. The strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its ability, not merely to interpret events, but also to show the way out. In the words of Karl Marx: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it." \*

Markoff held out before his students and impressed upon them what the new *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* says about the essence of creative Marxism:

"The Marxist-Leninist theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, nor must the Marxians themselves be regarded as pedants and learned blockheads. The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the labor movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of a communist society. As a science it does not and cannot stand in one spot—it develops and perfects itself. It is understandable that in the course of its development it cannot but enrich itself with new experiences, new knowledge, while certain of its theses and conclusions cannot but change with the passing of time, cannot but be replaced by new conclusions and theses that correspond to the new historical conditions."

This understanding of Marxism-Leninism, Markoff tried to embody in the Workers School. The Workers School, under his direction, fulfilled a three-fold task: it equipped the more developed among the workers with the fundamental teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin; it developed from the best of the work-

---

\* A. Markoff, "Fifteen Years of the Workers School" in *The Fifteenth Anniversary Celebration Journal of the Workers School*, December, 1938.

ers and intellectuals new Marxist-Leninist instructors; and it created that demand for Communist literature and for Communist explanations of events in America and the world over which stimulated Marxist-Leninist analysis and moved many authors, even in the universities and colleges, to pay serious attention to Marxism-Leninism.

The Workers School under Markoff became the center of Marxist-Leninist schooling in the United States. It was only natural that it should branch out and influence the creation of other centers in the principal cities of America.

Markoff was organizer, builder and leader of the various workers' schools and also of special training-courses for Party functionaries. In addition to his tireless organizational work, he was an indefatigable instructor, one who threw his whole heart into his teaching.

To Markoff must go the major share of the credit in creating and molding a Marxist teaching staff of first-rate calibre. In the development of the Workers School, Markoff, as the director, was faced with many problems and difficulties. This is no ordinary school, provided with an endowment and sustained by high fees. The regular professional teacher would not qualify for the type of instructor required by the school. Markoff set the highest standards for himself and expected others to meet them too. Teachers in the school had to be people with sound theoretical grounding in the science of Marxism-Leninism. But mere book knowledge is not sufficient by itself. The knowledge of the teachers regarding the

theory and practice of the labor movement had to come, not only from books. The teachers had to be drawn from among active participants in working class activity, men and women with a variety of experiences within the labor movement.

Such a faculty, which was to be the mainstay of the school, did not exist anywhere in America ready-made, nor could it be created overnight. One had to know how to attract the proper people. One had to know how to take young promising material and mold it into shape. One had to be wise and patient and possessed of wide knowledge and experience himself. One had to be able to inspire and encourage and at the same time criticize and evaluate. All these qualities Markoff possessed in abundance. It was his patient guidance, wise leadership and warm encouragement that inspired young men and women whom he gathered around him to do their best work and meet these high standards. It was his great contribution to the Party and to the labor movement that he created the first group of real and highly qualified Marxist educators who carry on his work.

Markoff made every effort to have America—living America, its labor movement, its political realities, its social struggles—studied in the Workers School, knowing that the light of Marxism-Leninism enables our people to understand our country better. While he himself devoted his major work to teaching the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he attracted many instructors who could give courses on the various phases of American life. Special atten-

tion was given to the study of the history and problems of the Negro people. The Workers School under Markoff has given many courses in the history of the American people, of the American labor movement, of American political parties, and of current political issues.

The rich curriculum of the Workers School needed supervision, cohesion, unity of outlook; and here is where Markoff's leadership came into play. Under his leadership, the Ruthenberg Library of the Workers School was established and developed into an institution of considerable service. Furthermore, classes in the Workers School became a means of promoting the distribution of Marxist-Leninist literature. It was the duty of every instructor to bring into the class magazines, pamphlets and books carefully selected by the Workers School management to assist the student in pursuing his independent study. Brief talks on the meaning and value of the Party publications, in the course of lectures, led many students to buy the literature, not only for themselves, but for their friends. Thus, the Workers School enormously assisted the dissemination of working class literature. Similar methods were also followed at the popular forums sponsored by the School.

Markoff gave detailed attention to his lectures. From the notes and out-

lines left after him, it is clear that he prepared himself very carefully. We have before us the outline which he prepared for a lecture on "Education and the Social Order." The outline occupies nine closely written pages, and there are several pages of quotations, clippings, and source references. The outline is replete with examples from American educational practices. The broad theoretical premises are buttressed by facts. This is an example of how carefully Comrade Markoff kept abreast of developments in education and other fields.

That his work was immeasurably appreciated was evident, not only from his popularity with the students, but also from the general growth of the Workers School. From 1929 to 1939, the number of students increased from about 2,000 to 9,000.

In spite of the tremendous task of directing the Workers School, Markoff found time to devote much energy to other Party activities.

He and his work were one. One could not think of Markoff outside of his work. One could not think of the Workers School without thinking of Markoff. One will never be able to think of the progress of Marxism-Leninism in the United States in the present decade without thinking of Comrade Markoff.

This is his monument. It cannot be destroyed.

---

# AN ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE BASIC KNOWLEDGE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

FOR THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE "HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION"

BY EMILIAN YAROSLAVSKY

**T**HE *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, published a year ago, laid the basis for a new and powerful ideological advance in the life of our Party and the entire Soviet people. The cadres of our Soviet intelligentsia have realized that this history is not an ordinary literary compilation, but a book embodying tremendous work on the part of the Central Committee of our Party, a book to which the Central Committee attaches great significance because it is a short encyclopedia of basic Marxist-Leninist knowledge.

Comrade Stalin himself took a direct part in compiling and editing the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. In fact, he rewrote the text anew, altered almost all the chapters, and wrote in their entirety a whole number of important sections, such as Part 2 of Chapter IV, and the conclusion.

Just before the book went to press, Comrade Stalin, together with the full membership of the Commission of the Central Committee working on the book, again made a careful examination of all the formulations contained in the text. To achieve the

work, Comrade Stalin went anew over a tremendous amount of literature on questions of the history of our Party, on Marxist-Leninist theory, and, first and foremost, the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. When the work was published in *Pravda*, conferences of propagandists in Moscow and Leningrad discussed methods of reorganizing propaganda work on better lines and of establishing the study of the history of the Party on a better basis.

The Central Committee attaches enormous importance to the teaching of the history of the Party, to its study and to the problem of raising to the necessary theoretical level the entire work of propagating Marxism-Leninism. The Party Central Committee itself is an example to all Party organizations of a Bolshevik attitude toward propaganda problems. It shows all of us that there is no such thing as being unable to find time for theoretical work, for the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory. It is well-known that Comrades Stalin, Molotov and Zhdanov are very busy people, yet they find time for theoretical work.

We frequently repeat the Marxist-

Leninist truth that without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement, that without revolutionary theory work goes on in blind fashion, people lose their perspective of development, their orientation, and their confidence in the correctness of the road they are following. However, many who repeat this statement still do not take the trouble to engage in the study of theory or are unable to organize their lives so as systematically to enrich their ideological knowledge. Yet, if one correctly organizes his work, one can always find time for the study of Marxism-Leninism.

In publishing the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union set itself the task of providing all the most important facts of the Party's history in the most concise form, in one book, the task of profoundly illuminating these facts with Marxist-Leninist theory, of generalizing the gigantic experience of the Bolshevik Party.

Previously, the study of the history of the Party was poorly organized. The former textbooks did not satisfy the high demands made by the Party Central Committee. The abundance, in these textbooks, of varying points of view which frequently ruled one another out, compelled the Party Central Committee to provide a single, comprehensively tested, scientific guide to the history of the Party. It was necessary to do away with the gap between Marxism and Leninism, on the one hand, and between Marxism-Leninism and the history of the Party, on the other.

Many propagandists, who considered themselves fully capable of teaching the history of the Party, have proved to be very much embarrassed. Some of them, as the experience of the present year shows, have been unable to state the basic principles of dialectical and historical materialism. However, this is just as though a chemist were to say that he has a splendid knowledge of chemistry, but knows nothing about the Mendeleev system, or as though a mathematician were to say that he has a splendid knowledge of mathematics, but cannot solve an equation containing unknown quantities.

#### HOW THE "HISTORY" TEACHES MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY

The study of dialectical and historical materialism helps us master the method of learning the laws of nature and of society. If we have not mastered this method, we cannot understand the path of social development, we cannot pursue a correct line of behavior or correct tactics; for our tactics flow from a profound understanding of the driving forces of the revolution and of the laws of social development. This knowledge cannot be acquired unless we make a study of Marxist-Leninist theory and of historical and dialectical materialism.

Marxism-Leninism is no dogma, but a guide to action. It is a powerful ideological weapon, which helps us to rout the enemies of socialism and to help forward the socialist revolution.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* shows how Marxist-Leninist ideas developed in a new epoch, the epoch of imperialism.

how Lenin and Stalin developed the theory of Marx and Engels in accordance with the new situation.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* has put an end to distortions of the history of the Party, has corrected errors committed in propaganda. The *History* is directed against vulgarization in the interpretation of certain problems of the theory of Marxism-Leninism and of the history of the Party.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* trains people, not on the basis of the biographies of individual persons, but of ideas. In this book, there is shown the development of such ideas as that of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the idea of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, the idea of the armed uprising, the idea of the development of the bourgeois into the socialist revolution, the idea of the victory of socialism in one country, the idea of Soviets as organs of power, and a number of others of the most important and advanced ideas of our time, which constitute the supreme achievement of the world proletariat. It is not only we who need to study these ideas; so also do the working people of all lands who are still faced with the question of overthrowing capitalism.

Comrade Stalin has defined the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* as Marxism-Leninism in action.

We must set ourselves the question: How, and in what degree, in studying the history of our Party, particularly in teaching it, should new material be employed? Let us take the exam-

ple of the elementary type of study circle where, as the Central Committee resolution regarding the organization of Party propaganda advises, it is necessary to conduct the teaching of Party history in a short and popular fashion. Above all, the question arises as to what theoretical literature to use. From its very first chapter, the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* contains as theoretical material the elaboration of the basic principles of Marxism, the teachings of Marx and Engels. Consequently, those comrades who have begun in the elementary circles to read the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have done the right thing.

Unfortunately, it often happens even now that people weaken before the difficulties of studying theory. We should be inspired, however, by the examples of the founders of our Party, Lenin and Stalin, who from their early youth, studied deeply the works of Marx and Engels.

#### COMRADE STALIN AS TEACHER

When Comrade Stalin was seventeen years old, he was studying Marx's *Capital*, without, of course, possessing the facilities that are now available to each one of us. In the whole of Tiflis, there was, at the time, only one copy of *Capital* in the library; the workers contributed their coppers in order to cover the fee for the book, found somebody to make copies of it, and studied *Capital* from the copies. With us, however, each one is in a position to procure all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin for himself. Our newspapers and journals publish articles and explanatory materials,



and one can apply for help on any question to special consultants.

Comrade Stalin has related the story of his first attendance at a study circle for propagandists. He was between seventeen and eighteen years of age, and, therefore, the old propagandists subjected him to careful scrutiny.

After attending the circle meeting, he was convinced that the teaching was being conducted in too boring and uninteresting a fashion for the workers, that the workers were not being drawn into the discussion of problems. The material studied was a textbook on political economy. The circle leader dealt first with the clan system, then with the slave-holding system, then with feudalism, and finally with the capitalist system.

Although the circle leader knew his subject, the lesson was dry and dull.

Comrade Stalin proposed a slightly different approach to the matter, and put forward his own plan of study, which he proceeded to follow.

At the first lesson, Comrade Stalin posed the following question before the students: "Why are we poor?" The workers themselves, who had to answer this question, began to think aloud. "Why are we poor?" "Because we possess no capital. Why do we possess no capital, while the merchants and manufacturers do?" The workers became interested, and were drawn into discussion. When, at the end of the lesson, Comrade Stalin summarized the problem and drew his conclusions, much that they had been told before became clear to them. The workers then understood the problem, and saw clearly the mechanics of capitalist society, of the exploitation

of the working people, and of the way surplus value was wrung from them.

At the second lesson, Comrade Stalin faced the circle members with the following question: "Why are we without rights?" The workers became interested in the problem, began to discuss it and pursued their discussion for several hours, clearing up their understanding of the political oppression that existed in tsarist Russia.

At the third lesson, Comrade Stalin raised the following question: "How are poverty and disfranchisement to be destroyed?" Comrade Stalin told the workers of the tactics and methods of the proletarian revolutionary struggle. All this stimulated the interest of the circle members. The workers understood why it was necessary to have a knowledge of the past, in order to understand the present, why it was necessary to understand the origin of classes. The lessons helped the workers to master the laws of social development and of the rise and fall of classes.

This example shows that at the outset of his revolutionary activity Comrade Stalin strove, as a propagandist, to arouse in his pupils a sense of independence, to strengthen their self-confidence in their ability, through their own efforts, to master theory.

#### HOW THE "HISTORY" STIMULATES INDEPENDENT STUDY

Students in classes must not be regarded as people incapable of independent study. On the contrary, everything possible should be done to instil in people a taste for their own

independent study of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* instills this desire in the reader.

In Chapter IV of this book, a splendid generalization is given of the ideological struggle for the establishment of the Bolshevik Party:

"The Bolsheviks wanted to create a new Party, a *Bolshevist* Party, which would serve as a model for all who wanted to have a real revolutionary Marxist party. The Bolsheviks had been working to build up such a party ever since the time of the old *Iskra*. They worked for it stubbornly, persistently, in spite of everything. A fundamental and decisive part was played in this work by the writings of Lenin—*What Is To Be Done?*, *Two Tactics*, etc. Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* was the *ideological* preparation for such a party. Lenin's *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* was the *organizational* preparation for such a party. Lenin's *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* was the *political* preparation for such a party. And, lastly, Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio Criticism* was the *theoretical* preparation for such a party." (pp. 140-141.)

In the various chapters of the *History* there can be found an exposition of, or references to, the basic classics of Marxism-Leninism. When studying the history of the Party, one should at least know the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin that are mentioned in the *History*, one should have them at hand and refer to them as they are dealt with in the text.

Let us give an instance. In Chapter IV, reference is made to the bloc between Lenin and Plekhanov, to the bloc between the Bolsheviks and the so-called Menshevik members of the Party in the period of reaction of 1906-08. A very brief extract is given at that point from a letter of Comrade Stalin to Lenin, written in exile,

in Solvichegodsk. It is very interesting to read the *whole* of the letter; then, it becomes clear *why* Comrade Stalin, though supporting this bloc, wrote that it was not destined to last long; that it was necessary to strengthen the Bolshevik faction, and to establish a political center of the Bolsheviks for the whole of Russia. The letter shows that, although Comrade Stalin was in distant exile, he carefully followed the events of Party life, was thoroughly in touch with them, had a splendid understanding of the entire circumstances of the political struggle, and gave useful advice to Lenin.

As another example, an extract is quoted in the *History* from an article by Comrade Stalin, written in April, 1912, about the Lena goldfield shootings. Upon reading the entire article, one immediately feels the pulse-beat of that epoch from Stalin's clear and profound lines.

Many comrades know from their own experiences that in the course of studying the history of the Party, many questions arise. It would be incorrect for these questions not to be answered. Unclear questions must be answered with the aid of both oral and printed explanations.

While the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* was being written, we asked Comrade Stalin whether it was not possible to dispense with the foreign, generally accepted, *scientific* terms, or, at any rate, interpret them in the text. Comrade Stalin was against this. He said: "Let people learn, develop; let them learn the significance of the various concepts."

In studying the *History*, even a fully qualified person may come across

passages requiring to be rendered more precise. Every unclear expression should be written down in a notebook, so that the reader will remember to secure a clear interpretation or definition. We should learn from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, from the old generation of Bolsheviks, doggedness and tenacity in mastering Marxist-Leninist theory.

Comrade Stalin has repeatedly made a study of the fundamental works of Marx, and on each occasion has made a brief record of the subject of his study. In 1910, when Comrade Stalin was arrested, the police found in his possession a notebook containing extracts from Marx's *Capital*.

This is an example of how we must turn repeatedly to the basic works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, because by "taking counsel" with them, we become enriched with new knowledge, with new historical experience.

#### THE "HISTORY" EXPLAINS THE RISE OF HOSTILE GROUPS

Certain unusual formulations are to be found in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. One such formulation deals with the struggle against the enemies of Leninism. Running through the whole of the *History* is the very important Marxist-Leninist thought that the appearance of the various opposition groups in the Party of the working class has resulted from the fact that the proletariat has not operated in some enclosed environment, has not been separated from other classes by a Chinese wall, but has been influenced by other classes. Particularly was this the case in Russia, where

petty-bourgeois spontaneity was predominant, thus giving rise to waverings and vacillations in the ranks of the working class. These vacillations even penetrated the Party. Economism, for example, was a reflection of the influence of the bourgeoisie on the working class. Menshevism, as a trend in the working class, was also the result of the influence of the bourgeoisie. Such trends as "God-building" and "God-seeking" reflected the influence of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat and its Party in the period of reaction.

The rise of various opposition groups in the Party, such as the Trotskyites, "Workers' Opposition," "Democratic Centralists," Right groupings, etc., is explained by the Party as being mainly the result of the influence of various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groups and trends. But at the same time, one of the sources of the rise of opportunism in our Party was the fact that a section of the Party's personnel had a poor knowledge of the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

In Chapter IX of the *History*, which deals with the transition to the New Economic Policy, we read:

"The Trotskyites and other oppositionists held that N.E.P. was *nothing but* a retreat. This interpretation suited their purpose, for their line was to restore capitalism. This was a most harmful, anti-Leninist interpretation of N.E.P. The fact is that only a year after N.E.P. was introduced Lenin declared at the Eleventh Party Congress that *the retreat had come to an end*, and he put forward the slogan '*Prepare for an offensive on private capital.*' (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XXVII, p. 213.)" (P. 257.)

Further, the *History*, explains:

"The oppositionists, poor Marxists and

crass ignoramuses in questions of Bolshevik policy that they were, understood neither the meaning of N.E.P. nor the character of the retreat undertaken at the beginning of N.E.P." (P. 257.)

Some comrades may say: "They did not understand; then, all that was the matter was that they were mistaken. Why, then, were they punished?" But the point is that we are not dealing only with the Trotskys, Bukharins and Rykovs, who were connected with foreign secret services and who pursued a deeply thought-out line of treachery. There were rank-and-file Party members who followed these traitors, because they were poor Marxists and were thoroughly ignorant in questions of Bolshevik policy, who did not understand either Bolshevik policy nor the character of the retreat undertaken at the beginning of N.E.P. "The misfortune of the opposition was that, in their ignorance, they did not understand, and never understood to the end of their days, this feature of the retreat under N.E.P." (P. 258.)

In studying the history of the Party, we must realize that two causes have determined the establishment of hostile groups: one—the existence of classes hostile to the proletariat, of alien groups, elements and sections hostile to the proletariat; and the other—ignorance in problems of theory, in problems of the history of our Party.

The resolution of the Central Committee regarding the organization of Party propaganda says on this score:

"It is necessary to understand that just this neglect of political work among the intelligentsia, among our cadres, has led to a position where part of our cadres who proved to

be beyond the political influence of the Party and were not firm ideologically, went politically wrong, became entangled with, and the prey of, foreign secret services and their Trotsky-Bukharin and bourgeois-nationalist agents."

#### THE "HISTORY" AFFORDS ENRICHMENT IN MARXIST-LENINIST KNOWLEDGE

The year's experience of the successful work of tens of thousands of comrades with the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, clearly shows how correct was the position of the Party Central Committee that it is a mistake to imagine that only a small number of Party workers can master theory. Marxist-Leninist theory is capable of being mastered. Especially now, with the existence of the Soviet power and the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., boundless possibilities exist for our leading cadres to master successfully Marxist-Leninist theory, to study the history of the Party, the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. To master the theory of Marxism-Leninism, states the Central Committee resolution, all that is needed is to display will power, pertinacity and firmness of character toward this aim.

When Lenin wanted to speak of overcoming some difficulty, he frequently compared the revolutionary movement with the ascent of a high hill. Lenin was very fond of hill-climbing, and he knew that it is sometimes difficult to get to the hilltop, but that once it is reached, new horizons are discovered. Our Marxist-Leninist theory opens very wide horizons before us in the movement, on our road toward the victory of communism.

The significance of theory was very

well expressed by Marx and Engels when they said that an idea becomes a material force when it takes hold of the minds of the masses. The idea of Marxism-Leninism is a great force. When Marx wrote *Capital*, Engels, in a letter to him, estimated this work as the most powerful ammunition hurled at the heads of the bourgeoisie. For us, Marxist-Leninist theory is the kind of weapon that has been tested through decades of our Party's history, throughout the entire struggle of our Party against the bourgeoisie and for socialism.

At the Eighteenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, Comrade Stalin said:

"It must be accepted as an axiom that the higher the political level and the Marxist-Leninist knowledge of the workers in any branch of state or Party work, the better and more fruitful will be the work itself, and the more effective the results of the work; and, vice versa, the lower the political level of the workers, and the less they are imbued with the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, the greater will be the likelihood of disruption and failure in the work, of the workers themselves becoming shallow and deteriorating into paltry plodders, of their degenerating altogether.

"It may be confidently stated that if we succeeded in training the cadres in all branches of our work ideologically, and in schooling them politically, to such an extent as to enable them easily to orientate themselves in the internal and international situation; if we succeeded in making them quite mature Marxists-Leninists capable of solving the problems involved in the guidance of the country without serious error, we would have every reason to consider nine-tenths of our problems already settled. And we certainly can accomplish this, for we have all the means and opportunities for doing so."\*

A year ago, in September, 1938,

\* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 46-47, International Publishers, New York.

when mobilizations were taking place throughout Europe, when it seemed that a general European war was on the point of breaking out, at that moment the members of our Party Central Committee and Comrade Stalin were participating, together with propagandists, in a discussion as to how to organize Party propaganda work, how to place on a proper basis the study of the history of the Party and of Marxist-Leninist theory. This was a manifestation of the supreme strength, wisdom, calm and confidence of the Bolshevik Party.

Our Red Army and Red Navy are splendidly armed. But this is not the entire armament of our country. The weapon of the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism is a source of tremendous strength for us. And if we make this theory the property of the millions of our people, we shall be still stronger and invincible.

The fascists are dragging modern society backward, to the Middle Ages, to misanthropy.

Marxism-Leninism is leading mankind on, toward development, toward the blossoming of all its creative powers, towards communism.

The oppressed peoples of the capitalist countries are becoming increasingly convinced of the great strength of the doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, of the invincible truth of the path along which we are being led by the Bolshevik Party. Let us make this path still clearer, so that the movement along it may become still shorter and yet mightier, so that, together with the working people of other countries, we may the sooner arrive at the complete and final victory of communism.

---

# PHILOSOPHICAL PRECURSORS OF MARXISM

BY S. KOLESNIKOV

**M**ARXISM, the most advanced and most revolutionary theory, arose as the generalization of the experience of the international labor movement, as the theoretical expression of the fundamental interests of the working class of all countries. From the viewpoint of theory, Marxism, as Lenin pointed out, was the continuation and the further development of the advanced ideological trends of the nineteenth century.

The immediate philosophical forerunners of Marx and Engels were the foremost German philosophers, Hegel and Feuerbach.

"When describing their dialectical method, Marx and Engels usually refer to Hegel as the philosopher who formulated the main features of dialectics. This, however, does not mean that the dialectics of Marx and Engels is identical with the dialectics of Hegel. As a matter of fact, Marx and Engels took from the Hegelian dialectics only its 'rational kernel,' casting aside its idealistic shell, and developed it further so as to lend it a modern scientific form."\*

Dialectics, in the condition in which it was left by Hegel, was useless as a scientific method of preception. Hegel developed dialectics on an idealistic basis. He considered that

a certain mystical absolute spirit, the Absolute Idea, is the creator of nature, and that the material world is the product of the Absolute Idea. Hence, and in justification of dialectics, Hegel made his starting point pure thought and not living, concrete reality. In his dialectics, as a doctrine of the development of the idea, of concepts and thought, Hegel, to use Lenin's expression, was able only to give a brilliant guess as to the dialectics of the development of the material world.

None the less, in the history of the development of philosophical thought, it is Hegel's great merit that he was the first to attempt to subject the metaphysical mode of thinking to all-around criticism. He tried, on an idealistic foundation, to prove the doctrine of development as a complex, contradictory process which takes place through "leaps," through the struggle of opposites. But Hegel himself changed his own method. As a dialectician, he affirmed that scientific truth is not something ready-made and complete, merely to be memorized, after which one can rest on one's laurels: truth is disclosed in a perpetual process of acquiring knowledge.

At the same time, Hegel, as the

---

\* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, p. 105, International Publishers, New York.

creator of an idealistic philosophical system, declared that his philosophy was the absolute truth and that consequently, after him, the development of human knowledge must stop, since there was nothing left to discover. In the political sphere, Hegel declared the feudal-absolutist system of the Germany of his day to be the apex of political development, the embodiment of the Absolute Idea. Thus, Hegel himself changed his own method and passed over to the viewpoint of metaphysics, which he had criticized.

This explains why the Hegelian dialectics, with its idealistic and mystical form, was at one time even possible in feudal-bourgeois Germany. For, as Marx says, "It seemed to transfigure and to glorify the existing state of things."\*

It was precisely in this spirit that the political reactionaries of that period tried to interpret the Hegelian thesis: "All that is real is rational; all that is rational is real." From this, it follows that the Hegelian dialectics needed to be radically reviewed, to be rid of its idealistic shell and given consistent further development on a materialist basis. When Marx and Engels carried out this veritably titanic task, when they gave dialectics a scientific form, it became hateful to all reactionaries, to all the bourgeoisie, since, in its rational, materialistic form, it struck terror into their hearts and presaged the inevitability of their doom.

As distinct from Hegelian dialectics, the dialectical method of Marx and Engels, subsequently developed

by Lenin and Stalin, makes its starting point the existence of the objective world, outside and independent of our consciousness. Instead of the self-development of the Idea, it postulates the self-development of real, concrete things. The dialectics of thinking is regarded as the reflection of the dialectics of the development of the material world.

"My dialectic method," says Marx, "is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, *i.e.*, the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea,' he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea.' With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."\*

The dialectical materialism created by Marx and Engels became the science of the general laws of motion in the outer world, and in the human thought that reflects this world. Thereby "the dialectic of Hegel was placed upon its head; or rather, turned off its head, on which it was standing before, and placed upon its feet again."\*\*

Materialist dialectics opened up endless perspectives for the development of human knowledge. As applied to society, it is a revolutionary-critical method, which thoroughly discloses the contradictions of capitalism, contradictions that doom capitalism to inevitable destruction.

Thus, materialist dialectics is by no means identical with, but differs

\* *Ibid.*

\*\* Frederick Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach*, p. 54, International Publishers, New York.

\* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. xxx, International Publishers, New York.

radically from, Hegelian dialectics. This circumstance, emphasized in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, completely exposes the Menshevik idealists, who slanderously affirmed that the dialectics of Marx and Engels is identical with the dialectics of Hegel. Both the Menshevik idealists, as well as the Machians, tried to destroy, to bury the revolutionary-critical method of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, so as to disarm the working class in its struggle for communism.

\* \* \*

Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872), representative of pre-revolutionary bourgeois-democracy in Germany, adhered, in the early days of his philosophical activity, to the Left supporters of Hegelianism (he never was an orthodox Hegelian). Beginning with 1836, Feuerbach began to turn to materialism, and as early as 1839 he subjected idealism to sharp and extensive criticism. In a number of materialistic works, such as *The Essence of Christianity* (1841), *Preliminary Theses to the Reform of Philosophy* (1842), *The Basic Principles of the Philosophy of the Future* (1843), Feuerbach, after the protracted domination of Hegelian idealism, restored materialism to its rights in Germany, and put up the most serious defense of pre-Marxist materialism. Feuerbach affirmed, writes Engels:

"Nature exists independently of all philosophy. It is the foundation upon which we human beings, ourselves products of nature, have grown up. Nothing exists outside nature and man, and the higher beings our religious fantasies have created are only the fantastic reflection of our own essence."\*

\* *Ibid.*, p. 28.

"The return to nature is the only source of recovery!" Feuerbach exclaims. "Contemplate nature, contemplate man! Here before, your eyes you have the secrets of philosophy."

The "inner kernel" of Feuerbach's materialism lies in the recognition of the objective world outside of our consciousness, *i.e.*, in the correct solution of the basic question of philosophy. With his materialism, Feuerbach helped Marx and Engels, at the time when they were forming their philosophical views (1841-44), to make a complete break with the idealism of Hegel (they were heading in the direction under the influence of the practical revolutionary struggle) and to pass over to the position of materialism.

"When describing their materialism, Marx and Engels usually refer to Feuerbach as the philosopher who restored materialism to its rights. This, however, does not mean that the materialism of Marx and Engels is identical with Feuerbach's materialism. As a matter of fact, Marx and Engels took from Feuerbach's materialism its "inner kernel," developed it into a scientific philosophical theory of materialism and cast aside its idealistic and religious-ethical encumbrances."\*

Even in those years, when they were under the influence of Feuerbach, Marx and Engels criticized the shortcomings and narrowness of his philosophy. In the *German Ideology*, written in 1845-46, they extensively criticized Feuerbach's views, and showed that he had not ventured beyond the bounds of the metaphysical materialism of the French philosophers of the eighteenth century (Holbach, Diderot, etc.).

\* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*, pp. 105-106.



Feuerbach's materialism has remained anti-historical and metaphysical. When criticizing idealism, Feuerbach failed to enrich materialism with the idea of development contained in Hegel's philosophy, passed it by, and cast it aside together with the idealistic system. Another failing of Feuerbach's philosophy is the profoundly contemplative and naturalist character of his materialism. This failing was closely connected with his passivity in public and political life; his philosophy was isolated from politics. Feuerbach was not a practical materialist whose task it is, as Marx pointed out in his famous theses on Feuerbach, not only to have a clear conception of the world, but also by practical revolutionary activity to change the surrounding situation.

A further shortcoming of Feuerbach's materialism is its inconsistency. While explaining nature in a materialist fashion, Feuerbach remained an idealist in history, in explaining the phenomena of social life. Feuerbach spoke a great deal about Man. He counterposed it to Hegel's Absolute Idea. But he studied man not from the social historical viewpoint, but from the biological, anthropological viewpoint. Hence, his Man is man in "general," who belongs to no social class. For Feuerbach, a materialist approach to the study of history was something inaccessible. His doctrine regarding relations between men did not go beyond the bounds of cordial, loving relations (and this in capitalist class society!). The sexual love of man and women is treated by Feuerbach as a cult, as a new religion. Feuerbach's ethical doctrine is developed in the same idealistic spirit. It

sings to a different tune the same old story of the possibilities of universal love in class society. Feuerbach's ethics distracted the proletariat from the burning questions of the struggle against the bourgeoisie. The call to happiness through universal love instead of through the struggle against capitalist society was an expression of typical bourgeois ethics. It was in this that Feuerbach expressed his idealism in the study of society.

Thus, Feuerbach's materialism is by no means identical with the materialism of Marx and Engels. The founders of dialectical materialism sharply criticized all the shortcomings and the narrowness of Feuerbach's materialism, overcame its principal defect—idealism in history and religious-ethical encumbrances. By taking from Feuerbach's materialism its "inner kernel," Marx and Engels enriched it with dialectics, developed materialism into a comprehensive scientific theory of philosophical materialism.

\* \* \*

The Menshevik-minded idealists and Machian vulgarizers tried to identify Marx's philosophical materialism with Feuerbach's materialism. This point of view distorted the facts and was hostile to Marxism-Leninism.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* gives a profound analysis of questions of dialectical materialism. This historical significance of the philosophy of Hegel and Feuerbach and the part played by them in preparing the ground for the Marxist dialectical method and Marxist philosophical materialism are dealt with in the *History* in the most precise and concise terms.

---

## FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

### UNITY OF ACTION TO SUPPORT THE POLICY OF PEACE AND FIRMNESS

*L'Humanite*, daily organ of the Communist Party of France; Paris, August 23, 1939.

*[Following is the editorial on the Soviet-German pact of non-aggression printed in the August 23 issue of l'Humanite, central organ of the Communist Party of France. This was the next to the last issue of the paper before its suspension by the Daladier government. The editorial was signed by P. L. Darnar.—The Editors.]*

SO THE aggressor against the peoples has been forced today to knock on the door which yesterday he spoke of breaking through. Hitler must negotiate with the powerful and peaceful Soviet Union and undertake an obligation not to attack her. This trip to Moscow is not like the one to Munich, however! Ribbentrop—he is the one who does the traveling this time—does not go to dictate conditions, to extort by threats the shreds of a dismembered nation.

When the land of socialism conducts negotiations with another country, it does not have on its conscience the surrender of Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia or Albania to a tragic destiny! It does not give in to black-

mail. The Japanese fascists learned at Lake Khasan how the Soviet Union gives a fitting reply to aggression.

This time it is the coveted prey which proves itself too big for the hunter. The preachers of the anti-Soviet crusade have taken another look and renounced their plans, for the moment. With one blow their anti-Comintern has been exploded. The strength of the U.S.S.R. broke up the front of its enemies and the face of the Japanese rulers must be something to look at.

The machinations of those who sought to push Hitler against the workers' and peasants' republic at the same time that they themselves regretfully negotiated with Moscow have been cut short.

The famed "Munich tip," as Stalin called it, the assent of the western states to an attack to the east, is left on the table by Hitler, who fears to burn his fingers on it.

Thus collapses the plan of the impenitent Munichmen. It was not an accident that the military negotiations, which were dragged out to give the Munichmen time to intrigue elsewhere, "got stuck" precisely on the question of the security of the Baltic coast. They were quite willing to consider a guarantee in other cases, but not in that of an aggression directed against the U.S.S.R. As if to give a bonus to the aggressors was not, as in the past, to encourage them to

continue their attacks against Poland and against us!

Only that the method of the U.S.S.R., which is quite different, the method of firmness, has changed the result of this plot.

The Munich policy has only brought closer the threat of war against France. For, no more than after the slicing up of Czechoslovakia, this policy cannot calm the atmosphere of Europe by surrendering Poland. It brings new elements of war.

On the contrary, the negotiations into which Germany has been brought by Soviet firmness, means a considerable contribution to peace.

How all those avowed fascists or defeatists in the face of Hitlerism, who shouted that "the U.S.S.R. wished to involve us in a war against Germany," that "the U.S.S.R. wished to create one ideological bloc against another," must look now!

The U.S.S.R. has once more proved that it only seeks peace for itself and for the peoples; peace—but in dignity and security. Like Lenin, Stalin has constantly proclaimed—and, as always, he translates thoughts into deeds—that the republic of Soviets was ready to reach an understanding with all nations offering guarantees, whose regimes are internal questions only concerning the peoples themselves.

This was the opinion expressed by Maurice Thorez [General Secretary of the Communist Party of France] when he declared in October, 1936:

"We wish to reach an understanding, even with Hitler, but we wish to discuss with him in the framework of the principles of the League of Nations."

Is there not a great contribution to

peace in this method, which opposes agreements directed against other countries or surrendering other countries?

If the Munich plans are shattered by the attitude of the U.S.S.R., nothing stands in the way of France, like England, reaching an understanding with Moscow in order better to assure the mutual security and the independence of the peoples.

The airplane for Moscow leaves every morning at 8 o'clock, M. Daladier.

Soviet firmness and its results have given you an excellent example. *Sign the pact!* Give your military delegates instructions to reach a conclusion and not to stall.

Go ahead! Take part in the construction of a general apparatus of security, of non-aggression, of guarantee for the peoples. By firmness, oblige the aggressors or those who dream of aggression to respect you.

This is the lesson of the U.S.S.R. This is the lesson of Stalin.

The first Socialist Republic has always followed a peace policy, requiring respect for every inch of its soil, coveting not an inch of anybody else's, aiding the peoples which defend the independence of their country. Under the guidance of Stalin and the men of the Bolshevik Party, it has always worked to protect the homes of the workers of the world. It has been the rampart of peace and remains this rampart.

Let international unity of the workers and the peoples support this policy of peace and firmness which has just won a new and striking success for the common security of the peoples of Europe.

## THE SOVIET-GERMAN NON-AGGRESSION PACT

London, *Daily Worker*, August 23, 1939.

*The following statement on the Soviet-German negotiations was issued on August 22 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain:*

**T**HE announcement of the Soviet-German trade and credit agreement and negotiations between the two governments for the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression represents a victory for peace and socialism against the war plans of fascism and the pro-fascist policy of Chamberlain.

It represents the fiasco of Hitler's policy of aggression and of Chamberlain's policy of support for that aggression. But it places before the British people, in particular, the sharpest urgency for the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Pact and the removal of Chamberlain.

The significance of this change in Nazi policy cannot be grasped unless we recall that the openly proclaimed aim of Hitler has been the crushing of Bolshevism. This was accompanied by the organization of an Anti-Comintern Pact, ostensibly aimed to bring about the complete encirclement of the Soviet Union.

This policy was meant also to appeal to the reactionaries in all European countries so that their support could be won for the fulfilment of this aim of destroying the Soviet Union.

It met at once with a response from the National Government of Britain, for such a policy was in ac-

cord with what the British ruling class had tried to do in the first years of the Russian Revolution, and failed to achieve.

This aim of Hitler's was the only possible explanation of why the National Government and, in particular, the Chamberlain government, went out of its way to help arm, finance and connive at the aggressive policy of Nazi Germany.

Regardless of the suffering and torture which would be caused by a new world war, Chamberlain intrigued with the object of bringing about a clash between Germany and the Soviet Union, in the hope that the land of socialism would be defeated and the international working class movement crushed and destroyed.

Hitler is forced to recognize the strength and power of the Soviet Union and his dreams of crushing it have received a setback.

It is therefore a salutary check to his aggressive policy in Eastern Europe, as it is a check to the policy of Chamberlain which was leading to a war between the Soviet Union and Germany.

It is a demonstration to the whole world of the firmness, mighty power and determination of the Soviet Union not to allow the peace of the world to be broken either by direct fascist provocation or the indirect methods of support for fascist aggression which has been organized by the Chamberlain government.

The Soviet Union has no interest in war. From November, 1917, up to the present moment, it has consistently made its proposals for peace and disarmament, which, if they had been adopted, would have prevented the

present international crisis from developing.

On March 10, this year, Comrade Stalin, in his historic report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Bolsheviks, outlined once again the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

The salient points are as follows:

"Far be it from me to moralize on the policy of non-intervention, to talk of treason, treachery and so on. It would be naive to preach morals to people who recognize no human morality. Politics is politics, as the old case-hardened bourgeois diplomats say. It must be remarked, however, that the big and dangerous political game, started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention, may end in a serious fiasco for them. . . .

"The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and explicit:

"(1) We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.

"(2) We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. That is our position and we shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet State.

"(3) We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

"(4) We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war, who attempt to violate the Soviet borders.

"Such is the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

"In its foreign policy, the Soviet Union relies upon:

"(1) Its growing economic, political and cultural might;

"(2) The moral and political unity of our Soviet society;

"(3) The mutual friendship of the nations of our country;

"(4) Its Red Army and Navy;

"(5) Its policy of peace;

"(6) The moral support of the working people of all countries, who are vitally concerned in the preservation of peace;

"(7) The good sense of the countries which, for one reason or another, have no interest in the violation of peace. . . .

"The tasks of the Party in the sphere of foreign policy are:

"(1) To continue the policy of peace and of strengthening business relations with all countries;

"(2) To be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflict by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them;

"(3) To strengthen the might of our Red Army and Red Navy to the utmost;

"(4) To strengthen the international bonds of friendship with the working people of all countries, who are interested in peace and friendship among nations."

That speech was directed towards the people of Britain as much as it was to the people of the Soviet Union.

With the exception of the *Daily Worker*, not a single newspaper in this country gave more than a column to it, although they always find space to quote Hitler in full.

The present negotiations with Germany are in line with that declaration of policy. They are in line with the whole peace policy of the Soviet Union.

Hitler knows full well the power of the Soviet Union. Hitler has seen the moral and material aid that the people of the Soviet Union have given to the peoples of Spain, China and Mongolia. It is high time the same things

were realized in all their significance by the people of Britain.

The record of negotiations over the Anglo-Soviet Pact are a shameful page in British history. The Soviet Union took the initiative in getting the negotiations for an Anglo-Soviet Pact opened. It was clear from the start that Chamberlain had no intention, if he could avoid it, of concluding a pact of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union.

On June 28, Comrade Zhdanov, one of the responsible leaders in the Soviet Union, had to draw the attention of the whole world to the delay in concluding the pact with Britain. He said:

"Of the seventy-five days, the Soviet Government required sixteen days to prepare answers to various British drafts and proposals, whereas the rest of the fifty-nine days passed in delays and procrastination on the part of the British and the French."

That statement needs to be considered in the light of the fact that Chamberlain himself on April 4, 1938, denounced any suggestion of an Anglo-Soviet Pact when he declared:

"The real effect of this proposal would be to do what we, at any rate, have always set our faces against, namely, to divide Europe into two opposing blocs or camps. So far from making the contribution to peace I say that it would inevitably plunge us into war."

Every person knows that the refusal to continue Parliament in session was, because it was hoped that it would put through a deal with the fascists that would leave the Soviet Union isolated. Even those newspaper edi-

tors who cannot now sleep at night were the first to warn against this very danger.

Everyone knows how the international situation has worsened since Parliament adjourned, how Chamberlain facilitated the visit of Lord Kemsley, the press lord, to Hitler, and his subsequent proposal for opening discussions with the Axis powers to come to terms; how Chamberlain sent a military mission to Moscow without any plenary powers, in order to deceive the people that this would automatically mean the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Pact; and how this mission had hardly time to arrive in Moscow itself before word was given to the Fleet Street press to say how unimpressed the British military mission was with the Soviet defense forces.

At any rate, Hitler is. That is the reason why the present negotiations have been forced upon him.

The Anglo-Soviet negotiations are a record of delay, sabotage and double-dealing on the part of the Chamberlain government that will arouse the anger of the people that their very destinies should have been played with in such a wanton manner by a British Prime Minister.

Chamberlain's policy of endeavoring to strengthen Germany to attack the U.S.S.R. and to refuse the peace front has turned out to be the fiasco that Stalin warned the people of Britain precisely against, at the same time as it has brought them into a position of extreme danger. It is this which makes the signing of an Anglo-Soviet pact of mutual assistance more urgently necessary than ever before.

The British people need the help of

the Soviet Union. That help can be given. But it has to be help on the basis of reciprocity, help that means Britain contributes, without any reservations, as much in the development of the peace front as it expects the Soviet Union to do, help that means Britain must assume the same kind of mutual obligations as it expects the Soviet Union to do.

It means an end must be made of all the double-dealing that has been going on; the talk about a five-power conference that would exclude the Soviet Union. It means ending the work of the Fifth Column for appeasement, that not only is meant to sacrifice the colonial people, but is also directed against the people of the Soviet Union.

Every day of these last five months the way has been opened for the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Pact. Every day of delay has brought greater dangers to the British people. The way is still open if the people are prepared to enforce their demands on the Chamberlain government. There is no time to be lost.

Let Chamberlain and Daladier fly to Moscow and open up direct conversations with the Soviet government. They did it a year ago with Hitler at Munich, and it was then claimed that by doing so they were saving the peace of the world. The state of Europe today is the eloquent testimony as to how false this has turned out to be.

Greater issues are at stake now. The only way to stem further acts of aggression, such as against Danzig, is the reversal of the present policy of Chamberlain, and the immediate conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet pact. The

danger to Poland's independence arises from the policy of Chamberlain, who has all along been bringing pressure to bear on Poland to make a deal with Hitler over Danzig.

It is time to dry a lot of the crocodile tears that are flowing in Fleet Street, Transport House and Downing Street over what might happen to Poland.

Was it not Poland who, under British inspiration, said she would never allow Soviet troops to pass through her country? Was it not the border states of Finland, Latvia and Esthonia that under British inspiration said the same? How many times has Chamberlain himself stated this in Parliament in trying to defend his delay in signing an Anglo-Soviet pact of mutual assistance?

If Poland and the border states want pacts of mutual assistance, let them open negotiations with the Soviet government at once.

If the British people force Chamberlain now to sign such a pact, then we may be sure these other countries will not lag behind.

Let us repeat again, the Soviet Union helped the people of Spain, China and Mongolia. They will help any country that fights against fascist aggression and for their independence as a nation.

The Soviet Union was the one country in the world that eagerly offered to help Czechoslovakia defend its independence, and the government of Czechoslovakia had to turn down that offer because of the pressure from Chamberlain.

These facts must be literally burned into the minds of the people. It is the Soviet Union which alone has stood

for the peace front. It is Chamberlain who has done everything in his power to prevent it from being established.

The present negotiations with Germany will have a tremendous significance for the German, Italian and Japanese people. For years they have been fed night and day on anti-Communism. For years Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado have been allowed to ride roughshod over other countries. Now Hitler and the anti-Comintern Pact has received a check and received it from that quarter which the people in the fascist countries had been led to believe could never happen.

What kind of discussions are proceeding today in German factories, shipyards and mines? What a strengthening of the mass opposition to the Hitler regime the negotiations will present? What an exposure of Hitler they represent.

But equally sharp lessons have to be learned by the people of Britain. To read the *Daily Herald* yesterday and its shameless slanders against the Soviet Union will arouse a tremendous revolt in the Labor movement. At the very moment when every weapon in Labor's armory needs to be turned out against Chamberlain, the *Daily Herald* tries to direct them against the Soviet Union. This is the climax in a record, the previous significant points of which were the support of non-intervention in Spain, and the support of the Munich betrayal last autumn. It represents the betrayal of labor's own aims of peace and socialism.

What did those Labor leaders who formulate the policy of the *Daily*

*Herald* expect the Soviet Union to do? We will speak frankly. They expected the Soviet Union to pull Chamberlain's chestnuts out of the fire without any special effort being expected from the people of Britain.

The Labor Party Conference in June was diverted from the main tasks that confronted it, of organizing the mass movement to secure the signing of the pact with the Soviet Union and the building up of the peace front on the basis of the unity of all labor and democratic forces, to the Bevin policy, the policy of confidence in Chamberlain and putting forward proposals that would allow Hitler "to come in on the ground floor."

The working men and women of this country will repudiate with indignation this treacherous policy of the *Daily Herald* and the dominant group of Labor leaders. They will recognize that the action of the Soviet Union in its present negotiations with Germany has spiked the guns of the pro-fascist intrigues of Chamberlain and has strengthened the hands of the British people in their fight for the Anglo-Soviet pact.

Now is the time and the hour to develop the mass movement for the immediate signing of the Anglo-Soviet pact. Now, as never in our lives, must we work night and day to expose the meaning of the Chamberlain policy and his responsibility for the present international situation.

But, above all, the Labor movement must be roused, for on the heads of the dominant group of Labor leaders rests the greatest responsibility of all. They have the power, the organization and the influence to rouse the organized workers against Cham-



berlain and for the Anglo-Soviet pact.

Demand that this shall be done now. At the same time, by personal example, show that we are all alive to the critical character of the situation, but that we know once the Anglo-Soviet pact is signed, then the entire situation will be changed.

End the delay and sabotage. Make your will felt on the Labor leaders and Chamberlain.

Now that mass pressure has forced the recall of Parliament the demand must be made that it remains in session.

The keystone of the peace front is

the Anglo-Soviet pact. Lay this foundation now.

Away with all defeatism and craven hearts.

The British people will resist fascism whether it comes from abroad or at home. But the price of success is also that the Chamberlain government shall be removed, and a government led by trusted representatives of the Labor movement shall come to power.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF GREAT BRITAIN.

***WORLD ACCLAIM!***

**THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

**364 Pages. Cloth \$1.00**

Over 16,000,000 copies of this great history have been printed in 31 languages! In the United States alone, over 95,000 copies have been sold in the last six months.

Of this book, Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, said:

"This is no ordinary book to be skimmed through and then laid aside on a bookshelf. It is a scientific textbook to be studied and mastered, not a collection of dogmas to be memorized, not for mechanical quotation of extracts, but to understand the essence of the theory of Marxism-Leninism so that it can be **applied to the most varied** and different problems and situations, so that this theory can be enriched with the new experiences of the revolutionary working class movement also of our country."

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

*New*



*Books*

**Theory of  
THE AGRARIAN QUESTION**

By V. I. LENIN

Volume XII of the Selected Works. \$2.00

**THE THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF  
MARXISM**

By V. I. LENIN

Volume XI of the Selected Works, 763 pages. \$2.00

**A HANDBOOK OF FREEDOM**

An anthology of the democratic tradition in English history from the time of Alfred the Great to the present. \$2.00

**WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?  
A Marxist Introduction**

By HOWARD SELSAM

Revised edition of a popular seller \$1.25

**Coming in October**

CULTURE AND THE PEOPLE, by Maxim Gorky

TWO SYSTEMS, by E. Varga



**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

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

**20TH ANNIVERSARY GIFT OFFER**

# YOURS FOR THE ASKING!

ANY ONE OF THESE TITLES WILL BE  
SENT TO YOU AS A PREMIUM WITH  
ONE YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION TO

## THE COMMUNIST

12 MONTHLY ISSUES, \$2.00

- AGAINST AGGRESSION, Maxim Litvinov
- BRITONS IN SPAIN, William Rust
- CHILD WORKERS IN AMERICA, K. D. Lumpkin and D. W. Douglas
- THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE, Karl Marx
- CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAMME, Karl Marx
- DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM, V. Adoratsky
- FIGHTING FOR PEACE, Earl Browder
- FOUNDING OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, Karl Marx
- GEORGE DIMITROFF, S. Blagoyeva
- I LOVE, A. Avdeyenko
- THE IRON FLOOD, A. Serafimovitch
- JEWS WITHOUT MONEY, Michael Gold
- LETTERS FROM PRISON, George Dimitroff
- PROLETARIAN LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES
- LABOR FACT BOOK NO. 4
- LAST PLAYS OF MAXIM GORKY
- LETTERS TO KUGELMANN, Frederick Engels
- LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF V. I. LENIN, R. Palme Dutt
- LUDWIG FEUERBACH, Frederick Engels
- THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION, Joseph Stalin
- PASIONARIA: ARTICLES AND SPEECHES, Dolores Ibarruri
- THE SPIDER AND THE CLOCK (Cloth), S. Funaroff
- TRAITORS ON TRIAL
- WHEN JAPAN GOES TO WAR, E. Yohan and O. Tanin
- WORKING WOMEN IN GREAT BRITAIN, Joan Beauchamp

---

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

Enclosed find \$2.00 for which please enter my subscription to **The Communist** for one year beginning with the.....issue. At the same time please send me without additional charge a copy of..... as announced in your 20th Anniversary Gift Offer.

Name .....

Address .....