

000177



000177

UNITY FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

SOCIALIST - LABOR
COLLECTION

by **EARL BROWDER**
General Secretary
COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A.

10c.

UNITY
FOR PEACE
AND DEMOCRACY

BY

EARL BROWDER

GENERAL SECRETARY, COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

NEW YORK
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

PUBLISHED BY
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.
P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK, N. Y.

September, 1939

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Contents

1. AMERICA AND THE WAR	5
THE EFFECTS OF THE PACT	12
THE U.S. AS A FACTOR FOR PEACE	17
2. UNITY TO DEFEAT REACTION IN 1940	24
THE TORIES VERSUS THE PEOPLE—THE 1940 ISSUE	27
WHO WILL CONTROL THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CON- VENTION?	32
HOW THE TORY COALITION WILL FIGHT	37
UNITY OF LABOR—THE KEY TO 1940	39
WHY THE FARMERS ARE OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE FOR 1940	42
THE FIGHT FOR A CONSISTENT PEACE POLICY	46
3. THE COMMUNIST PARTY—ITS ROLE AND TASKS	60
RELATION OF THE PARTY TO THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT	74
HOW OUR PARTY BUILDS ITS IRON DISCIPLINE	76
4. SUMMARY	82
SLOGANS	87

This pamphlet contains the complete report of Earl Browder, General Secretary, to the enlarged meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in Chicago, Ill., September 1 to 3, 1939, in celebration of the Party's twentieth anniversary. The Party had its birth at a convention which opened in Chicago on September 1, 1919. In addition to the members of the National Committee, more than 500 leading Party members from all parts of the country attended the anniversary session.

The first part of this report, "America and the War," was delivered before an audience of 17,000 in the Chicago Stadium on the night of September 1, before the entry of Britain and France into war against Germany.

The second and third parts, "Unity to Defeat Reaction in 1940," and "The Communist Party—Its Role and Tasks," were given as the main report to the National Committee on September 2.

The fourth part, "Summary," was given at the conclusion of the National Committee's session, on the evening of September 3.

1. America and the War

WAR threatens the world. War of the most destructive, most devastating kind, beyond anything conceived by the human mind. Americans must ask themselves: What can America do for the cause of peace? For war, whether America is a combatant or not, will seriously damage and will threaten the destruction of human culture also in our land. We have a natural interest in world peace. All progressive mankind feels the most profound hatred for the war-makers and equal sympathy for the Polish people, who must pay with their blood for the criminal stupidity of their government's policy directed by Chamberlain, of rejecting the proffered help of the Soviet Union which alone could have averted the danger.

Americans will overwhelmingly agree with the President's declaration that our country cannot become involved in the quarrels that led to the present conflict. America must actively seek an opportunity for a decisive intervention for peace to follow up and cooperate with the energetic peace efforts of the Soviet Union.

Let us understand from the beginning that for America to make any serious contribution to world peace, Americans must begin to understand what forces threaten peace, how they can be defeated and what our country could contribute to that task. Above all, Americans must learn how to free themselves from the falsehoods of special interest propaganda which throws a fog of poison gas around the questions of war and peace.

Last week, the world heard the announcement that the Soviet Union and Germany had signed a pact of non-

aggression; that each had promised, for ten years, they would not attack the other nor join in any combination of powers for such attacks. In the midst of war threats and preparations, two of the militarily strongest powers declared that they would not attack one another. This has been greeted with a great outcry by American newspapers and over the radio. All persons who take their opinions ready-made from editorial columns or the radio are already convinced that the Soviet Union made an alliance with Nazi Germany against the rest of the world. But what are the facts?

Examine the evidence, the undisputed evidence which is before you, but covered up with a thousand masks of lies, insinuations, slanders and deliberate misrepresentations. Each person must learn to use his own head, to dig beneath the special interest propaganda to the facts, to understand these facts.

First of all we must remember Munich. The Munich pact of a year ago, hailed as a great "peace pact" by everyone but the Communists, turned out to be the opposite. It destroyed Czechoslovakia, it led to the military defeat of the Spanish Republic, it created the conditions of the present threats of war against Poland, it was a blow against American interests. And yet it was presented to the world as a "peace pact." Actually, Munich was the blow that shattered the world peace. The world has learned that fact since a year ago, and the same world that cheered Munich then curses Munich now. No curse word is as strong today as the simple epithet of "Munichman." It means a sly, hypocritical, cold-blooded traitor of the human race.

Our country has been deluged by a flood of propaganda disseminated by the newspapers and radio trying to convince us that the debacle for Chamberlain is a debacle of the Western World and civilization.

It all proceeds from the tacit assumption that only by

the unconditional acceptance of the dictatorship of Chamberlain could the triumphant march of the Axis toward world conquest be halted. It ignores and covers up the fact that Chamberlain's only credentials for such leadership lay in such documents as Munich, the death certificates of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Albania and the Spanish Republic, the bloody record of Japan in China, not to mention his mess in Palestine. It accuses the Soviet Union of "double crossing" and treason upon the assumption that to break openly and dramatically with Chamberlain and his fellow appeasers is to betray peace and democracy; although the Soviet Union never made any commitments to Chamberlain's policies and always openly opposed them. Nothing more abject and shameful in American public life can be found over many years than this crawling to the service of Chamberlain by American newspapers and radio commentators to the total subordination of American national interests and the American viewpoint.

Why should Americans defend Chamberlain and his policies? Every one knows that the great majority of Americans distrust Mr. Chamberlain fully as much as the Russians do, and that there is good reason for it. Mr. Chamberlain and his class, the rulers of Britain, are the main cause for the strength of "American isolationism," which is a wrong-headed and dangerous kind of answer to the menace of Chamberlainism to the United States. Everyone knows that it was the Chamberlains who created the bloody mess in Palestine, after duping the Jews of the world by promising them territory they had already promised to the Arabs, and then setting the two peoples to fighting one another in fratricidal struggle. Everybody knows it was the Chamberlains who sabotaged America's movement to halt Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931, and slyly gave Tokyo the wink to go ahead. Everybody knows that it was Chamberlain who organized the opposition to Roosevelt's

policy in the Lima Conference of the American Republics last December. Everybody knows that if the United States went into a diplomatic conference with Chamberlain, as the Soviet Union did, it would be even more careful to sew on its shirt and pants in order not to be forced to leave the conference room naked. America has often been forced to break up international conferences without any agreement, largely on account of the role of Britain.

In the light of this well-known fact, which has been proved in America, we must estimate the negotiations in Moscow and the conclusions that come out of them, that have so profoundly changed the face of the world. What was shown in the Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations that have proceeded from last April until a week ago? We have received official judgment of the Soviet government contained in the speech of Comrade Molotov to the sessions of the Supreme Soviet last night, which endorsed and confirmed the non-aggression pact. The speech of Molotov is of the greatest historical importance, and yet the same newspapers and radios which give you ad nauseam from morning until night the speeches of Hitler and Chamberlain and all their documents, haven't given you fifty words of the speech of Molotov. I wonder if you will be interested enough, patient enough, to allow me to read to you a few extracts of Molotov's speech:

“What have the negotiations with Great Britain and France shown? The Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations have shown that the position of Great Britain and France is marked by howling contradictions throughout. Judge for yourselves.

“On the one hand, Great Britain and France demanded that the U.S.S.R. should give military assistance to Poland in case of aggression. The U.S.S.R., as you know, was willing to meet this demand provided

the U.S.S.R. itself received like assistance from Great Britain and France.

"On the other hand, precisely Great Britain and France brought Poland on the scene, who resolutely declined military assistance on the part of the U.S.S.R.

"Just try, under such circumstances, to reach an agreement regarding mutual assistance when assistance on the part of the U.S.S.R. is declared beforehand to be unnecessary and intrusive.

"Further, on the one hand, Great Britain and France offered to guarantee the Soviet Union military assistance against aggression in return for like assistance on the part of the U.S.S.R.

"On the other hand they hedged around their assistance with such reservations regarding indirect aggression as could convert this assistance into a myth and provide them with formal legal excuse to evade giving assistance and place the U.S.S.R. in the position of isolation in the face of the aggressor.

"Just try to distinguish between such a 'pact of mutual assistance' and a pact of more or less camouflaged chicanery.

"Further, on the one hand, Great Britain and France stressed the importance and gravity of negotiations for a pact of mutual assistance and demanded that the U.S.S.R. should treat the matter most seriously and settle very rapidly all questions relating to the pact.

"On the other hand they themselves displayed extreme dilatoriness and an absolutely light-minded attitude towards the negotiations, entrusting them to individuals of secondary importance who were not invested with adequate powers.

"It is enough to mention that the British and French military missions came to Moscow without any definite powers and without the right to conclude any military convention.

"More—the British military mission arrived in Moscow without any mandate at all, and it was only on

the demand of our military mission that on the very eve of the breakdown of negotiations they presented written credentials. But even these credentials were of the vaguest kind, that is, credentials without proper weight.

“Just try to distinguish between this light-minded attitude toward the negotiations on the part of Great Britain and France and frivolous make-believe at negotiations designed to discredit the whole business of negotiations.

“Such are the intrinsic contradictions in the attitude of Great Britain and France towards the negotiations with the U.S.S.R. which led to their breakdown.

“What is the root of these contradictions in the position of Great Britain and France?

“In a few words, it can be put as follows:

“On the one hand, the British and French governments fear aggression, and for that reason, they would like to have a pact of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union provided it helped strengthen them, Great Britain and France.

“But on the other hand, the British and French governments are afraid that the conclusion of a real pact of mutual assistance with the U.S.S.R. may strengthen our country, the Soviet Union, which it appears does not answer their purpose. It must be admitted that these fears of theirs outweighed other considerations. Only in this way can we understand the position of Poland, who acts on the instructions of Great Britain and France.” *

Why did the Soviet Union conclude the non-aggression pact with Germany? We Americans need to understand this. We need to know what forces and policies created a situation where a decisive blow for peace could only be made by the conclusion of that non-aggression pact.

* V. M. Molotov, *The Meaning of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact*, pp. 5-6, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

America in the coming months and years will be faced with similar decisions and we must learn how to handle them. Again I turn to the speech of Molotov which has been hidden from the American people by the newspapers that are supposed to inform you. Molotov says:

“The decision to conclude a non-aggression pact between the U.S.S.R. and Germany was adopted after military negotiations with France and Great Britain had reached an impasse, owing to the insuperable differences I have mentioned.

“As the negotiations had shown that the conclusion of a pact of mutual assistance could not be expected, we could not but explore other possibilities of ensuring peace and eliminating the danger of war between Germany and the U.S.S.R.

“If the British and French governments refused to reckon with this, that is their affair. It is our duty to think of the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. All the more since we are firmly convinced that the interests of the U.S.S.R. coincide with the fundamental interests of the people of other countries. But that is only one side of the matter. . . .

“For example, people ask with an air of innocence how the Soviet Union could consent to improve political relations with a state of a fascist type. . . . But they forget that this is not a question of our attitude toward the internal regime of another country, but of the foreign relations between two states.

“They forget that we hold the position of not interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and correspondingly of not tolerating interferences in our internal affairs. . . .

“In our foreign policy towards non-Soviet countries we have always been guided by Lenin’s well-known principle of the peaceful co-existence of the Soviet state and of capitalist countries.

"A large number of examples might be cited, to show how this principle has been carried out in practice but I will confine myself to only a few. We have had, for instance, a non-aggression and neutrality treaty with fascist Italy ever since 1933.

"It has never occurred to anybody as yet to object to this treaty. That is natural. Inasmuch as this pact meets the interests of the U.S.S.R., it is in accord with our principle of peaceful co-existence of the U.S.S.R. and capitalist countries.

"We have non-aggression pacts also with Poland and certain other countries whose semi-fascist system is known to all. These pacts have not given rise to any misgivings either.

"Perhaps it would not be superfluous to mention the fact that we have not even treaties of this kind with certain other non-fascist bourgeois-democratic countries, with Great Britain herself, for instance; but that is not our fault." *

THE EFFECTS OF THE PACT

Now, what is the situation following the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact? What does it mean for the world, for Europe, for America, for the Far East? Are the great changes that it has brought about favorable or unfavorable? Is the world situation worse or better as a result? In finding the answer to this let's first of all hear a few words of Molotov on the significance of this pact, words which have been kept away from you by the American organs of public information. Molotov says:

"The chief importance of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact lies in the fact that the two largest states of Europe have agreed to put an end to the enmity between them, to eliminate the menace of war and live at peace one with the other, thereby making nar-

* *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 7, 9, 10.

rower the zone of possible military conflicts in Europe. Even if military conflicts in Europe should prove unavoidable, the scope of hostilities will now be restricted.

“Only the instigators of a general European war can be displeased by this state of affairs, those who under the mask of pacifism would like to ignite a general conflagration in Europe. The Soviet-German Pact has been the object of numerous attacks in the English, French and American press. Conspicuous in these efforts are certain ‘Socialist’ newspapers, diligent servitors of ‘their’ national capitalism, servitors of gentlemen who pay them decently.

“It is clear that the real truth cannot be expected from gentry of this calibre. Attempts are being made to spread the fiction that the signing of the Soviet-German Pact disrupted the negotiations with England and France on a mutual assistance pact. This lie has already been nailed in the interview given by Voroshilov.

“In reality, as you know, the very reverse is true. The Soviet Union signed a non-aggression pact with Germany, for one thing, in view of the fact that the negotiations with France and England had run into insuperable differences and ended in failure through the fault of the ruling classes of England and France.

“Further, they go so far as to blame us because the pact, if you please, contains no clause providing for its denunciation in case one of the signatories is drawn into war under conditions which might give someone an external pretext to qualify this particular country as an aggressor. But they forget for some reason that such a clause and such a reservation is not to be found either in the Polish-German Non-Aggression Pact, signed in 1934, and annulled by Germany in 1939 against the wishes of Poland, or in the Anglo-German declaration on non-aggression, signed only a few months ago. The question arises: Why cannot the

U.S.S.R. allow itself the same privilege as Poland and England allowed themselves long ago?

"Finally, there are wiseacres who construe from the pact more than is written in it. For this purpose all kinds of conjectures and hints are mooted in order to cast doubt on the pact in one or another country. But all this merely speaks for the hopeless impotence of the enemies of the Pact who are exposing themselves more and more as enemies of both the Soviet Union and Germany, striving to provoke war between these countries."*

We have seen in these last days in America wonderful examples of that about which Molotov speaks. The pacifists in America, who have been shrieking that under no circumstances should America go to war about anything, are now shrieking because the Soviet Union has agreed with Germany not to go to war.

Molotov further pointed out:

"This pact, like the unsuccessful Anglo-French-Soviet negotiations, proves that no important questions of international relations, and questions of Eastern Europe even less, can be settled without the active participation of the Soviet Union, that any attempts to shut out the Soviet Union and decide such questions behind its back are doomed to failure.

"The Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact spells a new turn in the development of Europe, a turn towards improvement of relations between the two largest states in Europe. 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, further consolida-

* *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

tion of our positions, of further growth of the influence of the Soviet Union on international developments.”*

If America hopes, and I am sure the great majority of Americans do hope, that our country can play a part in banishing this specter of war and organizing the world for peace, let us begin to understand that in this great task the natural and inevitable partner of America is the Soviet Union.

It is worthy of special note that those who shriek the loudest against the Non-Aggression Pact are the people who call themselves “Socialists.” Why are these “Socialists” so anxious that the war from which they say America should stay out, the Soviet Union must enter at all cost? Molotov pointed out in this connection:

“We must be on our guard against those who see an advantage to themselves in bad relations between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, in enmity between them, and who do not want peace and good neighborly relations between Germany and the Soviet Union.

“We can understand why this policy is being pursued by out-and-out imperialists. But we cannot ignore such facts as the especial zeal with which some leaders of the Socialist parties of Great Britain and France have recently distinguished themselves in this matter. And these gentlemen have really gone the whole hog and no mistake (*laughter*). . . . Is it really difficult for these gentlemen to understand the purpose of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact on the strength of which the U.S.S.R. is not obliged to involve itself in war either on the side of Great Britain against Germany or on the side of Germany against Great Britain?

“Is it really difficult to understand that the U.S.S.R. is pursuing and will continue to pursue its own independent policy based on the interests of the people

* *Ibid.*, p. 15.

of the U.S.S.R. and only their interests? (*Prolonged applause.*)

"If these gentlemen have such uncontrollable desire to fight, let them do their own fighting without the Soviet Union. . . .

"In our eyes, in the eyes of the entire Soviet people, these are just as much enemies of peace as all other instigators of war in Europe. Only those who desire a grand new slaughter, a new holocaust of nations, only they want to set the Soviet Union and Germany at loggerheads, they are the only people who want to destroy the incipient restoration of good neighborly relations between the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and Germany."*

A question that weighs heavily upon the minds of many Americans is—but what about Poland? The invasion of Poland is a barbarous act of imperialist aggression, threatening the national independence of the Polish people. It marks the further extension of the second imperialist war and carries within itself the menace of becoming transformed into a world war.

This attack on Poland by German fascism became possible primarily because the governments of England and France, assisted by the reactionary Tory coalition in the U. S. Congress, have abandoned the policy of collective security. It became possible because the Chamberlains and Daladiers and Becks have successfully sabotaged the efforts of the Soviet Union, supported by the masses all over the world, to bring about a genuine peace front of non-aggressive countries.

This attack on Poland is also the result of the refusal of the reactionary leaders of the Socialist International and of the Amsterdam International, as well as the American Federation of Labor, to accept the repeated offers of the world Communist movement to establish a united labor

* *Ibid.*, p. 14.

front internationally and in each country for the purpose of combatting Munich betrayals and checking fascist aggression.

Can the independence of Poland be saved? Yes, it can, even though now it becomes much more difficult than before.

Had the Polish government, together with the French and British governments, accepted the proposals of the Soviet Union for a real mutual assistance pact, the present invasion of Poland would probably not have taken place. But it is still not too late. The Polish people with their glorious tradition of struggle for national liberation have clearly indicated that they are willing and ready to fight for the national independence of their country.

The Polish people have also shown that they trust the Soviet Union, that they want the collaboration of the Soviet Union, as well as the cooperation and support of the peace and democratic forces all over the world.

Should the Polish people find ways and means of imposing their will to resist upon their government, should they find ways and means of bringing about the collaboration of their government with the Soviet Union and should, as a result of it, the peoples of England and France succeed in eliminating from their governments the criminal policies of Munich betrayals, Poland's national independence will be saved and made much more secure than it has ever been in the last six years.

THE U. S. AS A FACTOR FOR PEACE

There is still another power in the world which can render an inestimable service to the Polish people in their hour of need and crisis. It is the people and government of the United States. Should the people of this country speak out clearly and definitely that they desire their gov-

ernment to utilize all the moral and political strength of our country on behalf of saving the national independence of Poland, and should the American people make it equally clear that the government of the U. S. today can exert its efforts for world peace most effectively in collaboration with the Soviet Union—then it is reasonably certain that the national independence of Poland and its freedom can be saved and made more secure.

Can a world war be prevented? People are asking anxiously whether the invasion of Poland means that a new world war has become inevitable. No, it does not mean that. The extension of the current second imperialist war into Poland and the transformation of this war into a world war has become more menacing and more imminent. That is true, but it does not mean that it is no longer possible to fight effectively to prevent this war from becoming a world war.

It has become commonplace to say that the people of the world do not desire war. It is important to remember this fact. But it is also important to remember that it is still possible for the people of England, France and the United States to compel their governments to follow a true policy of peace which means rejection of the policies of the Munich betrayal and an honest effort to join with the Soviet Union as the basic force in the world today in the struggle for peace.

In this struggle to prevent the transformation of the present war into a world war, the working class has to play a decisive role, nationally and internationally. In this struggle to prevent the present war from becoming a world war, two countries, especially, by their collaboration could exercise a decisive influence to check aggression and to prevent the coming of a world war. These countries are: the Soviet Union and the United States.

It lies within the power of the people of this country,

especially of labor, to bring about such collaboration between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

And what can and should the working class of our country and of all countries do at this critical moment? It is primarily the working class in each country and on a world scale that has it in its power, by united action, to stop aggression, to defeat decisively the policies of Munich betrayals pursued by the reactionary bourgeoisie in all countries, especially in England and France, to make the continuation of such betrayals impossible, to back up the leading role of the Soviet Union in the fight for peace.

The reactionary leaders in the Socialist International and in the Amsterdam trade unions have been successful thus far in preventing the working class from uniting its forces to exert them in favor of world peace. These reactionary, so-called labor leaders in all countries have been playing the game of the Chamberlains, following a policy in the labor movement that is largely responsible for the Japanese attack on China, for the destruction of Czechoslovakia last year and for the present invasion of Poland.

The Communist International has made in the course of the last two years no less than ten proposals to the Socialist International to join hands for united working class action, on a world scale and in each country, against aggression and for peace. Those responsible for the rejection of these offers will have to answer before the working class and before the peoples of the world.

It is time to make an end to the policies of these reactionaries in the labor movement. The working class in each country must demand that the forces of the workers in all countries be immediately united in the struggle for peace in an effort to prevent the disaster of a new world war. This can be done. Only the labor movement and the

toiling masses of each capitalist country must make their will for united action effective.

What can America do? The United States is the biggest bourgeois-democratic country in the world. Our country is not interested in war. It is interested in the preservation of peace for America, for Europe, for the world.

The U. S. is not directly involved in those imperialist rivalries which have led up to the invasion of Poland. It is therefore in a position to exert great influence, moral and political, to help check fascist aggression, to prevent the fruition of new Munich betrayals, to help prevent the coming of a world war.

The reactionary coalition in Congress, by refusing to revise the neutrality laws, has, in effect, prevented the government of the U. S. from exerting the full power of this country in favor of peace. The tory coalition, therefore, bears a heavy responsibility for the invasion of Poland and for the threat which this carries to the peace of the world and to the United States.

The American government cannot take sides in the imperialist rivalries which directly led up to the invasion of Poland. But it can, and must, intervene jointly with the Soviet Union on behalf of peace, on behalf of the national independence of Poland, on behalf of a peace policy which would prevent the realization of new Munich betrayals.

The Soviet Union, despite its sad experiences with Chamberlain and Bonnet, offered a mutual defense pact to Britain and France, if the terms could be agreed upon. But Poland declared flatly she did not need and would not accept Soviet military help; Chamberlain and Bonnet supported this point of view. The issue boiled down to this: Chamberlain wanted the Soviet Union to agree to be automatically at war with Germany when Chamberlain decided, for his policies, but with its hands tied, and unable to move

in any way except when and in the manner Chamberlain and his advisers might decide.

Chamberlain was even willing to drift into war without even this agreement, and falsely assured the British and French people that he had guaranteed their safety. Chamberlain's policy became the greatest danger for Poland, the greatest danger for the Soviet Union, for the U. S. and for the British and French people themselves. It had to be exposed and smashed at all costs.

In declaring that it would not attack Germany, the Soviet Union was merely repeating what it had always declared as its basic policy. But in obtaining from Hitler a similar guarantee, the Soviet Union won a victory not only for itself but for the peace of the whole world. It smashed the fascist Axis, the combination of powers whose joint action had upset the equilibrium of the whole world. It smashed the whole fascist ideology, and released the German people from its hypnosis. It broke the deadlock in which the world had been drifting into war without any serious initiative being taken to stop it. And it built a great barrier against a repetition of the shameful Munich agreement of a year ago which destroyed Czechoslovakia without a blow being struck in her behalf.

Americans should first of all judge any event by its effects upon American national interests. The Soviet-German Pact has greatly improved the position of the U. S. It has already brought a grovelling protestation of undying affection for America from Japan, broadcast directly to America from Tokyo by the same officials who a few weeks ago were bombing American missions, slapping American women, and generally trampling on American rights and sentiments. It has lifted a heavy cloud from America's position which recently was described by a very conservative columnist, Dorothy Thompson, as a threat that: "There will be no open door in the Far East, no Monroe Doctrine, and

no Europe. . . . We shall have isolation confined to North America." At one blow, the Soviet-German Pact has begun to restore the open door in the Far East, to dissolve the threat to the Monroe Doctrine, and has given the first ray of hope that Europe may survive.

That "isolation confined to North America" has been dissolved almost overnight, and the voice of the United States is heard with respect once more in the councils of the world.

Alfred Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the Admiralty in Britain, a few days ago, in a newspaper article, complained against Mr. Chamberlain that he is a poor fisherman because he had allowed Russia to escape from his hook. Yes, the Soviet Union escaped from Mr. Chamberlain's hook, but they had publicly warned him and the whole world many times that they saw the hook, that they would not bite, and if Mr. Chamberlain wanted to do business he should drop his role of fisherman, put away his hook and line, and sit down in serious conference quickly to arrive at an agreement between equals that would meet adequately the world emergency. Let those who complain that the Soviet Union "betrayed" any people or cause by refusing to bite on Chamberlain's hook openly answer the question: "Do you advise the United States to bite that hook? Do you want America impaled at the end of Mr. Chamberlain's fishing line?" If the answer to that question is no, then cease forever your slanders against the Soviet Union.

The truth is mighty. The truth, the facts will reach the people of America just as they are reaching the people of France in spite of the dastardly action of the French government in closing down *l'Humanité* and other anti-fascist papers. The great campaign of incitement being carried on by the apologists of Mr. Chamberlain in America, with the aim to discredit the Soviet Union, comes to

a catastrophic shipwreck upon the rocks of American common sense.

All Americans need to do, in order to arrive at a reasonably correct understanding of the Soviet Union and its pact of non-aggression with Germany, is to ask themselves the question: "How would I want my own government of the U. S. to act in this world situation? Would I want Washington to deliver over to Chamberlain the power to put us into war with Germany under conditions and at a time dictated by him, and with his control of American armed forces? Or would I prefer that Washington declared, since America is not immediately threatened and is able to defend herself, that we will fight only when the cause is clearly the cause of peace, and not the sustaining of Mr. Chamberlain's Empire, only when our government has secured guarantees that we are not fighting merely to impose a new and more horrible Versailles upon the world?"

The answer to those questions will be agreed upon by the overwhelming majority of the American people. And the verdict thus rendered will at the same time be one of emphatic approval of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, and of its Non-Aggression Pact with Germany. America, like the Soviet Union, is a peace-loving nation, it does not want war, it will keep out of the imperialist squabbles of Europe, and it will intervene only on the side of the peoples against their war-making governments, will help make a people's peace and a people's world.

The Stadium, Chicago, Ill., September 1, 1939

2. Unity to Defeat Reaction in 1940

COMRADES, as a matter of economy of time, we will assume that my speech last night in the Stadium was heard by all of you and is a part of this report, and that I won't need to go over the same ground again here this morning. This will enable us, having given the answers to the most burning immediate issues of our current situation, to proceed more directly to the detailed, intricate, rapidly changing political problems and alignments within our country leading toward the elections of 1940.

National and international crisis, political and economic, provide the setting for the historical stage today, as we observe the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and prepare our Party for the decisive tasks which face it.

It is no mere formal exercise in historical research when, in the face of most stupendous struggles, of the heaviest tasks for our Party, we make the keynote of this National Committee meeting the anniversary of our Party's birth, and the review of its development. Without our twenty years of experience and growth, we would be in no position to discuss seriously what course our Party should take, as one of the decisive influences of the country, in meeting the crisis problems.

The C.P.U.S.A. is one of the decisive political influences in the U. S. Millions of people consider and are influenced by our decisions, even though our Party membership has only now reached the hundred-thousand mark. Our enemies register the important role of our Party even more emphatically than do our friends, and often even grossly

exaggerate it for their own reactionary ends. The Dies Committee has furnished the most fantastic examples of this. Mr. Sokolsky, the highly-paid agitator for the big employers' associations, has even accused our Party of deliberately hiding its own strength. But we have learned how, amidst all confusion and conflicts, to keep our heads cool, to estimate our own strength and role *accurately*, neither exaggerating our own position nor playing it down below its true value. It is but sober judgment to say, since all camps in American political life find it necessary to take the Communist Party into consideration, that our Party has become one of the decisive influences in the country.

The most dramatic example of this is seen in the past weeks when American newspapers which have a circulation of from forty to fifty million copies per day have turned to speak directly to the 100,000 members of the Communist Party, to appeal to our membership to turn away from their leaders. But all the prodigious labors of this mountain could not even bring forth a mouse.

With this new role comes heavy responsibility. We must weigh each policy, each decision, even each word, to be certain that it will truly serve the best interests of the working class and of the American people in their overwhelming majority. We must dig to the bottom of each problem and issue, not only as it presents itself immediately, but in its historical development and setting. And we must know our own Party history, what historical forces went to create it, the difficulties and distortions of its growth, the diseases it lived through and overcame, as well as its rich accumulation of accomplishments and achievements. We must know our relationship to American and world forces. We must know from whence we came and where we are going.

Twenty years ago, here in Chicago, were formed the first

definitely Communist political party organizations in the United States, dedicated to the development of Marxism-Leninism on American soil. It was a moment of intense political struggle in America, a struggle to determine the post-war course of our nation. That period holds many lessons for the America of today. Then, as now, the forces of democratic progress were attempting to transform the Democratic Party into the instrument for the people's will; then, as now, the forces of reaction were gathered about the Republican Party, which had been out of power for eight years; then, as now, the strategy of the reactionary camp was to split the democratic front, using the "red menace" as the sharp edge of the wedge; then, as now, the chief reliance of the Republican-reactionary general staff was upon the collaboration of the reactionary wing of the Democratic Party and its tools within the Wilson Administration itself. Wilson had his A. Mitchell Palmer, who will be known in history for two things: the infamous "red raids" against the infant Communist movement, and the subsequent wholesale deportations; and the corrupt administration of the "alien property custodianship" which played such a big role in the bankruptcy and collapse of the Wilson Administration. Roosevelt today has his modern version of Palmer in Martin Dies, with his notorious "un-American" Committee.

The reactionaries of today, remembering how A. Mitchell Palmer opened the road for their triumphal return to power in 1920, make the repetition of that strategy the key to their campaign for 1940. But much water has flowed under the bridge in the past twenty years. The American people are not exactly inspired by the prospect of reviving the days of Harding, Coolidge and, especially, of Hoover.

They cannot forget that the abysmal Hitler rose to power in Germany and brought the whole world under the

shadow of war and catastrophe, with the slogans of Palmer and Dies. They cannot overlook the barbarous garrotting of the Spanish Republic under the same banner. They see the magnificent "impartiality" by which the "anti-Communist" banner served to justify the destruction of Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and even little Albania. They are appalled by the horrors of the Japanese military adventures in China carried out under the same flag. And they cannot fail to know, today, that the cry against the "red menace" is primarily intended to destroy the labor movement and the whole New Deal program insofar as it has given the people some alleviation of their troubles. Therefore, to "sell" the American people a 1940 version of the Palmer 1920 "red menace" will not be so easy. Forewarned is forearmed, and the American people have the terrible warning of the conditions of every land where the "anti-Communist" heroes seized power.

Then, too, twenty years have not left the democratic front as it was in Woodrow Wilson's time. As Roosevelt towers above Wilson, in the consistency of his defense of middle-of-the-road democracy, this reflects and expresses the higher degree of organization and understanding of the democratic mass movement of the American people. And, last but not least, the Communist Party is not the infant of twenty years ago; it has risen to political maturity. There is something symbolic in the fact that our Party will celebrate twenty-one years, will reach the American "voting age" before the 1940 elections. Yes, twenty years have changed our land, as well as the rest of the world, and in these changes we see the conditions for victory for the people, reversing the results of 1920.

THE TORIES VERSUS THE PEOPLE—THE 1940 ISSUE

When the Tory coalition in Congress wrecked the President's legislative program, especially when it rushed to

a disorderly adjournment without so much as debating his "lending program" for capital investment under governmental encouragement and supervision, and blocked his foreign policy, the stage was thereby set, in all main essential points, for the 1940 elections.

The President's legislative program was deliberately wrecked. A minority of Congressmen of the President's party (about one-fourth to one-third) joined with a solid Republican representation to defeat the President's most important proposals and to set about dismantling former accomplishments.

This wrecking job was done under the demagogic slogans of "economy," of "restoring free democratic processes," the "independence of Congress," and of "keeping the U. S. out of war." The profound falseness of these slogans was proved during the very act of wreckage.

The Tory coalition wrecked the President's economic program under the slogan of "economy." But in the very act of destroying planned governmental intervention in the economic life, the Tory coalition appropriated almost two billion dollars more than the President proposed; the Tories were not against "spending," when they could direct it toward breaking up a planned program, increasing disorder in the national economy, and strengthening their own electoral support. In the name of "economy," the Tories refused even to discuss the proposals for large-scale capital investment, under governmental guarantees, for the creation of more wealth for the nation. This is not even the most formal "economy"; it is the clearest case of wrecking.

The Tory coalition claimed to be "restoring free democratic processes." But they conducted their raids, as much as they possibly could, under the strictest anonymity, avoiding record votes as much as possible and resorting to parliamentary subterfuges and indirection. Every Tory Con-

gressman was trying every possible trick to avoid personal and party responsibility for the results of their wrecking work.

Thus, the country is presented with a legislative debacle, in which the Republicans cry out, "We are not responsible; aren't we a minority in Congress?" The Tory Democrats plead, "We were only voting according to our individual consciences," and the loyal Democrats admit, "We were defeated by deserters from our own ranks." And all this sabotage of the democratic process is put forth as its "restoration." Nothing can more discredit and undermine any parliamentary democracy than just such irresponsible chaos, the product of treachery and unprincipled alliances.

The Tory coalition claimed that the wrecking was necessary to restore "the independence of Congress." According to Tory logic, Congress is "subservient" if it keeps its majority united around a program and leadership on the basis of which it was elected, but is "independent" when it carries out a program dictated in all essentials by the minority party and its leadership, which were overwhelmingly repudiated at the polls. That is, Tory "independence" means "independence of the will of the people." As a result of this Tory wrecking, Congress has not for a long time been in such low esteem in the eyes of the country. And, conversely, not in a long time has Congress been so esteemed and praised by the traditional enemies of the people, the big bankers and their political agents.

The Tory coalition blocked the President's efforts to amend the harmful and dangerous "Neutrality" Act, on the plea that this was necessary to "keep us out of war." But their act aroused the greatest enthusiasm and support precisely in the official circles and newspapers of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo, among the universally-recognized war-makers.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." The Tory coal-

tion in the Congress of the U. S. has launched a war against the civil liberties of the American people, against our immediate economic livelihood, against our prospects of economic recovery, against our democratic processes of government, and against our peace.

Unless we are to assume that this wreckage was the result of simple stupidity or blind malice, then it is possible to conclude only that the Tory camp has deliberately set itself the aim to create chaos in the United States, as the precondition necessary for it to seize power. The long-continued sit-down strike of capital has already grown over into a general program of political, civil, and economic disorder, confusion and breakdown. No other judgment is compatible with the facts of the Tory course of action, unless we assume that even that much rationality is not present.

The desperate and dangerous wrecking policy of the Tories, both Republican and Democratic, flows out of their knowledge that the overwhelming majority of the people (and of the voters) are against them, and support the President and his general direction of policy. There is little chance indeed, if any, for a Republican victory in the Presidential election in 1940, against the New Deal candidate, whether it be Roosevelt himself or someone supported by Roosevelt and guaranteeing by his record the continuation of the same line of policy. The first big effort of the reactionaries, therefore, is to prevent Roosevelt or any real New Dealer from being nominated by the Democratic Party convention. The President must, therefore, if the Tories are to win, be discredited in his own Party and in the country.

That is the goal which has been set by the Tory camp. And from this approach, all their course becomes clear and understandable, even though equally disastrous for the American people. For the Tories prefer to rule in a coun-

try brought to ruin, rather than acquiesce in the further development of democracy and the New Deal. They refuse to permit any economic recovery in the country, if that should strengthen the mass movement of the people, and especially that of the working class. Their whole course is summed up in their determination to "Get Roosevelt at all costs."

It is this Tory strategy of desperation that has stirred the apprehension of the masses of the people; it is this that has given rise to the unprecedented mass movement to "draft Roosevelt" for a third term. The Tory attack against the President has been so ferocious and savage that it overshot the mark, and itself became the principal stimulus to a deep and determined movement to keep Roosevelt in office for another four years.

Already, last May, in our National Committee meeting, we gave a forecast of events, of things to come in the national political life, which has been more than borne out by events since that time. We must say that we erred in two respects: We failed to give sufficient emphasis to the desperate determination of the Tory camp to come back to power at all costs, and therefore were not urgent enough in our warnings of the rising dangers to the working class and to the country; and at the same time we did not see the full depth of understanding of the fundamental issues among the masses of the people. Concretely, we did not expect that the Tory coalition would go so far as to vote expenditures of two billion dollars above Roosevelt's budget estimates, for the single purpose of covering up their wrecking of his program as a whole; nor did we foresee the full depth, volume and speed with which the masses would rally to the demand for a third term for the President. All of which should warn us that the principal source of political errors today lies in failure to appreciate the terrific speed at which history is moving.

The first phase of the 1940 electoral struggle, between the people and the Tory coalition, centers on and culminates in the Democratic Party Convention. Who will control that Convention? Will it be Roosevelt and the New Deal forces, or will it be the Tory wing, headed by Garner, which is working in coalition with the Tory Republican Party high command?

So far as the Republican Party is concerned, no such question can be raised. There is a large and growing progressive sentiment in Republican ranks, but it is unorganized, largely inarticulate, and entirely incapable of bidding for control of the Republican Party. It will influence the Republican Convention only indirectly, insofar as its possible defection at the polls in November may dictate demagogic concessions in form and phrases, and on minor issues. But whatever the Republican Party's platform and whoever its candidate, its dominant force and political direction will be determined by Wall Street, and it will be cheered on by the fascists all over the world. That much is reasonably certain.

The Democratic Party, on the contrary, is the scene of a struggle for control which in intensity and bitterness exceeds anything in American history since the period before the Civil War.

Already last May we gave a fundamental analysis of this struggle, and estimated the forces on both sides. It is not necessary to go over that ground again; what we said then has been confirmed by events. What remains to be added is to estimate the effect of events since then upon the two camps, and upon the perspective of their struggle.

Did the Tory Democrats gain additional strength within their own Party by their wrecking coalition with the Republicans in Congress, or did they lose strength? Were the Tories successful in creating the impression among the

masses that "Roosevelt has failed," and that "the New Deal is finished"?

In seeking the answer to this question, we need to guard ourselves most carefully from the danger of "wishful thinking," from jumping to a conclusion that just because the realities of the situation are clear to us, they are also equally clear to the masses of the people. We know from bitter experience, in this and other countries, that it is possible for the Tory forces, with their enormous resources, to succeed, in Lincoln's phrase, to "fool all of the people part of the time," or at least to fool an effective majority part of the time. We need to know, with some accuracy and precision, what success the Tory camp is having in their efforts to place the results of their own wrecking upon the shoulders of the President.

First, and most important, of Tory successes in fooling the masses, arises from the tendency among the least advanced politically to identify the damaging results of the Congress sessions with the Democratic Party majority in Congress, and the New Deal, including Roosevelt, with that majority—and therefore to place responsibility upon the chief leader of the Party which had power but enacted the program of the opposition. The opposition, the Republicans, are forgotten and absolved from responsibility since they piously insist that if they had been in the majority, a better program would have solved all problems and restored prosperity for everyone.

This simple-minded thinking is to be seen all about us, and undoubtedly is a factor working for success of the Tory strategy. It is energetically promoted by Norman Thomas and his "Socialists," by the Trotskyites of all sects, by the Lovestone group, by the Social-Democratic Federation, and by the most reactionary leaders of the A. F. of L. Taking care not to underestimate the degree to which this primitive and backward thinking exerts its influence, and must be

constantly and patiently combatted among the masses, we must, however, establish the powerful factors which limit it and work in the opposite direction. These are, primarily, the growing political activity and thinking among the masses, their rapidly deepening understanding of political issues, alignments, and personalities, and the more aggressive leadership which is arising among them, especially within the working class.

A concrete aspect of this problem is the role of Garner, and his relation to the masses. The Tory Democrats have organized their forces behind the "Garner-for-President" boom. They speculate that Garner, as the official "second man" to Roosevelt, could combine both a large section of the New Deal following with the conscious anti-New Deal camp, prevent the rise of any other figure as a possible successor to the President, and thereby conquer the Democratic Party, its convention, or lead it into a confused split. That there is substance to their speculations is testified by the straw vote Gallup and *Fortune* polls; upon the assumption that Roosevelt will not be a candidate in 1940 these polls uniformly show Garner leading all other candidates, even though with a minority. But what is not shown is the fact that the overwhelming majority of those who indicate Garner as their choice, if Roosevelt does not run, are for Roosevelt if he does run. The Garner boom bases itself, preponderantly, upon the behind-the-scenes character of Garner's role as leader of the Tory Democrats. That is at once its strength and its fatal weakness. In this instance the Tory strategy again overshot its mark; its net result was to add to the volume and intensity of the movement for the third term for Roosevelt.

Labor's initiative has made the greatest contribution to date in the clarification of this problem. Through the mouth of John L. Lewis, appearing before a Congress hearing, came the stirring words of denunciation of the secret

machinations of this "labor-baiting, whiskey-drinking, poker-playing, evil old man." This turned the spotlight of public attention into the dark places where the Tory coalition hatches and carries out its conspiracies against the people. And from Garner's own state of Texas came a ringing "Amen" from the president of the state branch of the A. F. of L., a stinging commentary upon William Green's warm courtship of Garner during the last months. The workers, the whole people, of America owe a vote of thanks to John L. Lewis, for those trenchant words which rang throughout American political life. It was the beginning of the end of the "Garner-for-President" movement.

Indeed, it is highly significant that it has been labor's initiative, and before all that of the local and state organizations of the A. F. of L., which brought the movement for a third-term for Roosevelt to its early, broad and powerful expression. And it is this third-term movement which is checkmating the Tory strategy, first of all within the labor movement, but also in the nation as a whole.

The third-term movement is a declaration of confidence in Roosevelt's integrity, in his identification with the needs and desires of the masses, and in the general direction of the New Deal policies, the defects of which are overshadowed by the Tory menace. But it is much more than that. It is a movement of the people to preserve and extend their *unity* as against their enemies, against monopoly capital, against Wall Street. The effective unity of the majority of the people against their enemies was first consciously realized in the course of the election campaign of 1936. That unity has become the most precious possession of the people. It is more important than Roosevelt, it is more important than the New Deal policies themselves, for all, everything, depends upon the maintenance of that effective unity of the majority. Should that unity once be lost, America is in the clutches of fascism.

It is the realization of the masses of the overwhelming importance of unity which gives the great push to the third-term movement. That unity was built in support of Roosevelt, in support of those policies which the President's name symbolizes, and the unity achieved has brought gains to the people in spite of the inadequacies of the program. The masses instinctively wish to avoid the process of selecting another as the President's successor, regardless of how many or how good candidates there may be, because they see in this too many opportunities for their open and hidden enemies to create confusion and division. Uppermost in the minds of the masses is the thought expressed in the old American saying: "Don't swap horses in the middle of the stream."

The third-term movement is the struggle of the people for unity; it expresses and carries forward also the struggle of the organized labor movement for unity; and it is the struggle to prevent the Tory Democrats from controlling the Democratic Party Convention and naming Garner as candidate. It is the struggle to defeat the old Tory game of controlling both major party tickets and thereby present the country with that dilemma, which, to use Roosevelt's witty phrase, allows only the choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledummer.

It is the unparalleled power and impetus of the third-term movement which has improved the chances of victory for the people. The democratic mass movement of the people is now in a position to be decisive in the Democratic Party Convention, and then move forward irresistibly to the victory at the polls in November.

The Tory wrecking crew in Congress has created much unnecessary suffering and misery for the people, it has multiplied their difficulties; but it has not succeeded in its strategic aim of shattering the unity of the people or dampening their fighting spirit. Given a full development

of the fighting spirit and policy expressed in the President's letter to the Convention of Young Democrats; given the full gathering of all the forces of labor which are uniting their voices in the third-term demand; given the consistent pursuit of the New Deal middle-of-the-road course which, while not fully satisfying any group, allows for the adjustment of their minor conflicts within the general unity against the enemy—given these conditions victory for the people is possible and is certain. The fight for democracy and peace becomes concretely a fight to realize these pre-conditions of victory.

HOW THE TORY COALITION WILL FIGHT

The Tory coalition has definitely become the party of civil disorder, political and economic breakdown and confusion, and national defeatism. They will develop this line as far and as fast toward its culmination in civil war as they find it possible to do so. This is the fundamental fact to be taken into account in estimating the character of the battles that reach their climax in the 1940 election.

Only by means of manipulation of the Party machine control, so as to present the country with the "Tweedledum and Tweedledummer" dilemma, has the Tory coalition any serious hope of retrieving national power fully into its hands. As this hope dissolves under the rising tide of the third-term movement, we will more and more have revealed to us the desperate lengths to which Toryism will go.

It is not only the democratic front forces, however, which have serious difficulties to overcome in achieving unity. This is equally a problem for the Tory camp, although in a different form. In the democratic camp, the obstacles are chiefly among the leadership, while the drive for unity comes from below, from the masses; in the Tory camp, on the contrary, there is a high degree of unity and coor-

dinated action in the high command, which is concentrated in the hands of the big capitalists who formed the "Liberty League" in 1935, while it is among their mass following that deep and almost insuperable divisions exist which drive the Tory leadership into the most unprincipled maneuvers and combinations. We have previously noted some of the most important of these, but may profitably examine a few in more detail.

One of the most ambitious schemes for Tory unity, fathered by Hoover and Hamilton, envisioned dropping the name "Republican Party" in order, under cover of a new name more acceptable in the South, to carry over the unofficial coalition into a united party organization. This plan is now definitely in the discard; it is given up as hopeless. The New Deal has done so much for the South that Southern Tories, no matter how viciously they hate Roosevelt and wreck his program, do not dare go the length of party unity, even under a new name, with the traditional enemy of the South, the Republican Party, without endangering their hold upon even the most backward sections of the population, not to speak of the conscious progressives. There is not the slightest chance of a Republican nominee carrying the Southern states. Not all the power of the Tory Democrat state machines could bring that about.

It must not be expected, however, that the Tory threat of splitting the Democratic Party will therefore be abandoned. That party was already irretrievably split when the Tory gang carried through their wrecking program in Congress to the bitter end. With less chance than ever of controlling the Democratic Convention, the Tories must now more than ever drive toward as damaging a split as possible. Having crossed the Rubicon of defeatism toward their own party, they must drive ahead at all costs to the logical conclusion, the split. They have great power in most South-

ern States; the New Deal mass following is largely unorganized, and a big majority of the poor people, white and Negro, are disfranchised; the Tories hold most of the key positions of power in their hands. They may conceivably attempt to create a new Tory Democratic Party, with Garner as its nominee, not with any idea of a national victory, but simply as the only chance to take the Southern electoral vote away from the New Deal and Roosevelt. Since it is impossible, so they reason, to swing the South to the Republicans, they may speculate upon segregating enough Southern states to block an electoral majority for Roosevelt (assuming the Republicans can make sufficient gains in the North), and thereby throw the selection of President into the hands of Congress, where the Tory coalition has a possible majority and more freedom for manipulation.

It is inherent in the whole strategical relation of forces that the Tory camp, both Republican and Democrat, depends for its success upon hiding its real aims, upon confusing and dividing the masses, upon setting them into struggle on unimportant, subsidiary, or false issues, and upon the unlimited use of demagoguery to manipulate their real needs and grievances. On the contrary, for the New Deal and progressive camp, all hopes of victory center around awakening the masses to the true issues and aims of both sides, clarifying and uniting the masses, and focusing their attention upon the dominant issues, those questions which by their solution lead to the solution of all other problems.

UNITY OF LABOR—THE KEY TO 1940

Once more we must emphasize that unity of the working class, and particularly of its organized section, is the necessary precondition for a people's victory in 1940. It is necessary for the unity of the progressive majority of the people, and for the preservation of democracy itself.

We must avoid any purely formal and vulgar estimate of this problem of labor unity. One could, for example, make the most profound error, by merely noting the persistent division between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., the tendency of Wm. Green & Co. to align themselves with the Tory camp, and the C.I.O. leadership to align with the New Deal, the lack of immediate prospects for organizational unity—and from these undeniable facts to conclude that labor is cancelling itself out as a political force for 1940. One could, following the same false but formal logic, note that some months ago unity negotiations were under way, that they are now discontinued, and conclude that therefore unity has received a great setback.

Such a picture would be thoroughly false and misleading. Since 1936 organized labor has almost, if not more than, doubled its membership. This membership is much more alert and active in political life than ever before. There is a broader and deeper common political understanding and direction of activity than ever before within the working class, embracing the majority of both A. F. of L. and C.I.O. members. Labor is playing, and will play in 1940, a much more decisive and important role than in 1936. All of this must be fully noted, not in order to minimize the importance of achieving the full unification of the labor movement into one single organization, but in order to emphasize that the grounds exist for a successful struggle to that goal, and that even short of that goal it is possible to achieve the unity in action that is required for victory in the national elections.

Further, the cause of unity is going forward, not backward. The successful repulse given by the C.I.O. to William Green's raiding and disrupting campaigns in mining, auto, textile and a dozen other fields was a most important victory for the cause of unity.

Most important of all, however, is the sweep of the move-

ment to draft Roosevelt for a third term, which has embraced and united all sections of the working class. Despite the most frenzied efforts of Green & Co. to prevent and halt this movement, which cuts across and blocks their divisive and reactionary aims, the lower organizations of the A. F. of L. have been in the very forefront of the third-term movement, and undoubtedly express the convictions of the overwhelming majority of the A. F. of L. membership. Unity in action, unity of declared aims, in the most crucial question of the national life, is actually being achieved in spite of and against the reactionary leaders of the A. F. of L.

Thus it is being proved in life, that there are very definite limits to the disruptive powers of William Green and his reactionary cohorts in the A. F. of L. Executive Council. Green & Co. can still block the merger of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. into a single organization, but they cannot prevent the members of the two organizations from thinking in the same direction, endorsing the same policies and candidates, and acting in the same general political camp. Green could sabotage and defeat Murphy, Maverick, O'Connell, Bernard, and others, in the 1938 elections, but by doing so he only raised to power enemies of the A. F. of L. itself, and injured the whole labor movement, and opened the eyes of his own membership to the supreme importance of unity.

And for 1940, it has already become clear that Green & Co. will absolutely break their necks if they try to lead the A. F. of L. membership into the Tory camp. The A. F. of L. rank and file and lower leadership are clearly on the move and we can expect that with the assistance of the whole progressive camp, they will destroy any leadership that tries to align them against the New Deal in 1940. The vast bulk of the A. F. of L. membership, more than in 1936, is definitely and irrevocably enlisted in the New Deal camp for 1940.

This creates the conditions necessary for the cementing of the broadest unity of the people against the Tory coalition. This creates the most favorable conditions for the whole struggle for labor unity, which must finally culminate in a single all-inclusive Congress of Labor. Unity of labor in the 1940 elections is already being prepared on a broad and deep basis; the struggle to carry this movement to victory will at the same time create better conditions for the complete and general unification of the labor movement. The task today is to give ever more definite, more organized, broader and more energetic expression to this demand and movement for political unity of labor in 1940.

WHY THE FARMERS ARE OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE FOR 1940

The realignment of class forces that is going on in the U.S. is, on the whole, favorable to the creation of the democratic front against monopoly capital. It is, for example, no particular loss when the reactionary bourgeoisie turns almost unanimously against the New Deal and carries on its vicious hate-Roosevelt campaign. In fact, the formation of the Liberty League in 1935 was one of the principal factors making for the overwhelming victory of the New Deal in 1936. Roosevelt showed a true political instinct when, during the 1936 campaign, he took note of the hatred toward himself of the "economic royalists," and welcomed it.

So, also, the main currents within the working class, with but minor deviations here and there, are more decisively toward conscious and principled rejection of the Tory position, and more consistent support and development of the New Deal. Among the middle classes of the large cities, as well, the main currents are toward the strengthening of the democratic front. But on the countryside, among the farmers, and in the small towns and villages dominated by agrarian problems and mentality, there exists in many of the most important states a condition of doubt, vacillation,

and even a certain degree of succumbing to reactionary demagoguery, which is a distinct danger to the cause of a people's victory in 1940.

That is why the problem of the farmers requires special attention at this moment from the whole democratic camp, and therefore above all from the Communists.

We can by no means be content to allow any important sector of the farming population to be swung over from the democratic to the Tory side. The class interests of the main body of farmers, especially of the more impoverished half (the heavily-mortgaged, the tenants, and the sharecroppers), should align them solidly in the democratic camp; while the upper-middle strata, which share certain interests on both sides of the main political alignment, should without too great difficulty be neutralized. Only the capitalistic and rich farmers are, by their class interests and social-economic role, predestined to be in bulk on the Tory side, but their bulk is small in relation to the whole agricultural population. And if, as seems to be the case, the Tory camp is making advances among the farmers, something is definitely wrong with the way in which their problems are being handled, and with the agricultural policies that are being applied.

At our meeting last May, we already made a fundamental criticism of the New Deal agricultural policies. The New Deal has given agriculture manifold more assistance than the Republican Party ever did or ever promised. But it departed from the principles of the Coolidge-Hoover farm relief only in a small and experimental way, and in the main field of farm relief merely applied the same principles on a much larger and more organized scale. And the fatal defect of all these efforts to help agriculture out of its chronic crisis (the crisis dates back long before the 1929 economic crash), has been that the main assistance has always gone to those sections of the population which

needed it least, and only the leavings went to those who needed it most. Agriculture was treated as an undifferentiated whole, so far as social-economic strata were concerned, and the only differentiations recognized were the technical ones of crop and regional differentiation. The inevitable result was that, to a certain degree, the so-called "natural" process of capitalist agriculture—squeezing out the little fellows and the aggrandizement of the big ones—was even accelerated.

During the last months I have made some inquiries, in selected communities in several states, to find examples of just how concretely this process works out. With an almost mechanical uniformity, it seems that the administration of federal agricultural policies is placed in the hands of what they call the "most substantial" farmers—which in most cases means the "natural enemies" of the policies. These most substantial farmers are the men who already occupy the advantageous positions in agriculture, and their new position as administrators for the federal government is inevitably used by them to bolster up and strengthen those positions of advantage. In the very nature of agriculture, there is an enormous latitude for personal discretion in administration, and these "most substantial" citizens begin to take on many of the attributes of semi-feudal lords. Their communities tend to become more and more dependent upon the personal favorable attitude of the administrator. Not only their economic, but above all their political, position is rapidly strengthened.

The Tory agitators cry out to the country that the New Deal is building up its own political machine by the federal relief policies. But the truth of the case is the opposite; the New Deal has been building up a Frankenstein in the countryside. It has almost uniformly placed the administration of its policies in the hands of Tories, and it is this very administrative apparatus that has become the most effec-

tive instrument for creating the disaffection from the New Deal in the countryside.

Thus the inherent defects of agricultural policy, which failed to channelize its assistance more directly to the population most in need, is exaggerated beyond measure by an administration, locally, of a character intensely hostile to these policies and hostile to the national New Deal administration.

It is a tribute to the deep strength of the democratic and progressive trends among the farmers that despite all these administrative distortions (sometimes reaching outright sabotage), and despite the inherent defects of agricultural policies, the Tory camp has swung over to its side as yet no decisive majority among the farmers, and that almost everywhere it is clearly possible to save the situation by some plain speaking and decisive action. We pass these observations on to those circles which are in a better position than we are directly to influence affairs among the farmers.

A point of serious weakness in the democratic camp is the lack of contact and organized cooperation between the farmers and the trade union movement. Simply from the lack of intimate knowledge of one another's problems, both labor and the farmers tend to fall victims to the organized provocation of the Tory agitators, who are busily at work sowing discord between them. This lack of a close and sympathetic connection between the two main sections of the toiling population is one of the greatest assets of Tory reaction, upon which they base much of their hopes for victory.

It is the trade union movement which must take the initiative to remedy this situation. Wherever serious efforts have been made in this direction good results have been obtained in a short time. This has been evident in California, and to a lesser degree in Washington and Illinois. The C.I.O. assistance to the New York dairy farmers' milk strike is an outstanding example. In Minnesota, where the farmer-labor organizational tie should have been best de-

veloped, through the many years of the Farmer-Labor Party, it is unfortunately a fact that the Trotskyites' role in the labor movement (A. F. of L. teamsters) has created profound distrust among farmers and middle classes, a distrust which has been extended to the whole labor movement because neither the Farmer-Labor Party nor the A. F. of L. has sharply dissociated itself from the notorious practices of the Trotskyite gang. Wherever such elements dominate a labor movement, it estranges labor from its natural allies, especially from the farmers.

The labor movement must go to the farmers and win them into close alliance against monopoly capital, against the Tory coalition, and for a more consistent and complete New Deal.

THE FIGHT FOR A CONSISTENT PEACE POLICY

The present crisis in world affairs finds the U.S. still without a consistent foreign policy; in its stead, we have a conflict of two directions of policy, one represented by the President and his supporters and the other by the Tory coalition in Congress, assisted by muddle-headed progressives like LaFollette. We can say, however, with more confidence than ever before, that the majority opinion in this country is now crystallized definitely against "neutrality" and "appeasement" toward the fascist powers, that it is definitely set in the direction of U.S. participation in the organization of a world peace front of the democratic nations, although there are deep and justifiable suspicion and resentment against any entanglement in the imperialist rivalries of Europe.

It must be recorded as a great victory for the development of a consistent and positive peace policy by the U.S. that Roosevelt's abrogation of the Japanese-American commercial treaty was received with such deep approval throughout the country, so that those most opposed to it

could only grimace and utter words of formal approval, and when on top of that came the smashing blow of the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact which cracked the Axis, the tendency of American policy in the Far East, which is in support of the Chinese war of independence, became stronger and clearer to the masses of the U.S. Senator Schwollenbach's vigorous advocacy of a complete embargo against Japan has resounded throughout the country.

But in the last days we have seen the most reactionary press, which reflects the Hoover camp directly, come out openly with the proposal that the U.S. form a *partnership with Japan* for joint exploitation of China. This brought such a kick-back immediately, even from its steady readers, that they had to shut up about it in public, although unquestionably developing grandiose schemes in this direction behind the scenes. We must remember also that the Chamberlain reactionaries in Britain are also speculating in this same direction.

What is most important at this moment is to watch most carefully and register changes that are taking place on paramount questions of policy which reflect the regrouping in democratic political life of our country in relation to foreign policy. We have no time to analyze in detail the latest developments along these lines. Sufficient to know that those circles which have been most closely associated with the Chamberlain policy of appeasement, those who have tried to develop an American counterpart to that Chamberlain policy, that those men, although speaking carefully at this moment, are definitely moving towards a policy of American partnership in the fascist redivision of the world, and the more they shout against the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, that this is an alliance with fascism, the more certain can we be that they are pressing forward to a policy of a partnership for America with fas-

cism, and that a victory for this camp represented by Hoover, Vandenberg, Garner, etc., in the 1940 elections would place America in the reactionary war-making fascist camp of the world.

The Tory coup in Congress which defeated neutrality revision was a great victory for Herbert Hoover, who represents the most conscious section of the Tory camp on foreign policy. It represented the subordination of all these contradictory trends within sections of the Tory camp to the inexorable logic of the Tory position most sharply represented by Hoover. On the very question toward which the Tory factions held the most contradictory opinions, they achieved the most united action—and that action had been most accurately forecast in the position of Hoover.

Nothing illustrates more clearly the unprincipled character of the Tory combination than this event. When principles stand in the way of their struggle for power, they find no difficulty in subordinating their principles. Landon, who had piously proclaimed his abandonment of "politics" in questions of foreign policy, came out with a bitter partisan attack against Roosevelt on the basis of his trip to Lima. Stimson, who had supported the President, retired into a dignified silence, so as not to embarrass his friends in their coup. The *New York Times* stepped over to the equivocal position formerly occupied by the *Herald Tribune*, which in turn moved further Right to open apology for the Tory maneuver. And the Southern anti-New Deal Democrats broke with their own past and with Southern opinion, as the price required for cementing the Tory coalition and delivering a blow against the President. In the struggle for power, principles and opinions were subordinated with the most remarkable facility—and by the very men who most loudly cry out as their justification for breaking their party ranks that "I only vote as my conscience dictates."

The most decisive single factor in the education of the American people on international affairs at this moment is the emergence of the Soviet Union as the decisive force in the struggle for peace. Notwithstanding all the confusion created by Chamberlain and his agents in America, this fact stands out like a mountain above the fog created by the reactionary propaganda. We have already dealt with this, and while it will require considerable and constant detailed elaboration and examination as we go on, and we will be presented with many questions which will have to be worked out in the electoral struggle for 1940 around these questions of foreign policy, the main direction is already clear.

The common interests of the Soviet and American peoples have emerged into the forefront of American consciousness. They stand out in simple outline for even the most backward people to see. The similarity of the relationship between the United States and the European quarrels, and the Soviet Union and the European quarrels, is striking. This position is so similar as to be striking and impressive even to the most unpolitical and backward minds among American citizens. The idea of Soviet-American collaboration for the furtherance of common interests has become a political force of first importance in shaping American peace policy. It is becoming clear to all whose minds can penetrate the fog of prejudice to the underlying realities of a most dangerous world that a Soviet-American understanding, the planned common action of these two most powerful nations in the world, is the *indispensable condition* for the full protection of American national interests. And this idea is breaking through to broad masses of the people.

Such an idea, of course, is to the Tory coalition and all their agents as the traditional red flag to a bull. That is the reason for that unprecedented campaign directed against

the Communist Party of the United States. Why are these people so concerned with our 100,000 members in the midst of 130,000,000 Americans? It is because they see the inevitable appeal of this idea to the masses of Americans, that our Party is the most effective instrument for propagating this idea among the masses, and they become afraid when they see the Communist Party as the champion of the idea which lies latent and with tremendous potential power in the minds of the majority of the American people. Only when we understand this, can we understand the extremes to which the Tory camp and all of its agents will go in their campaign against the Communist Party.

The foreign policy of each nation is the reflection and extension of its inner regime. The policy of brutal aggression and conquest of other peoples, practiced by the fascist powers, is but the counterpart of the bloody dictatorship against their own people, upon which these powers were erected. The peaceful role played in international relations by the United States reflects the continued existence of a bourgeois-democratic inner regime, while the hesitations and gaps in our peace policies reflect the existence of strong anti-democratic forces at work in America. The firm and consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union is based upon and reflects the fact that in that country the masses of the people have taken their destiny entirely into their own hands, while any remnants of anti-democratic forces that may still exist in that country are powerless to influence the course of its government. Let those who want to believe the myths of the Soviet power as a dictatorship over the people try to reconcile such fantasies with the known and acknowledged role of the Soviet Union as the most peaceful power, entirely lacking any aggressive tendencies, the most firm in upholding orderly international relations and the sanctity of treaties, in the whole family of nations. That role can be played only by a regime arising organically

from the people and firmly anchored in their affections, that is, by the most democratic regime known to history.

Joseph Stalin gave the most complete and authoritative statement of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on March 18 of this year. That statement should be re-read and studied many times. It is a model of foreign policy which, if adopted and practiced everywhere as it is in the Soviet Union, would insure that era of universal peace of which the best thinkers of mankind have always dreamed. Allow me to quote it at length. Said Stalin:

“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 as 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 Red 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." *

Yes, we Communists support unreservedly this policy enunciated by Stalin, and we urge its adaptation by all countries, including the U. S. Mr. Martin Dies charges that this fact makes of us "agents of a foreign power" and guilty of "un-Americanism." In reality, it is this position which makes us supporters of President Roosevelt's orientation in foreign policy, and it is Mr. Dies' charges against us which reflect his opposition to the President, leader of Mr. Dies' own party. Leaving aside for the moment the question of the "Americanism" of the American Communists, we are willing to leave it to popular vote of all Americans, as to who best represents Americanism, whether it is Martin Dies who opposes the President, or President Roosevelt whose foreign policy is supported by the U. S. Communists. We know that the verdict will not be in favor of Mr. Dies.

In all these questions of foreign policy for the U. S., we Communists advocate and support the defense of American national interests. We understand the national interests as

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 16-17, International Publishers, New York.

the interests of the toiling masses of the American people, and we do not identify them with the special interests of American corporations which may be in conflict with the interests of another nation. This is the only qualification which we find necessary, in the interest of full clarity, to make to our unconditional stand on the grounds of American national interests as the basis for foreign policy. And this is fully consistent with the most advanced internationalism, just as Jefferson's foreign policy was fully consistent with the most advanced internationalism of his day. We repeat again, what we have many times emphasized, that we Communists are good Americans because of our internationalism, not despite it, and we are all the better internationalists as we learn more and more to be in the forefront among good Americans.

To be a good American it is not enough for anyone to declare in words his wish to defend American national interests. We have in the past few days had a great political initiative taken in the Tory camp on the slogan of the defense of American national interests. The Tories propose to defend American national interests by forming a coalition national government in which President Roosevelt will agree to subordinate himself to a special council, upon lines dictated by them, and composed in its majority of conservative Republicans and Tory Democrats. Just think of that for a moment and begin to see its significance. When the Tory camp calls for national unity and under cover of this slogan makes the demand for an unconditional surrender of the New Deal, what it really means is, they are threatening the country: "If you don't give us this control over the President you are not going to have any national unity; you are going to have us in opposition and when you have us in opposition, you have in opposition the men who control the economy and finances of America." Therefore, we see behind their slogan of national unity a threat

to destroy our national unity. Democratic America will never fall for this kind of a slogan of national unity, which consists in the abandonment of everything that it has been fighting for, and achieving in some small measure, in these last eight years. National unity will be achieved not by weakening or abandoning the progressive policies of the New Deal. National unity will be achieved by bringing greater justice to the masses of the nation, a better life to the masses, a more complete New Deal to the masses of America, and that is the only possible road to national unity in the face of this dangerous and war-mad world of today. Every policy, act and word must be judged by the degree to which it actually helps or harms these interests.

Let us examine, to take a very important example, the question of Spain. Mr. Dies thought it important to place on the record of his committee the charge that American Communists, by supporting and helping the Abraham Lincoln Battalion in Spain, had thereby demonstrated their un-Americanism. Mr. Dies thought it terribly "un-American" that some three thousand American boys had enlisted to defend the Spanish Republic, and most terrible of all that among them were a high proportion of Communists, perhaps almost half, who had as he describes it "entered the service of a foreign power."

But let us ask, who really defended American national interests—those, like Martin Dies, who whooped it up for Franco and the fascist invaders of Spain, or the boys of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion, more than one-third of whom gave their lives to preserve the Spanish Republic? Spain, under Franco, has become a source of fascist infection to all Latin America, and the organizing center for anti-Americanism among the Spanish-speaking people of the world; it has created another potential military front against France, and it has given Hitler a potential Atlantic naval base closer to most of Latin America than is New York.

It is not necessary to be a Communist in order to see that the preservation of the Spanish Republic was a crying need of American national interests, and that the defeat of the republic by Franco was one of the severest blows delivered against America in a long time.

Allow me to cite on this question the words of a well-known, anti-New Deal, rabidly anti-Communist authority on public questions, none other than Miss Dorothy Thompson, my favorite columnist. In a recent column she wrote:

“If we seriously wanted to prevent the possibility of South America, a continent with the most intimate cultural ties to Spain, from becoming eventually an outpost of the Axis powers, then the opportunity lay in the last three years in Spain, where an active and positive policy pursued with others could have determined the outcome of the Spanish civil war. . . . But, instead, we chose to regard the Spanish civil war as a purely European affair and to keep clear of interference.”

She then comes to the conclusion that if the U. S. continues along such a line, then in a relatively short time—I quote:

“There will be no Open Door in the Far East, no Monroe Doctrine and no Europe. . . . We shall have isolation confined to North America.”

The little item that Miss Thompson overlooked in her calculation was the Non-Aggression Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany, which smashed her doleful perspectives and greatly improved overnight the international position of the United States. But at the time she wrote her observations, they had a great deal of realism and facing of facts from the conservative point of view. Miss Thompson is entirely correct in tracing the growing threat to America, to its very national independence, directly to the fall of the Spanish Republic. We may ask, what did she

and her political associates do to ward off this danger? What did Martin Dies do? What did the whole Tory camp do? What did even many of our convinced progressives do? Of most of those of whom we cannot say they did nothing at all, it is necessary to say that they did worse than nothing, that they actively helped Franco to his military victory! But that cannot be said of the Communists. Communists unconditionally offered their lives to help ward off this danger to America.

Who was defending American national interests? No one, without any exception, defended America like the glorious Abraham Lincoln Battalion. I can declare in the name of the Communist Party that we are proud beyond measure to be publicly recorded as the unconditional political supporters of that magnificent body of American boys, whose selfless heroism and political vision helped to check the sweep of fascism, and gave us time to awaken our country to its dangers before it was too late! We are content to allow all the supporters and apologists for Franco to write their names into American history alongside those of Benedict Arnold and Aaron Burr!

It is necessary here that we give special attention to the problem of the Spanish refugees and the remainder of the Lincoln Battalion in France whose admission into the United States has been delayed. Especially the problem of the Spanish refugees is a burning and difficult question multiplied in its difficulties by the present situation in Europe. Only the Americas can give a solution of this problem which meets in the slightest degree the responsibilities which progressive Americans must assume towards maintaining certain standards of humanity throughout the world. I do not want at this moment to go into the details of this question but merely to emphasize that we must place on the order of the day as a political problem for the United States the solution of the Spanish refugee problem. Some

detailed examination of this and the tasks which we have in this respect will be given later on in our meeting.

What is the general character of the present moment in world affairs? It is interesting to note how the most astute representative of the Tory camp speaks. Again I turn to my favorite authority for a quotation, to Dorothy Thompson, who has the rare qualification of embodying in her own political personality every contradiction of the Tory camp in its sharpest form; she is at one and the same time the darling of the Union League, one of the potential Tory candidates for the Presidency, and known among the cruder fascist circles as a "Bolshevik" because of her fear of Hitler! Miss Thompson wrote the following a few weeks ago and we must remember this is like saying, in ordinary times, a couple of decades ago. A few weeks ago Miss Thompson wrote:

"What is coming to head in Europe is not a decision about Europe. It is a decision about this planet. . . . The issue involves the total redistribution of world power and the complete reorganization of the whole world."

The lady is 100 per cent correct. And it is from this understanding that one must estimate the events which have occurred since Miss Thompson wrote that paragraph. It is in that light that you will understand Chamberlain's refusal to come to an agreement with the Soviet Union for mutual defense. What is taking place is a struggle for total redistribution of world power among the imperialists. Mr. Chamberlain could not come to agreement with the Soviet Union without abandoning the old British tradition that "Britain rules the world and must continue to rule the world." For the Soviet Union couldn't be hitched to the continuation and further development of that policy of Britain.

Equally, I think, the U. S. will never be hitched on to that. In the struggle for total redistribution of the world, our policy must be directed towards the breakdown and breaking up of all imperialist domination over other peoples, no matter by whom exercised. We must see that no imperialist power or combination of powers establishes its complete reorganization of the world. The world must be reorganized, but it must be reorganized by the people, it must be reorganized by the eliminating of the rule of one nation over another and not by extending and perpetuating this rule, no matter under what banner the imperialist exploitation is carried out.

And we must say that what is coming to a head in the United States presidential elections in 1940, to paraphrase the words of Miss Thompson, is not a decision about the U. S., but is a decision about this planet. It is a decision as to whether the United States of America shall itself enter independently into the struggle for the redistribution of world power, as a rival imperialism or in collaboration with another imperialism, as our Tory camp in American political life envisions our future; or whether America shall be thrown into the world scale to stop this imperialist redivision of the world, to liberate the oppressed nations and give a people's reorganization of the whole world. This is the issue of the American Presidential election in 1940.

Only when we understand this basic fact can we see the full significance of the issues, the bitterness and intensity with which the 1940 political struggle will unfold.

The fundamental characteristic of American political alignments in relation to foreign policy is this: The labor and New Deal camp represents the alignment of the American people toward the struggle for liberation, against fascism and all imperialist domination. The Tory coalition, Hoover, Garner and Co., represents the idea of American partnership in the imperialist redistribution of the

world or American hegemony on an imperialist basis. And we must prepare and must help the whole democratic and labor camp to prepare for that full understanding of its tremendous historic significance.

3. The Communist Party—Its Role and Tasks

LET US now turn our attention more directly to our own Party, to deepen our understanding of its historic role, and thereby the better equip it successfully to carry through its tremendous and growing tasks.

We have taken the opportunity, suggested by the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Communist International (March, 1919), and the twentieth anniversary of the founding of our own Party (September, 1919), to initiate this year a more intensive and systematic study of our own history. We have received an impetus and support in this effort, of a value beyond computation, in the example of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*—a history of that Party which rose from a small group to the position of architect and creator of the new socialist society on one-sixth of the earth's surface, embracing one hundred and seventy million people.

The field and scope for our own historical studies are necessarily limited by the modest range of our achievements, but the essential principles developed in the *History of the C.P.S.U.* are of universal validity, and furnish us a key which, with industrious application and creative understanding, will open all the doors to full intellectual mastery of our own historical problems. The mastery of history is the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory.

In the current issue of *The Communist*, I have contributed some observations on our Party history, mainly dealing with the historical roots of our Party (before 1919), the

first decade, during which our Party crystallized itself, and finally cleaned out the hostile elements, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites (1919-1929), and the period of the great capitalist crisis (up to 1935), leading to the definite crystallization of the democratic front policy (the Seventh World Congress, 1935, and our Ninth National Convention, 1936). It is in this historical setting that we can best and most correctly evaluate our Party growth and development in the past four years, during which we have emerged as one of the significant national political forces.

The Communist Party, now and at all times, has the fundamental goal of guiding and organizing the transformation of society from its present capitalist basis to a socialist basis, from a society of class divisions and class struggles to a society without classes, from a system of exploitation of the masses by a relatively small parasitic class to a system without exploitation where the people own their means of livelihood in common, from a society perpetually involved in ever more destructive wars into a society guaranteeing universal peace. These aims were, are, and will be the fundamental reasons for the existence of the Communist Party. Only when these aims have been fully achieved will the Communist Party, having fulfilled its historic mission, disappear.

It follows that the Communist Party, while welcoming into its ranks all persons agreeing with this program and loyally working to achieve it, while representing and taking fully into account the interests and aspirations of all sections of the toiling population, is first and foremost the Party of the industrial wage-workers, the Party of the proletariat. This is determined not only by the fact that the industrial workers are the most decisive factor within the popular democracy, but above all by the fact that socialism corresponds to and arises out of the class interests and class position of the industrial workers more completely than of

any other class, that the industrial workers are peculiarly the destined leaders of humanity to its next higher stage, socialism, that they are the bearers of the new socialist culture. The prime purpose of the Communist Party is to bring full consciousness of this historic mission to the broad masses of the working class, to make it conscious of itself and of its tasks.

The policy of the people's front, and of the democratic front, which aims to achieve the broadest democratic people's unity against fascism and war, regardless of their attitude toward socialism, is in no way any abandonment or modification of our fundamental socialist program. On the contrary, it is the most scientific, the most precise, the most complete adjustment of these aims to the realities of the immediate historical moment. For there is no simple and direct short-cut to the future socialist society, which is not a Utopia which will drop from the heavens, but is conceived in the womb of the old society and is born in travail and suffering. The road to socialism is the road of education of the masses, of the majority of the people, through their own experiences and struggles to defend all those things they value in life and to expand them into a better life for all.

Our Marxist-Leninist theory teaches us that socialism is the *inevitable* next stage of society. But this inevitability has nothing in common with mechanical, mystical, fatalist concepts of the forces that determine human destiny. We have completely departed from the last traces of supernatural predestination. Socialism is *inevitable* because capitalism makes it *necessary* as the only alternative to chaos and destruction, and because capitalism has created the industrial working class, capable of achieving socialism, and because humanity has achieved a sufficiently high level of intelligence and organization to be able to avoid the catastrophe which is its only alternative.

But this truth is not revealed in a single moment of insight or inspiration to humanity as a whole, to any nation as a whole, nor even to the working class of one nation as a whole. As the guiding thought of effective majorities within nations, this truth crystallizes gradually out of the accumulated experiences of struggle against immediate and particular oppressions, exploitations, atrocities, catastrophes, war, inflicted by monopoly capitalism, and by the destructive forces born of capitalism.

The particular historical moment through which we are living takes its character from the rise of fascism, as a concrete expression of the rotting of monopoly capitalist rule and its turning into an instrument for the destruction of all human culture exemplified in world fascism. This is the concrete form of the world crisis of capitalism, its breakdown, the initiation of "the final conflict" on a world scale.

Hundreds of millions of people, of the toiling masses, whole nations in fact in their overwhelming majority, are deeply conscious of the menace of fascism, of the war threat of the fascist powers that hangs over the whole world. They are ready to fight for the protection of those things that make life happy, joyous, significant, worth living—all the best products of human culture—and they know that fascism must be destroyed or these things will disappear from the face of the earth. But only a relatively small minority—and this is especially true of the United States—understands even faintly as yet the final and complete solution of their problems in socialism. They are ready to fight for democracy, for culture, for civil rights, for all the good things of life that they know from their own experience and wish to preserve against the threat of fascist dictatorship and war—but they are not ready in sufficient numbers to fight for a new system of society which alone can guarantee these things and their full development.

If we allow the democratic masses to be irreconcilably divided between those who want socialism against those who merely want to halt fascism, then fascism has gained a terrible advantage in its ruthless drive to power. Then the two groups will find unity only in the concentration camps of a bloody dictatorship of monopoly capital in partnership with the criminal underworld. That is not the best conceivable situation to prepare a nation for socialism.

The link which must be seized today by all Communists, by all true socialists, is that which will tie us most closely with the broadest masses in their most deeply felt needs. That link is the unity of all democratic, of all anti-fascist, people. The defeat of fascism is the precondition for a future of socialism. And it is easier to defeat fascism before it comes to power than after. And direct defeat of fascism by socialism is possible only where the majority of the people have already accepted socialism.

Our Party has the supremely important task of insuring the unity of the democratic front, and simultaneously the freest development of socialist thought and understanding among the workers and the toiling masses generally.

That requires that we shall be in the forefront of the democratic ranks, fighting in the most effective manner for aims we hold in common with the whole democratic front of the majority of the people. But it also requires that we shall be good Communists, in the sense of more and more fully mastering the theory of Marxism-Leninism, more deeply understanding the forces of history and their concrete forms of development in our own country.

“Theory,” said Stalin, “becomes the greatest force in the working class movement when it is inseparably linked with practice; for it, and it alone, can give the movement confidence, guidance, an understanding of the inner links between events; it alone can enable those engaged in the practical struggle to understand

the whence and the whither of the working class movement." *

The Communist Party is the human embodiment of Marxist-Leninist theory. Its growth in organization and even more in influence is a demonstration of the potency of our theory. This theory it was which enabled us so to foresee events that we could make significant and vital contributions to the rise of the modern labor movement; this it is which enables us to be the most effective force for trade union unity and solidarity; this it is which made it possible for us to crystallize at least the beginnings of a powerful democratic front in our country. Our theory is the guide which enables us with precision already to indicate the main outline of the 1940 battles and thereby guide the thought and action of millions to the most effective goals.

But we must say that our Party is very inadequately equipped with theoretical understanding. We must today set the task of overcoming, of wiping out, this inadequacy. For every Communist the watchword is the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory. Only this can prepare us for the coming sharp turns, cataclysmic events and transformations, and the heavy and trying battles to which the world is being inexorably driven. This is the central word which we must say today about our own Party.

Recently, when I was in Los Angeles, I received the courtesy of an invitation to be interviewed over the radio by J. Frank Burke, the owner and manager of the station, and a well-known and influential progressive in California. In the course of a very interesting interview, Judge Burke asked me one question which was very interesting indeed. He wanted to know why, since the Communists are so

* Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I.

loyally and effectively supporting the progressive aims, measures and even candidates of the New Deal, it would not be better to dissolve the Communist Party and enter en masse into the Democratic Party, where we could also spread our socialist ideas in cooperation with Democrats who are socialistically inclined. I would like now to enlarge somewhat upon the answer which I gave at the time to this question.

For Communists and those with some theoretical understanding the answer of course has been given rather fully. But I am thinking of our millions of present and potential friends and allies, to whom the answers which are quite conclusive to us as Communists may not be so convincing. To these people we must prove in word and deed not only that we Communists are the kind of people they want to cooperate with and whose assistance they will welcome, but that our value in the common struggle is multiplied at least a hundredfold precisely through our organization in the Communist Party. We must prove empirically, by force of concrete evidence, that the presence of the Communist Party conduces powerfully to victory for the democratic forces. Only thus can we establish satisfactory working relations with our allies in the democratic front.

We have a wealth of examples, small and large, to prove the point, even to the most skeptical. For example, to begin with small things, I could have pointed out to Judge Burke that but for the existence of the Communist Party there is but small probability that I would have enjoyed meeting him, and his radio audience would have missed that stimulating interview. Or, to pass immediately to large things, we could cite the 1938 elections in New York State. It was the 100,000 Communist voters in New York who turned the tide for the joint Labor-Democratic candidate for Governor, defeated the Republican 1940 presidential hope, Mr. Dewey, and enabled Governor Lehman to tell

the A. F. of L. State Convention two weeks ago that New York was the outstanding state which had withstood the "reactionary sweep" in the country and maintained its progressive legislation. Now Mr. Dewey and the whole Tory camp may have sufficient reason to wish the dissolution of the Communist Party, as a result of this experience, but certainly every progressive must draw only favorable conclusions toward our Party as a result of this experience. If any progressive leaders, of more conservative trend, console themselves with the thought that they would have gathered those votes regardless of the Communist Party and its policy, or that they could have got those votes easier without the Communist Party, that is only a flagrant example of wishful thinking and of complete blindness to the growing complexity of American politics. Without the Communist Party that 100,000 New York voters would have been largely left at the mercy of the many varieties of disruptive demagogues, from Father Coughlin to the Trotskyites, not forgetting to mention Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party who did yeoman service for the election of Dewey.

Time does not permit further enlargement upon these examples. But every progressive can convince himself, from his own investigations, that the Communist Party as an organization, and not merely its component members, is a necessary factor for the immediate battles if victory is an important consideration in his eyes. American progressives and democrats are learning the lesson which in China led to the reunion of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party after ten years of civil war; which in Chile brought the defeat of reaction and the installation of a People's Front president; which in Spain enabled the republic to hold out through two and a half years of fascist invasion; that is the lesson that the Communist Party is an absolutely indispensable ally in the struggle for democracy, liberty,

and peace, the lesson that the Communist Party is the most loyal and selfless in upholding the common cause to the end, even to death—the lesson that all those who profess to fight “both communism and fascism” equally always end up as the conscious or unconscious agents and allies of fascism itself.

The Tory camp in the United States is making really extraordinary efforts to fasten, directly or indirectly, the stigma of illegality or at least official suspicion upon the Communist Party. The newspapers are kept full of stories repeating the legend that the Communist Party propagates “the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence.” They entirely suppress any mention of our Party Constitution, which specifically and in detail pledges every member of the Communist Party to combat such conceptions, a Constitution solemnly adopted in convention by unanimous vote and afterward ratified unanimously in a referendum vote of the membership. They entirely hide from the broad public the true reason for the increasingly vicious attacks against us, namely, that we are effectively and energetically supporting and advancing the progressive policies of the New Deal and the President and helping to strengthen and unite the labor movement. They are trying to catch our Party on some little technicality, which the public would not understand, or to manipulate with little-known or badly understood terms of the literature of scientific socialism and twist their meaning into the opposite.

The Communist Party is, however, a legal American political party and means to maintain that status against all attacks. In the past few years we have learned, among other things, how to protect ourselves against these attacks of our enemies. Our Constitution is the complete refutation of every misrepresentation and slander; and it provides authority to our National Committee to amend the Constitution in any way that may be required by new legal at-

tacks against us to maintain intact the full legal status of the C.P.U.S.A. In view of the urgency of this question in relation to developing struggles of the 1940 election campaign, and in view of the certainty that new assaults will be made in the coming months, before our National Committee meets again, I suggest that this plenary session adopt a formal resolution authorizing the Political Committee to take any action which in its judgment may be required to defend the full legal status of the Communist Party, including amendments to the Party Constitution, with the same force and authority as if it were by the National Committee itself, and in the name of the National Committee.

In this connection it is my duty to inform you about certain correspondence between the Party and officials in Washington relating to certain attacks against us. Taking cognizance of the action of Congressman Martin Dies, as reported in the newspapers, calling upon the Department of Justice to prosecute the Communist Party under the law of June, 1938, requiring the registration with the State Department of "agents of foreign principals," I addressed a letter to Attorney-General Murphy on April 17, 1939, stating that Mr. Dies' charges were absurd, but since they were made by a public official, we request an opportunity to place the relevant facts before his Department should he consider that it required any action. I received an answer on April 24, as follows:

"This Department acknowledges receipt of your letter of April 17, 1939, in which you refer to a statement to the effect that Congressman Martin Dies, as Chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, has brought to the attention of the Department his charge that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. represents a foreign power, and that under the statute, representatives of your party

are required to register with the Secretary of State.

"It is noted that you contend that this charge is without merit and you request an opportunity to make available to the Department the facts within your knowledge.

"Your request will be given consideration and if it is found necessary, you will be given full opportunity to present available facts in your possession to the Department.

"Respectfully,

"For the Attorney-General,

"Brien McMahon,

"Assistant Attorney-General."

In the course of the month of June, a New York representative of the Department of Justice, Mr. Starr, called at my office to make inquiry on the subject matter of this correspondence. Although he seemed unaware of the exchange of letters that had taken place, I assume that his visit was the consequence of this exchange. We made available to Mr. Starr all the available literature and documents of the Party which he thought in any way relevant to the subject, and spent many hours answering his detailed questioning into every conceivable angle. Besides myself, Comrade Foster and seven or eight other comrades had interviews with Mr. Starr, including every one whom he expressed a desire to meet.

We have received no information as to the conclusions, if any, reached by the Department of Justice as a result of this inquiry. Early in August, however, Comrade Foster and myself, as Chairman and General Secretary of the Party, received identical letters from the State Department, dated July 28, 1939, reading as follows:

"My dear Mr. Browder:

"There is enclosed for your information a copy of the *Rules and Regulations Governing the Registration*

of Agents of Foreign Principals under the Act of Congress Approved June 8, 1938 (Public No. 583-75th Congress). If your activities are such as to require you to register with the Secretary of State pursuant to the terms of the act and the rules and regulations issued thereunder, you should submit a registration statement on the prescribed form. Several blank forms of Registration Statement are enclosed for your use in case you are required to register.

"I should appreciate it if, in any event, upon the receipt of this letter you would inform me whether or not either you or the Communist Party in this country is the agent of, receives compensation from, or is under the direction of, any foreign principal within the meaning of the act mentioned above.

"Sincerely yours,

"For the Secretary of State:

"(Signed) Joseph C. Green,

"Chief, Division of Controls."

To this the following reply was sent in identical terms by Comrade Foster and myself:

"August 2, 1939.

"Mr. Joseph C. Green,
"Chief, Division of Controls,
"Department of State,
"Washington, D. C.

"Dear Mr. Green:

"Your letter of July 28, with enclosures, duly received, requesting information whether or not either I or the Communist Party in this country is the agent of, receives compensation from, or is under the direction of, any foreign principal within the meaning of the Act of Congress (Public No. 583-75th Congress.)

"Some time ago, when we were informed that Congressman Martin Dies had raised the question of Communist Party registration under this Act, I wrote

to Attorney General Murphy informing him that the Communist Party did not consider itself covered by the terms of the Act, and asking him, if he considered the question of any importance, to permit us to place the facts before his Department. Subsequently, we have met with an agent of the Department and furnished him with all relevant material and answered all his questions.

"Pursuant to your request, I hereby inform you that the Communist Party is not an agent of, does not receive compensation from, or is not under the direction of, any foreign principal within the meaning of the act mentioned above. The same answer applies to myself personally. Should you desire any more specific information I will be glad to furnish it to you.

"This letter has been read to and approved by the Political Committee of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, which is the authoritative spokesman of the Communist Party.

"Sincerely yours,

"(Signed) Earl Browder,

"General Secretary, C.P.U.S.A."

From these documents it will be seen that no position has been taken, so far as is known, by any authoritative department or official, on the charges of Congressman Dies, that the issue has merely been noted, and the formal answer of our Party placed in the government archives. We may hope that this will be the end of this particular absurdity, although we cannot expect it to end this particular sort of attack upon us.

You should also be informed that during May I made a voluntary appearance before the counsel of the Dies Committee, Mr. Rhea Whitley, and answered his questions for many hours. Further, I received, under date of August 24, 1953, the following letter from the Dies Committee:

"Dear Mr. Browder:

"In view of your previously expressed desire to testify before this Committee, it is requested that you report to Room 531, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at ten a.m., Monday, August 28, 1939, at which time you will be afforded the opportunity to testify.

"If there should be any change in the above date, I will telegraph you immediately.

"Very truly yours,

"(Signed) Rhea Whitley,
"Counsel."

I immediately got Mr. Whitley, the counsel, on the telephone and agreed to accept this invitation on the date mentioned, provided it was understood that I could leave on the 29th, in order to come to Chicago for this plenum. I received a telegraphic confirmation in the name of the committee that they agreed to this, but on the Saturday before the appearance was scheduled, the Dies Committee itself, after announcing my appearance to the newspapers, sent me a telegram, postponing, without date, the hearing, but indicating to the newspapers that the postponement had been at my request. That is not true. I requested no postponement. Since arriving in Chicago, I received further request from the Dies Committee, to appear before them on September 5, although they were informed some time ago of my detailed plans and knew that this request was breaking up all arrangement I had made for my work. I have, while protesting this discourtesy to a voluntary witness, informed the Dies Committee that I would be present on the date they request, September 5.

We can make all these attacks against the Communist Party serve a useful purpose, if they further help to awaken every member to the necessity to equip himself with such a complete command of our Party theory, program and

tactics that not even the most elaborate and subtle provocations can confuse him or entangle him in any Trotskyite deviations, or any weakness in unconditional defense of principle.

RELATION OF THE PARTY TO THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Communist Party, as a working class party, must necessarily concern itself most seriously with the great mass organizations of the workers, their principal source of power and advancement, their primary means of solidarity—the trade unions. Our Party has long understood that only through intimate understanding of the trade unions and their problems, tireless assistance to them in their struggles, and deepening cooperative relations with them, can we attain success in our main political objectives.

This basic interest of our Party in the trade union movement is distorted by the enemies of both, in order to make it appear that the Communist Party strives for *domination* of the unions by an outside force. Innumerable attacks have been made against particular unions in the past months on trumped-up and spurious charges of "Communist Party domination." This reached its highest point, when in the frame-up attempt to deport Harry Bridges, an attorney by the name of Sapiro gave testimony purporting to quote me as promising to "give the most drastic orders" to Bridges, as a Party member, to do such and such in trade union questions. The particular question of Bridges is being handled in the hearings before Dean Landis, and it is not necessary for me to deal with it here, beyond repeating what you well know, that Harry Bridges, for whose leadership in the labor movement we have the greatest respect, is not and has not been a member of the Communist Party, although he has every right to be without molestation by anyone, if and when he should come to full political agreement with our program, which is com-

pletely legal and not in contravention to any federal or state law. But the question posed so sharply by the false testimony in the Bridges case may well serve for another restatement of Party relations to trade unions and their leadership.

Our Party has made many changes, modifications, and turns in its attitude to particular issues of strategy and tactics involving the trade unions. *But we have consistently and over a long period completely rejected the theory and practice of the Party making decisions for trade unions or any other mass organizations; of Party leaders "giving orders" or "instructions" to its members who occupy leading posts in those organizations, or in any way trying to determine "from outside" the decisions or actions of such organizations.* In the past years we have issued only one "Party order" to our members in trade unions, and that was an order prohibiting them from attempting to use Party discipline even of groups entirely inside a mass organization as a means of achieving a unified attitude by purely organizational means, insisting that unity must be achieved through the democratic processes of the union itself.

For nine years I have been Secretary of our national organization, and never once during that time have I given or attempted to give "orders" or "instructions," or spoken to any one in such terms, directly or indirectly, concerning matters of inner concern and decision of a trade union or other mass organization. If the Communist Party is growing in influence within the labor movement, and it certainly is, this was made possible not only because our advice to the workers is more and more proved correct by life itself, but because we never give this advice in the form of "orders" or "instructions" but always depend entirely upon the inherent reasonableness of our arguments, upon the force of logic.

There is no example of the Communist Party working

otherwise than this, unless perhaps many years ago when the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites still worked within our Party and distorted its development. But the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites were cleaned out with an iron broom ten and eleven years ago, and their last remaining influence has long disappeared. How quickly their kind of leadership "by orders" destroys itself was dramatically illustrated by the "career" of Lovestone's protege, Homer Martin, whose "meteoric rise" was matched only by the dull and sickening thud of his equally sudden downfall. The Communist Party has been the sworn enemy of such practices in leadership, leadership by order, leadership by instruction, whether in our own Party or in the broad mass organizations, for a long time, ever since we began really to master the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Thus the testimony of the dubious attorney, in the Bridges case, overreached itself and proved its own falsity to every person who has had any direct experience in practical work with the Communist Party. And it serves us for a text to again make clear and explicit, to our own members and to our friends and allies, what is really the correct Leninist-Stalinist method of work among the masses and in their organizations.

HOW OUR PARTY BUILDS ITS IRON DISCIPLINE

No other organization is quite so democratic, in its inner life and in its relation with the masses, as the Communist Party. Those persons for whom "democratic" is synonymous with "disorderly" and "disunited" see a fatal contradiction between this declaration and the observed fact of the unexampled unity of thought and action that exists among the Communists, and the "iron discipline" upon which we pride ourselves. Such persons can understand discipline and unity only as something imposed from above

by authoritarian methods. With such conceptions they can never understand the Communist Party.

Our Party is entirely a voluntary association of individuals with common ideas and aims, who agree to work together unitedly to advance the common cause, to work together in the fashion demonstrated by Lenin and Stalin, exemplified by the victorious Communist Party in the Soviet Union. It is a Party of a new type. No one is admitted to membership unless the Party has reasonable assurance that he holds these basic views which unite the Party, and no one is constrained to membership for any reason; whenever, for any reason, the individual member finds himself out of harmony with this voluntary association, he is free to terminate it; likewise, whenever the Party feels that an individual is an alien body within its ranks, it is free to expel that individual. There is nothing forced about our relationship. It is free on both sides, on the side of the collective body of the Party and the side of the individual members. Within this association, we find the democratic process of discussion and decision fully ample as the instrument to build unity of thought and action, which expresses itself in the "iron discipline of the Party."

This type of Party organization is not the unique discovery of the American Communists. We learned it above all from the example of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and from the teachings of those great leaders. Stalin fully rounded out this concept of the Communist Party in the great discussions in 1925-26, which defeated and eliminated the influence of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin and those others later exposed as agents of fascism. A few quotations from Stalin may serve to deepen and sharpen our exposition on this point.

"The authority of the Party," said Stalin, "is maintained by the confidence of the working class. The

confidence of the working class is not to be won by force; for the use of force would kill confidence. It can only be won if Party theory is sound, if Party policy is correct, if the Party is devoted to the cause of the working class, if the Party is closely linked with the masses of the working class, and if the Party is ready and able to *convince* the masses that its slogans are the right ones." *

Stalin continues:

"Unless these conditions are fulfilled, 'the authority of the Party' and 'the iron discipline of the working class' are but empty phrases, are but an idle boast." **

After showing several concrete examples of how the C.P.S.U. attained (and maintained) these conditions in the Soviet Union, in the course of the Revolution, Stalin continues:

"Now let us contemplate another possibility. Let us suppose that, owing to the political backwardness of the working class, the Party policy (though right in the main) does not inspire general confidence or command general support; let us suppose that the Party has not yet been able to convince the working class that its policy is sound, the reason being that (as the phrase runs) the time is not yet ripe. In such a case, is the Party to take a decided initiative? Should the Party try to give a strong trend to the actions of the masses? No, certainly not! In such cases the Party, if it is to lead effectively, must know how to wait until it has convinced the masses that its policy is sound, must help the masses to learn this by their own experience."***

Stalin then quotes the words of Lenin, written in 1920:

* Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 37, International Publishers, New York.

** *Ibid.*, p. 41.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 44.

"No revolution is possible without a change of views in the majority of the working class. Such a change of views is brought about, in the masses, by political experience.

"The proletarian vanguard has been won over to our ideas. That is the main thing. Until so much has been achieved, we cannot take even the first step toward victory. The vanguard cannot conquer unaided. It would be worse than a blunder, it would be a crime, to send the vanguard into the fighting line before the class as a whole (the broad mass) is ready to support it, or at least ready to show benevolent neutrality and fully determined not to go over to the enemy. But propaganda and agitation alone will not suffice to ensure that the class as a whole, the broad masses of those who labor and are exploited by capitalism, are to be depended upon. For this the masses must have learned by their own political experience."

Those words have special and compelling significance for us American Communists today, in relation to our whole policy of this period, as well as our conception of the Party in general and its relation to the masses. And the following words of Stalin, applied to another country and time, fully corresponds to our own present moment in the United States, when he says:

"The present moment is one at which it is more than ever incumbent on us to keep these dangers well in mind, at a time when the political activity of the masses is increasing. Now, especially, the Party must be ready to pay close attention to the voice of the masses; must have a fine ear for their demands; must display extreme caution and show peculiar elasticity in its policy. Now, more than ever, will the Party leadership of the masses be imperilled if Communists should suffer from swelled head. Let us never forget Lenin's golden words at the Eleventh Party Congress: 'Among

the masses of the people, we Communists are but drops in the ocean, and we cannot rule unless we *give accurate expression to the folk consciousness.*'"

If we need a horrible example of what it means for a political party to depart from these principles, so clearly set forth by Lenin and Stalin, just look at the miserable debacle of the Socialist Party under Norman Thomas, for all its prattling about "socialism," "party discipline," and the like. Or, for a more extreme illustration, see how the Trotskyite sects have become the direct auxiliaries of Father Coughlin's fascist activities, and of fascism and reaction in general.

Our Party is growing, its relations with the masses are deepening, its influence is spreading, its membership is more steeled, its discipline is more solid, precisely because our Party as a whole has grasped the basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism and is learning how creatively to develop them in the peculiar historical and political setting of the United States, and in this particular moment of world history.

All Americans who love peace, who hate fascism, who hate oppression owe a debt of gratitude to the genius of Lenin and Stalin, which erected the great bulwark of peace, culture, democracy and socialism in the Soviet Union, the only firm point in a world swept by colossal storms. Especially do American Communists feel the deepest love and devotion to Stalin, whose example and teaching have guided us through the rocks which in previous generations wrecked the American socialist movement, and have launched us on the open seas of American life, to Stalin who is the leader of progressive humanity in the struggle for peace and against fascism.

Next December, Joseph Stalin will observe the sixtieth anniversary of a most full and fruitful life. We will be honoring ourselves, if we determine to celebrate that anni-

versary, by taking the most decisive steps to more thoroughly study, understand and master the deep wisdom which brought the victorious establishment of socialism on one-sixth of the earth, that wisdom given to us in the writings of Stalin, and above all the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. We have distributed 100,000 copies of the *History* in the English language, and close to 50,000 in other languages. That is good, that is excellent, but it is only the beginning. Now to study, to mastery of theory, to the application of our theory in the life of the American working class and toiling people generally—this is the road of building our Party, the road of victory over reaction by the American people, the road to American participation in the defeat of world fascism, the road of democracy and socialism.

Chicago, September 2, 1939

4. Summary

I THINK, comrades, that I can speak very briefly. Just a few observations and then the summary of the key issues of the day, as we can summarize them in slogan form. First of all, a word about the work of our Party in these days. I was very happy a few moments ago to hear from Comrade Krumbein a report from New York City; the district office had to put on a double staff to handle the telephone calls from the sections and branches, demanding latest information, plans of work and supplies of literature. The entire membership is out on the streets, going from house to house, distributing Molotov's speech and the *Daily Worker*. The great demand is for direction, leadership, materials. The demand is greater than the supply. It is clear why we should get started back home as soon as possible.

Another observation. One of the dangers that we face these days is that the pressure of the dominant issues may make us overlook or neglect vitally important problems. For example, under so-called normal conditions, one of the central points of examination in this meeting of our national committee would have been the impending nationwide packinghouse strike, which we have merely spoken of. Let us mention it again, for its own importance and as an example of the type of problems to which we must be immediately sensitive, be quick to act, and give the most careful attention.

The solution of the world political problems rests upon such problems as this nation-wide packinghouse strike as its

foundation. Also it rests upon the smallest detailed organizational work to which great attention must be given. There must be no neglect or loosening up of organizational work and especially no neglect of Party building. We are not proposing any Party recruitment campaign because we feel that the conditions for Party building are so favorable that a campaign is not necessary and might even retard the process of building the Party. We are going to swell our ranks with every step forward and we want to impress this consciousness upon the Party, so that Party building will become inevitably an accompaniment of everything else that we do.

In these days, we are able to build more soundly than in ordinary times, because from hour to hour we have the testing of recruits that we bring in. The very act of their joining us as they will more and more when the full force of our political word reaches the country will itself, especially in the first stages, be a good test.

Furthermore, this is the time in which we test the leading personnel of our movement and of working class organizations generally. We must study all the leading cadres, from top to bottom of the movement. We must register those who come forward strongly, give real, clear, bold, confident leadership. We must also carefully note those who lag, those who fall behind, those who display weaknesses. First, in order to help them, and, second, in order to guarantee that the Party does not place great responsibilities in any place where there is any danger of breakdown, that the responsibilities of leadership go onto those shoulders that prove in life that they are able to bear these heavy responsibilities.

We are going into serious times not only for Europe, but also for America. The political barometer in this country will begin to rise rapidly. Today, all public voices are shouting "national unity" and this will be a popular slogan

because it expresses the deep-felt need among the people. The people demand national unity and at this moment, all voices join in that demand, beginning with Herbert Hoover and ending with the Plenum of the Communist Party.

But as I pointed out earlier, behind this slogan of national unity as raised by the Hoovers, the Walter Lippmanns and Mark Sullivans, is the threat against national unity; they say we must have national unity *but*—to obtain it the President must establish a council to control his decisions, a council of Republicans, Tory Democrats, and, as a concession, the President's supporters. That is the demand that President Roosevelt relinquish his post of leadership of the country to his enemies, that he abandon the policies for which the people gave him a mandate, that this is the price of national unity and if this price is not paid, there will be no national unity. This understanding of the meaning of the cry of national unity, when it comes from the Hoovers and the Lippmanns, must be brought to the workers and to the country, and as the falseness of this cry from the Tory camp is demonstrated and the struggle sharpens, the political temper of Americans will rapidly rise.

Out in the wide open spaces of the West they are already openly talking in crude and vulgar terms that which the whole Tory camp will be expressing before the middle of 1940. Comrade Wood yesterday gave me a copy of the *Tulsa Daily World* of August 15. On the editorial page, in two parallel columns, there is side by side, a boost for "Garner for President" and next to it a column which opens up, "*It has been a long time since this country had a good president assassinated.*"

We have had occasion in the past to point out this agitation for violence against the President and largely as the result of our exposure and denunciation of it, it was driven out of the public prints and back into the club rooms of the rich, where it originated. It is emerging once more

into the public prints as a portent of the temper that is being generated by the reactionary camp.

We should not be surprised that the Tories have become the party of force, violence and disorder in the United States. The Tories always become that when they no longer have the full power to determine for themselves what is law and order. We should not be surprised because we are living in a period of the general break-up of the foundations of bourgeois law and order; not only these latest days in which we live, but for twenty-five years, the world has been in a period of break-up of the old order of society, the sapping, rotting and collapsing of its foundations, with the consequent catastrophes, crises, revolutionary upheavals and wars, that result in the superstructure of society.

Lenin taught us this fundamental fact long ago, and to understand it more deeply we should refresh our minds constantly by going back to the brilliant, penetrating utterances of Lenin in the period of the World War and immediately after.

I picked out a page and a half from Lenin that I have not seen often quoted but which to me seems to be the best short piece which I could find to give us a characterization of the complexity of the problems which in general we face in this period of a collapsing capitalist society. This is from a speech of Lenin made in one of the discussions on the question of the program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union along in 1918, or 1919. The quotation bears some internal evidence that the speech was made towards the conclusion of a long and exhausting meeting, because, unlike most of Lenin's utterances, it has some very long and involved sentences; but the thought expressed in it is so crystal clear, throws such light on today, that I chose it rather than better-known, more-quoted expressions of Lenin, to emphasize one of the main points that we have been making in this meeting. Lenin says:

“ . . . This is the general perspective of world history, and the fundamentals of socialism should not be forgotten. Whatever the subsequent vicissitudes of the struggle may be, however many partial zigzags it may be necessary to overcome (and there will be very many of them—we see from experience what tremendous twists the history of the revolution is making, and so far only in our country; matters will be far more complex and proceed far more rapidly, the speed of development will be more furious, and the twists will be more complicated when the revolution becomes converted into a European revolution), in order not to get lost in these zigzags and twists of history and to preserve the general perspective—in order to perceive the crimson thread that connects together the whole development of capitalism and the whole road to socialism, which, it is natural, seems to us to be straight and which we must picture as being straight, in order to see the beginning, the continuation and the end (in actual life it will never be straight, it will be incredibly complex)—in order not to get lost in these twists, in order not to get lost in the periods of retreat, retirement or temporary defeat, or when history or the enemy throws us back—in my opinion the important and the only theoretically correct thing is not to cast out the old basic program! For we here in Russia are now only in the first transitional stage from capitalism to socialism.

“History has not granted us those peaceful conditions which for a certain period were theoretically conceived of, and which would have been desirable for us and would have permitted us to pass through these transitional stages rapidly! We at once see how much difficulty has been caused by the civil war in Russia and how this civil war is becoming interwoven with a whole series of wars! Marxists have never forgotten that violence will be an inevitable accompaniment of the collapse of capitalism on its full scale and of the birth

of a socialist society. And this violence will cover a historical period, a whole era of wars of the most varied kinds—imperialist wars, civil wars within the country, the interweaving of the former with the latter, national wars, the emancipation of the nationalities crushed by the imperialists and by various combinations of imperialist powers which will inevitably form various alliances with each other in the era of vast state-capitalist and military trusts and syndicates. This is an era of tremendous collapses, of wholesale military decisions of a violent nature, of crises. It has already begun, we see it clearly—it is only the beginning.”*

Answering those who in 1918 could not understand how the Soviet Union could make an agreement with its enemies, a problem which worries many American liberals, Lenin said:

“... I very well recall the scene when, at the Smolny, it was my lot to hand an act to Svinhufvud—which in Russian means ‘swinehead’—the representative of the Finnish bourgeoisie, who played the part of a hangman. He amiably shook my hand, we exchanged compliments. How unpleasant that was! But it had to be done, because at that time the bourgeoisie was deceiving the people, was deceiving the toilers by declaring that the Muscovites, the chauvinists, the Great-Russians, wanted to stifle the Finns. It had to be done.”**

SLOGANS

Now, comrades, to sum up the issues which we have been discussing in this session, as we must crystallize them into

* V. I. Lenin, “Report on Revising the Program and Name of the Party,” *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, pp. 315-16, International Publishers, New York. Report delivered at the Seventh Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), on March 8, 1918.

** *Ibid.*, “On the Party Program,” p. 341. Report delivered at the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), March 19, 1919.

the simplest possible form to transmit our message to the broadest possible masses. I want to read you a series of slogans with a few words of comment on some.

1. *For American National and Social Security.*

This is the main slogan put forward at our Plenum last December. Its significance and importance will only today be understood in its full depth. It is the starting point and summation of our whole line. We must not forget it; we must not let the masses forget it; and we must return to it time and time again.

2. *Full Moral, Diplomatic and Economic Help for the Polish People and Those Who Help Poland Defend Its National Independence.*

What is the significance of this particular formulation? Why do we not ask for immediate help to Chamberlain and Daladier? They have declared war on Germany ostensibly to help the Polish people. But we have no reason to feel the slightest bit of confidence today any more than the day before yesterday that Chamberlain and Daladier are not preparing another Munich, which they did not dare to bring before their Parliaments today because of the temper of the people; but if they can present the British and French people, in the course of a week or ten days, with sufficiently serious military setbacks, they may achieve their aim. So we say, help to the Polish people and those who help the Polish people, but put not your trust in Chamberlain and Daladier.

3. *Embargo Japan and Germany for the Defeat of Fascist Aggression and for Establishing a Democratic Peace!*

Why this particular formulation? Why didn't we just say embargo the fascist powers for the defeat of fascist aggression and leave out the rest of it? Because that is not enough any more. Chamberlain wants to defeat Germany

and Japan, that is, he wants to defeat them a little bit, enough to make them ready for an alliance. He wants to go far enough so that Britain can dictate the terms of peace and that it will be a British peace, a Munich peace, a Versailles peace. So we want, in every such proposal as this, to include in our formulation the demand for a democratic peace. Whatever we propose is for the reaching of a democratic peace and we will do everything possible to help prevent any other kind of a peace from being imposed upon the world. Another point: The Socialists and Trotskyites already developed for their masters a counter-attack against this demand for an embargo on Japan and Germany. And this Trotskyite weapon will undoubtedly now be used in every newspaper in America, to help put across the Chamberlain line.

They will say to us: "While you Communists demand an embargo, the Soviet Union is carrying on trade with Germany! How dare you speak of America placing an embargo on Germany when the Soviet Union has a trade agreement with Germany and evidently intends to continue this trade?" How do we answer this? Let us return to our first slogan—For American national and social security. If the Soviet Union is continuing and developing its trade with Germany, it is because that is the only way they found to protect the national and social security of the Soviet people. If America places an embargo on Japan and Germany it will be for exactly the same reason—to protect the national and social security of the American people. We have never said that what is good for one country is necessarily good for every other country in exactly the same form. The very individuals and groups that charge us with being unprincipled, because we advocate an American embargo while the Soviet Union does not place an embargo, *are the very ones who insist as a matter of principle that all such questions as that should be decided by each country indepen-*

dently and no country should try to dictate to another. They would be very indignant if the Soviet Union should try to dictate to the United States whether it should or should not have an embargo, but before deciding the American policy they demand to know if the Soviet Union will do the same—and do it first! It is not we who have anything unprincipled in our attitude, it is those who attack us on such ground who themselves are unprincipled and are torn with the greatest of contradictions. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has in effect a *de facto* embargo on Japan, but the U. S. has not, the Soviet Union long had a *de facto* embargo on Germany but Great Britain insisted, up to last week, upon furnishing Hitler with at least one-third of his materials for rearmament.

4. *All Possible Credits and Material Aid to China!*

This is an old and well understood slogan. It is a slogan that is of greater appeal to Americans today, than ever before, and it is one that gains in significance precisely as the prospects for China's struggle grow brighter. We must not allow this to fall into the background.

5. *All Help to the Democratic Forces in Spain and Full Aid to the Spanish Refugees!*

This I think has been adequately discussed here today in the speeches of other comrades.*

6. *Help the German People Establish a Democratic Germany! For the Freedom and National Independence of Czechoslovakia and Austria!*

The importance of this lies in the keeping in the forefront, at all times, the spirit of friendship for the German people, even when there is no possibility of an *immediate action* in order to help the German people establish a democratic Germany. Even if we ourselves can do nothing at the moment, we must keep this idea in the forefront to

* The speeches referred to will be published elsewhere.—Ed.

counteract the *chauvinism* that is already being spread in this country, the chauvinism we saw in its bestial nature in the last war by which the Americans were taught to hate the German people. We must spread the idea to be friends of the German people and our Americans must stand ready to help the German people the moment they move to get rid of the barbarian regime of Hitler.

7. *United States and Latin American Initiative, in Collaboration with the Soviet Union, for a World Peace Conference.*

I think this is clear and needs no further explanation. We can take this idea to the country and the country will listen to it gladly. It is the guarantee of a democratic peace.

8. *Defeat the Plotters of a New Munich and Their Trotskyite and Lovestoneite Agents!*

The whole plenum has been an explanation of this slogan.

9. *Support the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union.*

10. *Strengthen the Good Neighbor Policy as a Bulwark of Democracy and Peace in the Americas!*

This is very important today and grows more important as the reactionaries are developing their foreign policy under the new war conditions and are driving for an American partnership with Japan on one hand and an iron hand in Latin America on the other. We must strengthen the consciousness of the American people on the Good Neighbor policy and press it for a stronger and more complete development by Washington.

11. *Unite the American People Around the New Deal and Its Progressive Policies!*

12. *Down with the Tory Threat Against American National Unity!*

These slogans are the answer to the Tory slogan of a coalition government as a means of national unity. National unity, yes—unity around the New Deal and its progressive policy—which forms the only possible basis for true national unity. The thought must be implanted deep in the public mind—every time the Tories talk about national unity it is a threat to break that unity. National unity can only be a people's, a progressive, unity.

13. *Unity of All Labor as the Backbone of National Unity!*

With this slogan we demand labor take its rightful place in the leadership of the nation, and place the needs of the nation in support of the demand for labor unity.

14. *Defend and Extend American Democracy!*

This slogan is the answer to all those muddleheads and weak souls who will stop defending American democracy now that war has begun. We of course have never given one fraction of an inch to the agitation that democracy ends when war begins, and raise the slogan not only to defend but extend American democracy. It is the only possible way to insure unity and bring it forward in the consciousness of the people.

15. *Nationalize the Munitions Industry!*

This is a popular slogan and the more we can hammer it home and bring it forward the more we can convince the people we will be directing the efforts against the main enemy—monopoly capital.

16. *Curb the Monopolists and Profiteers!*

Already we must raise the alarm against the profiteers—against those who will exploit us in war conditions with tremendous monopoly profits. The driving against monopolists and profiteers of all kinds will become more and more a central issue as war conditions develop.

17. *Replace the Monopolists on the War Industries Board with Representatives of the People!*

What is the situation today? The War Industries Board has been composed by appointment, almost if not quite exclusively, of some of the worst monopolists in America. One can understand the motives of a President who wants to get certain things done and can get them done only through these great trusts controlled by these monopolists—in retreating before them and handing over this most strategic point of control of national defense. The American people cannot be satisfied with such short-sighted and shallow reasons, however, and cannot remain silent on this issue.

War industries, if they are important to the American people, must be controlled by representatives of the people and not by the monopolists, who are the oppressors and bloodsuckers of the people, and we must raise this issue which, as the situation develops, will become more and more sharp.

18. *Guarantee the Rights of Unionization, Collective Bargaining and Trade Union Standards in All Industry!*

Why does this become especially important at this moment? Because already reactionaries are raising the slogan that the conditions of war will require sacrifices. Sacrifices from whom? The big corporations and monopolists? No, from labor. Already reactionary labor leaders are beginning to think about reaching agreements with monopoly capital whereby in return for support of certain privileges, they will establish agreements not to carry unionism into the unorganized industries. Against such projects there must be aroused the most intense vigilance.

19. *Full Support to the Unionization of Workers in All Industries and the Improvement of their Conditions!*

20. *Put America Back to Work!*

This is an old familiar one, but more timely than ever.

21. *Maintain the American Standard of Living Against All Attacks!*

As we go along this slogan will have to be concretized in the most varied forms, locally, in the states, sectionally and nationally. There are going to be thousands of different forms of attacks on the workers, the unemployed, the farmers and the middle classes, and we must raise the alertness and vigilance of every section of the people to resist every effort against their standard of living.

22. *Maintain Freedom of Speech, Press and Assembly. Protect the Bill of Rights!*

This is especially necessary now. Under war conditions, even when our country is not at war, there immediately arises stronger and stronger the tendency to dispense with the Bill of Rights. We must fight such tendencies, in cooperation with all progressive forces and under all conditions we must maintain freedom of speech, press and assembly.

23. *Defeat the Attacks on the Legality of the Communist Party as Attacks Against Democracy and the Unity of the People!*

We must take the defense of our Party to the masses, not on the question of whether they agree with our Party program, but regardless of what their opinion of our Party program is; if they want to defend democracy, and the unity of the people, the only way they can do it is to defeat these attacks on the legality of the Communist Party.

24. *Put an End to All Campaigns Against Jews, Negroes, Catholics and the Foreign Born as an Offense Against American Unity and Liberty!*

In this slogan is summed up the whole campaign against those reactionary propagandas typical of the fascist and pro-fascist forces.

25. *Defend America's Youth—the Defenders of America!*

26. *Build the Democratic Front of the People to Defeat Tory Reaction in 1940.*

In this slogan is summed up our whole attitude toward the coming election campaign.

And finally the last slogan which is again an inclusive one, which sums up and expresses our whole line, the slogan:

27. *For Jobs, Security, Democracy and Peace!*

I think, comrades, that here we have for the moment sufficient directives for our work, sufficient formulations of our line for the broadest mass distribution, for the broadest mass education. I think that we have armed ourselves for the immediate period in the immediate struggle. As we go along we will have to supplement this with other ideological and political armaments, but for the next drive forward I think the Party is prepared.

Finally, I think that we must register at this meeting of our National Committee that in general during these weeks our Party is not only consolidating itself internally, not only meeting its responsibilities to the working class, to the people and the nation, but that it has registered upon the mind of the country the most powerful impression. We have accumulating evidence that the Party has won deeper and more profound respect among serious-thinking people in America in the past ten days than in any other previous period in our Party's life, and that is as it should be.

From this meeting of the National Committee, let us go forth to perform our duty to the working class and the people more fully than ever before, to really bring understanding not only to the hundreds of thousands but to the millions of Americans, to reach the hearts and minds of all Americans, and bring America into the struggle for peace side by side with the Soviet Union.

Chicago, September 3, 1939