

FEBRUARY, 1936



THE

COMMUNIST

Review of the Month

A. B.



The Party of Lenin and the People's Front

EARL BROWDER



The A.A.A.—and After

DAVID RAMSEY



The Coming National Negro Congress

JAMES W. FORD and A. W. BERRY



The Decree on Peace

V. I. LENIN



Left Trends in the Socialist Party

ROBERT MINOR



Developing Party Cadres in the Chicago District

BEATRICE SHIELDS



Draft Charter of the United Party of the Proletariat
of France

20
CENTS

FEBRUARY, 1936



THE

COMMUNIST

Review of the Month

A. B.



The Party of Lenin and the People's Front

EARL BROWDER



The A.A.A.—and After

DAVID RAMSEY



The Coming National Negro Congress

JAMES W. FORD and A. W. BERRY



The Decree on Peace

V. I. LENIN



Left Trends in the Socialist Party

ROBERT MINOR



Developing Party Cadres in the Chicago District

BEATRICE SHIELDS



Draft Charter of the United Party of the Proletariat
of France

20
CENTS

Build the United People's Front

By EARL BROWDER

This pamphlet, containing the report to the November Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, constitutes the main materials for the pre-convention discussion in the period preceding the Ninth National Convention. In this report, Comrade Browder sums up our recent experiences and achievements, and sets forth our tasks in the light of the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the C. I.

72 Pages—10 Cents

Other New Pamphlets

- THE TOWNSEND MOVEMENT, *by Alex Bittelman*05
- UNITED WE STAND—For Peace and Socialism,
by Gil Green05
Report on the Sixth World Congress of the
Young Communist International.
- THE MENACE OF A NEW WORLD05
- A HANDBOOK FOR PROJECT WORKERS, *by
Herbert Benjamin*05

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

THE

COMMUNIST

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of
Marxism-Leninism



PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Vol. XV.

FEBRUARY, 1936

No. 2

CONTENTS

REVIEW OF THE MONTH	99
By A. B.	
THE PARTY OF LENIN AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT	120
<i>(Speech Delivered at the Lenin Memorial Meeting, Madison Square Garden, January 20, 1936.)</i>	
By EARL BROWDER	
THE A.A.A.—AND AFTER	130
By DAVID RAMSEY	
THE COMING NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS	139
By JAMES W. FORD and A. W. BERRY	
THE DECREE ON PEACE	143
By V. I. LENIN	
LEFT TRENDS IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY	147
By ROBERT MINOR	
DEVELOPING PARTY CADRES IN THE CHICAGO DISTRICT	165
By BEATRICE SHIELDS	
DRAFT CHARTER OF THE UNITED PARTY OF THE PROLETARIAT OF FRANCE	171
ECONOMIC TRENDS	181
BOOK REVIEWS	187
Spiking Mussolini's Guns..... By THEODORE REPARD	
A "New" Interpretation of History..... By H. M. WICKS	

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates \$2 a year; \$1 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20c.

In 1936

The Communist International

will be published as a monthly magazine

THE organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, formerly published twice a month, will henceforth appear monthly. Issues will sell for 15 cents a copy; subscription will be \$1.75 for the year. In combination with *The Communist* (\$2.00) and *International Press Correspondence* (\$5.00) subscription for all three magazines will be \$7.20 for the year.

A special Chinese issue of
THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
will be published in the middle
of February.

Send your subscription to any of the bookstores
on the back cover, or

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. BOX 148, STA. D

NEW YORK CITY

Review of the Month

Reaction and the Supreme Court—N.R.A. and A.A.A.—Jackson and Roosevelt—The Right and “Left” Wings of the Administration—Supreme Court Autocracy or the Liberties of the People—The Congress and Legislation—The Liberty League Has a Program; What Is Roosevelt’s?—Substitutes for the A.A.A. and the Independent Proposals of the Toiling Farmers—A Billion Dollars for War and the Fight for Peace—Neutrality and Peace or “Neutrality” a la Morgan—An American Peace Policy—Molotov’s Report and the Socialist Advances of the U.S.S.R.—From Fascist Germany — Cuba, Mexico, and Venezuela — Will Hutcheson Have His Way?—The Preparations for the Ninth Party Convention.

REACTION in the United States has scored another victory by the six-to-three decision of the Supreme Court invalidating the A.A.A. But it lies in the power of the working class and its allies to turn this victory into a defeat—a defeat for the monopolies and a victory for the people.

The Supreme Court smashed the A.A.A.; but the six reactionaries who did it were aiming further than that. With their old and bony hands they were trying to set up another barrier to the growing struggles of the masses for the improvement of their conditions. These six old men decreed, in effect: No legislation of any kind that benefits in any way the toiling masses! The decision of the Supreme Court was nothing else but a legalistic transcription of the program of the Liberty League. It put into lawyers’ language the dictates of Morgan-du Pont, of Hearst and Ford, of the reactionary monopolies.

When the government pours out billions of the people’s money to save the investments of the big bankers and monopolies, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies, this is all right; this accords fully with the general welfare clause of the Constitution. When the government provides for the spending of a billion dollars a year for armaments and war preparations, this is all right again; this, too, is “general welfare”. But when

part of the same people's money is spent for the farmers (true, only a small section of them, mostly farmer-capitalists), this is not all right; this is not "general welfare"; this violates the Constitution. Thus speaks capitalist reaction through the mouth of the Supreme Court decision.

This was the second major blow—first, the invalidation of the N.R.A., now the A.A.A.—delivered by the Supreme Court against the laboring people of this country within the last ten months. This shows clearly that the reactionaries will stop at nothing to prevent the toilers from shifting the burden of the crisis back to the rich. These blows of the Supreme Court strike vitally at the democratic rights and civil liberties of the American people. It is not Congress, say the reactionaries, that has the right to decide what is good for the general welfare of the people, but the monopolies. And if the monopolies happen to be displeased with the decisions of Congress, then the Supreme Court will do the job for them. The Supreme Court has always been the last fortress of reaction. That is why the capitalists and landlords who framed the Constitution placed so much power into a body of nine old men appointed to office for life. Capitalist reaction has not been disappointed; the Supreme Court has come to the rescue. Not Congress, a body elected by the people, although the basis of election is far from democratic, but the Supreme Court, a totally appointed institution, is the final arbiter of what the people may or may not have.

The workers, farmers and middle classes of this country are thus compelled to give their answer to two fundamental issues raised by the attack of the Supreme Court:

1. Are we going to continue permitting the monopolies to use the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution for the "welfare" of Morgan-du Pont & Co. and against the welfare of the people, or are we going to fight to make this clause mean the welfare of the masses against their exploiters?

2. Are we going to allow the monopolies to use the Supreme Court for blocking all legislation that the masses can compel Congress to pass in the interests of the toilers, the overwhelming majority of the American population, or are we going to destroy that power of the Supreme Court and thus deliver a telling blow against the monopolies and capitalist reaction?

It lies in the power of the working people of this country to decide these issues in their own interests and to enforce these decisions. But this power must be organized into an independent political force. Workers, farmers, Negroes and the middle classes must get together into a party of their own—a Farmer-Labor Party. They must form a People's Front against reaction as proposed by

the Communist Party (see Appeal of its Central Committee, *Daily Worker*, January 11, 1936). In this way the victory of reaction will be turned into a victory of the people.

Roosevelt's opponents from the Right have naturally greeted the Supreme Court decision with glee. They worked for it and they got it. The Republican *Herald Tribune* is satisfied that it is a thoroughly "American" decision which points "The American Way". But the American people cannot and must not allow the reactionaries to identify American ways with reactionary ways. While it is a fact that America today is owned and controlled by the Morgans, du Ponts and Hearsts, the America of tomorrow is the country of the American people. And the American people will identify the American way with progress, not reaction; with struggle in defense of the democratic rights and liberties of the toiling masses as against the dictatorship of the monopolies and its Supreme Court weapon; with the struggle for a new social order that will be truly based on the general welfare instead of the unrestrained robbery of the masses by the monopolies. And in doing so the masses will be reinforced by many of the revolutionary traditions—*American traditions*—of this country.

It is worthy of note that the jubilation of the reactionaries with the Supreme Court decision is markedly restrained. The same *Herald Tribune* finds it necessary to say:

"A gradual liquidation of the A.A.A. would obviously have been the better solution. Since that is apparently impossible under the Supreme Court decision, there should be every effort to devise other ways and means that are constitutional for cushioning the return to normal methods of production." (Jan. 9, 1936.)

"Cushioning the return"—here speaks the dread of the monopolies of a possible explosion of mass resentment. Here we also see the strategy of reaction to solidify its victory before exposing too much its plans for new attacks and for winning the rich farmers. But we must not be fooled by that. Already it is well known that such measures as the Wagner and Guffey Acts as well as the Railroad Pension Act—to mention only some—are slated by reaction to be *schechtered* in the same fashion as the N.R.A. and A.A.A. were.

Equally noteworthy is the attitude to the Supreme Court decision on the part of Roosevelt's own Right wing, that section of finance capital which is still supporting Roosevelt and which finds its best spokesman in the *New York Times*. And what is that attitude? It is one of unreserved *approval* of the Supreme Court decision. And let us not forget: the section of finance capital which still supports Roosevelt is not just a "wing" in the same way as

Roosevelt's "Left" wing is. No the Right "wing" is still Roosevelt's *main class base*. It is the social group whose class interests are for Roosevelt the *starting* point for all his policies; whatever concessions Roosevelt gives or plans to give to other social groups in order to get their support, he does so for the purpose of serving the class interests of this section of finance capital. It is to this group of finance capital that he listens most attentively; it is they whom he is trying to satisfy most completely. Figure out, then, how much consistency the masses can expect from Roosevelt in the fight against the reactionaries and monopolies, as long as Roosevelt has his main class base in the finance capitalists for whom the *New York Times* speaks. And it speaks in this case quite plainly. Trying to dissipate the "pessimism" of those who fear serious economic disturbances as a result of the Supreme Court decision, the *Times* says:

"Had the decision come in 1933, much of this pessimism might have been justified. As matters stand, however, it seems rather that A.A.A. has served effectively as a temporary bridge across a gully to more solid ground." (Jan. 8, 1936.)

We are still to hear what Roosevelt's "Left" wing (Wallace, Ickes, Tugwell, and the Roosevelt supporters among the trade union leaders—John L. Lewis and Hillman) has to say about this frank position of his Right "wing". It would be very important to hear from this "Left" wing how such two wings, held together by Roosevelt, can produce a barrier to reaction in the future. It is well known that it has been no barrier to reaction in the past and present. Incidentally, it would also be very important to know what particular section of the Roosevelt set-up is demanding the removal from office of Ickes, Tugwell and Hopkins. Surely, there must be a serious basis for this piece of news circulated by the United Press some time ago.

What is Roosevelt proposing to do to meet the attack of the Supreme Court decision? We shall discuss presently the new substitute for the A.A.A. Here we are concerned with the much bigger question of what measures Roosevelt is proposing to curb the Supreme Court. So far there is no indication that he is going to do anything real in the matter. His present policy seems to be one of accommodating his legislative proposals to the Supreme Court rulings. That is a policy of capitulation to the reactionaries, a policy which can be realized only at the expense of the toiling masses.

The Communist Party has proposed three immediate and practical measures:

"1. Congress and President should repudiate the right of the Supreme Court to declare laws unconstitutional.

"2. To impeach judges who usurp the democratic rights of the people.

"3. To amend the Constitution to prohibit the Supreme Court from declaring laws unconstitutional."

This is the way to begin an earnest fight against rising autocracy and entrenched greed of which Roosevelt spoke quite eloquently in his message to Congress. We listened to these words and we said: O. K.—Let's turn the words into deeds. And when, on the morrow of Roosevelt's message, the Supreme Court released its bombshell, it became doubly evident that words alone will not do. Deeds are called for. But where are they?

True, the workers, farmers and middle classes are not the only ones that demands deeds from Roosevelt. The finance capitalists who support him also demand more deeds. Speaking of Roosevelt's message to Congress—a message fighting in form but conciliatory to reaction in substance—the *New York Times* talks again quite plainly and frankly:

"It is an old phrase of the Roosevelt family that we must judge a man by deeds, not words. American citizens, even those surprised by the language of his message, will be ready to apply that to the President. *They will expect him, having now fired off his rhetoric at his critics, to settle down to constructive and helpful work as Chief Executive.*" (Jan. 5, 1936—Our emphasis—A. B.)

Granting that Roosevelt will not exactly "settle down", for the reason that his Right opponents will not let him, it should be clear that his present policy of accommodating the Supreme Court is a policy of steady capitulation—a retreating fight—to reaction. It is a policy that emboldens and strengthens reaction and worsens the conditions of the masses.

In his Jackson Day speech, coming on the heels of the Supreme Court decision, Roosevelt had an opportunity to say what the people want said: Repudiate the right of the Supreme Court to invalidate legislation; call for the impeachment of the six reactionaries who killed the A.A.A.; propose an amendment to the Constitution. Instead, Roosevelt smiled, likened himself to Jackson, and proclaimed with bravado, "We will not retreat".

Well, we do not know what Jackson would have done in 1936. But in his time, when he fought, it was not only in words. On the two big issues on which the farmers and workers were fighting the manufacturers and bankers—the opening of the public lands of the West and the dissolution of the second United States Bank—Jackson fought to the end. He threw the Western land open to the workers and farmers and he destroyed the bank. He made no compromises

on that. He did not retreat, nor did he conciliate the bankers and manufacturers of his time. But Roosevelt does. It is, therefore, nonsense for him to claim, that he, Roosevelt, is today playing the role that Andrew Jackson did in his time.

The results of this policy of fighting words and retreating deeds are piling up mountain high. Immediately after Roosevelt made his Jackson Day speech, the Supreme Court went to work again and ordered the government to return to the textile magnates and meat packing trust \$200,000,000 of impounded A.A.A. taxes. And so, what have we? The capitalists get two hundred million dollars; the toilers get a fresh speech, this time from Farley, calling the bankers brigands. Speeches for the masses, millions for their exploiters.

The Communist Party points the way to what the masses should do in the situation. In its statement on the Supreme Court decision, the Central Committee of the Communist Party says:

“A wide people’s movement—a militant Farmer-Labor Party, the unity of all toilers—this must be the answer of the American people to the challenge of Wall Street.”

The responsibility devolves primarily upon the leaders of the American Federation of Labor. It is in their power, as the official spokesmen of organized labor, to bring together all organizations—economic and political—of the workers, farmers and middle classes, for joint action in this serious situation. The collaboration of the Socialist Party with the Communist Party on this issue will exert great influence in promoting action by the A. F. of L. for the creation of a People’s Front. How soon will such collaboration on the part of the Socialist Party come forth?

As reported by the *New York Times* (Jan. 8), William Green was seeking “united action” by organized labor and farmers “for a constitutional amendment” and was going to hold “conferences with the heads of the principal agrarian groups” to that end. That looks hopeful; but looks are sometimes very deceiving. It remains to be seen what the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., now meeting in Miami, will decide on the question. We hope that the Council will not overlook the road pointed out by the Communist Party; that it will not turn away (as it usually does) from the appeal of the Communists that the leaders of the A. F. of L., of the Socialist Party, and of the farmers must meet the declaration of war made by Wall Street with a peace pact among themselves (and with the Communist Party), which will unite all their forces.

At the same time we must arouse the masses to the need of immediate action along these lines. We must proceed most ener-

getically in every locality and in every state with promoting and building the People's Front—the Farmer-Labor Party.

The Seventy-fourth Congress is now in its second session. The original program of the Roosevelt Administration was for a short session; the Supreme Court attack will no doubt change these plans. The important question is what role can this session be made to play in promoting the struggle of the masses against the monopolies and capitalist reaction?

As usual, the Liberty League is on the job. Between robbing the masses and cheating the national treasury, du Pont and Rascob have still plenty of time left to formulate all sorts of programs. And so they have prepared a 12-point program for Congress. It is the usual stuff of plundering the masses, plundering the treasury, for the sole benefit of Morgan-du Pont, but nothing to help the masses. The "joker" in this program, though not intended as such, is its insistence that its aims are "to encourage the legislative branch of the government to reassert its constitutional prerogatives". The Liberty League, you see, the same people who engineered the invalidation of the N.R.A. and A.A.A. by the Supreme Court, the same people who were instrumental in delivering these vital blows at the legislative prerogatives of Congress, are also trying to appear as the champions of the "constitutional prerogatives of Congress". Is there a limit to their hypocrisy?

Roosevelt had this program before him (it was published on December 26, 1935) when he delivered his message to Congress. And in that message he incorporated a good deal of what the Liberty League demands. He called for no more taxation of the rich; for no increase of relief expenditures, but a perspective of decreasing them. He went out of his way to show that he is aiming at a balanced budget at the expense of the workers and farmers.

It is clear that Roosevelt's program for this session of Congress was not planned with a view to meeting the acute needs of the toiling farmers. The needs of about fifteen million unemployed and of the bulk of the farmers whose economy is still in deep crisis cannot obviously be met by a policy which precludes new and heavier taxation upon the rich. Roosevelt is speculating on improving business; but that, as everyone knows, has had little effect upon employment, wages, or the income of the toiling farmers, especially of the small tenants and sharecroppers. And yet a budget is presented by the administration which take little account of these facts. Roosevelt's program for this session of Congress is not one of helping the masses at the expense of the monopolies.

Luckily the programs of the Liberty League and of Roosevelt are not the only ones now before Congress. There are the Lundeen

and Frazier Bills for old age, unemployment, disability, and maternity insurance. There is the Marcantonio Bonus Bill as well as the Youth Bill. These are measures that have the support of large masses and organizations among the workers, farmers, and middle classes. They are measures in the interests of the masses. There are also other bills which, by proper amendments, will be of great service to the toilers, such as, the Townsend (McGroarty) Bill, the measure providing for a 30-hour week without reduction in pay, the Massingale Agricultural Bill seeking to secure to the farmer the cost of production, a number of measures which the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. has formulated, and one proposed by the Textile Workers Union (the Ellenbogen Bill). These are measures, some of them needing serious amendments, that will, if passed, considerably improve the lot of the toilers of city and farm. But their passage will not come by itself. Organized, independent, and united mass political action will bring results. Only such action can enable the masses to utilize this session of Congress to improve their conditions and to prepare for more effective struggles in the coming national elections.

The destruction of the A.A.A. by the Supreme Court has, as already pointed out, compelled the Roosevelt Administration to modify its plans for the present session of Congress. To this extent, the administration must seek to pass a substitute for the A.A.A. and to provide funds for meeting the previous A.A.A. obligations to the farmers.

What is Roosevelt proposing as a substitute for the A.A.A.? His proposals are based upon the recommendations of "a mass conference of representatives of farm organizations", held in Washington on January 11. At this writing these proposals have not yet been incorporated into legislative form; but their character is quite clear. It is, in essence, another A.A.A.; but approached from the angle of conservation of soil fertility. Naturally, it has some new features that were not present in the old A.A.A.; but these do not change its character. For example, the seven-point program recommended by the conference of farm organizations provides for a certain form of subsidizing agricultural exports, a feature to which Roosevelt is opposed. There will probably be considerable friction over this and some other points between the administration and the farm organizations which sponsor the seven-point program.

More important, however, is the central fact that this seven-point program, which Roosevelt proposes to realize through the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, *does not meet the needs of the small farm owner, the small tenant, and the sharecropper*; it does not meet the needs of the majority of the agricultural population. And

no wonder, the representatives of the small and toiling farmers had very little voice in the "mass conference" which Wallace organized and which worked out these recommendations. The dominating influence in that conference were the leaders of the "American Farm Bureau Federation"; and these speak for certain sections of the rich farmer, the agrarian capitalist largely. We did not hear at this conference from the Holiday Associations, the Farmers National Committee for Action, the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, the Sharecroppers Union—organizations that can and do speak for the small farmers. Thus far the only report carried by the capitalist press on the position of organizations that represent more or less the small and middle farmer, is the report on the attitude of the Farmers Union which is planning to demand the incorporation into the new Bill of the provision guaranteeing the farmer the cost of production.

Wallace and Roosevelt are now proposing to reincorporate the essentials of the A.A.A. by way of conservation of soil fertility. To this we answer: Nonsense, such an approach will serve the small farmer even less than the old A.A.A. And we call to witness no less an authority than the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, himself.

Writing for the *New York Times*, on March 31, 1935, he declared:

"... we should realize that neither the A.A.A. programs nor any relief program can really come to grips with the fundamentals of these conditions."

And what conditions was he talking about? He was talking about this fact: "Today we find that half our farm lands are operated by tenants and nearly as large a percentage of our farmers rent all of the land they farm." (*Ibid.*)

He was talking about the following fact:

"By 1930 about 53 per cent of our farmers operated leased land and 42 per cent of them rented all the land which they operated. The forces of depression appear to have increased this proportion, so that today it is estimated that not less than 45 per cent of all our farmers are tenants." (*Ibid.*)

Significant is the conclusion which he reaches:

"We can hardly deal fundamentally with erosion and other types of soil wastages until we bring about a change in the relationship of tenant farmers to the lands they operate." (Ibid.)

In plain English this means: (1) you can't help 53 per cent of our farmers with any such scheme as the A.A.A., new or old; and (2) you can't tackle properly the problem of conservation of soil fer-

tility unless you restore these 53 per cent of our farmers to the ownership of the lands they now operate. This was what Wallace said in March of last year. Yet, in January of this year, he supports another A.A.A., and, in addition, such a one as undertakes to solve the problem of soil conservation. What does this show? It shows that the agricultural program of the Roosevelt Administration—the old A.A.A. as well as the new substitutes—is *designed to help the rich farm owners and not the majority of toiling farmers* (small owners, tenants and sharecroppers), that it is a program to be executed at the expense of the small farmers and the toiling population of the cities.

This program will fall even harder on the sharecroppers, especially in cotton. It will be recalled that the old A.A.A. program in cotton virtually ruined the sharecroppers by enriching the big planters. Even Wallace was forced to admit: "We recognize that the operation of the cotton program has probably added to the immediate difficulties." (*New York Times*, March 31, 1935.) And Calvin B. Hoover, economic adviser in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, upon investigating the effects of the A.A.A. upon the sharecroppers in cotton, an investigation forced upon the government by the mass struggles of the sharecroppers, was compelled to register these conclusions:

"(1) There have been a considerable number of cases in which tenant farmers have not received the full amount specified by the 1933 cotton contract. (2) The operation of the acreage reduction program creates a motive for reducing the number of tenants on farms. The acreage reduction contracts have within them provisions designed to prevent this motive having effect, but the system of enforcement of these provisions has been inadequate. (3) The percentage of the rental payments paid to share tenants and sharecroppers for land withdrawn from cultivation in accord with the 1934 cotton contracts is less than in other contracts. (4) The way in which the 1934 cotton contract has been drawn has produced considerable confusion in the classification of the types of tenantry. Upon this classification the division of benefit payments by government between landowner and tenant depends." (*New York Times*, April 22, 1935.)

Mild and restrained as this official report is, it nonetheless clearly demonstrates that the A.A.A. was working against the interests of toiling farmers in cotton. It tended to drive them off the land altogether, while helping considerably the large landowners and planters. Now this same program is being proposed again by the administration as a measure to help "all" farmers.

Now, therefore, is the time for the toiling farmers to get together and to fight for their own program of demands. Many of these are incorporated in the Farmers' Relief Bill championed

by the Farmers National Committee for Action. Others are proposed by the Farmers Union—cost of production—a proposal that, with proper amendments of the Massingale Bill, can help the small farmer owner and tenant. In addition to these, the toiling farmers should insist upon a number of guarantees that will tend to protect them from the abuses of the old A.A.A., guarantees that follow from Mr. Calvin B. Hoover's report. Such as: (a) strict provisions in all contracts for *adequate* payments to small tenants and sharecroppers; (b) regardless of reduction of acreage, no tenant farmer should be displaced from the land; either landlord or government or both to be responsible for the tenant's remaining on the land and for his securing an income adequate to maintain himself and family; and (c) democratic control of the planning and enforcement machinery of the A.A.A. or its substitute, control in which the small farmer, the tenant, and the sharecropper shall have the main say. These three points are advanced, not for the purpose of making the new A.A.A. acceptable to the small farmers; this cannot be done. The purpose of these points is to suggest guarantees that will protect, in a measure, the toiling farmers from the inevitable hardships of any program that is built upon the Roosevelt A.A.A. principles.

The main fight of the toiling farmers now must be waged for their own program of demands, as stated above (Farmers' Relief Bill, an amended Massingale Bill, and a properly amended Lemke Bill). In this connection we want again to warn the farmers against the Bankhead "Farmers' Home Bill". This bill is essentially (as it now stands) a bill for subsistence farming. Bankhead himself said of his bill: "... it will not increase the amount of cash crops that the A.A.A. has been fighting to control. It states that special efforts will be made to avoid expansion of production for the market." This means *subsistence* farms, the worst curse that could befall the toiling farmer and tenant. As against this, which William Green has seen fit to endorse in a press statement of April 14, 1935, we urge consideration of the proposal advanced by the recent annual convention of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union for "a new Homestead Bill". The conference of farm organizations called in Washington, D. C., for February 7, 8, and 9, will have an opportunity to draft such a measure as will embody the principles of the new Homestead Bill.

The toiling farmers should work out their own program of demands and unite forces to fight for them. From this the toiling farmers should proceed to join hands with the workers and the middle classes of the cities, including the Townsend movement and the mass followers of Coughlin, to build the necessary political or-

ganization—the Farmer-Labor Party—which will lead the common fight for the common demands.

This presents another opportunity for a specific united front between the Socialist and Communist Parties.

* * *

A billion dollars is the budget appropriation for the Army and Navy for 1937. This means a billion dollars for war preparations.

The people are entitled to know whom we are preparing to war against. Surely, Roosevelt will not maintain that there is danger of invasion. And if he did, no one would believe him. Hence, this terrific burden of armament costs is not for the purpose of protecting this country from invasion but in order to prepare for war against some other country or countries. Which?

In his message to Congress, Roosevelt spoke a good deal about the foreign situation; but he found it necessary to say little on the question of why we must spend a billion dollars for armaments when there is no danger of invasion. He did, however, indicate what his foreign policy is, and from that we may be able to find the answer to our question.

He said, “the United States is following a two-fold neutrality towards any and all nations which engage in wars *not of immediate concern to the Americas*”. That means, in wars which *are* of immediate concern to the Americas our policy is not neutrality. It is not hard to see that Roosevelt was speaking here especially of Latin-America and the Far East. In Latin-America we have the Monroe Doctrine—this is a policy to secure for American imperialism monopoly domination in the countries of the Caribbean and of Central and South America. Wars such as the still unsettled conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay in the Chaco fall within the category of those that are of concern to the United States. Roosevelt made that amply clear by undertaking to speak to the world, not only in the name of the United States, but in the name of all American countries. We do not know who authorized him to do so. We do know that by doing so, Roosevelt freshly restated the imperialist Monroe Doctrine of American imperialism. He thus served notice upon the imperialist rivals of Wall Street, chiefly England and Japan, that the United States would wage war to protect the Monroe Doctrine. This is one reason for the billion-dollar appropriation for the Army and Navy. Not to guard against invasion, but to prepare to uphold by war the imperialist policies of Yankee monopolies in Latin-America.

Another reason for the billion-dollar armament budget is preparation for war against Japan. It is true, and we have said that many

times, that American imperialism favors the status quo in the Far East as well as on a world scale. This is explained primarily by the fact that Wall Street does not yet feel that the forces of American imperialism are strong enough to force a redivision of the world by means of war. But Japan is upsetting the status quo in the Far East. Japanese imperialism is at present one of the chief incendiaries of a new world war. And American imperialism is preparing for that war, is preparing to be strong enough to establish its own domination in the Far East and in the Pacific generally. The billion-dollar armament budget is a budget of war preparation against Japan and for mastery of the Pacific.

The naval conference in London is practically deadlocked. Whether the Japanese leave London altogether or remain for a while as observers, it is evident that no agreement seems possible either between the United States and Japan or among Japan, the United States, and England. The imperialist contradictions between the three chief capitalist powers in the Pacific are apparently too acute for any substantial agreement to be possible now. What conclusions does Roosevelt draw from this fact? One conclusion is evident. It is to prepare for a naval race. It is to prepare for war with Japan. It is to prepare for another world war, for a war to establish the domination of American imperialism in the Pacific and in the world. The billion-dollar armament budget is a budget of preparation for a naval race and a new world war.

Which brings us to the question of the Anglo-American relations. After all, the main rival of American imperialism is England. And when English imperialism is increasing its armaments, American imperialism is not proposing to lag behind. For the present, Japanese aggression in the Far East, which presses upon both England and the United States, tends to push the Anglo-American antagonisms somewhat into the background. It seems even to create some sort of basis for temporary common action between the two chief imperialist antagonists. Whether such common action will materialize (if it does), it will naturally be of the most transient and precarious character. Especially, if British imperialism continues the present policy of building up Hitler fascism as a counterbalance to the United States on a world scale, and also if British imperialism continues to maneuver between America and Japan. Hence, while contemplating the possibility of some sort of common action with England against Japan, American imperialism banks, not upon that, but upon increasing its own armed forces and preparing for war. Speaker Byrns was not just palavering when he said he "will support proposals in Congress for a stronger air force, an Alaskan aviation base and strengthened fortifications in Hawaii". (*New York Times*, December 30, 1935.) Furthermore, if no naval agreement comes

forth from the London conference, and it will not, voices will become stronger from the imperialist camp to fortify the Aleutian Islands and the Philippines. MacArthur is already helping the Philippines to build a modern army. In this way the United States will be drifting directly into a new war. The billion-dollar budget is preparation for it.

And last, but by no means least, American imperialism is preparing to take advantage of the new world war which Hitler and Japan are hatching. It is by this time evident to all that Hitler fascism and the Japanese military clique are preparing a world war—a war against the Soviet Union, but not only against the Soviet Union. It is this drive of Hitler and Japan that stands in the center of world politics today. American imperialism, with the exception of a small clique of ultra-reactionaries and warmongers (Hearst & Co.), does not favor a war now; it is not ready for it. But it sees the war coming and is preparing to fight for its imperialist interests. The billion-dollar armament budget is preparation for this war.

In the face of these facts, what substance is there to the so-called neutrality legislation now before Congress? At best it may offer a slight impediment, and only for a short while, to the United States being drawn into a new war. At worst, it may turn out to be an effective smoke-screen for more intensive war preparations. It depends—what *kind* of neutrality legislation is finally adopted. And it depends *primarily* upon the anti-war movements of the American toilers.

The administration's neutrality bill gives expression, in a general way, to the status quo position of American imperialism. Roosevelt's message to Congress expressed that position quite effectively. But the administration bill is based upon the idea of neutrality only in such wars as are not of "immediate concern to the Americas". It leaves American imperialism free to prepare for war and to engage in war to "defend" the Monroe Doctrine and the "Open Door" in China.

It is from this angle, and not for the "reasons" given by the reactionaries, that we oppose giving the President "discretion" in the application of the neutrality policy. The reactionaries want to hamstring the President in order to give a free hand to the imperialist monopolies; we seek to hamstring the monopolies by not allowing the President to give the monopolies too much freedom of action. That is why we insist that Congress formulate a clear and definite *peace policy*. Such a policy can be based today only on one principle, the principle of non-aggression based upon the definition of an aggressor given by the Soviet Union. We want a foreign policy adopted by Congress, and a peace policy. Otherwise we may have

a repetition, and in much worse form, of the "neutrality" bluff of Wilson in 1914-1918.

Wilson, as will be recalled, urged the nation to be neutral, not alone in deed but also in thought. And while he was uttering these sonorous phrases, he was conspiring, *under the pressure of Morgan and Co.*, to drag this country into the world slaughter. Read the last revelations of the Munitions Investigation Committee of the Senate under Nye. Make every American toiler know the facts uncovered by this committee. Then they will know how flimsy and treacherous "neutrality" slogans may become when they are not based upon a *peace policy* and when the toiling masses are not organized to *fight for the enforcement of such a policy*.

We have already shown above that at *best* a neutrality policy in the hands of a capitalist government, even when based upon a peace policy on the Soviet lines of non-aggression, is only a temporary and very slight impediment to the country's being drawn into a new war. But it is an impediment nonetheless, and should be set up. But in order for it to serve even as a slight impediment, the neutrality policy must rest upon a clearly stated foreign policy of peace, which means non-aggression in the sense of the Soviet Union's definition; it also means readiness of the toilers to fight in an organized way to compel the capitalist government to stick by the peace policy.

From this point of view, the neutrality bill proposed by the National Peace Conference is more acceptable to the genuine fighters for peace, to those who really fight to keep this country out of war. It is more acceptable than Roosevelt's bill because it tends to formulate a peace policy, or rather, it urges the formulation of such a policy and in the direction of non-aggression. Therefore, we support this bill as against the reactionaries and also in part as against the vital defects (lack of peace policy) of the administration's measure. It is more or less certain that the sentiments of the toilers, given a chance to express themselves, would also favor the Bill of the National Peace Conference as amended by our proposals. What are our supplementary proposals?

They could be summarized as follows: immediate withdrawal of all naval and military forces of the United States from China, the Philippines, the Caribbean (Cuba), and from all foreign countries. Not a cent, not a man, for armaments and war! Demand that Congress refuse the military appropriation for the 1937 budget! Down with the threatening naval race which leads to a new world war! Prohibit all government subsidies to munitions manufacturers and war industries. Outlaw all private trading and transportation of arms. Use all war funds for relief. Formulate a neutrality policy on the basis of a *peace policy* resting on the definition of non-aggression as given by the U.S.S.R.

We claim that the neutrality bill of the National Peace Conference, supplemented by these proposals, will create a slight impediment to this country's being drawn into a new war. And for this, it is worthwhile fighting. Above all, such legislation will have great value when backed by the organized power of the toiling people and their daily struggle for peace.

It is clear that nothing can seriously keep this country out of war as long as the Monroe Doctrine is in effect, or as long as United States naval and military forces are stationed in China and in the Far East, or as long as we allow the development of a naval race. It is precisely these war danger spots that Roosevelt had in mind as the ones that *are* of concern to American imperialism. Therefore, we must concentrate on fighting for such an *American peace policy* as will enable the people to fight successfully for the repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine, for the withdrawal of American forces from China and against a naval race.

We said before that the toiling people would favor such a policy. There are already tangible indications that this is so. The growing mass movement for peace is an undeniable fact. In addition, there are various signs coming from popular referendums. The one undertaken by the American Institute of Public Opinion, no doubt predominantly middle class and partly capitalist, shows 52 per cent this, it is worth while fighting. Above all, such legislation will have larger navy appropriations. (*Herald Tribune*, Dec. 29, 1935.) The result of the National Peace Poll conducted by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational and Christian Churches of America is even more comprehensive and revealing. It shows:

"Membership in the League of Nations—yes, 70,411; no, 89,661. Consultation with other nations in support of the Kellogg Pact and other peace agreements—yes, 134,221; no, 18,851. A larger army, navy and air force—yes, 64,432; no, 85,585. Abolition of compulsory military training—yes, 99,350; no, 54,884. Government control of the munitions industry—yes, 144,030; no, 16,847." (*New York Times*.)

This poll also is most likely predominantly middle class, with the youth playing a part. Yet the poll unmistakably favors the *kind* of neutrality policy for the United States which we are advocating and which the working class will surely support.

We are glad to see that Norman Thomas favors the neutrality bill of the National Peace Conference in somewhat the same sense as we do. He sees its shortcomings but also its merits as compared with the administration bill. He even departs somewhat from his isolationist tendencies when he says appreciatively of the National Peace Conference Bill:

"It adopts neutrality as a national program and yet provides for a solemn act under which the United States might under some circumstances depart from its national policy for aid to a victim of outrageous aggression." (*Socialist Call*, January 4, 1936.)

The recent Third National Congress of the American League Against War and Fascism shows the growth of the mass movement for a peace policy and an independent struggle for peace. The League emerges from its Convention a stronger and more authoritative spokesman and organizer of the anti-war and anti-fascist forces in the United States. It is precisely this fact that promoted the movement for the united front, for *widening* the movement so that it embraces more trade unions, the Socialist Party, the farmers' organizations, etc. The decisions of the Congress and of the Socialist Party to collaborate with a view to broadening the united front anti-war movement in the above-stated sense will be applauded by wide masses. Thus and only thus will the struggle for peace, the fight to keep the United States out of war, gather the necessary strength, not only to agitate for peace, but actually to check the war mongers and fascists.

* * *

At this writing the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. is in session in Miami, Fla. The membership of the A. F. of L. will judge this session mainly on two counts. (1) What will the Council do to help (at last) organize industrial unions in the steel, auto, rubber, and radio industries? (2) What will the Council do to help bring together the workers, farmers, and middle classes into a People's Front against reaction?

It is known that the Hutchesons and the Duffys, far from helping organize these workers in the basic industries, are contemplating a blast, perhaps a splitting move, against the adherents of industrial union organization and against the Committee for Industrial Organization. We should warn the reactionaries to watch their step. The American workers are not in a mood to let Hutcheson trifle with the most vital interests of the working class and with the unity of the trade union movement.

It is also known that the same Hutcheson and Duffy, far from helping to build the People's Front against reaction, are even opposed to the proposal that the A. F. of L. join forces with others to promote a movement for a Constitutional Amendment to curb the powers of the Supreme Court. The workers should tell William Green to beware permitting the Hutchesons to dictate the policies of the Executive Council, especially on the question of the Constitutional Amendment. The trade unionists and workers generally are not in a

mood to accept the blows of the Supreme Court lying down. They are in a mood to fight for their rights and liberties and, if need be, they will carry on this fight without and against the Hutchesons and Duffys.

The Executive Council is facing grave responsibilities.

* * *

Molotov's report to the recent session of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. (*Daily Worker*, Jan. 13, 1936) is a historic report of tremendous significance. We urge everyone to become familiar with the contents of that report. Unfortunately space does not permit an adequate review of the deliberations of the Central Executive Committee. We must, however, say this: the session demonstrated the true workers' democracy in action, the steady growth of the Socialist economy and of the well being of the people, the growth of the power of our Socialist Fatherland to fight for peace and to defend itself and the acquisitions of the Revolution against the attacks of the class enemies.

Every class-conscious worker will take pride in the achievements of the international fortress against reaction and for peace. Every friend of progress and peace will take renewed courage in the knowledge that the powers of defense of the Red Army are growing and that new measures are being taken to increase still further these powers of defense. The growing strength of the Red Army signifies the growing power of the forces of peace all over the world.

The capitalist press in this country tried to tone down the achievements of the Soviet Union on the economic and cultural fields, but stressed especially the plans for increased defense measures and expenditures. In an effort to counteract the increasing sympathy of the American people for the Soviet Union, the Hearst press has spread upon its feature page as the latest of its anti-Soviet offerings, a vicious slander article from the poison-pen of the counter-revolutionary Trotsky. We should not be surprised presently to see some of these papers, maybe the Hearst press, urging support for larger armaments by the United States on the "ground" that, if the Soviet Union may—why not we. The answer to this would be: when the United States becomes a country of Socialism, governed by the workers and farmers, then and only then will the American toilers become interested in national defense, then and only then will they be interested in supporting all measures that may then be necessary to defend the Socialist United States.

The U.S.S.R. is a country of Socialism. Even its bitterest enemies (Hitler, for example) will not maintain that the U.S.S.R.

seeks the acquisition of other people's lands. Even Japan knows that the Soviet Union seeks only to defend its own Socialist land and the peoples inhabiting it. From this it follows that when the U.S.S.R. strengthens its Red Army and armaments it does so to defend itself and the interests of the world revolution from the evident war preparations of the fascists and imperialists. But when capitalist governments seek increased armaments, even those which like ours, favor the status quo, it is for imperialist aggression and against the toilers at home. To such governments we say: Not a cent, not a man, for armament and war!

* * *

From fascist Germany comes the news:

“The labor market report for December is bad. There was an increase of 522,000 in the number of unemployed, compared with one of 250,000 in December, 1934. Since August, which witnessed the year's smallest number of unemployed, joblessness has risen by more than 800,000, whereas in the same months of 1934 the increase had been only 200,000. Should January show the same result as did January, 1935, this winter's unemployment will have increased by 1,200,000, whereas the most unfavorable of the official estimates issued in the autumn predicted an increase of 1,000,000.” (*New York Times*, January 12, 1936.)

* * *

We hail the first national conference of the Communist Party of Germany, since the advent of Hitler, recently held in Brussels, Belgium.

We hail its leader, Ernst Thaelmann, who is still incarcerated in a dungeon of Hitler.

* * *

In the Caribbean: The bogus elections held in Cuba have settled nothing, not even who is the elected president. Caffery was smart. He was seeking to get Gomez elected and thus acquire a “democratic” front for the Batista military dictatorship which is in reality a dictatorship of Caffery, *i.e.*, of Wall Street. But the thing did not work out as planned. Now more than ever the People's Anti-Imperialist Front in Cuba needs to be spread and cemented. Grau San Martin was right when he said the other day that only by revolution will the Cuban people win their liberty and national independence. But to make this possible, the Cuban people need the anti-imperialist united front.

Incidentally, what does Roosevelt think of Caffery's doings in

Cuba? The smiling president bears full responsibility for Caffery-Batista.

Mexico is building a People's Front against the reaction led by Calles. The Communist Party of Mexico is an active and stimulating section of this front. Its recent manifesto indicates a practical way of destroying the economic and political power of the Callistas and calls upon President Cardenas to put this program into effect. All support of the American toilers should go to this program of struggle against Calles. All fighters for peace, against imperialism and reaction should urge President Cardenas of Mexico to apply the program urged upon him by the Communist Party and by the united front of the toilers.

In Venezuela, President Lopez, who took the place of the dead Gomez of unspeakable memory, is trying to check the developing people's revolution for freedom and national independence. Lopez is at the same time pretending to be a liberal and a friend of democracy. But the people of Venezuela can have no confidence in President Lopez Contreras. He is of the same gang of rapacious landowners and flunkies of imperialism as the dead Gomez. A people's anti-imperialist government is what the Venezuelan masses are fighting for, and this is the aim of the developing people's revolution in Venezuela.

The American workers and toilers have everything to gain from the victory of the Venezuelan revolution.

* * *

The Ninth Convention of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., to be held early in March in New York City, will meet at a crucial moment in the life of the country. The November Plenum of the Central Committee opened the convention discussion and preparations. The subsequent plenums of the District Committees, held throughout the country, have developed the discussion further, thus laying the basis for every Party unit and member to engage in the pre-convention discussion.

The center of our work in preparing the convention now lies in the units. This work consists in a review of our experiences in winning the masses for the general line of our Party, the line that resulted from the application of the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International to the political situation and the needs of the masses in the United States.

Central in the convention preparations is the question of building the united and people's front against capitalist reaction, fascism, and war. What are our experiences in the fight for the united front with the Socialist Party, for trade union unity, for the Farmer-Labor

Party? What are the best ways, proved by experiences, of preventing reaction from capitalizing the spreading mass resentment against Roosevelt? What are the best ways of overcoming the fears of those relatively advanced workers that the building of the Farmer-Labor Party may tend to help defeat Roosevelt and elect a Liberty League administration?

In short, the Party units and membership should seek in the convention discussion to prepare the basis for the concrete and practical application and further development of the Party's strategy at the present time, which is, to mobilize the widest masses to combat the offensive of capitalist reaction (Liberty League, etc.), to frustrate the designs of the reactionaries in the national elections of 1936, and to seek to accomplish this class aim of the proletariat by disabling Roosevelt from checking the crystallization of a Farmer-Labor Party.

In addition, the Party units should sum up their experiences in the readjustment of organizational forms to the present political tasks. The more thoughtfully and comprehensively these organizational experiences are reviewed, the more successful will be the Party Convention in the final formulation of our organizational policies.

Experiences in the building of cadres should be reviewed with the greatest care and thoroughness. This is a vital point in the building of the Party and of the united and people's front. Practical measures for the promotion of the best and most trustworthy mass workers and mass leaders and their training in Marxism-Leninism should be discussed in detail and proposals formulated for final action by the convention.

Experiences in our mass agitation, in the building and spreading of our press, and in developing better ability to apply Leninism in the live, Stalinist way, are another subject for review and summation by the units in the convention preparations.

We must remember always that an inseparable part of discussing these subjects is our experience in the movement to organize the unorganized and to build the unions, as well as in the building of militant movements among the toiling farmers. We must remember, too, that an inseparable part of these discussions is our work for winning the Negro people, the youth, and the toiling women.

Let us organize and direct along these channels the pre-convention discussion in all units of the Party. Let us seek to draw into these discussions the widest number of non-Party workers who are active in mass struggles. Let them benefit by our knowledge and let us benefit by theirs.

A. B.

The Party of Lenin and the People's Front

(Speech Delivered at the Lenin Memorial Meeting, Madison Square Garden, January 20, 1936)

By EARL BROWDER

FRRIENDS and comrades, it is twelve years since Lenin died. With each passing year his name grows brighter, his words and his work gain greater authority among the toiling masses of every land. Twenty years ago his name was almost unknown to the broad masses outside of Russia; today all the great names of that time have dimmed and disappeared. There are no people so benighted today as to do honor to the names of the great men of 1916, whether it be the name of a capitalist statesman or a reformist labor or Socialist leader. Since 1917, all reputations have crashed—except those who welcomed the great upheaval which created a new world under the leadership of Lenin, except those who identified themselves with Lenin and his historic work.

On this twelfth anniversary of his death, Lenin's name shines with an especial luster through the whole world. Today we can speak, without any exaggeration, of the final and irrevocable victory of the Socialist society founded by Lenin. Today, when capitalist society condemns tens of millions to enforced idleness, to starvation alleviated only by a miserly and diminishing dole, the Soviet Union, fruit of Lenin's genius and Lenin's Party, blossoms forth in a Socialist prosperity unprecedented in the history of the world. Social security, a guaranteed well-being for all, has been made a reality in the Soviet Union, at a moment when the rest of the world, ruled by finance capital, groans under the agonies of the crisis, of growing insecurity, of reaction and fascism, of the feverish preparation for a new imperialist war.

Today, more than ever before, the greatness of Lenin lives in the world Party of the international proletariat—the Communist International, the International at whose head stand the great Stalin, leader of the world proletarian revolution, and the helmsman Dimitroff, tried soldier of Bolshevism—the international Party, which has produced such valiant leaders as Ernst Thaelmann, true son of the German proletariat, whose name will be remembered long after the leaders of the hangman regime of Hitler and Goering will be forgotten. Our proletarian honor demands that we leave no stone unturned to rouse the entire population of the country in

behalf of the unconditional freedom of Ernst Thaelmann, and his fellow anti-fascist prisoners. The Party of Lenin stands today in Italy at the head of the growing forces of revolt against the war-maker Mussolini. It fights against the Japanese oppressors and war makers. It already leads tens of millions in the Soviet territory of China, and is rapidly advancing towards a people's revolt against the Kuomintang hangman's regime in China.

Today the genius of Lenin is universally acknowledged, even by our enemies. But it is not so universally understood. As it happened with Lenin's teachers, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, so those who have fought and now fight most fiercely against Lenin's Party often try to invoke the authority of Lenin's name for their confusionist or reactionary attempts. Lenin himself best described this when, speaking of Marx, he said:

"During the lifetime of great revolutionaries, the oppressing classes have visited relentless persecution on them and received their teaching with the most savage hostility, the most furious hatred, the most ruthless campaign of lies and slanders. After their death, attempts are made to turn them into harmless icons, canonize them, and surround their *names* with a certain halo for the 'consolation' of the oppressed classes and with the object of duping them, while at the same time emasculating and vulgarizing the *real essence* of their revolutionary theories and blunting their revolutionary edge. At the present time, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the labor movement are cooperating in the work of adulterating Marxism."

Today, Lenin's words on Marx apply fully to Lenin himself. But history does not merely repeat itself. Today the adulterators of Lenin's teachings, not least the Trotskyites, those dogs who bark after the locomotive of socialism, have a more difficult time. Lenin left behind him a victorious revolution, headed by a steeled and tested Leninist Party—the Communist Party and the Communist International. Lenin's place was taken by his best student and co-worker, who with incomparable wisdom, clarity, and boldness, carried on Lenin's program to its final and irrevocable victory—our present leader who has taken his place unchallengeably beside Marx, Engels, and Lenin—Joseph Stalin.

LENINISM GUIDES THE WORLD WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Lenin's fight against the imperialist World War, the fight for peace, led directly to the fight for socialism, to the victory of Soviet power. In the midst of war and capitalist collapse, the Soviet power dedicated itself from its first moment to the struggle for peace and socialism. From the October days of 1917, Lenin's program has guided the Soviet Union and the revolutionary movement of the whole world. That is why the Soviet Union is today such a power-

ful force on the side of peace; that is why its peace policy, rallying the masses, the colonial peoples, and the smaller nations, has even been able to utilize that "den of thieves", the League of Nations, as an instrument, even if weak and unreliable, to impede imperialist world war.

Developing the theories of Marx in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Lenin was by no means a vulgar pacifist or neutral in relation to war, as some people who quote Lenin nowadays would like it to appear. He declared that the international working class movement had to be defeatist in relation to both sides of the World War, because both sides were dominated by imperialist war aims, and victory for either side would necessarily result in imposing that imperialism upon the rest of the world. The workers and the toiling masses as a whole stood to gain only through the defeat of their own governments. Like Marx, Lenin always examined each war situation concretely. He was not neutral; and in each war, where the interests of the oppressed masses, or of national liberation, could be definitely identified with one side, he called for support of that side.

Lenin organized and led the wars to save the Soviet power from the series of interventions. The policy of Stalin, which confronts the fascist war makers, not only with the unarmed mass movement of the toilers in the capitalist world, but with superior military force on the part of the Soviet Union, *rallying around it all other nations interested for the moment in resisting this fascist aggression*, is a Marxist-Leninist policy. It corresponds to the needs of the workers of every land. Our interests also demand the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union in the face of threatening imperialist war.

Lenin always abhorred the grandiloquent revolutionary phrase, which only served to cover up a practical retreat from the central question of the day, as a face-saving gesture. One can imagine with what blistering scorn he would have greeted the demand that now comes from reformist sources, that the Soviet Union should at this moment withdraw from the League of Nations and that it should alone proceed with sanctions against fascist Italy—a course which could only result in a blockade of the Soviet Union instead of Italy and would help those now trying to create a wide coalition for war against the Soviet Union. It is important to use this occasion to point out the dishonesty of that demand, which pictures the Soviet Union as helping Italy make war on Ethiopia. How slanderous this charge is can be revealed with a few figures of 1935 trade as compared with 1934. Instead of increasing, like the trade of the United States and even of England (which supposedly is in direct conflict with Mussolini over Africa), Soviet-Italian trade

declined by one-third. The much talked of oil trade dropped by more than two-thirds—at the moment when oil trade from the United States was skyrocketing. It is clear that the Soviet Union, without making any gestures of isolated action, was actually supplying Italy in 1935 with much less than she had supplied her during the year before the outbreak of hostilities. The peace policy of the Soviet Union is a Leninist policy, that means: an effective policy, not a policy of gestures, but a policy of getting results.

Lenin always urged American revolutionaries to study the specific problems and revolutionary traditions of our own country, and to use them for the socialist revolution. He opened for us the rich revolutionary treasures of American history. Lenin organized the first demonstration for Tom Mooney that caused Wilson to cancel his death sentence.

Today, when we utilize the special position of the United States, which gives rise to the mass demand for "neutrality" as a means of keeping out of a new imperialist war, it is undoubtedly in the tradition of Lenin, to direct this mass demand toward measures which really obstruct war and war preparations, while combatting those theories of "neutrality" which are used by Hearst, du Pont, the Liberty League, and all the militarists, as a cover for new imperialist war-maneuvers. It is in the tradition of Lenin to welcome and make the fullest possible use of the revelations of the Nye munitions investigation for the education of the masses. The Nye Committee has roused the anger and hatred of the most reactionary forces of the country, who are trying to shut off these revelations of how we were duped and tricked into the last war. Following Lenin, we must rouse such a mass demand for the continuance of these investigations and for the full publication of their findings (many of the most important documents are still kept secret), that if the Committee is really cut off, the whole country will understand the reason—that such crimes against humanity are hidden behind those closed doors because our rulers are afraid of a revolution should they be disclosed. Lenin always emphasized the importance of getting into the imperialist secret archives; he himself did the greatest work in this field, with the publication of the tsarist secret archives regarding the World War.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LENIN'S WRITINGS FOR THE SOCIALIST WORKERS

To those workers in the Socialist Party who are breaking with their reformist past, who are trying to find the road to a revolutionary policy, we offer the help of the teachings of Lenin. It is one of the most hopeful signs of the seriousness of their movement that they are beginning to read Lenin, and even to quote him.

True, they often quote him without full understanding, and try to accuse us Communists of abandoning Lenin just at the moment when they are beginning to study and adopt Lenin's line. But Lenin wrote a special pamphlet for people in just such a stage of development, called, "*Left Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder*", which will help them to get over this. We have also provided them with a rich treasure of Lenin's writings, many volumes, which we were not fortunate enough to have in the formative years of our Communist Party. We are sure that the Socialist workers will seriously study Lenin, apply his teachings to their own problems of the day, and thus rapidly move toward the united front with us, and eventually toward organic unity of all revolutionary Socialists in a single Party.

Fully in the spirit of Lenin was the whole work of the great Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Basing itself upon the mighty achievements of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and upon the bankruptcy, now completely revealed, of the reformist path of the Second International, the Seventh World Congress has placed the world labor movement fully upon the road toward achieving a united front against capitalism, and a mighty people's front against fascism and war.

The central slogan of today in the United States—For a Broad Mass Farmer-Labor Party—as the medium for such a united front, and for the people's front in its broadest aspects, proceeds directly out of the teachings of Lenin. Sometimes our new friends from the Socialist Party reproach us for being "too broad" in our efforts to make the Farmer-Labor Party a real mass people's party; they call on us to "return to Lenin". Let us recall, however, the words of Lenin written thirty years ago. After pointing out that Bolshevism "has justly fought and continues to fight against the bourgeois-democratic abuse of the word, 'people'", that "it absolutely insists on the need for the complete class independence for the Party of the proletariat", Lenin then said:

"But it divides the 'people' into 'classes', not in order that the advanced class may become self-centered, or confine itself to narrow aims and restrict its activity so as not to frighten the economic masters of the world, but in order that the advanced class, which does not suffer from the half-heartedness, vacillation, and indecision of the intermediate classes, shall with all the greater energy and enthusiasm fight for the cause of the whole of the people, at the head of the whole of the people."

We Communists in the United States take upon ourselves this same task, to fight for the cause of the whole people, at the head of the whole people. That is our conception of the Farmer-Labor Party which we exert all our energy to help bring into existence, together with all progressive forces of the country,

Already we can see the line of the Seventh World Congress taking shape among the masses in this country. Lenin's teachings live and grow in the mass movement for united action against fascism and war, for the protection of the interests of the people. We see it in the growing movement for a Farmer-Labor Party. We see it in the great movement for industrial unionism, headed now by the Committee for Industrial Organization, for the organization of the basic industries, and for a more powerful and militant trade-union movement. We saw it in the past weeks in the great Congress Against War and Fascism in Cleveland, where representatives of over 3,000,000 people, including those of over 600,000 trade unionists, gathered around a fighting program. We see it in the movement for the protection and liberation of the Negro people, such as the move for the coming National Negro Congress and the broad united front defense of Angelo Herndon and the Scottsboro Boys. We see it in the Leftward strivings of the members and followers of the Socialist Party, which move, even if slowly, toward a united front with the Communists, as part of an ever-broader united front. We see it in the amalgamation of the student organizations into the new and significant American Student Union. We see it in the great American Youth Congress, which is sweeping into its orbit the youth masses of all progressive tendencies throughout the whole country. We see it in the stirrings of the farmers' organizations, under the blows of the Supreme Court decisions and the continued disasters of the crisis. We see it in the unification of all the most important mass unemployed organizations, now in process of being completed. We see it even among the broadest strata of the impoverished city middle classes, who move to unite their efforts with the workers and farmers. We see it in the great movement for Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance, around the Frazier-Lundeen Bills now before Congress. These, and a hundred other evidences, show that the policy of Lenin, expressed in the Seventh World Congress, arises out of the deepest needs of the masses of the United States and the whole world.

LENINISM THE GUIDE FOR THE LIBERATION OF ALL
OPPRESSED PEOPLES

Lenin taught the Communist Party to fight uncompromisingly for the Negro people, for their full social, economic, and political equality—for their complete liberation and their right to self determination. Our Party carries out the policies of Lenin and Stalin for the liberation of the colonial and colored peoples who are doubly oppressed by imperialism. The Communist Party fights for the Negroes, not only in the United States, but wherever they are

people against Italian fascism. All oppressed peoples receive the support of the Communists who thus carry out the program of Lenin and his world Party. That is why the Jewish people in Germany, who are the victims of the fascists, find the Communists are their firm allies; and wherever anti-Semitism raises its ugly head, the Communists are in the forefront of the battle to destroy this manifestation of capitalist oppression and degradation.

The supreme contribution of Lenin to human progress, a contribution which has been further developed and perfected under the leadership of Stalin, was the creation of that indispensable and central instrument of the working class—the Communist Party.

The basic concept of the Communist Party was already fully expressed in 1848 by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*. Let us recall the words of that historic document:

“The Communists are distinguished from other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

“The Communists, therefore, are, on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

“The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement.”

Lenin achieved the goal thus laid down by Marx and Engels. To understand the scope and swing of Lenin's work in this respect, we need but read his words in the crucial years of 1903 to 1906. It was in this period that Lenin spoke the following words:

“In wartime, recruits must be trained directly during military operations. Therefore, comrades, adopt the new methods of training more boldly! Organize more boldly more and more new units, send them into battle, recruit more of the working youth, extend the usual framework of all Party organizations, from committees to factory groups, trade unions and students' circles! Remember that every moment of delay in this task will play into the hands of the enemies of Social-Democracy [now, Communism]; for the new streams are seeking immediate outlets; and if they do not find Social-Democratic channels, they will rush into non-Social-Democratic channels. Remember that every practical step in the revolutionary movement will inevitably and unavoidably teach the young recruits

Social-Democratic science, for this science is based on an objectively correct estimation of the forces and tendencies of the various classes; for revolution is nothing more nor less than the break-up of old superstructures, and the independent action of different classes, each striving to erect the new superstructure in its own way. But take care not to degrade our revolutionary science to the level of mere book dogma, do not vulgarize it by despicable phrases about the tactics-process, organization-process, by phrases that condone confusion, vacillation and lack of initiative. Give more scope to every variety of enterprise by the greatest number of groups and circles of all kinds, and bear in mind that, apart from our counsel and regardless of our counsel, the relentless march of revolutionary events will keep them to the correct course. It was said long ago that in politics one often has to learn from the enemy. And in revolutionary movements, the enemy always compels us to draw correct conclusions in a particularly instructive and speedy manner."

These words of Lenin could very well have been written especially for the Communist Party of the U.S.A., so well do they fit our own problems today. These words are the key to the task of building our Party, on which depends the speed and extent of progress in all fields of struggle against reaction, for a new social order.

Everywhere today, even those who do not yet agree with the full Communist program increasingly realize that it is the participation of the Communists in their progressive work which above all else makes it living, vital, growing and powerful. All the more, then, should we, who know the full significance and power of our Party, understand the necessity to build it, to build it as Lenin taught us.

We call upon all class-conscious and advanced workers to join our ranks. There is a place for each, which you alone can fill. By joining the Communist Party you are joining the only revolutionary party, the only united party of action. You raise yourself higher to where you can see further and clearer; you join hands in a circle which transforms individual weakness into collective power; you bind yourself ever closer to the broadest masses. You become one of those described by our great and wise Stalin, when he referred to our International Party in the following words:

"We Communists are people of a special mould. We are made of special material. We are those who comprise the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honor to belong to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the Party founded and led by Comrade Lenin. It is not given to all to be members of such a Party. It is not given to all to withstand the stress and storm that accompanies membership of such a Party. Sons of the working class, sons of poverty and struggle, sons of incredible deprivation and heroic effort—these are the ones who must first of all be members of such a Party. That is why the Leninist Party, the Communist Party, at the same time calls itself the Party of the working class."

(Excerpts from Comrade Browder's Lenin Memorial Speech delivered at Symphony Hall, Boston, on January 26, 1936)

WHAT a clear proof of the correctness of the Communist policy was given us last night by the speech of Al Smith, at the American Liberty League dinner in Washington! Just as Hitler in Germany sailed under the banner of socialism, Al Smith uses the sacred name of liberty to the same purpose.

This Liberty League is the greatest threat to American liberties today. Its organizers and contributors are headed by the munitions-makers, the du Ponts, who made 1,000 per cent profits out of the last World War, who smash trade unions, who finance reaction everywhere. Morgan is its guiding genius. Al Smith is its mass leader, to give the "democratic" face; Father Coughlin and Hugh Johnson are its come-on men.

It is full of joy at the Supreme Court decisions forbidding forever all social legislation in the interests of the workers and farmers. It wants to make permanent the present condition of big profits for big capital and deep poverty for the masses.

A FARMER-LABOR ANSWER

Al Smith said last night, as the keynote of his speech: "I am in possession of supreme happiness and comfort."

From this beginning he argued that the conditions and institutions which produced his supreme happiness and comfort should be protected against all change.

Let us make a concession to Mr. Smith. Let us agree that every one who has that same supreme happiness and comfort shall line up with Smith and the Liberty League-Republican-Hearst combination. Let all the millions whose happiness and comfort have been shaken and even entirely destroyed by the crisis and depression, by capitalism, line up on the side of a Farmer-Labor Party. That would be the best answer to Smith-du Pont-Morgan-Hearst. That would mean a workers' and farmers' government in the United States. That would mean opening of factories. That would be Al Smith's disaster, which he says would mean Moscow, red flag, the International.

Al Smith should not so lightly identify Washington, the stars and stripes, with the Supreme Court powers to throw out all social legislation. Because the people of America are going to smash that power of the Supreme Court, and Al Smith may persuade them that they must, to accomplish that necessary task, set up Soviets in America. And that would be too bad—for Al Smith and his friends.

COMMUNISTS GUARD RIGHTS

But we do not give the American flag and Americanism to Al Smith. He claims the Stars and Stripes, but uses it only to cover up the black flag of piracy of Wall Street which he represents. We Communists always have the American flag at our meetings to remind us of those words of the Declaration of Independence which Smith wants to forget:

"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness), it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such forms as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

ROOSEVELT RETREATS

There are still many people who say: Yes, that is right, but you go too far when you attack Roosevelt also, when Smith attacks him. After all, they say, a Farmer-Labor Party may get only a few million votes, and that might be just enough to defeat Roosevelt and elect a Liberty League man.

To this argument we must say: Roosevelt is in full retreat before the Liberty League. He can't fight and run away at the same time. He roars like a lion and acts like a rabbit. That is because talk is cheap, but action in the Democratic Party is controlled by the solid South of Scottsboro, by half-fascist Democratic Illinois, by California, where McAdoo works with Republicans to smash the maritime unions, by Indiana where a Democratic governor has had the militia on duty for six months now, breaking strikes. Roosevelt's promises, the New Deal policies, are all in the ash-can already. No new promises he can think up will have any hope in them for the workers and farmers.

BUILD THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY NOW

No, we need something really new, the independent power of the workers and farmers, against the capitalists. Yes, that is what Al Smith said he feared most, the alignment of class against class. Al Smith fears this because it would break up the present game in which his capitalist friends can stand at the head of both parties, and say: take your choice; heads we win, tails you lose. But when it becomes class against class, then we workers and farmers are the overwhelming majority. Then we win hands down.

That is why we fight for the united front; that is why we insist upon the need to build the Farmer-Labor Party now, in 1936.

The A.A.A.—and After

By DAVID RAMSEY

THE Supreme Court made one of the most important decisions in its history when it nullified the A.A.A. The Court went much further than in its decision on the N.R.A. It narrowed down the powers of the federal government in matters of social legislation to the point where the rest of the New Deal can be thrown out of the window. Immediately after the A.A.A. decision, the Railroad Pension Act was challenged by 135 big roads on the same "constitutional" grounds. It is most likely that the Wagner Labor Disputes Act, the Social Security Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other phases of the Roosevelt program will also be scrapped by the Supreme Court.

The majority of the Supreme Court declared that the federal government did not have the power to pass any social legislation for the relief of a distressed section of the population. To bolster this opinion the Court asserted more emphatically than ever before in its history that it had the power at any time to overrule the opinions of Congress and the overwhelming majority of the people. These actions by the judicial oligarchy have alarmed some sections of the capitalist class. They are afraid that the majority opinion will incite the masses to acts curbing the power of the judiciary.

This was reflected in the important minority opinion. Justice Stone attacked the majority for usurping the power to repeal all legislation. He said that "for the removal of unwise laws from the statute books, appeals lies not to the courts, but to the ballot and to the processes of democratic government". The sharp division within the Court alarmed certain groups within the ruling class. Thus the *New York Times* pointed out that the minority opinion would turn large sections of the population against the Supreme Court. Donald Richberg, former head of the N.R.A., sounded the warning that the expansion of judicial power would in the long run "result in extensions of legislative power and curtailment of judicial power through constitutional amendments that may work infinitely more radical changes in our institutions and render individual rights and property rights much less valuable and secure".

This is the general frame-work of the case, indicating the most important political implications. But before we take them up in more detail let us review the history of the A.A.A. By taking up

the changes in the economic situation of the country which have taken place in the last three years, we will better be able to understand why the A.A.A. was challenged and then destroyed by the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital, whose attitude and program were expressed in the decision of the Supreme Court.

HISTORY OF THE A.A.A.

We must remember that the A.A.A. was originally an emergency measure. It was designed to meet a critical situation which alarmed the capitalist class as a whole. When Roosevelt took office, farm prices had dropped to their lowest point in history. The net income of the farmers was only half of what it had been in 1929. Mortgage and tax foreclosures had driven many farmers off the land, and many others who had been pauperized were converted into tenants. By 1933 almost half of the American farmers no longer owned their own land, the crisis speeding up the process which is converting the small American farmer into a landless peasant.

The discontent among the farmers was reflected in mass struggles against evictions and in demonstrations for relief. Some kind of action by the government was imperative if the farmers were to be kept in check. To win the farmers for his election, Roosevelt outlined in skeleton form the program of the A.A.A., in a speech which he made in Kansas in September, 1932. With certain modifications, this program which was drawn up by Peek and General Johnson was passed by Congress as the A.A.A. and went into effect in May, 1933.

One of the purposes of the act was to calm down the resentment of the farmers by giving them minor concessions in the form of relief, disguised as allotment checks. Another objective was to raise farm prices as part of the whole New Deal scheme for an inflationary rise in commodity prices. This was to be accomplished by restricting agricultural production. By cutting down the large surpluses of wheat, cotton, corn, hogs, etc., the administration intended artificially to raise prices. Rising farm prices were not meant only for the benefit of the farmers, but were to restore the values of farm mortgages held by the banks, insurance companies, and mortgage sharks. Another objective of the A.A.A. was to make the class lines in agriculture sharper by helping the rich farmer, and by forcing the small, poor, and tenant farmers off the land. The program of the rich farmers was expressed in the phrase used by Secretary of Agriculture, Wallace: two million farmers and fifty million acres were to be taken out of production.

The A.A.A. was launched by cutting down wheat acreage,

killing six million young pigs, plowing up ten million acres of cotton. Payments to the farmers were financed by processing taxes imposed on farm products. Commodity prices skyrocketed in anticipation of these taxes and of inflation, starting a rise which has been maintained ever since and which has doubled the price of farm commodities during the past two and a half years.

Although there were subsequent amendments, the objectives remained the same: to raise farm prices, to regulate agricultural surpluses by restricting production, to keep the poor farmers in check by giving them some meager cash relief, and to drive farmers off so-called sub-marginal lands. We must note that the restriction program would probably have failed, if left to itself. The rich farmers, through more intensive cultivation of their reduced acreage, increased their crops. It was the droughts of 1933-35 which largely enabled the administration to carry out its aim of cutting down agricultural production. By the end of 1935 there were no longer any large surpluses of wheat, corn, or hogs, because of the droughts and because the administration deliberately withheld relief and fodder from the farmers in the worst-stricken areas. The cotton surplus remained pretty much at the same level, since the reduction in the crop was more than matched by the falling off in exports. The sharp decrease in available supplies had already forced the administration to withdraw its restrictions on wheat and hogs during 1935.

WHO BENEFITED?

What took place under the A.A.A.? Farm prices went up from about 60 to 110 (1913 taken as 100) at the end of 1935. But the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar did not rise in the same proportion. Those things that the farmer has to buy had gone up considerably due to the inflationary rise in prices, so that the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar only advanced from 61 to 87 during this same period.

The largest share of the rise in farm prices did not go to the farmers. Their net income increased only about 35 per cent from 1933 to 1935, while farm prices advanced by 100 per cent. The lion's share of this increase was taken by the commodity speculators and by the food, textile, and other manufacturers. Using the processing taxes as an excuse, these manufacturers raised prices many times more than the small increase warranted by the processing tax.

What benefits did the farmer get from the A.A.A.? The rich wheat, tobacco, and cotton farmers received large subsidies. Some groups of small farmers, especially those in the Middle Western grain regions received a little cash. This relief stipend was very

important to the small farmer, since it represented almost all of his available cash. But the majority of the farming population received very little of the \$1,000,000,000 handed out by the A.A.A. The small dairy, truck, and poultry farmers received no benefits at all. The dairy strikes of 1933-34 were violent protests against their miserable lot and against the robbery by the milk trust. The tenant farmers in the South, especially the sharecroppers in the cotton belt, received nothing or practically nothing, and some 200,000 sharecroppers were forced off the land and left in complete destitution.

The benefits of the A.A.A. went almost entirely to the rich farmers and to the monopolists who made large profits out of higher prices. What made monopoly capital turn against the A.A.A.? Certain manufacturing interests, like the textile and food capitalists, turned against the A.A.A. because they wanted to pocket the sums paid out of processing taxes and add them to their profits. This was especially true in the textile industry where the market was small, and in the meat industry where high prices had reduced tonnage sales. These groups were backed by exporters who blamed the A.A.A. for the loss of their markets. And finally, the decisive sections of finance capital took up the fight against the A.A.A., because it gave minor concessions to the farmers. As long as the farmers were getting some cash relief, whether it was called a benefit payment or not, it would be an incentive to the unemployed and other distressed sections of the population to demand aid from the government. By destroying the A.A.A., these concessions would be wiped out and nothing would be left of the promises made by Roosevelt. In this way the monopoly capitalists hope to close the door against all social legislation, and to use the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution as the spearhead of their drive against the living standards of the toiling people.

When the A.A.A. was killed by the Supreme Court it had fulfilled its purpose of quieting down the revolt of the farmers. With discontent at a lower ebb than in the spring of 1933, finance capital could strike decisive blows at the farmers through the Supreme Court, which declared that Congress did not have the constitutional right to give any relief to the farmers. This was not only a blow at the farmers, but at the entire toiling population. It is legally impossible now to enact any kind of social legislation within the framework of the Supreme Court's decision, unless the pressure of the masses is used against the judges and the government.

The minority opinion of the Court made this very clear. It attacked the majority for denying the federal government the right to aid any distressed section of the population. Justice Stone pointed out that this same logic would necessarily invalidate the granting of

subsidies and loans by the R.F.C. to banks and industries; but, of course, the Constitution has always been interpreted by the American courts as an expression of the dominance of property rights over human rights. Consequently, the Supreme Court has always found any measure designed to aid the capitalists more than constitutional.

The split within the Court is important. It has brought out an issue that is very clear in the minds of many sections of the American people, namely, that the Supreme Court is abusing its judicial power. It has set itself up as an oligarchy which can overrule the "democratically elected Congress". The disagreement among the judges has made it more difficult for the capitalists to paint the Supreme Court as standing above politics and class interests. It is seen to be composed of men who serve the vested interests of finance capital and who have sharp disagreements as to how best to carry out their specific functions.

AFTER THE A.A.A.

What will be the economic results of the end of the A.A.A.? There is not likely to be a major drop in the prices of wheat, corn, hogs, etc. There is a real shortage in these commodities which will be used to raise prices even more. Some commodities, like hogs, may go up considerably in price, first, because the large hog raisers are demanding a share of the money formerly paid out in processing taxes; and, second, because many farmers who were raising corn will now turn to other crops, thus raising the price of corn, and subsequently of hogs. Cotton, which is heavily overloaded with a large surplus, may see a fall in prices. The large cotton planters, with the aid of government money received in 1933-35, will go in for more intensive cultivation. New areas in the Southwest may also be exploited as the result of economies brought on by the mechanical cotton picker. A much larger crop is thus the prospect for 1936, with the possibility of a disastrous break in the market, unless the government takes over the crop.

The consumers in the cities will not benefit from the end of the A.A.A. The tobacco and textile manufacturers have already announced that there will be no reduction in their product. Food prices as a whole will remain high. The Liberty League, which was clamoring for the end of the A.A.A., on the grounds that it was responsible for the high cost of living, will now probably change its tactic and say that high living costs are due to the past actions of the A.A.A. and the fear of future deeds by Roosevelt on the part of businessmen. The only ones who will benefit from the end of the A.A.A. are the industrialists and manufacturers who will now add the former processing taxes to their own pockets.

The administration expected the decision, but did nothing to meet it. Roosevelt was afraid of raising the constitutional issue too sharply and is still undecided as to which course to pursue with reference to the Supreme Court. At the moment, his future action is uncertain; but something will be done by Roosevelt to save the farm vote in the presidential election. Some form of crop regulation and some method of giving subsidies to the farmers will be worked out. It is significant that the financial and reactionary press, which hailed the end of the A.A.A., at the same time declared that some farm program had to be worked out by Congress. They implied that agriculture was confronted with what may be a permanent depression, and the only way of heading off another farm revolt was to be found in new legislation. Some scheme has to be adopted which will maintain farm prices and prevent overproduction.

The Republicans from the Mid-West, who never dared to attack the A.A.A. openly, are now proposing legislation which would give smaller subsidies to the farmers and which would dump surplus crops at a loss to the government in the world market. This is easy to understand, since the Mid-Western farm regions are in an uproar over the Supreme Court decision. In Iowa farmers hanged the justices of the Supreme Court in effigy. Consequently, we find Landon, Governor of Kansas, a leading Republican candidate, coming out in half-hearted support of the A.A.A. He said:

“The A.A.A., sound or unsound as it may have been in some of its long time, permanent implications, nevertheless was the only major agency operating to meet the admitted farm emergency. On that basis I had given it and Kansas had given it full cooperation. The Supreme Court decision abruptly ending its activities necessarily caused confusion, and, to many, disappointment.”

The present plans of the administration have boiled down to two things. Roosevelt has indicated that he will ask Congress to allocate some \$280,000,000 with which to pay farmers who hold 1936 contracts with the government. And the government is pushing a scheme for the “conservation of soil fertility” which will carry out the worst features of the old A.A.A. Crop restrictions are to be maintained and the amount of cash payments to the small farmer are to be cut.

THE NEW FARM PROGRAM

The so-called soil conservation program is not merely an emergency scheme worked out to meet the present situation. It is part of the long-term policy of the New Deal which is favored by the big farmers, and to which both capitalist parties are committed in principle. In his report for the fiscal year of 1935 Wallace urged

that poor land which is now owned by small farmers be taken out of production, while allowing increased production on the better land held by rich farmers. This is now to be the official policy of the administration. Under the cloak of soil conservation the New Deal intends to keep agricultural production down to the lowest levels of the crisis. At the same time, it intends to drive new tens of thousands of small and tenant farmers off the land. The rich farmers will benefit at the expense of the smaller and poorer ones. Wallace put this bluntly in his report when he said that the administration should increase farm income only for those "who should be on farms", that is, for the big farmers.

This program will cut down the cash benefits of the small farmer, and will thus increase the number of evictions which in 1935 were three times as large as in the preceding year. At the same time, farm production will be limited as it was under the A.A.A., although Roosevelt has himself declared that "the average citizen lives today on what would be called by the medical fraternity a third-class diet".

What is actually needed, as the United States Department of Agriculture has admitted in its official reports, is not less, but more, production. "To feed the 125,000,000 people according to the best standards nearly 40,000,000 acres would have to be added to the land now used for growing food and feed crop." But in the name of soil conservation the New Deal plans to justify the reduction of crops and a program of discrimination against the poor and tenant farmers.

Roosevelt did not seize the opportunity, offered him by the minority group in the Supreme Court, to make an issue of limiting the powers of the judiciary. He apparently decided to play safe and see how insistent the demands of the farmers would be; to see whether farm prices would be maintained, etc. He made only a passing reference to the Supreme Court in his Jackson Day speech, and up till now has issued no demagogic attacks against the Courts along the lines of his speech condemning the "autocrats" at the opening of Congress. The Republican Party has challenged him to make an issue of it in the election; but he seems to have decided to use the issue when he is certain that it will have political value for him.

The Liberty League forced itself on the scene by taking the unprecedented action of sending a letter through its Lawyers' Committee to Wallace and to J. R. McCarl, the comptroller-general, warning them that they did not have the right to make any further payments to farmers under A.A.A. contracts for 1936. The Liberty League-Republican Party alliance is pressing Roosevelt to make

an issue of the Constitution and the powers of the Supreme Court. Whether Roosevelt takes up the challenge or not, it is already obvious that the constitutional question is bound to become one of the major political issues of the immediate future.

REACTION STRIKES NEW BLOWS

Since the A.A.A. decision the Supreme Court has struck further blows against the rights of the toiling population. It approved one of the biggest steals in the history of the country when it decreed on January 13 that \$200,000,000 in processing taxes were to be turned back to the big monopolies. They had already made huge profits out of the rise in prices, and had passed on the cost of the processing taxes to the workers and middle classes in the city. This money taken from the pockets of the consumer is thus handed over as a free gift to big business. The arrogance of the judiciary is very well exemplified in the following statement by Federal Judge John P. Barnes, who ordered \$55,000,000 in processing taxes returned to the big meat packers. He refused to listen to a petition which said that the processors had not paid the tax but had deducted it from the price paid to the farmers. He said that he could not "act as an economist", declaring: "I don't wish to get a lot of people thinking they will get something when they won't. I suppose, next, the man who bought the bacon will come to court claiming that it was he who paid the taxes." It makes no difference to this judge that the farmer had the processing tax deducted from the price paid to him, and that the consumer ultimately paid the tax. As the servant of the rich, his one concern is that the monopolies make this legal steal.

The workers and farmers will both suffer from the Supreme Court decision. More than ever it is of the utmost importance to rally the American people around the slogan issued by the Communist Party: Sweep away the autocratic power of the United States Supreme Court! The broadest front of labor, farmers, progressives, and liberals must be created, which will work out a constitutional amendment to limit the powers of the Supreme Court, and which will bring pressure to bear upon Roosevelt to force him to take measures to protect what is left of the social security program from the attacks of the Court and the Liberty League. In this way the resentment of the masses against the judicial autocrats can be used as a weapon to strike decisive blows against the offensive of the capitalists.

WHAT MUST BE DONE?

The Communist Party has important tasks to carry out. The

farmers must be mobilized around the slogans that all allotment checks must be paid, that more cash should be given to the farmers and not less, as is being planned by both the Roosevelt government and the Liberty League. The benefits of poor and tenant farmers must be greater than under the A.A.A. No farm families should be evicted from their land on the grounds of soil conservation, etc. And, finally, every effort must be made to force the government to increase farm production so as to make possible an adequate diet for the entire population. Pressure from the farmers assisted by the working class is the only way of forcing Roosevelt to put through legislation which will continue benefit payments. The reactionary character of the Liberty League should be exposed in connection with its arrogant demand to the administration that the latter refuse to fulfill its contract commitments to the farmers.

To the workers in the city who have been told by the Liberty League that it is the A.A.A. and the farmers who are responsible for the high cost of living, we must show that they will not get any benefits from the destruction of the A.A.A. The removal of the processing taxes will not be passed on to them in the form of lower living costs. This money will simply go into the pockets of the big corporations. Already the reactionaries are proposing that subsidies to the farmers should be financed by a national sales tax which would directly hit the workers in the cities, and which would take away the small pittance which the farmer may get, by raising the price of the things he has to buy. We must convince the workers and the farmers that the fight against the A.A.A. decision of the Supreme Court is a fight against the Liberty League and against the trusts, whose mouthpiece it is. A fighting alliance of workers, farmers, and middle class people will be able to give a fair price of production to the farmers, and higher wages to the workers at the expense of the trusts and the rich; only such an alliance will win back for the people the rights taken away from them by the courts. In the words of the Central Committee of the Communist Party what is needed is:

“An organized movement of labor and farmers and middle class people which will fight unitedly on the picket line, in strikes and demonstrations, with the ballot, in the struggles of the farmers. . . . A wide people’s movement—a militant Farmer-Labor Party, the unity of all toilers—this must be the answer of the American people to the challenge of Wall Street.”

The Coming National Negro Congress

A NEW PHASE IN THE LIBERATION STRUGGLES
OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE

By JAMES W. FORD and A. W. BERRY

THE National Negro Congress scheduled to convene in Chicago on the birthday of Frederick Douglass (February 14), will be another historic milepost in the struggles of the Negro people for liberation in the United States of America. A really representative Congress in the U.S.A. with international connections will exercise a needed influence on world opinion, especially in the period now opening when the example of the struggle of the people of Ethiopia is bound to lead to a new and upward movement throughout Africa.

Congresses of the Negro people are not new in America. But the character and composition of the 1936 Congress will present something *new* in the form of working out united efforts on a broad scale.

The difference between this and former congresses is indicated with remarkable clearness by A. Philip Randolph (National President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters), in his introduction to the pamphlet *Let Us Build a National Negro Congress* by John P. Davis. We quote Mr. Randolph:

"In this *deepening crisis of monopoly capitalism* . . . the Negro in politics, industry, education and his entire social life, is faced with a decisive and imperative challenge, to develop and fashion a new and powerful instrumentality with which, not only to arouse and fire the broad masses to action in their own defense, but to attack the forces of reaction that seek to throttle Black America with increasing jim-crowism, segregation and discrimination."

These words, from an outstanding labor leader, evidence a *new* and *potent* force making for a change within the ranks of the Negro people; *viz., first*, the growing maturity of the Negro working class, its willingness and readiness to fight determinedly against oppression; and, *secondly*, the realization, on its part, of its power, force, and leadership in the Negro liberation movement. This was a big factor absent in many former Negro Congresses, which accounts for the lack of decisiveness on the part of the participants.

Other welcome factors that will influence the policies of the coming Congress are (1) the changing attitude of the Negro middle class and its organizations; (2) the growth of a broad progressive bloc in the official trade union movement pledged to industrial unionism; and (3) the general united front mass movement of the toilers against fascism and war.

The recently consummated united front Scottsboro defense and the united front in defense of Herndon illustrate the first point. Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, analyzed this trend in a speech last October in Madison Square Garden:

"We must recognize that hundreds and thousands of those who formerly opposed us most bitterly are themselves changing and turning towards more militant policies, under the influence of the crisis and the educational effects of our own work. Even the N.A.A.C.P., which fought us most bitterly, which still carries on vicious slanders against us, has itself been forced by the *new mood among the masses* to reorientate itself towards the Left, to become more active and more bold in demanding equal rights for the Negroes."

When John L. Lewis challenged the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor on the Negro question at the last convention, and later headed the Committee for Industrial Organization, representing over a million organized workers, repercussions could be heard in every Negro community in the country. This development in the trade union movement can be a step toward the elimination of craft barriers now raised against Negro skilled workers in industry. Although unorganized, the potential support of Negroes to industrial unionism is tremendous.

The general united front movement has had the greatest influence among the Negro youth, who, almost everywhere in the country, are uniting their organizations to carry through progressive social activity directed against jim-crowism and segregation. A great upsurge has been seen among both white and Negro farmers and agricultural workers who have effected fighting organizations during the depression in the heart of the reaction-ridden "deep South".

These forces, which grew up during the crisis period from among the Negro people, are certain to crystallize a positive, lasting program based on their needs and experiences. These are the guarantees for a genuine liberation program and organization resulting from the Congress.

Six demands around which the discussions and decisions will revolve point out already the main direction to be taken by the Congress. We quote from the Call to the National Negro Congress:

"1. The right of Negroes to jobs at decent living wages and for the right to join all trades unions. For the right to equal wages and equal labor conditions with other workers. For the

organization of Negro workers with their fellow white workers into democratically controlled trade unions.

2. Relief and security for every needy Negro family; and, for genuine social and unemployment insurance without discrimination.

3. Aid to the Negro farm population, to ease the burden of debts and taxation; for the right of farmers, tenants and sharecroppers to organize and bargain collectively.

4. A fight against lynching, mob violence and police brutality; for enactment of a federal anti-lynching law; for the right to vote, serve on juries and enjoy complete civil liberty.

5. The right of Negro youth to equal opportunity in education and in the economic life of the community.

6. For complete equality for Negro women; for their right, along with all women, to equal pay for equal work; for their right to a suitable environment for themselves and their children—an environment which demands adequate housing, good schools, and recreational facilities; for their right to organize as consumers.

7. To oppose war and fascism, the attempted subjugation of Negro people in Ethiopia, the oppression of colonial nations throughout the world; for the independence of Ethiopia."

Although the Call was issued before the last American Federation of Labor Convention, the first proposed demand means clearly the working out of cooperation between the Congress and industrial unionism. John L. Lewis has endorsed the Congress, which is a further indication of the mutual need for such cooperation. With 100,000 Negro workers organized out of 5,000,000 Negroes eligible for organization, the importance of organizing this potential force into the organized labor movement is stupendous.

The Congress must consider ways and means of breaking down opposition to anti-lynch and civil rights legislation and work out a program which meets the approval of all Negro and defense organizations, for united action to enforce the passage by Congress of the anti-lynch and Civil Rights Act. Administration after administration has been able to pass the buck on this issue because up to now no united mass pressure has been mobilized behind *one* bill with *one* campaign. One united campaign for civil rights and against lynching by the Negro people and sympathizers would make Negro rights a major political *issue* instead of a political football in the U.S.A.

All reports show that a large number of artisans, professionals, as well as Negro small business men will attend the Congress. They will come with problems to be solved. Shall problems of the artisans, professionals and small business men suffering discrimination receive the attention of the Congress? We hold the answer should undoubtedly be in the affirmative.

We present the above as one of the problems which the Congress will face, although it is not raised in the pamphlet by Mr. John P. Davis.

The Congress will deal with the special problems of youth and

women. It will also have to deal thoroughly with the farm question; for the agricultural crisis has hit the Negro people doubly hard, from the standpoint of a marketer and a field laborer. With the burning economic problems of the Negro farmers piled on top of lynch-terror, the denial of civil rights, etc., which grow out of slavery hangovers, we see that the Congress forces will have to give special attention to the South. That the problems of the Negroes in the "deep South" form the core of the Negro question in the United States will undoubtedly be revealed by the Southern delegates. The Congress will have to take seriously into account the most pressing question of the increasing political reaction and contrast the programs and attitudes of the old political parties with that of a Farmer-Labor Party.

We have raised here a few of the most pressing problems which, in our opinion, will confront the coming National Negro Congress. The very fact that these concrete problems of Negro liberation are vital day-to-day interests, bound up with the demands for freedom and equality is evidence of the real historical significance of the Congress. Can the Congress solve these problems?

This question has been raised, skeptically, in some sections of the Negro press. But the Negro people and the working class have received six years of rigorous training in the school of depression and crisis. The lessons have been well learned. Did not the pullman porters' victory teach the worth of organized working class power? Was not the slave law of Georgia successfully challenged by the united front defense of Herndon? Did not the unity of Negro and white workers organized in struggle defeat the N.R.A. wage differentials in the Southern mines and mills? By building a strong organization, have not the Southern tenants and sharecroppers won many significant victories? Did not united action behind the *Amsterdam News* strikers in Harlem bring a highly important victory and lesson? And could not a real anti-lynch campaign have been conducted victoriously by united organized action of the masses?

The answers to these questions represent lessons well learned. With these experiences as a guide the participants might well ask (as many are asking): Why not take the lessons of these victories, affecting tens or hundreds of thousands, as a means of solving the problems of millions? The fact that the Congress organizers plan to attack the question of Ethiopian defense indicates to what heights the Congress will rise.

With hard work and energy we can be assured that the National Negro Congress will be the beginning of a real Negro liberation movement, a historic step in the direction of land, equality and freedom. The Communist Party wholeheartedly supports the National Negro Congress.

The Decree on Peace

(Adopted by the Second Congress of Soviets on Nov. 7-8, 1917)

By V. I. LENIN

[We are reproducing here the historic DECREE ON PEACE adopted by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, because of the timely bearing which the tenets contained therein have on the burning political questions of the hour. The DECREE, adopted on the day following seizure of power, eloquently testifies to the central position which the program of peace has from the outset occupied in the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R.

The significance of the Soviet peace policy for the world toilers, the guarantees of independence for the weaker nations, the abolition of secret diplomacy (the Soviet Union was the only state which opened up the archives to bare the secret imperialist war machinations), the entry into mutual pacts of non-aggression, the basic reliance on the independent peace movements of the toilers—these Leninist anti-war principles contained in the DECREE—further developed to meet the needs of the world working class at the present historic moment—are today being applied in the Soviet peace policy as formulated under the guidance of Comrade Stalin.—EDITORS.]

THE workers' and peasants' government created by the revolution of November 6-7 (October 24-25) and backed by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies calls upon all the belligerent peoples and their governments to start immediate negotiations for a just and democratic peace.

By a just, or democratic peace, for which the vast majority of the working and toiling classes of all belligerent countries, exhausted, tormented and racked by the war, are craving, a peace that has been most definitely and insistently demanded by the Russian workers and peasants ever since the overthrow of the tsarist monarchy—by such a peace the government means an immediate peace without annexations (*i.e.*, the seizure of foreign lands, or the forcible incorporation of foreign nations) and indemnities.

The government of Russia calls upon all the belligerent nations to conclude such a peace immediately, and expresses its readiness to take the most resolute measures without the least delay, pending the final ratification of the conditions of this peace by plenipotentiary assemblies of the people's representatives of all countries and all nations.

In accordance with the sense of justice of the democracy in general, and of the toiling classes in particular, the government interprets the annexation, or seizure, of foreign lands as meaning

the incorporation into a large and powerful state of a small or feeble nation without the definitely, clearly and voluntarily expressed consent and wish of that nation, irrespective of the time such forcible incorporation took place, irrespective of the degree of development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed to, or forcibly retained within, the frontiers of the given state, and finally, irrespective of whether the nation inhabits Europe or distant, overseas countries.

If any nation whatsoever is forcibly retained within the boundaries of a given state, if, in spite of its expressed desire—no matter whether that desire is expressed in the press, at popular meetings, in Party decisions, or in protests and revolts against national oppression—it is not permitted the right to decide the forms of its state existence by a free vote, taken after the complete evacuation of the troops of the incorporating or, generally, of the stronger nation, without the least pressure being brought to bear upon it, such incorporation is annexation, *i.e.*, seizure and coercion.

The government considers that it would be the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war for the purpose of dividing up among the strong and rich nations the feeble nationalities seized by them, and solemnly declares its determination to sign immediately conditions of peace terminating this war on the conditions indicated, which are equally just for all peoples without exception.

At the same time the government declares that it does not regard the above-mentioned terms of peace as an ultimatum; in other words, it is prepared to consider any other conditions of peace, but only insists that they be advanced as speedily as possible by any of the belligerent nations, and that in the conditions of peace proposed there should be absolute clarity and the complete absence of all ambiguity and secrecy.

The government abolishes secret diplomacy and, for its part, expresses its firm determination to conduct all negotiations quite openly before the whole people. It will immediately proceed to the full publication of the secret treaties ratified or concluded by the government of landlords and capitalists during the period March (February) to November 7 (October 25), 1917. The government proclaims the absolute and immediate annulment of the contents of all such secret treaties, since they are aimed, as in the majority of cases they are, at securing advantages and privileges for the Russian landlords and capitalists and at the retention, or extension, of the annexations made by the Great Russians.

Appealing to the governments and peoples of all countries immediately to begin open negotiations for the conclusion of peace, the government, for its part, expresses its readiness to conduct such negotiations in writing or by telegraph, or by negotiations between

representatives of the various countries, or at a conference of representatives. In order to facilitate such negotiations, the government is commissioning its plenipotentiary representatives to neutral countries.

The government proposes to all the governments and peoples of the belligerent countries to conclude an immediate armistice and, for its part, considers it desirable that the armistice should be concluded for no less than three months, *i.e.*, for a period long enough to permit the conclusion of negotiations for peace with the participation of the representatives of all peoples and nations involved in or compelled to take part in the war, without exception, and the summoning of plenipotentiary assemblies of the representatives of the peoples of all countries for the final ratification of the terms of peace.

While addressing this proposal for peace to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia appeals in particular to the class-conscious workers of the three most advanced nations of mankind, the largest states participating in the present war, namely, Great Britain, France and Germany. The workers of these countries have made the greatest contributions to the cause of progress and socialism; they have furnished the great examples of the Chartist movement in England, a number of revolutions of world and historic importance made by the French proletariat, and, finally, the heroic struggle against the Anti-Socialist Law in Germany, and the example shown to the workers of the whole world in the protracted, persistent and disciplined work of creating mass proletarian organizations in Germany. All these examples of proletarian heroism and historical creative work serve as a pledge that the workers of the countries mentioned will understand the duty that now lies upon them of emancipating mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences. For these workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely energetic action, can help us to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation.

* * *

The Workers' and Peasants' Government created by the revolution of November 6-7 (October 24-25) and backed by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, must begin immediate negotiations for peace. Our appeal must be directed both to the governments and to the peoples. We cannot ignore the governments, for that would delay the possibility of concluding peace, and the people's government dare not do that; but we have no right not to appeal to the peoples at the same time. Everywhere there are differences between the governments and the peoples,

and we must therefore help the people to interfere in the question of war and peace. We will, of course, insist upon the whole of our program for a peace without annexations and indemnities. We shall not retreat from that program; but we must deprive our enemies of the opportunity of declaring that their conditions are different from ours and that therefore it is useless to start negotiations with us. No, we must deprive them of that advantageous position and not advance our terms in the form of an ultimatum. Therefore the point is included that we are ready to consider all terms of peace and all proposals. We shall consider them, but that does not necessarily mean that we shall accept them. We shall submit them to the consideration of the Constituent Assembly, which will have the power to decide what concessions can or cannot be made. We are combating the duplicity of governments which in words talk of peace and justice, but in fact wage annexationist and predatory wars. There is not a single government that will say all it thinks. We, however, are opposed to secret diplomacy and will act openly in the eyes of the whole people. We do not, and never did, close our eyes to difficulties. War cannot be ended by refusal, it cannot be ended by one side only. We are proposing an armistice for three months, but shall not reject a shorter period, so that the exhausted army may breathe freely even for a little while, and because, moreover, in all the civilized countries national assemblies must be summoned for the discussion of terms.

In proposing the conclusion of an immediate armistice, we appeal to the class-conscious workers of the countries that have done so much for the development of the proletarian movement. We appeal to the workers of England, where there was a Chartist movement, to the workers of France, who have in repeated insurrections displayed the strength of their class consciousness, and to the workers of Germany, who waged the fight against the Anti-Socialist Law and have created powerful organizations.

In the manifesto of March 27 (14) we called for the overthrow of the bankers, but, far from overthrowing our own bankers, we entered into an alliance with them. Now we have overthrown the government of the bankers.

The government and the bourgeoisie will make every effort to unite their forces and drown the workers' and peasants' revolution in blood. But the three years of war have been a good lesson to the masses: Soviet movements in other countries, the mutiny in the German fleet, which was crushed by the Junkers of the hangmen Wilhelm. Finally, we must remember that we are not living in the wilds of Africa, but in Europe, where news can spread quickly.

The workers' movement will triumph and will lay the path to peace and to socialism.

Left Trends in the Socialist Party

ON THE LEFT-WING "DRAFT FOR A PROGRAM FOR THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES"

By ROBERT MINOR

A STORM is blowing around the House of the Dead at No. 7 East Fifteenth Street, and rattling the windows and giving rheumatic pains to the old men within. A tornado of revolutionary thought and feeling is stirring the ranks of the Socialist Party. The Old Guard leaders hold a fraction of the New York organization, fighting desperately with every bureaucratic weapon against all signs of life within the party, making war against the youth because of a reasoned fear that all that is young is against them. One of the younger leaders of the Socialist Party recently wrote of the Old Guard:

"Their socialism has become for them something like a religious dogma, something that one is supposed to believe but is not expected to practise."

And the writer, Haim Kantorovitch, might well have gone further and spoken of the practical, the *active* side of this "dead Marxism", as expressed by the visit of Louis Waldman to the American Federation of Labor Convention to plead in vain for the "Red Amendment" as a method of war against the trade unions by reactionary bureaucrats. Yes, "dead Marxism" has an active side, just as all death is accompanied by its active agencies that live to putrify and to poison what is not yet dead.

The great majority of the members and functionaries of the Socialist Party feel the hot pressure of life itself for the *practice* of Socialism. But "without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice", and the result is an effort in the Left Wing (really comprising the great majority) of the Socialist Party to bring forward a revolutionary program of Marxism for the present day.

This effort is before us now under the title, "Draft for a Program for the Socialist Party of the United States", published in pamphlet form by the *Socialist Call*, as formulated by the Left Wing at the Socialist Call Institute, Bound Brook, N. J.

To a certain extent this draft program gives expression to the

vast and growing determination of the Socialists to rescue their party for Socialism. But it is also an expression at the same time of certain resistance to this determination. Some of the resistance arises from the old type of somnolent middle-class illusions; and some of it is, what might be called, within the Socialist Party, a relatively new type of resistance to the living power of Marxism.

The document does not claim to be more than a draft that "will inspire discussion in the branches, locals and forums of the party", and, as such, it must be considered seriously.

The foreword gives clearly enough the reason (or at least one side of the reason) for its appearance:

"Ever since the defeat of the working class in Germany, the international Socialist movement has been in a state of ferment. In all countries the tendency is to examine the circumstances which contributed to that defeat, so that the errors shall not be repeated elsewhere. The threatening war danger, the almost unchecked rise of fascism, the continuation of the severe economic crisis, all make necessary the clarification of the issues, so that a foundation for genuine revolutionary action may be achieved."

In this tone the program proceeds to an exposition of the character of present-day capitalist society which has "outlived its usefulness", and "not only impedes the progress of humanity, but threatens to plunge the entire world into a new era of chaos, wars, and partial extermination". In reversal of the action of the Socialist Party convention of 1928, which struck out from the party's program all reference to class struggle, this draft speaks of the existence of "bitter and unremitting class war".

No pacifist illusion finds expression in this first section of the draft. Showing that the defeat of Germany in the World War and the adoption of the Versailles Treaty led to a new and more intense rivalry, and that "the slow but steady fall in the rate of profit compels the imperialist groups to seek new and less exploited markets, thus constantly coming into conflict, not only with their 'enemies', but also with their 'allies' ", the program draft proceeds to a straightforward statement of the present situation, with no concession to the illusion, so recently prevalent, as regards the absence of an imminent war danger:

"Since the close of the World War, there has been an uninterrupted series of small wars. The rearming of Germany, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, Japan's seizure of Manchuria and Northern China and her activities against the Soviet Union, the endeavor of the fascist rulers of Germany to provoke an attack on the Soviet Union, indicate that a new world war is more imminent and dangerous than ever."

The program declares: "Only the overthrow of capitalism can put an end to the constant threat of war forever." Standing foursquare on this proposition, the draft shows that the World War marked the end of capitalist advance, that the period of decline has set in, which is also the epoch of proletarian revolution:

"A series of revolutionary eruptions gave notice that a new society was in the making. The Soviet Union emerged—the first great successful effort to establish a workers' society."

All of which is a serious attempt to bring about a profound change in the program and tactics of the Socialist Party of the United States, in connection consciously with the world socialist movement and as part of it. We cannot but reflect upon the consequences of such an advance, of such a reaction to the growing determination of the Socialist workers to look to the Socialist character of their party.

BASIC PROGRAMMATIC QUESTIONS

Some basic programmatic questions are dealt with in a manner to indicate that there exists in the Socialist Party a genuine effort to discard the illusions prevalent in the Second International regarding the state and democracy:

"The peculiar feature of the classical capitalist state, which distinguishes it from other forms of class dictatorship, is that it is surrounded by a buffer of democratic forms which tend to hide its real character and function. These democratic forms make it appear as if the state is the representative of society as a whole, including the workers, as if the workers have equal rights with the capitalists, as if all were equal."

Capitalist democracy "is not genuine democracy for the working class".

"In the United States, as in all capitalist countries, the state, like its predecessors, is an instrument of class rule."

". . . Every important class action of the workers becomes transformed into a struggle between the workers and the state."

On the question of state power and socialism, the draft significantly declares:

"The change from capitalism is a revolutionary act, involving the transfer of the means of production from one class to another. Therefore, socialism, in the economic field, cannot be the result of the accumulation of economic reforms (higher wages, shorter hours, etc.). Similarly, on the political field, it cannot be the result of the accumulation of political reforms. In order to make possible the change from capitalism to socialism, the working class will have to

take political power in its own hands, and set up its own state in the form of a workers' and farmers' government."

And, "based on the will of the majority of the workers", this will be "for the first time true political and industrial democracy for the workers and farmers". This democracy will exclude all capitalist exploiters and suppress all efforts at a capitalist restoration. It will promote workers' organization and ensure freedom of press, speech, and assemblage for the toilers.

Without overlooking such important questions as participation by the middle class in political life and in the building of socialist society, the ending of child labor and the exploitation of youth, and the bringing of "complete equality to Negroes", as well as the liberation of the colonial victims of American imperialism, the draft makes clear that there is a tremendous growth of understanding among the Socialist workers of the real meaning of *democracy as the indispensable basis for socialism*. The truth that socialism is impossible without democracy has been distorted into its opposite by the reformists, into the false idea that the disguised dictatorship of capitalist "democracy" must be undisturbed as the indispensable basis upon which socialism will "grow". This program draft shows an appreciation of the fact that, yes, democracy is indispensable for socialism, but that it must be a *thousand times deeper, broader and more direct form of democracy* than the crippled and debased form that capitalism affords and upon the basis of which socialism would truly be impossible:

"Just as capitalist democracy is in form adapted to the needs and interests of the capitalist class, workers' democracy, under a workers' and farmers' government, will be adapted to the needs and interests of the workers and farmers of the country."

The necessary conclusion, without which it would be impossible to understand anything of the Marxian conception of the state—the postulate that "having accomplished these tasks", the state "wither away"—is recognized. With all the immense importance of these basic conceptions of the state—theoretically formulated here and to a certain degree applied practically to European experience of 1914-18—these correct general *formulations* would "wither away" in the hands of these comrades if they make of them a dogmatic strait-jacket, if they do not know how to translate them into concrete living terms and to utilize them as guides to action in a new situation not duplicating that of 1914. Later, when we come to the draft's plan for *action* in the *present* situation—the matter will come to a severer test.

* * *

The draft shows an appreciation of some lessons of post-war history in saying that the working class in its fight for socialism "must utilize all the reforms, all the democratic rights which it has won from the capitalists", and must fight against the abrogation of these rights:

"The experiences of the workers in Germany, Austria, Spain, Russia and elsewhere, show that the capitalist class will destroy democratic rights and the possibility of democratic procedure when a democratic majority for socialism seems imminent."

Of course the authors must be conscious here that in each recorded case when "a democratic majority for socialism seemed imminent", the realization of socialism was not made imminent by anything the Social-Democratic parties were doing. The draft continues, that the capitalists "will resort to violence, even to foreign armies, to oust the workers' governments which come into power peacefully, as was shown in Finland and Hungary".

Is it necessary to interject here that the imminence of socialism and of the expropriation of the bourgeoisie in both *Finland* and *Hungary*, as the comrades will recognize, was due to the support the masses gave to the Communist Party; that the imperialist bourgeoisie was perfectly content to rule through the Social-Democratic parties in Germany, Austria, Spain, Russia, Great Britain, and Scandinavia?

SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC POLICY IN CENTRAL EUROPE

A healthy desire in the Socialist Party to assimilate the lessons of the past decades of war, revolution, counter-revolution and fascism, especially as related to the opportunism of the Social-Democracy of Central Europe, is given voice:

"The victory of fascism in some countries was possible only because the working class did not fulfill its historic mission of taking power at the opportune time and proceed to reconstruct society on the socialist basis. And the failure of the working class can be explained by the fact that the Socialist parties of the important European countries were not in reality revolutionary parties."

Referring to the truce of these parties with the ruling classes in the World War, the draft continues:

"After the World War the Social-Democratic Party of Germany surrendered the power which the workers gave it to the capitalist class and was satisfied to become the doctor instead of the gravedigger of capitalism. It clung tenaciously to capitalist democracy and to an entirely false conception of the state. It erroneously believed in the possibility of ushering in socialism by a gradual transformation of the capitalist state through the processes of bourgeois democracy."

"In rejecting the Marxian conception of the state as an instrument of class oppression and clinging to capitalist democracy the Social-Democratic Party of Germany objectively prepared the conditions for the victory of fascism."

This is a very good and basic rejection of the colossal crime of the social-chauvinist treason of 1914-18 and a validation of the Marxist-Leninist thesis as against the whole subsequent process of social-treason that paved the way for fascism in Germany. At the same time it is a body-blow at the identical course followed by the Old Guard in America which leads toward the same results.

In passing, we will say, however, we do not think the words "*clung tenaciously to capitalist democracy*" are a correct description of the course of German Social-Democracy from 1918 to 1933. That party really prepared the way for the victory of fascism by *surrendering*, one by one, each of the economic gains and, in turn, each of the political rights that were the fruits of the revolution of November, 1918. The German Social-Democratic Party, *not tenaciously*, but *very weakly*, clung to the eight-hour day, the workers' rights of free organization and intervention in questions of conditions of labor in the shops, and then quickly let go of these rights as soon as it was asked to do so by the bourgeoisie. The only tenacity of the German Social-Democratic leaders in the class struggles of 1918 to 1933 was in their holding on to the bourgeois dictatorship in its disguised and "softened" "democratic" form *as against the working class*. They did not even "cling tenaciously" to the "democratic" form of bourgeois state *as against* the open, fascist form of bourgeois dictatorship when the final test came in 1932-33. Perhaps this is what the program has in mind; but we mention the matter to guard against a certain *abstract* approach to this question which could lead to sterile sectarianism, rather than to a revolutionary, program.

Later the program continues:

"To defeat fascism, labor unity is essential. That mere unity of the working class without a bold revolutionary policy is not sufficient to ensure victory against the fascists is evidenced by the defeat of the Austrian workers after a heroic but belated struggle. The Austrian Social-Democratic Party, like its brother party in Germany, adopted the policy of choosing the lesser evil of supporting a government ostensibly democratic as against the fascists."

On the reasons for the defeat of the workers and the victory of fascism in Germany and Austria, this draft is an improvement over the thesis of Otto Bauer, Theodore Dan, and Jean Zyromski, who gloss over and therefore protect the policies of the two Social-Democratic parties of Central Europe by laying the blame for the

failure of the proletariat to take power upon the "Allies" instead of upon the Social-Democratic leaders who advised the workers not to take power and turned the old monarchist troops upon them when they disregarded this supine advice.

In the above-given quotation we would like to think the expression, "as against the fascists", was a slip of the pen or a typographical error. In the summer of 1917 Lenin and his Bolshevik Party gave a certain support to the Kerensky government *as against* the counter-revolutionary putsch of General Kornilov. Was this an opportunist error on the part of Lenin? It did not result in the fascist-like General Kornilov taking power, but in his *defeat*, in the smashing of the monarchist reaction. But did it perhaps result in the strengthening of Kerensky? No, it resulted in the vast strengthening of the revolutionary forces and their unity in guarding their bourgeois democratic rights, not only against the Kornilovs but *also against Kerensky*. It was support of Kerensky *as against* Kornilov; *not unconditional* support of Kerensky, and not any degree of support of Kerensky *as against* the workers and peasants. Therefore, the conditional support of the "ostensibly democratic" bourgeois government not only served very effectively to defend the bourgeois democratic rights of the workers, but finally became the kind of support for Kerensky that a man gets from a rope when he is hanged.

We do not want to assume too much on these two words, "as against", but the possibility of sectarian interpretation here seems to be borne out later in the text of the draft.

The wrong course followed by the Social-Democratic Parties of Germany and Austria *did not lie in their defending bourgeois democracy against fascism* (which they did not do), nor even in their supporting conditionally and temporarily (if they really had done so) and "ostensibly democratic" government of the bourgeoisie *as against* a fascist attempt to overthrow it. No, if we consider the period during the rise of fascism, their mistake lay in *failing* (disgracefully and supinely) to defend bourgeois democracy against fascism; in *failing* to mobilize the whole working class (and other classes) to defend bourgeois democratic forms (such as the state government of Prussia which was in the hands of Socialists) *as against fascism*; in failing to attempt to unify the whole working class with its trade unions to act as the leading force to lead the whole exploited population *against the fascist reaction*; in failing to pursue an independent working class revolutionary policy which could very well have included, what Marx called, "coalitions" with political parties of other class elements; and, therefore, in failing to follow the revolutionary policy of *carrying the defeat of fascism over*

into the defeat of the classes guilty of attempting to establish fascism, into the removal of these classes from power and the substitution of the revolutionary power of the working class, the only guarantee against fascism.

Concretely, why did the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Party have to refuse the offer of the Communist Party to form a united front and to call upon the trade unions for a general strike against fascism at the time of the forceful ousting of the Socialist government of the state of Prussia? Was it not because such a general strike against the illegal seizure of the state government of Prussia by Hitler's handful of officers, accompanied, as it would have been, by a universal movement of the whole working class and an appeal to the peasants and middle class, would necessarily have *developed from a defense of bourgeois democracy into an action far beyond the bounds of bourgeois democracy?* Was it not that the German Social-Democratic leaders dreaded more than anything else the carrying of the struggle by the workers *beyond these bounds?*

Clearly, one beggars the whole matter if one says the mistake lay in defending bourgeois democracy, or even in "supporting a government ostensibly democratic *as against the fascists*".

And is not this particularly dangerous now, when all such questions are vital to the *present* development of the world-wide struggles? Are the authors of the draft program perhaps laying down a platform that would mean *objectively* a sectarian *inaction* against fascism, behind some very "revolutionary" words that have crept into their otherwise good criticism of the opportunism of Social-Democracy in Central Europe?

A LITTLE "SCHLEICHHANDEL"

Interlarded in the analysis of the bankruptcy of the policies of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany are the following remarks:

"The disruptive policies of the Communist Party of Germany, its organizational and ideological flirtations with fascism, its theory of social fascism and opposition to the united front, its complete dependence upon the policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for its own policies, contributed just as much to the victory of fascism."

We must decline to consider these statements as a sop to the Old Guard Cerberus. By "disruptive policies", the drafters cannot simply mean the grave errors that were made by the German Communists and which were so sharply pointed out by their spokesman, Comrade Wilhelm Pieck, at the Seventh Congress of the

Communist International. The mistake of the German Communist Party was laid wide open in the self-criticism of the German Communists for the whole world to see, and for the workers of all countries to understand so that such mistakes would not be repeated. As George Dimitroff summed up the matter:

"At that time [of capitalist stabilization] it was bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy that the revolutionary workers were facing in a number of countries and it was against bourgeois democracy that they were concentrating their fire. In Germany, they fought against the Weimar Republic, not because it was a republic, but because it was a *bourgeois* republic, which was suppressing the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, especially in 1918-20 and in 1923.

"But could the Communists maintain this stand also when the fascist movement began to raise its head, when, for instance, in 1932, the fascists in Germany were organizing and arming hundreds of thousands of Storm Troopers against the working class? Of course not. It was the mistake of the Communists in a number of countries, particularly in Germany, that they failed to take into account the changes which had taken place, but continued to repeat those slogans, maintain those tactical positions which had been correct a few years before, especially when the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship was an immediate issue, and when the entire German counter-revolution was rallying under the banner of the Weimar Republic. . . ."

Do the Left Socialist program-makers undertake an honest explanation of this for the thousands of Socialist workers who are looking to them for honesty? No. In the liquidation of the bankrupt firm of Noske, Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., wholesale butchers, our Left Socialist program-writers are trying to conceal some of the "assets" of the bankrupt business. The American Socialist workers see in the mirror of German experience the rottenness of the American Old Guard leaders' policies; but evidently there are some men who think it is still possible to obscure and preserve some of this rottenness; the method of doing so is to present the errors of the *revolutionary* party as though to prove that the revolutionary party is *not essentially different* from the party of "capitalist democracy". (As all revolutionary parties inevitably at moments make mistakes, such dishonest bookkeeping is always possible for those who want to use it; but this is not leadership.) With the one statement that the Communist Party of Germany "contributed just as much to the victory of fascism", the program-drafters swallow all the previous fine words with which they had denounced the social treason that cost the lives of 20,000 German workers butchered by order of Ebert and Noske in 1918-19 and delivered Germany into the hands of Thyssen and Hitler. As though in a panic of desire to retract everything, these men who had just shown that the Social-

Democratic policies exemplified in Germany were the "social" road to fascism, immediately apologize to the Noskes by denouncing the German Communist Party for pointing out on the class battlefield, at the time of action, exactly what these program-writers are now saying at their writing desks years later.

Do the authors of the draft, after all they have said of the German social-reformist policy paving the way for fascism, wish us now to believe that the line of the Old Guard in the United States would *not* weaken the labor movement and pave the way for an American fascist reaction? Or that efforts of the revolutionary party here or in Germany to break away backward workers from Huey Longs and Coughlins are "flirtations with fascism?" Or that the parties of the Socialist and Labor International are the *preponents* of the united front and that the Communist Parties are the ones that *reject* it? Or that what the American Socialist workers need, in order to replace Old Guard opportunism with an effective revolutionary Marxist program, is to give *less* attention and study to the Party that has conquered power and is building the classless Socialist society in one-sixth of the earth? These would be the only possible inferences from their words.

THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

That the authors of the draft program do not ignore the importance of the struggle to defend the democratic rights of the workers is shown when they say:

"In the days of its decline, capitalism is embarrassed by its own historic identification with democracy. It seeks now to liquidate the democratic and civil rights gained through many years of struggle as well as the entire parliamentary system. The workers have become the foremost fighters for broad democratic rights."

WAR

Necessarily the most important phase of a program drawn up in the world of today is that relating to *war*. But war cannot but be closely linked to the subject of fascism; and the whole program has to be tested by the question: With what *action* do you intend to meet this problem? The draft says:

"So long as the capitalist system remains, it will give birth to more and more devastating wars. The re-arming of Germany, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, Japan's seizure of Manchuria and Northern China, and her activities against the Soviet Union, the endeavor of the fascist rulers of Germany to provoke an attack upon the Soviet Union, indicate that a new world war is more imminent and danger than ever."

“Only the overthrow of capitalism can put an end to the constant threat of war forever.”

“Fascism leads directly to war.”

It correctly describes the pre-war complex of imperialist rivalries that inevitably led to the World War of 1914:

“The imperialist world aligned itself into two camps, with Great Britain and Germany heading them.”

But as to the *post-war* complex of imperialist rivalries—which has to do with *present action*—the program is not so clear. “The defeat of Germany and the adoption of the Versailles Treaty did not end imperialist rivalry”, it truly says, and “a new and more intense rivalry was born”. But as to *what are the groupings of powers* in this “new and more intense rivalry”, the program becomes vague, begins to avoid clear statement. True, it indicates a series of war plans, or at least a Japanese imperialist war plan directed against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and against China. But of the “new and more intense rivalry” between the United States and Great Britain which pervades the whole world and touches every continent, and which has actually already flamed into “proxy” warfare in South America—the program shows no consciousness.

The draft program begins here to lose its way because its authors cannot see the post-war imperialist rivalries concretely in their new features alongside of, and in their relation to, the most fundamental antagonism of all—the antagonism between the world of capitalism and the world of socialism. This deepest and *most decisive* contradiction they can see only in a detached way as having little or nothing to do with the *general* situation as to war and peace, and as in no way affecting *what is to be done* about war. The program writers do not show any consciousness of their major determining feature of the present situation—the fact that the anti-Soviet war plans of the fascist imperialists of Germany and Japan are a component part of a general plan of expansion and conquest; and the related fact that these war plans for a new repartition of the world bring both Nazi Germany and militarist Japan, as well as fascist Italy, into sharp clash with a whole complex of existing interests, intensifying the antagonisms between the imperialists on a world scale and creating a regrouping of capitalist powers, large and small, in opposition. Of this the program gives us nothing more than the vague remark: “Fascism, therefore, finally turns to foreign conquests as the remedy.” There is no specific word, nor any general observation that would indicate that these comrades understand the fact (which they cannot but know) that imperialist

interests of capital in Great Britain and the United States are affected by Japan's war of conquest in China. There is no mention of facts which determine the course of events—that the territory and security of France are menaced by the attempt of Hitler to secure the hegemony over Europe; that the very national existence of a whole series of relatively small European nations is *threatened* with complete extinction by the fascist wars of conquest planned by Hitler and already begun by Mussolini.

Our program makers cannot clearly see these things, which are among the decisive things in the present war situation. Why can't they see them? Because they are not approaching the subject in a Marxist way, are not searching for the specific character of this war situation, as distinguished from other war situations. For them it is precisely the same as that of 1914; nothing has changed. It appears as though they set out to reach a pre-established conclusion, a fixed idea as to slogans which, being rather new to them, seem to them a kind of panacea, a dogma rather than a guide to action.

THESES ON "COMMUNO-CHAUVINISM"

All of which was bound to lead up to something. And it does. Here we begin to discover the "*action*" (or otherwise) that the writers of the draft program have in mind. Here we begin to read a thesis on "communo-chauvinism" that indicates a certain course which these program writers think they can induce the Socialist workers to follow in relation to the menace of war. The program draft would say for the Socialist Party:

"It can find no reason why the workers of a capitalist nation should support their government in a war under any circumstances. It is opposed to social-chauvinism, *communo-chauvinism*, which stand for national defense." (My emphasis—R.M.)

Its thesis is approximately this:

1. That the Revolutionary Socialists are ready to turn away now from the ruinous opportunism of the "German" type of Social-Democracy of the Ebert Republic and to embrace the genuine Socialist position of Marx and Engels.

2. That in embracing this revolutionary Marxist position against war, they accept it as carried out under the leadership of V. I. Lenin (though they don't feel that they can mention his name) in the war and revolution of 1914-17, as the living example of its application.

3. That, unfortunately, just at this moment, these accursed Communists, with bewildering inconsistency, are deserting the revolutionary line of Lenin.

4. That this has at once the effect (a) of interfering with the unity of action between the two parties which would be so urgently needed and so possible if only the Communists would stick to their Leninist principles, and (b) of compelling them, the Revolutionary Socialists, to stand firmly against the new opportunist "communo-chauvinist" desertion of Leninism. They, the Revolutionary Socialists, would never sink to the opportunism of the "communo-chauvinists!"

Let us analyze this nonsense.

In July, 1915, Lenin stated sharply and clearly the Marxist-Leninist view in the war situation at that time. And we do not subtract or change one syllable of that statement—the best without exception in all the literature of the revolutionary labor movement:

"A revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but 'wish the defeat of its government'.

"This is an axiom. It is disputed only by the conscious partisans or the helpless satellites of the social-chauvinists. To the former, for instance, belongs Semkovsky . . . to the latter belong Trotsky and Bukvoyed; in Germany, Kautsky. To wish Russia's defeat, Trotsky says, is 'an uncalled-for and unjustifiable political concession to the methodology of social-patriotism which substitutes for the revolutionary struggle against the war and the conditions that cause war, an orientation along the lines of the lesser evil, an orientation which, under given conditions, is perfectly arbitrary. . . .'

"This is an example of the inflated phraseology with which Trotsky always justifies opportunism. 'A revolutionary struggle against the war' is an empty and meaningless exclamation, the like of which the heroes of the Second International are past masters in making, unless it means revolutionary action against one's own government in time of war. A little reasoning suffices to make this clear. When we say revolutionary actions in war time against one's own government, we indisputably mean, not only the wish for defeat, but practical actions leading towards each defeat."*

Lenin then pointed out: "*Transformation* of war between governments into civil war is, on the one hand, facilitated by military reverses ('defeats') of the governments; on the other hand, it is *impossible* to strive in practice towards such a transformation without at the same time working towards military defeat."

In one of the best examples of the use of the Marxian dialectical method in all Socialist literature, Lenin showed that the slogan of Bukvoyed and Trotsky: "Neither victory nor defeat!" was "nothing but another version of the '*defense of the fatherland*' slogan". Lenin said:

* Lenin, *The Imperialist War*, p. 197, International Publishers, New York.

"This is putting the question on the level of war between governments (which, accordingly, must remain in their old place, 'retain their positions') and not on the level of *struggle* of the oppressed classes against their governments." *

Note well what Lenin says about the view of Trotsky that the war must end without either victory or defeat, while the same governments "retain their positions"; that is, Trotsky overlooks just the "little" thing: that in the present epoch capitalist governments *do not come out of war in the same shape as they went in*; Trotsky overlooked—the *revolution*. We shall refer to this again later, in speaking to the American Left Socialists.

Doubtless some of the Left Socialists are being made to believe that to carry forward the heritage of Lenin they must now raise the alarm against the Party that Lenin founded, which is pictured as on the verge of betraying the cause of the revolutionary class—*because* our application of the foregoing formulation is not performed mechanically, without the slightest attempt to consider the *changes* in the situation.

Norman Thomas exclaims in the *Socialist Call*:

"Let us serve peace in the hours when even the Communists have gone back to the old doctrine of the capitalist war which may somehow be good for the workers!"

And another writer in the *Socialist Call* says:

". . . The Communists have forgotten all about revolution and are concentrating on defending democracy against fascism and supporting capitalist government in good wars. . . ."

And the unconscious joker in the Trotsky camp attempts to "help" the Left Socialists by calling it:

". . . a historical reversal of roles of the two parties: the Communist Party now standing on the platform of social-patriotism while the Socialist Party, endeavoring to rid itself of its Right-wing ballast, is moving in a Leftward direction."

Some Socialist Party comrades try to make us believe that Lenin said that *always and under all circumstances* in this imperialist epoch, at least, the revolutionary party of the workers must throw out the slogans: "Defeat your own government" in each country on both sides of any war. If this were true, Marxism would be so simple that even Professor Sidney Hook could understand it—and all we would need would be to memorize a few slogans.

Not only did Lenin not regard the "defeat your own government" slogan as applicable to all sides uniformly in any and all situations of war in the imperialist epoch, but, on the contrary, he

* *Ibid*, p. 200.

explained painstakingly in the first words of every utterance on the subject the exact character of that particular war. Lenin explained the slogans and its universal application to the situation of 1914-18 as arising out of that particular character, and not otherwise.

In his famous pamphlet *Socialism and War*, written after one year of the World War, Lenin points out two conditions under either of which the Socialists should *support* a war during this imperialist epoch, "even at the present time" (August, 1915). At that time Plekhanov and other Social-Democrats-turned-chauvinist were harping on "poor little Belgium", victimized by German imperialism, as a reason for supporting the Allied imperialists, including Bloody Nicholas. Did Lenin answer, as our American Left Socialists try to do, by making of the slogan "Defeat your own government" a dogma, good for application to all sides at all times and circumstances? No, Lenin said:

"Suppose all nations interested in maintaining international treaties declared war against Germany, demanding the liberation and indemnification of Belgium. In this case the sympathies of the Socialists would naturally be on the side of Germany's enemies."*

This was written by Lenin, not in 1936, but in 1915, in the next month after he had written the article quoted before, on the slogan of "Defeat one's own government". The extreme necessity was to emphasize with all force at his command the fact that "the opinion which justified 'defense of the fatherland' *in the present war* is false, hypocritical, and in glaring contradiction to the historic facts", and that "the Socialists must utilize the struggle between the bandits to overthrow all of them". (My emphasis—R.M.) Yet even under those circumstances, requiring the utmost pounding on the central thesis, Lenin felt obliged to make the stipulation that under different circumstances, the proposed "*Defeat your own government*" slogan could not receive the same universal application, and Socialists should follow a different form of tactics in the struggle against war and capitalism. Under what different circumstances? Precisely a then-hypothetical case in which "*all nations interested in maintaining international treaties*" would take action together against the aggressor (German imperialism) *in order to force the "liberation and indemnification" of another nation victimized by the aggression* (Belgium). In that hypothetical case, the duty of Socialists would be to *take sides definitely* with this action of "all nations interested in maintaining international treaties", even though the concerted action suggested was *not sanctions* but a *declaration of war*. At the same time Lenin set aside that hypothetical case as *not being* true to the situation existing in 1914-15:

* *Ibid.*, p. 225.

"The truth, however, is that the war is being waged by the Triple (and Quadruple) Entente, *not* for the sake of Belgium. This is well known, and only hypocrites conceal it. England is robbing German colonies and Turkey; Russia is robbing Galicia and Turkey; France is striving to obtain Alsace-Lorraine and even the left bank of the Rhine; a treaty providing the sharing of spoils (in Albania and Asia Minor) has been concluded with Italy; with Bulgaria and Rumania there is haggling as to the division of the spoils." *

It would be an easy mistake for comrades to say: Well, nothing has changed; England is still robbing German colonies, and Laval and Hoare and Mussolini have even now tried to put through still another "treaty providing the sharing the spoils" by the shameless division of the very country they pretend to want to save—Ethiopia. But has nothing changed? . . . Take Lenin's next sentence in regard to 1915:

"In the present war, conducted by the present governments it is impossible to help Belgium without helping to throttle Austria, or Turkey, etc." **

Does anyone dare to say *now*, in 1936, that it is "impossible" to help Ethiopia without helping England and France to throttle Egypt, the Sudan, India, and Morocco?

On the contrary: The outbreaks in Egypt and in India *during the Ethiopian war crisis* show that the slightest success on the part of any one of the oppressed semi-colonial countries, or even boldness in resisting oppression, tends to turn loose a veritable world-volcano of liberation struggles on the part of the three-fifths of the population of the earth that constitute the slave-empires of the "advanced" imperialist nations. True, England and France are not acting now "for the sake of" Ethiopia, any more than they were acting "for the sake of Belgium" in 1914, but for their own imperialist purposes, such as England's fear of an Italian hold on the headwaters of the Nile and France's fear of losing England's support in an attack by Hitler-Germany. And was not Laval's and Hoare's attempted dirty deal with Mussolini for the partition of Ethiopia based partly upon the fear that the Ethiopian war of liberation would spread the flames of revolt throughout Africa as it had begun to spread into Egypt? Was not the denial by England and France of arms to their "friend" Ethiopia, in the first place, based upon the fear of the contagious example of a successful resistance by an African people against a European "advanced" Power?

Certainly, helping Ethiopia now, either to obtain the cessation of

* *Ibid.*

** *Ibid.*

the war of conquest, or to accomplish the military defeat of Italy, will not help England and France to throttle the rest of Africa, but *will help every oppressed people in the world to advance its struggle for national liberation.*

So, something has changed.

I hope our Left Socialist comrades will not think we have become promoters of war when we quote Lenin as saying in 1914:

"In conformity with the historical circumstances, the interrelation of classes, etc., our attitude towards the war must be different at different times. It is foolish to renounce participation in war forever and as a matter of principle. . . .

"To determine our attitude towards the present war, we must understand wherein it differs from the former wars, what its peculiarities are. . . .

"The present war is an imperialist war. That is its main characteristic. . . .

"Only when we observe this war in its peculiar historical surroundings, as it is the duty of a Marxist to do, can we determine our attitude towards it. Else we would be manipulating with old terms, with arguments fitting old and different surroundings. . . ."*

It is necessary to face these matters, not hysterically, not timidly, not afraid that by facing the truth we shall become opportunists, but as clear-headed Marxists-Leninists determined to make, not a sentimental flourish of oratory, but a successful struggle against war and a successful Socialist revolution.

What is it that the authors of the draft are overlooking?

If Trotsky in 1914-15, with his slogan, "Neither victory nor defeat", overlooked the "little" thing—the revolution that was to come these American Left Socialists are overlooking the revolution that did come in 1917 and which is now here in the form of a powerful Socialist state.

Trotsky's mistake in overlooking the coming revolution made him reject the slogan, "Defeat one's own government". The Left Socialists' mistake today of overlooking the accomplished revolution is largely the cause of their attempting to apply in a mechanical way, a way that would absolutely defeat its own purpose, the principle embodied in the slogan: "Defeat one's own government".

Does anyone seriously imagine that Lenin, or, before him, Marx, who was no pacifist, would not have made a profound, a drastic change in the application of the "Defeat 'our' own government" slogan *after one-sixth of the world has passed into the hand of the revolutionary working class with the bases and decisive features of socialism already established within that sector?* Would they have

* *Ibid.*, pp. 67 *et seq.*, reproducing a newspaper report.

applied it to all states, or even to all states except the socialist state? After the revolutionary Socialist Republic had become the most powerful force in all of Europe and Asia, and had become able to draw into cooperation with it a whole series of nations interested, for the time being, in the prevention of the outbreak of war—including imperialist nations not for the moment desiring war, as well as a score of smaller nations fearing for their national existence which is menaced by the fascist war makers—does anyone imagine that the principle embodied in that revolutionary slogan would not have been applied by Marx or Lenin in a changed form? Wouldn't it have been in so changed a form as to attempt under the *new* conditions to bring about the prevention of the outbreak of war? Would it not have been applied in such a way as to cause the defeat of the fascist war-makers in cases where "all nations interested in maintaining international treaties" could be brought into an agreement to apply sanctions against an aggressor seeking to submerge all Europe in fascist conquest? Do our Socialist comrades really want to *prevent* war, or do they think merely of keeping themselves morally "pure" of the "sin" while the war goes merrily on?

(To be continued)

Developing Party Cadres in the Chicago District

By BEATRICE SHIELDS

(Contribution to the Discussion Preliminary to the Ninth Convention of the C.P.U.S.A.)

THE Ninth Convention of our Party is about one month away. The new tactical line laid down by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, and rendered concrete by our Central Committee for American conditions, places very sharply on the agenda of our pre-convention discussions the subject of "human forces". The need to develop a broader and stronger corps of Communists, practically and theoretically able to work in the new way, is a basic guarantee that our line will be carried out. Much attention is given this problem by both Comrade Dimitroff and Comrade Browder. Comrade Dimitroff states:

"It is likewise necessary in each country to insure the correct application of the decisions adopted by the Congress. This will depend primarily on appropriately testing, distributing, and directing the cadres. . . . We must do everything to help our cadres reorganize, to be retrained in a new spirit, in the spirit of the decisions of the Seventh Congress."

Comrade Browder, speaking at the November Plenum of the Central Committee, testified to the quality of our Party members. He stated that our Party is composed of devoted and loyal fighters, who have shown themselves in the splendid response to the *Daily Worker* campaign, in the numerous demonstrations, strikes, and actions which found them in the front ranks. This gives an active rebuff to the argument often heard that "we have no people, we have no cadres". There are plenty of people. New people are finding their way into the Party every day. American workers from the ranks of the organized and unorganized are being recruited into the Party. Young people full of desire to fight capitalism and win concessions for their class are being attracted to our Party. The problem is how best to utilize them, how to train them, how to make Bolsheviks of them. Comrade Lenin and Comrade Stalin taught us the value of appreciating and utilizing our forces. Lenin said:

". . . there are no people—yet there are numerous people. There are numerous people because the working class and the most diverse strata of society, year after year, advance from their ranks

an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest. . . . At the same time we have no people, because we have no leaders, no talented organizers capable of organizing extensive and at the same time uniform and harmonious work that would give employment to all forces, even the most inconsiderable."

We need more organizers who will master the art of putting others to work and teaching them how to work among the masses. We need more trained agitators with roots among the masses. We need more people who are sensitive to the problems of the masses. We need more forces who will be able to work in the new way; who will be able to build the united front, the Farmer-Labor Party, while at the same time developing the Communist Party into a powerful mass Party of revolution. In the quick realization of these needs will lie our successes.

During the pre-convention discussions, much time must be given in the district, sections, and units to examining in great detail down to every individual Party member how this problem is being tackled.

PROBLEMS OF TRAINING CADRES

The examination of the problem of forces presents us with two questions:

1. *The systematic re-education of some of our old forces who have grown up with old sectarian habits and still cling to them.* Many of these people have become isolated from the masses, and, hence, either have a very general schematic approach to problems or fail to understand them entirely. In our discussions of the Seventh Congress, we discovered that it is precisely from this source that confusion came, as well as, in many cases, from a failure to study and understand the new tactical changes.

Here it is necessary to re-orientate the comrades practically, to throw them boldly into mass work, to help them acquaint themselves with local politics and with the needs of the masses around them. In this work it is very likely that in many instances we shall have to do as Comrade Dimitroff warned us:

"but when the old bottles prove unsuitable for the new wine, the necessary conclusions must be drawn—not to spill the new wine, or spoil it by pouring it into old bottles—but to replace the old bottles by new ones."

2. *The problem of giving a firmer theoretical foundation to the new forces that have come into the Party during the period of crisis as a result of mass struggle.* These comrades have shown a great aptitude for adapting themselves quickly to new requirements and new methods; but they still lack sufficient experience and theoretical

firmness to apply the line that they instinctively understand, to their everyday work. These comrades need the most patient and systematic attention. Comrade Browder, at the last meeting of the Central Committee, made a plea for "humanism". He called for greater consideration in reckoning with the personal problems of our forces. This is of tremendous importance. Both in the Central Committee and in the districts, considerable changes in our attitude can be noticed. However, we still have many cases of neglect, lack of attention, lack of proper training and education, which either stultifies or "kills" many promising young comrades.

The report of the Central Control Commission to the November Plenum of the Central Committee contains a very revealing story. The report shows that among the 268 expulsions from the Party during the first ten months of the year, sixty-two were functionaries. Of these, twenty-six were unit functionaries, seventeen section functionaries, five district functionaries, three members of district language bureaus, etc. The document of the Control Commission brings to the attention of the Party some general faults from which these cases come:

"The first important fault is failure to give guidance and attention to the new functionary after he is selected and installed. He may be sent to another city or town to act entirely on his own responsibility; he may be confronted with difficult financial problems (if a full-time functionary), yet receive no help from the district or section; if then he should happen not to be of the strongest and best, falling into bureaucratic practices and financial looseness will be nothing unusual. So, also, desertion of posts. Hardly any other conclusion can be drawn from the number of cases involving financial irresponsibility and looseness, mechanical approach and bureaucracy, and leaving posts without permission and without proper arrangements.

"Insufficient care in the selection of our functionaries appears to be another among these faults. Specifically, it means failure to check up on the political development and experience of the candidates; how well they understand the program, the tactics, and the discipline of the Party; in what organizational activities they have already been involved and with what results; whether they will be able to recognize the Party line and to apply it correctly in various situations; whether they understand the principles of democratic centralism: that it is not merely centralism, but *democratic* centralism; whether they have produced results in their previous activities, not merely good reports and excuses? In addition, if the candidate for the given office is not yet quite well known in the locality, there should be some check-up as to his reliability. That these points have not been taken sufficiently into consideration is attested by the number of expulsions and inner disciplinary actions against functionaries for factionalism, disruption and bureaucracy, for Trotskyism and for Right deviations from the Party line; for unreliability and for general irresponsibility."

Just as in all of our work, so also with the training of forces, the methods used must be based on concrete reality and the local situation. In the Chicago District a number of methods have been employed since the last convention. First, there is a continuous increase of Party members in the Chicago Workers' School. The number is still not adequate, showing that the entire Party is not yet fully conscious of how to utilize every facility for theoretical training. However the effect of the small number is being felt in the Party units. In many parts of the district, the students of the school have become leaders of broader workers' study circles. Invariably these comrades become leaders of discussions in the units. In other places, they have been instrumental in organizing regular weekly discussions in the units. However, new and more concrete methods had to be employed to solve our basic task, that is, to improve the quality of work in the trade unions and among the basic industrial workers. The general theoretical discussions and study at the Chicago Workers' School were insufficient. We had to adopt methods that would allow particular attention to individual comrades in strategic positions, to groups of comrades organized in fractions in local unions and mass organizations, and to hand-picked comrades from the units, sections, and mass organizations, who were being trained for specific functions. In every case we had to introduce a concrete approach to individuals and problems and read-just our studies accordingly.

SOME EXPERIENCES IN THE CHICAGO DISTRICT

1. A District Training School was conducted last summer. The students were hand-picked by the District Bureau in consultation with the sections and the fractions. Every comrade was a leader in the trade unions and in the various sections. Most of them were taken away from important work and sent to school as a major assignment. The value of the school and its contribution to the solving of our problems can best be seen now, six months later. With very few exceptions, the comrades are all leaders in their field of work. They are doing better work and making rapid strides. Characteristic, and perhaps the best example of the group, is a coal miner who cannot speak about his accomplishments without giving honorable mention to the two short weeks of schooling. He stated that the school opened a world for him. It clarified his local problems and made him understand how those problems are part of the general Party outlook. This leader among the miners began, for the first time, to understand that Marxism-Leninism was the greatest weapon in the struggle, provided it is mastered, not as a "dogma, but as a guide to action".

2. To follow up the enthusiasm and success of the District Training School, seven schools were organized in the various sections of the district as well as two short-term schools in the mining region. The specific purpose of these schools was to provide better functionaries for the lower units of the Party. The agit-prop director of the stockyards section reports on their training school as follows:

"The school was exceptionally interesting, so much so, that not a single one of the 29 students was lost during its duration. In a frank discussion at the completion of the school, the students enthusiastically approved of the method of training and urged that further schools of a similar nature be organized in order to provide education for all comrades."

Comrade Green, in charge of Section 7 Training School, in his article in the *Party Organizer*, points out some of the results of the Section Training School as follows: (a) There is an intense hunger for Party education among the Negro comrades. (b) These workers were all impatient with hackneyed phrases. They cut right through these phrases and seek for the living meaning beneath. Lecturing, therefore, was the least satisfactory method and the method of questions and answers the most effective. (c) The success of the school was guaranteed by good organization, proper selection of students, and popularization of the school in the entire Party. (d) The school emphasized the need for establishing compulsory Party education in the sections.

One hundred and forty comrades in the city of Chicago and thirty in the coalfields attended the schools in the period of one month. Leading comrades from the District Committee were assigned to take care of the classes. Excellent results were achieved in those sections where students were selected carefully and where the schools were properly organized with the objective of getting better organizers and agit-prop directors into the lower organs of the Party.

3. The most interesting experiment "based on practical study by the student of the cardinal problems" in their particular field of work is the week-end training school for leading Communists in the trade unions. Comrades holding positions as secretaries, presidents, delegates, members of executive boards and other strategic people in the trade unions were selected to attend the 30-hour week-end school. The following subjects were taught:

1. The Nature of the Capitalist Crisis.
2. The War Danger and the Trade Unions.
3. Trade Union Unity: (a) Problems of the United Front;

(b) Problems of the Farmer-Labor Party in Chicago; (c) Fascist Development in the U.S.A.; (d) Tasks and Methods of Work in the Local Unions and the Central Bodies.

4. The American Federation of Labor Convention—Issues, forces, resolutions, basic changes expressed at the convention, tasks.

5. Problems of Chicago Industries—steel, stockyards, metal, railroads, in the organized trades of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

6. The Use of the Labor Press—*Chicago Federation News*, etc.

7. Parliamentary procedure.

Most of the time was devoted to discussion, reports, and summaries by instructors. Many valuable experiences, both good and bad, were related. The new and less experienced comrades benefited by the contribution of the stronger and more experienced ones. The hours were well spent. Leading comrades who carried the burden of leadership in the local unions found answers to their many questions. A systematic follow-up of such courses, which combine basic theory with practical tasks, will better equip the comrades to work independently, both politically and organizationally. The classes will continue as semi-monthly conferences to study and discuss new developments and new methods to be employed.

In order to meet the tremendous needs for forces in this period, the difficult, careful, and painstaking job of training cadres cannot be confined exclusively to one department in our apparatus. It has definitely to become the job and responsibility of all the leading comrades in the districts and sections. Training that will basically build leaders cannot be gotten through schools alone. The older, the better trained and more experienced comrades must consciously show, by example, how to work in the new way. In the daily contact with the new comrades, the leading comrades can contribute tremendously, provided they approach them "humanly", and give them daily attention and patient explanations of all problems and difficulties that confront them.

It must be emphasized that those leading comrades who have had the advantage of advanced Party training should feel especially duty-bound to give the benefit of their training to developing other comrades—by teaching in our workers' schools, in our district schools, in study circles, and in units.

To repeat—we have good, devoted, loyal, fighting comrades all over the country. The doors of the Party are wide open to recruit to a total of 40,000 members by the time of the Party Convention. With proper attention and the proper utilization of all our facilities we can soon develop 40,000 Communists among the masses.

Draft Charter of the United Party of the Proletariat of France

[The following historic Draft Charter of Unity was presented by the Communist Party of France to the Unification Commission, composed of representatives of both the Communist and Socialist Parties of France, on May 29, 1935. It is the most important document yet issued as a practical basis for the organic unification of the Socialist and Communist Parties.]

The Unification Commission began its sessions on April 11, 1935. About a month and a half later, the Communist delegates presented their proposals for the unification of the French proletariat. At the time, the Communist delegates stated that they looked forward to an early Socialist reaction to their Draft Charter. Periodically, the Communist delegates repeated this request for the opinion of the Socialist delegates to their proposals.

On June 14, Comrade Severac of the French Socialist Party informed the Unification Commission that a similar Draft Charter was being drawn up by the Socialist delegates. It was not until November 21, 1935, that Le Populaire, central organ of the French Socialist Party, published a Draft Charter of Unity drawn up by the Permanent Administration Committee of the French Socialist Party. Almost six months elapsed before the presentation of the Communist Draft and the publication of the Socialist Draft. Meanwhile, the Socialist delegates still gave no opinion on the Communist Draft. Under Communist criticism of the Socialist Draft printed on November 21, the Socialist delegates to the Unification Commission brought in amendments which seriously altered the original document. These amendments were brought in by the Socialist delegates, on November 26. The Communist Party published on Jan. 9, 1936, in its central organ, l'Humanité together with the Draft Charter, a commentary presented by the Communist delegates to the Unification Commission. This commentary gives the complete history and background of the unity proposals together with a detailed criticism of the Draft Charter published in Le Populaire. (It is to be regretted that the Socialist Call, in its issue of January 18, 1936, published the Socialist draft without the subsequent amendments.)

The commentary will be published in The Communist of next month.—THE EDITORS.]

FOR ONE PARTY OF THE PROLETARIAT

CHARTER OF UNITY OF THE
WORKING CLASS OF FRANCE

*Draft Submitted by the Communist Party to the Unification
Committee at the Session of May 29, 1935*

PREAMBLE

CAUGHT in the midst of the confusion and disintegration of the capitalist world, humanity seeks for a solution to its hardships and its anguish. More and more, the proletariat is becoming conscious of the final condemnation which the old social order deserves. More and more, the workers who are driven by greedy capitalism to defend their piece of bread see in communism the road to liberation, the road to salvation. More and more the idea of storming the strongholds of this regime matures in the minds of the masses.

But, in order to defend themselves successfully against every attack by their class enemies and in order to advance correctly towards their great task of transforming the social order, *the workers must be united.*

The temporary defeat inflicted on the proletariat in several countries has been the cost of the divisions in the ranks of the proletariat. In Germany, if at a time when some preached quiescence and passivity, the working class would have been united for struggle, Hitler fascism would have been vanquished.

In France, unity of action, fortunately achieved since February, 1934, and which was sanctioned by the pact signed by both the Communist Party and the Socialist Party, has permitted us to deliver some severe blows against fascism and to impede its development.

In this way, the French people have been spared the sad ordeal suffered by our German and Austrian brothers. The split in the forces of the working class is the fatal consequence of a policy of class collaboration. That is why working class unity is so indispensable and can be achieved only on the basis of an independent class policy which will both determine the methods of action and make clear the final objectives of the proletariat.

The working class of France has been divided since 1920. In brief, the minority at the Congress of Tours thought that they could not accept the decisions of the majority.

This split has endured too long and after the experience of more

than a year of united action, the hour has come for a *united party*, capable of fulfilling the great historic mission which is given to the proletariat.

The United Party of the Proletariat plunges its roots in the revolutionary past of our country. It continues the glorious tradition of Babeuf and his disciples who fell in the cause of social justice. It continues the traditions of struggle of the Parisian rebels of 1830, of the silk workers of Lyons, of the revolutionists of 1848, of the immortal fighters and martyrs of the Paris Commune.

It inherits all that is great and enduring in the work of the forerunners of socialism—Fourier, Saint-Simon, and Proudhon.

It inherits the revolutionary will to struggle of August Blanqui, of Paul Lafargue who did so much to make Marxism known in France, of the unwavering class policy of Jules Guesde, of the policy of rallying the masses of people against reaction symbolized by Jean Jaures.

The United Party of the Proletariat, continuer of the French Labor Party (*Parti ouvrier francais*), and of the pre-war United Socialist Party (*Parti socialiste unifié*), taught by the experience of the national and international working class movement, takes the lead in the class struggle along the path traced by Marx and Engels.

It inscribes on its banner the immortal words of the *Communist Manifesto*:

“The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

“Workingmen of all countries, unite!”

The United Party of the Proletariat reclaims the heritage of the Encyclopedists of the eighteenth century whose materialist philosophy helped undermine the foundations of feudal society and which finds its complete development in the dialectical materialism of Karl Marx and Engels. It defends the lay public who are menaced by the forces of obscurantism and social reaction.

The United Party of the Proletariat defends and spreads the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels and applies it as a revolutionary method of the knowledge of reality for the revolutionary transformation of reality.

As a consequence, the *United Party of the Proletariat* fights all varieties of bourgeois thought together with theoretical and practical opportunism.

Against the Right, it fights against any policy which, forgetting

the final aims which the working class pursues, tends to sink into class collaboration. Against the Left, it fights against "revolutionary" appearances and phraseology which discredit the revolution in the eyes of the masses of workers and as a consequence help the present social order.

The United Party of the Proletariat of France which adopts as its aim the socialization of the means of production and exchange, that is to say, of transforming capitalist society into a *collectivist or Communist society* proclaims that *this aim can only be achieved by the conquest of power through the greatest struggle against the bourgeoisie.*

The United Party of the Proletariat follows the path outlined by *Lenin*, the great strategist of the revolution who, after the experience of the Commune and the teachings of Marx had been revealed, showed the proletariat that the bourgeois state had to be destroyed and replaced by the proletarian state, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to fight against counter-revolution, that victory for the proletariat is not possible without a disciplined and centralized party.

The United Party of the Proletariat follows the path outlined by the builders of the new society in the Soviet Union which, guided by Stalin, have taken socialism out of the realm of hopes and have given it life through the length and breadth of a country which spans one-sixth of the world.

The United Party of the Proletariat is thus the Party which aims at the dissolution of the dictatorship of capital and the establishment of a state which guarantees to the proletariat the exercise of its power to smash all counter-revolutionary efforts and to prepare the ascent to the classless society.

The United Party of the Proletariat not only defends both the immediate and future interests of the working class, but it also defends the daily interests of the peasant toilers, of the small businessmen, of the intellectuals and the white collar workers. It strives to unite the whole toiling population in the same struggle against capitalism and for the advent of a society in which man will no longer be exploited by man.

The United Party of the Proletariat considers international entente and action indispensable for the working class. It belongs to an international organization whose aims and methods correspond to its own and whose members everywhere take the lead in the class struggle against the governments of the bourgeoisie. It strictly applies the decisions adopted by the international congresses. *The United Party of the Proletariat* raises high the banner of unity and working class victory.

THE FUNDAMENTAL BASES OF THE UNITED PARTY

I.

The United Party of the Proletariat aims to struggle against and to destroy the capitalist system, generator of misery and war, and will not admit into its ranks a policy of collaboration with the bourgeois class. None of its members may participate in a capitalist government. The elected representatives have the duty to refuse to vote for military credits that will be used to prepare for imperialist wars, to vote for credits which will enslave colonial peoples, and this goes for the whole budget.

The sacred union of 1914-1918, which ended in the bankruptcy of the Second International, must not be revived. In no event may the working class enter into any pact with the bourgeoisie of its own country in wars between imperialist nations.

Furthermore, the *United Party of the Proletariat* of France, faithful to the Stuttgart resolution, inspired by the struggle against war led by Jaures, and faithful to the teachings of Lenin, takes the position that if, despite its efforts, the imperialist war breaks out, the workers must do everything in their power to bring about the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the rise of proletarian power.

There is no national defense for the proletariat in the event of imperialist war, and it is for this reason that the United Party takes the lead in the struggle against militarism and war among the workers, peasants, among the whole toiling population, and among the armed forces.

In the event of war against a country in which there is a proletarian government, the workers must refuse to fight their free brothers and must unite their efforts with those of the revolutionary army.

The United Party completely supports the victories of the great proletarian revolution of October, 1917, of the first socialist revolution ever victorious in the whole world. It calls upon the workers of France to support *by every means* the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, supreme hope of the exploited of the world and bulwark of peace throughout the world.

The United Party supports with all its might any movement for liberation in other countries.

II.

The United Party considers the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only means of rescuing humanity from the horrors of capital-

ism. The dictatorship of the proletariat signifies a considerable enlargement of democracy for the people, at the same time as it limits the liberty of the exploiters and oppressors of the people. The proletariat of France cannot but be inspired by the example given by the power of the Soviets which assures the carrying out of the dictatorship of the proletariat under conditions through which a true proletarian democracy functions.

III.

The United Party fights against chauvinism and nationalism and fights together with the people of all lands, not only of the white race, but of all races and all colors. It intends that the proletariat of the various countries gathered together in the same international organization should practise the same policy of class struggle, of irreconcilable opposition to the bourgeois social order, of rejection of national defense in the event of imperialist war, of defense of the first victorious socialist revolution, and of support of the struggles for liberation of the enslaved colonial peoples. The United Party recognizes the right of self-determination for the people of Alsace-Lorraine. It organizes the common struggle of the French and Alsace-Lorraine workers against their enemies within the country and against Hitler fascism.

The execution of the international decisions is considered one of the most important conditions for the victory over the bourgeoisie.

The United Party of the Proletariat of France considers itself a part of the united world party of the working class.

IV.

The United Party, in order to be capable of overthrowing capitalism and establishing communism, must adopt a strongly centralized structure. All decisions are to be made after a completely free discussion, and the decisions are obligatory upon all.

Discipline is the same for all. In any event, no infractions of discipline are admissible in the Party, neither by the members of parliament nor by active members.

In order to be a member of the Party it is not sufficient to declare oneself in agreement with the aims and methods of the Party, but it is also necessary to work to carry out all the decisions of the Party and regularly to contribute dues.

V.

The United Party is based on democratic centralism. The directing organs of various ranks are elected by general assemblies, conferences, and congresses. The directing organs must render periodic reports of their activity before those who chose them.

The decisions of the higher organs are obligatory upon the lower organs.

Only in this way can the carrying out of decisions by the whole Party be assured, as demanded by the exigencies of the situation and as evaluated within the framework of party policy determined in the congress by all the members.

VI.

The central organ of the Party directs the whole Party, including the parliamentary group and the press, and is duty-bound to demand the complete carrying out of the decisions. Ideological unity, a condition of the fighting strength of the Party, is indispensable. Journalists, speakers, and writers of the Party must defend the same policy: the policy of the Party.

VII.

The United Party, anxious to fight capitalism in its own strongholds, in the industrial prisons, adopts a form of organization which enables it to lead the action of the masses of people in the establishment and on a local scale.

The United Party, working in the economic and political organization of the proletariat, works with all its forces to achieve national and international trade union unity.

VIII.

The United Party of the working class, which conducts legal activity, also conducts all necessary illegal activity and puts itself in the position of resisting the fiercest attacks by the class enemy.

Only those can be members who have decided to lead in the class struggle, to fight in the vanguard of the laboring people of the country, under the banner of the proletarian revolution, under the banner of proletarian internationalism, under the banner of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to unite, the working class must free itself from the influence of the capitalist enemy.

The banner of unity is the banner of the class struggle. It is the banner of victory.

THE PROGRAM WHICH IS PROPOSED TO LEAD
THE UNITED PARTY TO POWER

I.

The overthrow of the domination of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a workers' and peasants' government can be accomplished only through an alliance of the workers, male and female, intellectuals, farm laborers, small business men, all laboring people, old and young.

The state as it now exists at the command of the banks, of the great industrialists, and the great landowners, will be smashed; the police chiefs will be driven out; the present police will be dissolved; bourgeois justice will be replaced by justice of the people.

The organs of true democracy, the *Soviets* or people's councils will be substituted for the present state and its organs.

From top to bottom, in every locality, factory, state or region, under the workers' and peasants' government, *all power* will be held by the councils elected by the workers, the legislative power and at the same time the executive power. The *elected representatives* will be under the permanent control of their electors and will be able to be withdrawn at any time. There will be no "Senate". The "Chamber" will be replaced by an Executive Committee of the People's Councils. *All workers*, from the age of eighteen, will be seated and will be represented there. Those who do not work will neither have electors nor will be eligible.

On the contrary, *those who work will be all*. The workers' and peasants' government will give to the peasants, to the women workers, to the foreign-born and colonial workers, and to the youth, complete political equality as well as the same pay for the same work.

II.

The workers' and peasants' government will put into the hands of the workers the organization of production, of transportation, and of distribution. To achieve this, it will decree the socialization of the banks, the railroads, and the ships of the great companies; the great landed estates will no longer belong to their owners, who will be expropriated without compensation. At the same time, after the expropriation of the great estates, the workers' and peasants' government will give them back *without cost to those who are working there*.

The workers' and peasants' government will do away with unemployment, and will introduce in practice the seven-hour work day immediately. At the same time, the close economic alliance with the Soviet Union and a systematic policy of raising the buying power and of increasing the needs of the working class will result in an increase in production, causing, not only a re-absorption of the unemployed, but an increase in the number of workers.

III.

While giving the land to those who work on it, the workers' and peasants' government will purely and simply abolish the mortgage debts of the peasant laborers. Increasing the consuming power of the urban population, it will reopen the markets which have been lost for the products of the soil. At the same time, it will make accessible to all the poor peasants the mechanical tools of modern agriculture. It will raise the countryside to the level of the towns, and the conditions of work of the agrarian proletariat to the level of the urban proletariat. It will involve the millions of peasant workers in the building of socialism.

The workers' and peasants' government will wage pitiless struggle against the high cost of living. Rent, gas, water, electricity, transportation, and all public services will be immediately slashed in cost. New prices will be established in proportion to wages and income. The large stores and the great merchants will be expropriated; the speculators of both town and countryside will be made powerless. *The debts of the small traders to the speculators, usurers, bankers, etc. will be annulled.*

The application of the principle: "He who does not work does not eat" will free the country of the cost of maintaining the bourgeois idle rich. From this will result a cut in the net cost of everything, from which the consumers will immediately benefit.

The workers' and peasants' government will solve the problem of lodgings. While waiting for the execution of a vast plan for workers' houses, it will install, as soon as it comes to power, the workers and the poor people of the towns in the palaces of the rich.

The workers' and peasants' government will develop culture, sciences, the arts; will assure all learned people, technicians, and artists the possibility of using their talent and their intelligence in the service of humanity. The workers' and peasants' government will carry out a broad policy of recreations and popular holidays.

Such are the first accomplishments of the workers' and peasants' government.

But the workers' and peasants' government will not stop with these. With the assistance of the workers and peasants, whose expression it is, it will proceed—and it alone can to this end proceed—to reorganize the economy according to a plan for the building of socialism in France.

The close political and economic alliance which the workers' and peasants' government will conclude with the government of the U.S.S.R., will constitute an invincible force which will insure the defense of the country and will advance, with giant strides, the cause of the workers of the whole world towards their final liberation.

Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to gain!

Economic Trends

THE year 1935 saw American capitalism continue its slow upward movement from the depths of the crisis. Production was approximately 14 per cent higher than in 1934, but total output was still 25 per cent below the level of 1929. The moderate increase in production was outstripped by a 30 per cent increase in the profits of the biggest corporations. The following two tables show the dynamics of the present upturn:

Production (1923-25 taken as 100)

1932	64
1933	76
1934	79
1935	90 (estimated)

The Profits of 418 Big Corporations

1932	\$ 49,000,000
1933	605,000,000
1934	911,000,000
1935	1,184,000,000 (estimated)

Contrast the enormous increase in profits with the increase of only 38 per cent in production since 1932. There has been recovery for the big capitalists at the cost of low living standards for the working people.

LIVING STANDARDS

The famous American standard of living, which was always pretty much of a myth for the majority of the population, has been beaten down to the levels of the nineteenth century by six years of crisis and depression. At least 80 per cent of the population in 1935 could not afford a budget that would allow a minimum standard of health and decency as set by government dietetic experts. More than half of these families were below the poverty line, having incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. At the very bottom was the vast army of jobless workers, who, with their families, make up one-third of the American population, and who "subsisted" on a meager relief pittance or what they could beg or borrow from their friends.

WAGES, SPEED-UP AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The workers have made no real gains under the New Deal. Unemployment in 1935 was higher than in 1934. Between twelve and fourteen millions were without jobs, according to conservative

estimates. (The Labor Research Association placed the number at 17,029,000 in November, 1935.) What is most important is that for the past two years the number of new workers entering the labor market has more than over-balanced the small number which was reemployed by industry.

The capitalists and Roosevelt have admitted that there is no room in industry and business for the army of jobless workers. In fact, Roosevelt has made the point that even if production should reach the levels of 1929, there would still be no jobs for at least 12,000,000 workers, professionals, technicians, etc.

The employed workers have fared little better. Their annual wages have failed to keep up with the 19 per cent increase in the cost of living recorded by the National Industrial Conference Board. This is especially true of the sweated trades and of the industrial regions where union organization is weak. Real wages—what the pay envelope of the worker will purchase—were only 1 or 2 per cent higher in 1935 than in 1932, the worst crisis year. What little increases the workers obtained were swallowed up by an increase of 40 per cent in food prices, 27 per cent in clothing prices, 15 per cent in rents, and 50 per cent in meats. Consequently the amount of food consumed in 1935 was 6 per cent less than in 1934 and 10 per cent less than in 1932.

The profits of the big capitalists were thus made at the expense of the well-being of the workers and their families. They cut labor costs by speeding up the workers at an unprecedented pace. The productivity of industrial workers was increased by 20 per cent during 1933-35 (National Bureau of Economic Research). Today 84 workers can turn out as many products as 100 workers did before the New Deal.

MORE TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Until recently most of the increased productivity was obtained by simply speeding up the pace of the workers, by rationalizing existing equipment, etc. Lately the trend has been more strongly in the direction of more efficient machinery. The capitalists are replacing worn-out and outmoded machines to cut labor costs and to gain a large share of the markets. This trend was responsible for the boomlet in machine tools which was one of the features of 1935.

The National Machine Tool Builders' Association has announced that close to a billion dollars will be spent for the modernization and retooling of plant equipment in 1936. Not since 1929 has there been so extensive a program for the expansion of existing capacities and the reequipment of old plants. In steel and auto, new semi-

automatic processes are being introduced which will eventually greatly reduce the number of workers in these industries. The new machine will only add to the chronic overcapacity that plagues American capitalism. By the spring of 1937, for example, the new continuous steel strip mills, which are being built now, will have a capacity that will be twice as large as the expected demand. It is the need of finding some outlet for this potential production that is forcing the steel companies into the housing field where they hope to sell pre-fabricated steel housing systems.

The full effect of this trend will not be felt until the end of 1936 and the beginning of 1937. Then there will be a large displacement of workers by these new tools and machines. The employers, to escape the small sums that they will have to pay under the Social Security Act, are introducing new machinery, especially new office equipment, in order to cut down their pay rolls. In some cases, as many as 50 to 75 per cent of the large office staffs will be eliminated by the use of new methods of work and ingenious office and tabulating machines.

“RECOVERY”

The huge army of unemployed, the prospect of increased technological unemployment, chronic overcapacity in terms of the limited capitalist market, are among the factors blocking the return to another period of boom activity. Recovery is thus taking place on a very narrow basis. There are artificial factors, like government expenditures, which, if removed, might crack up the entire shaky structure.

It is not profitable for the capitalists to invest in the capital goods industries because of general over-capacity. There is no large-scale construction of new factories, railroad building, etc. That is why the heavy industries are relatively stagnant. This explains why freight car loadings in 1935 only averaged two-thirds of their 1929 volume, why the level of building activity was but one-third of the 1928 level, and why cement, steel, and the other industries which supply the sinews of industry in 1935 produced about half of their 1929 output.

In previous crises it was recovery in the capital goods industries which paved the way for the return to another boom period. They reemployed workers who increased their demand for consumption goods, and, in turn, the increased activity of the consumers' goods industries stimulated the rising demand for more machinery, more factory buildings, etc. But today the capitalists cannot on the whole find profitable new investments in heavy industry. New corporate financing in 1935, which would be mainly

used in the capital goods industries, amounted to only about 4 per cent of the 1929 volume. Hence, there is no basis for a swift return to a new period of prosperity. This means that the capitalists will launch sharper attacks against the workers to maintain and increase their profits on a depression volume of production and business.

THE MONEY CHANGERS AND THE NEW DEAL

When Roosevelt took office he promised to drive the money changers out of the temple of our national life. But there are no indications that he has carried out or will carry out this verbal threat. In point of fact, the money changers have flourished under the New Deal, and the concentration of banking has gone on at an accelerated pace.

The *American Banker* reports that in 1935 the 100 largest commercial banks held 56 per cent of all deposits. In 1925 the 100 largest banks carried only 31 per cent of total deposits. By 1929 they had increased their share to 42 per cent. And since then, despite years of crisis and depression which wiped out thousands of small banks and the saving of hundreds of thousands of small depositors, these giants have increased their stranglehold on the life of the country. Ten super-giants controlled by a handful of finance capitalists have 25 per cent of all banking deposits. The dominance of monopoly in banking is shown by the following fact. The 200 largest banks have 64 per cent of all deposits; the other 15,000 smaller banks have only 36 per cent of total deposits, a percentage which will shrink rapidly in the immediate future.

NATIONAL DEBT AND TAXES

The American toilers are staggering under the increasing burdens of public debt and taxes. The total public debt at present totals about \$50,500,000,000. Of this about \$30,000,000,000 are federal debt and about \$20,500,000,000 state and municipal debt (National Industrial Conference Board).

This debt is approximately equal to the national income at the present level. To pay the bankers their interest alone, the sum of \$2,800,000,000 is required every year, or about twice the amount spent by the federal government for direct relief. About one-third of federal tax receipts is used to pay the bankers interest on government bonds, etc. In 1934 total tax collections—federal, state and municipal—amounted to \$9,300,000,000, or 20 per cent of the national income. Most of this went back to the rich in the form of interest, profits on contracts, etc.

It is the toilers of the United States who are forced to carry

this growing burden. The tax burden of the rich has *decreased* by *half* while the tax burden of the poor has been *doubled* by the New Deal. From 1930 to 1934 the proportion of revenue obtained from income taxes *decreased* from 68 per cent to 34 per cent, while the proportion obtained by taxing food and other consumers' goods increased from 32 per cent to 66 per cent.

The debt burden is increasing. The federal debt will reach \$36,000,000,000 by July, 1937, according to Secretary Morgenthau. The toll paid to the bankers will increase correspondingly. Roosevelt has said that there will be "no new taxes, over and above the present taxes". By this he meant that there would be no new taxes put on the rich. But the poor will be taxed to meet the increased deficits in the national budget.

Big business has renewed its proposals for a national sales tax which would put the entire burden upon the poor consumer, and which would hurt the farmer by cutting down consumption because of higher prices. At the recent convention of the Retail Dry Goods Association, Mark Graves, New York State Commissioner for Taxation and Finance, came out for a national sales tax. He explained that this would enable the government to collect taxes by a kind of installment method from the consumer and would avoid the necessity of imposing higher income taxes. This ballyhoo is being trumpeted by the apologists for big business, and the present session of Congress will see a determined effort made to rush such a measure through. Strong pressure must be brought to bear upon the administration to make the rich pay for the costs of the crisis out of their swollen profits and surplus funds.

THE NEW DEAL AND BIG BUSINESS

While the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital "gang up" against the New Deal, Roosevelt meets their attack by offering one olive branch after the other. The "liberal" wing of the administration, Ickes-Tugwell, thunders against "the fascist-minded" men of big business. But the other wing, Hull-Roper-Farley reassures the big capitalists that they have nothing to fear from the New Deal. Roosevelt then proves this by making one concession after another to the demands of the monopolists.

Another example of the administration's policy of retreating under the fire of the reactionaries was given by a recent statement made by Uncle "Dan" Roper, the contact man with Wall Street. Two weeks after Roosevelt defied "the autocrats" with verbal daring and a few days after the Supreme Court jumped all over the triple A, Roper made one of his chronic speeches in defense of profits.

He said: "In our country increased re-employment must come as a result of general and just profits." He had been saying this for some time. That he is a good interpreter of the administration's policies is shown by the way in which the New Deal has consistently put profits above every other consideration, no matter what the cost in human suffering. With Roosevelt meeting the offensive of the reactionaries by capitulating to their main demands upon the administration, it is no wonder that the *Annalist* looks forward to a good year for the capitalists. There will be no more "monkey-shines . . . under the flimsy disguise of the protection of human rights". The Supreme Court, it crows, "stands solidly for the protection of property rights". All of this, the *Annalist* concludes, will make for more conservative policies, that is, for less or no relief to the unemployed and farmers, lower wages, and for the other blessings which the Liberty League wants to wish upon the American toilers.

CURRENT TRENDS

The trend of business and production in the second half of January displayed a sagging tendency, although the general level was well above that of last year. Because of the earlier introduction of automobile models this season, there was not the customary sharp rise in auto and steel production in January. There was a levelling off due to the increased backlog of used cars which weakened the demand for new autos and subsequently for steel. Unless payment of the bonus provides an artificial stimulus, the present sagging tendency may continue through February.

D. R.



SPIKING MUSSOLINI'S GUNS

ETHIOPIA AND ITALY, by *Emile Burns*. *International Publishers*,
New York, 223 pp. with a map. \$1.25.

Reviewed by THEODORE REPARD

THOSE who have followed the development of the Italo-Ethiopian conflict with any care must have been struck by the fact that almost as a direct consequence of this one stroke by Italian fascism, the attention of the whole world has been fastened on the very roots of imperialist rivalries in our epoch. From Europe to the Far East, Ethiopia has acted as a sort of catalyst which set even larger forces in motion. A catalyst with a difference, however, because Ethiopia too has, least of all, been unaffected.

For example, Mussolini's war drive has resounded with a terrific impact in the Orient. This onslaught upon a fairly obscure people in East Africa has crystallized, almost in a flash, the pretty complicated maneuvers which had been proceeding for a few decades in the Far East. British and American imperialism have been drawn closer as a result of further Japanese aggression in North China, while the Japanese war-lords themselves are trying to gain an open entry into the U.S.S.R. through the Mongolian People's Republic.

The German fascists have been far from idle. It is quite certain that they have finally reached some sort of understanding with Japanese imperialism against the Soviet Union. Almost at the same time, on January 17, three and a half months after the outbreak of the Italo-Ethiopian War, Nazi Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels delivered a speech in Berlin in which he threw Hitler's hat into the ring of imperialist struggle for colonies.

The Italo-Ethiopian War is a laboratory of imperialism such as we have not had since the war of 1914-1918. We must take advantage of this situation, and to do this we must prepare ourselves to take advantage of it. In the first place, this means mastering, not only the details, but the fundamental causes of the present situation. We must be capable of tracing its development and unraveling the skeins of diplomatic intrigue.

It is interesting to recall that one of the last statements made by Lenin deals precisely with this task. In his famous instructions to the Soviet delegation to the Hague conference written in December, 1922, Lenin com-

plained that "we give the masses no actual living idea of how a war can break out". Then he went on and pointed to the necessity for extracting from every imperialist rivalry, no matter how slight, material for exposing the whole robber system. He wrote:

"... every present-day conflict, even the most trifling, must be adduced as an example of how a war may break out any day with no further cause than a quarrel between England and France with regard to some detail of their agreement with Turkey, or between American and Japan over some unimportant difference referring to a question of the Pacific Ocean, or between any of the other Great Powers with regard to disagreements about colonies, tariffs, or general commercial politics."

Into this category fits the present Italo-Ethiopian War, an event much greater in scope than even the examples mentioned by Lenin. It is big with the possibilities of another world catastrophe, on the one hand, and a united imperialist invasion of the Soviet Union, on the other. We must dig in and find out all there is to know about this war.

Comrade Emile Burns' book is an excellent beginning. In its little more than 200 pages of large type, it succeeds in gripping the main issues.

Completed just after the outbreak of the war on October 3, 1935, the book begins by relating the events immediately prior to that date in a style that is swift and clear. Then the scene shifts to an examination of the three rival empires—Great Britain, France and Italy—and their competition for Ethiopia. This, to my mind, is the most valuable section of the book. From this point, Comrade Burns goes on to analyze these fundamental issues which underlie the present situation: the economic roots of war, imperialism and fascism, and the League of Nations. The latter sections of the book deal mainly with the struggle against Italian fascism and an evaluation of various methods of fighting for peace.

The most fruitful part of the book, as I have said, lies in the section which deals with the imperialist antagonisms from the late part of the nineteenth century right up to the outbreak of hostilities for the conquest and control of Ethiopia. Why is it so fruitful? Because it does just what Lenin called for—a concrete picture of the development of wars through the rivalries and intrigues of rival robber nations.

It is interesting to learn, for example, that the Italian invasion of 1896 was beaten back by Emperor Menelik with arms and munitions which the Ethiopians received from the French. In return for this assistance, which made possible the historic defeat of the Italian forces at Adowa, the French obtained the concession to build their railway from the port of Jibuti, in French Somaliland, to Addis Ababa, capital of Ethiopia. As Comrade Burns comments, "the French capitalists won the battle of Adowa (1896) in more senses than one". They won the "first round" in the struggle for the economic exploitation of Ethiopia because "the main external trade of central and eastern Abyssinia—capable of enormous development—was in the future to pass through French territory".

But the race was far from over. In 1906, another round was fought, this time a three-sided affair. At that time, all three of the rivals came in for some booty; but little of it was realized by any of them, because a hitch in the agreement called for consent from the Ethiopian government. This could not be obtained without force, then as now, and neither of the three

Powers was inclined to undertake the job at a period when the World War was beginning to take form.

Thus continued the jockeying for position, until finally Italian fascism came to power. After more than ten years of starvation and misery inflicted on its own people, it sought new worlds to conquer and oppress, and reopened, by a violent operation, the old imperialist sore.

Why is it so important to know something about these imperialist antagonisms over Ethiopia in the past 50 years? Because here we have important clues to an understanding of the imperialist maneuvers *since the outbreak of the war*. These latter are only skimpily treated in the book, unfortunately, due to the limitation of subject matter which the speed in bringing out the book imposed. This story, and its connection with the pre-war situation, must still be done. *But the maneuvers between Italy, Great Britain and France since October 3, 1935, is a continuation of the pre-war maneuvers.*

Another great merit in the book is that it does not fail, in the most concrete way, to link up *the special characteristics of the Italo-Ethiopian War with the general characteristics of imperialist drives for colonies*. Thus we get some excellent, yet very simple, explanations of the basic forces in our time—capitalism, imperialism, fascism—in the central section of the book.

Burns make this point clear at the outset of this analysis:

“The history of European relations with Abyssinia is only exceptional insofar as Abyssinia has succeeded in maintaining its political independence and a considerable measure of economic independence. In other respects it merely repeats the history of the relations between the industrially-developed countries and industrially backward countries.”

To round out the book, the tasks of the working class together with all its allies and friends of peace come under scrutiny. Especially fine is the treatment of independent labor action against Mussolini's war, and sanctions.

In arguing for sanctions, Comrade Burns does not make the mistake—as some have made—of so emphasizing that angle that everything else becomes insignificant. Not at all. The independent action of the working class, so that not a ship, not a train, not a penny shall be permitted to pass through to Italian fascism for the sinews of war is clearly charted in all its primary importance. At the same time, an excellent case is made against the opponents of collective economic sanctions. The examples chosen invariably deal with the British labor movement; but all their counter-parts exist here.

Yet, it must be stated, that Comrade Burns' book is neither definitive nor always satisfactory. It is far from definitive, because it is a little too slight, in view of the tremendous importance of the subject, and because most of the book reads like an outline, rather than a full analysis.

Again, only about half of the book deals directly with either the background of the antagonism between Ethiopia and Italy or the antagonism itself. At least half of the book is devoted to an analysis of fascism and imperialism *in general*. As I have said, this is to the great credit of the book, especially in comparison to the pot-boilers on the subject which have recently appeared. But there is a lack of proportion here. In a larger, more detailed book, the general analysis would not only be more significant but it would not crowd out much significant material not given and enlargement of the concrete data which are given. At it is, there is not enough concrete, living development of this *particular* conflict in the book seen as a whole.

A final word of criticism. Some of the analysis, although this quite infrequently, is a little too simplified. For example, the author states that the French government has supported sanctions in order not to break with Great Britain. Would it not be more complete to say that, in addition to this reason, Laval "supported" sanctions at a certain stage because he could do more for Mussolini by going along in the League with the other nations, at the same time doing everything in his power to negate and destroy sanctions? To have openly joined Mussolini would have wrecked Laval's possibilities for maneuvering and temporizing in the League. Also, is it not true that the position of British imperialism, even when Comrade Burns wrote the book, was one in which at any moment, once the British lion would feel that his empire was secure, sanctions would be ditched by him and the salvaging of Mussolini's regime taken up as the great task for world imperialism?

However, Emile Burns' book cannot be compared with the several other books which have recently appeared on the war. This book stands by itself. It alone applies the pungent, penetrating, pitiless Marxist-Leninist logic to a chain of events which may hold the final fate of world imperialism. It throws an invaluable illumination on what is, next to the Far Eastern situation, the most exciting, most ominous international crisis since the last war.

A "NEW" INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

DEMOCRACY AND MILITARY POWER, by *Silas Bent McKinley*,
Vanguard Press, 313 pp. \$3.00.

Reviewed by H. M. WICKS

THE technology of contemporary warfare, by diminishing the role of the militia, is responsible for the rise of dictatorships in a number of countries—Italy, Spain, Germany, Austria, Russia—and "for the fascist movements in England and France and the semi-dictatorship in the United States". Such is the theory, proclaimed "an entirely new interpretation of history", put forth in this curious book by Silas Bent McKinley, sometime lecturer in history, Washington University, and late assistant professor of history, Vanderbilt University.

A considerable array of material is gathered from the history of ancient Greece, Rome, and Sparta, from feudalism and from modern times in an attempt to prove that democracy has been able to arise and maintain itself only in those periods when infantry has been superior to cavalry and to the technical branches of militarism. In all instances where the superiority of infantry has been lost, popular government disappears before the advance of dictatorships based upon the support of those engaged in specialized military technique.

In his survey of past history the author depicts three periods when

democracy has been able to maintain itself; when the city states of Greece utilized as their principal military weapon the foot soldiers of the phalanx, when the Roman legions enlisted the manpower of that state, and in the period that began with the fall of feudal power and entered its decline in the closing months of the world war. "Democracies," says the author, "to remain such, must rely upon infantry, as history proves." He then concludes: "If the theory be correct, democracy throughout the world is endangered by recent advances in the technical arms of the military service. Indications of this are not wanting in Europe today."

The ascendancy of mechanized warfare, air forces, tanks, heavy artillery, chemicals—these are the harbingers of change, and in the last 16 years these "have undergone an intensive development which has convinced many that the usefulness of infantry is threatened seriously". With the decline of infantry, that is to say of vast citizen armies, and the rise of mechanical warfare that requires men of considerable skill and training, military power becomes highly centralized and separated from the masses of the people, hence, as Charles A. Beard says in the introduction to McKinley's book, "the latter are in peril of losing their liberties".

Such an "interpretation" of history leads to the theory of the inevitability of fascism. This is set forth by the author in these words:

"Feeling the approach of agencies which in the end will hopelessly undermine the basis of their power, the people often capitulate without putting the matter to actual test, because in some obscure way they realize that the end is inevitable and early surrender is the least dangerous course. There is even a sort of self-delusion that democracy is not worth the struggle, that peace under the rule of a man who will think for them will bring the greatest happiness."

Thus, we have an example of another method used by the imperialist apologists of the university chairs to equip the theoretical arsenal of fascism. By use of the most vulgar metaphysics, interspersed with a pretense of profundity through distorting history, Dr. McKinley strives to develop his "new" theories. In all the 308 pages of his work there is not one word about the basic class character of the state as an instrument of oppression in the hands of one class to enable it to impose its will by force upon other classes. The entire movement of history is reduced to one thing—democracy advances or is retarded according to the changes in the relative strength of citizen infantry or cavalry and professional armies. This is, of course, a complete rejection of any dialectical, hence any scientific, interpretation of history. Everything is reduced to a simple, mechanical formula, applicable to all times and places. And, today, the world is headed straight for fascism, unless the military theorists are mistaken and the dominant role in military science must still be played by the men on foot.

One of the chief errors of the book flows from the fact that the author has no historical perspective and no understanding of the fact that dictatorship and democracy are not mutually exclusive categories. Were he equipped with a correct understanding of historical movement he would know that the democracy of ancient Greece was in reality a form of dictatorship of the slave-owning class and that the great masses were excluded from participation in this democracy. He would know that the citizen soldiers of the Roman legions were the mercenary forces that extended the tyrannical rule of that slave empire. He would realize that bourgeois democracy is the concealed dictatorship of the capitalist class. He would further realize

that the open and avowed dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union is, at the same time, the highest form of democracy that the world has ever seen—as Lenin said, “a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic”. Knowing these things he would not have repeated the slanderous lumping together in one category of dictatorships the open terrorism of fascism, with its throttling of democratic rights, and the thriving democracy of the Soviet system.

To be sure, McKinley cites certain facts of history that, to superficial thinkers, would appear to support his theory. It is true that tyrannical rule has always been destroyed by those who were able to realize sufficient continuity of resistance and concentration of force to defeat the organized violence of the tyrants. But this was not because of a change in military technology. It was due to the fact that the old ruling class was unable to rule as before and the masses were unwilling to live as before. Neither in the American revolution, nor in the French revolution at the close of the eighteenth century, were the revolutionary movements preceded or accompanied by any marked changes in the mechanics of warfare. In the course of both revolutions new tactics were employed because of the unleashing of the energy of a new class rising to power.

Another thing the author overlooks is the fact that in all revolutions previous to the proletarian revolution, after the victory has been won with the aid of the masses, the victorious class in the period of the consolidation of its power, proceeds to disarm those who made its victory possible. And here, again, our author fails to understand that the bourgeois revolutions were able to enlist in their service other parts of the population because they were able to make it appear that their own interests were the common interests of all humanity. Hence, the author fails to perceive that while a revolutionary class is still on the ascendancy, that is to say still fulfilling a progressive role in history, it is able to defend and develop its economic interests by an intricate combination of social institutions, not the least of which are those that have to do with ideological sway over the masses. As Marx said: “The prevailing ideas of any given period are the ideas of the ruling class.” These, and all other social institutions that form the vast superstructure of society are entirely ignored by our author.

Aside from the fundamental error upon which the work is based, the thing abounds with historical inaccuracies and in many cases downright distortions that cannot be regarded as other than deliberate in an effort to twist facts to conform to a preconceived theory. Thus, the Bolshevik revolution is depicted as a military coup, brought about by the Red Guards and the Petrograd garrison. The Bolsheviks had just begun to stir up the working men and peasants. Not a Party at the head of the majority of the toiling masses, but “modern military technique”, made possible the victory. Further, according to the author, the Nazis in Germany are a middle class movement that gained control of the government “through threat of armed force”.

Finally, his conclusions are based upon an error regarding modern warfare itself. In spite of the vast mechanization, the increasing use of complicated machinery, every competent military strategist knows that infantry must still play the dominant role when it comes to holding territory. Planes, tanks, poison gases can devastate, but they cannot consolidate control over new territory. That all governments realize this is proved by the increase in infantry everywhere. Hence, the work is useless as to facts, as to interpretation of military history, and as to history in general. It will be useful only to those who try to spread defeatist illusions among students and others who are actual or potential fighters against fascism.

New FEBRUARY Books

On the  **INTERNATIONAL** List

Rulers of America

A Study of Finance Capital

By ANNA ROCHESTER

"This is the most penetrating analysis of the composition of the financial groups that rule America that has yet appeared . . . Miss Rochester allows us to peer behind the scenes to observe the power exercised by the financial monarchs of our day. After monumental research, she has brought together an elaborate tabulation of the financial groups, their interconnections and the companies they dominate or influence. We are allowed, almost for the first time, to glimpse the full extent of the vast empires they have constructed. . . .

"But the present work is not alone a study of the emergence of financial empires or of financial leaders. It is a description of the trends which brought American capitalism into its present pattern, together with a statement of probable future development."

—Colston E. Warne, Professor of Economics,
Amherst College.

Book Union Selection for February - - \$2.75

THE SOVIET UNION

A Symposium by Soviet Leaders

Comprehensive picture of the Soviet Union in every sphere of activity during the past few years. Articles on: Machinery and Men; The Soviet Government; Soviet Democracy; Economic Progress; Heavy Industry; Agriculture; Financial Program; Foreign Trade; National Defense; Moscow Subway.

\$1.25

THIS FINAL CRISIS

By ALLEN HUTT

Economic and political survey of the major turning points in social development during the last hundred years. Describes how social crises in the past were solved within the framework of capitalism and indicates how such a solution is no longer possible today.

\$2.00

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF MARXISM - LENINISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

- Aberdeen, Wash.:** 514 E. Market St.
Akron: 365 South Main St.
Baltimore: 509 North Eutaw St.
Boston: 216 Broadway
Buffalo: 65 West Chippewa
Butte: 119 Hamilton St.
Cambridge: 6½ Holyoke St.
Camden: 501 Market St., Rm. 6
Chicago: 161 North Franklin St.
2135 West Division St.
1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 540 Main St.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Dayton: 712 Wayne Ave.
Denver: 522 Exchange Bldg.
Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.
Duluth: 114 West First St.
Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.
Hartford: 88 Church St.
Hollywood: 1116 No. Lillian Way
Los Angeles: 224 So. Spring St.
230 S. Spring St.
2411½ Brooklyn Ave.
Madison, Wisc.: 312 W. Gorham
Milwaukee: 419 West State St.
Minneapolis: 241 Marquette Ave.
Newark: 847 Broad St., 3rd fl.
New Haven: 280 Park St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
112 West 44th St.
140 Second Ave.
115 W. 135th St., Harlem
1001 Prospect Ave., Bronx
1337 Wilkins Ave., Bronx
369 Sutter Ave., Brooklyn
4531 16th Ave., Brooklyn
- Omaha:** 2404 Parker St.
Oakland: 419 12th St.
Paterson: 201 Market St.
Philadelphia: 46 N. 8th St., 2d fl.
118 W. Allegheny Ave.
4023 Girard Ave.
2404 Ridge Ave.
Pittsburgh: 1638 Fifth Ave.
Portland, Ore.: 314 S. W. Madison St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St.,
Room 42
Reading: 224 North Ninth
Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.
St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.
Salt Lake City: 415 Hooper Bldg.
San Francisco:
170 Golden Gate Ave.
1609 O'Farrell St.
121 Haight St.
San Diego: 635 E St.
Santa Barbara:
208 W. Canon Perdido
Seattle: 713½ Pine St.
4217 University Way
Spokane: 220 Washington St., R. 2
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D.C.: 513 F St., N.W.
Youngstown:
310 W. Federal St., 3d fl.

Write for a complete catalog to
any of the above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City