

The

COMMUNIST

SEPTEMBER



REVOLUTIONARY BACKGROUND OF THE CONSTITUTION

BY EARL BROWDER

Vanguard Role of the Communist Party ALEX BITTELMAN

The Sino-Japanese War and the
American People LAWRENCE HEARN

Scottsboro and the Negro People's
Front JAMES W. FORD
and ANNA DAMON

Communist-Socialist Unity in Spain C. P. OF SPAIN
From the World Communist Press



TWENTY CENTS

Making History Live---

As you read this issue of *The Communist*, your mind responds to the finest analysis of past and present events in America.

Here is the splendid fruit of Marxism applied to our own problems of today, linked by Communist writers to the living moving history of the world.

Once a month *The Communist* gives you a digest of news interpretation. Every day in the week the *Daily Worker* gives you news of the living present and an immediate interpretation of this news.

The American Constitution has become a major issue in the political picture in 1937. Browder's article on "Revolutionary Background of the American Constitution" supplies a key to the great instrument which is the basic law of the land. But to know what modern Tories are doing to the Constitution—you must read the *Daily Worker*.

In Spain and in China imperialist and fascist forces are assailing the freedom of millions of people. When you have read about "The Sino-Japanese War" in *The Communist*—for day-to-day news, you must read the *Daily Worker*.

Alexander Bittelman's article on "The Vanguard Role of the Communist Party" links the present fighting Party of the working class to its roots in the past, but for today's history of the Party—you must read the *Daily Worker*.

Subscribe Now!

DAILY WORKER • SUNDAY WORKER

50 East 13th Street, New York City

The COMMUNIST

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



CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	779
Revolutionary Background of the United States Constitution	EARL BROWDER	793
The Vanguard Role of the Communist Party	ALEX BITTELMAN	808
The Sino-Japanese War and the American People	LAURENCE HEARN	824
Scottsboro in the Light of Building the Negro People's Front	JAMES W. FORD and ANNA DAMON	838
An Open Letter on Communist-Socialist Unity in Spain		848
Thoughts on Peace and the Probable Advantages Thereof	THOMAS PAINE	856
From the World Communist Press		862
Recent Publications Acknowledged		872

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

THE LEADERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.



CHARLES E. RUTHENBERG
1882-1927

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

EARL BROWDER

THE LEADERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.



CHARLES E. RUTHENBERG
1882-1927

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

EARL BROWDER

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Labor Evaluates Political Experiences. How Can the Government Be Made More Responsive to the Needs of the Masses? Leadership or Alliance? Two Wrong Reactions to Failures of the Federal Government. The Progressive Camp and the Municipal Elections. Senator Black's Nomination. A New Phase in the Fight for Supreme Court Reform. Evaluating Experiences of First Defeat. The Labor Movement Needs Some Self-Criticism. A Situation That Was Not Utilized. The Role and Contribution of the Congress Session. No Dependable Roosevelt Majority. Elections in 1937 and 1938. Statement of Labor's Non-Partisan League. Cotton Loans and Crop Control. The Struggle for Trade Union Unity. Growth of C.I.O. Makes Unity Practical Task. Unity of Action the Burning Need. Brophy on the First Anniversary. The Central Committee Initiates a Two-Month Recruiting Drive. A Matter of Duty and Honor.

PROGRESSIVE labor is today intensively evaluating the country's recent political experiences. In doing so, labor seeks an answer to a number of urgent and practical questions. What political conclusions are to be drawn from the steel strike, from the struggle for the reform of the Supreme Court, from the various successes scored by reaction in Congress and outside?

In its report to the International Executive Board of the United Mine Workers of America, the Steel Workers Organizing Committee (S.W.O.C.) has the following to say on the conduct of government agencies in the steel strike:

"In each of the steel areas where the strike has been in effect, local authorities acting in complete collusion with the officials of the steel corporations and the National Guard have violated state and national laws and have infringed in the most flagrant manner upon the civil liberties of the steel workers."

And what did the federal government do about it? Says the report:

"The federal government throughout this entire situation has not displayed the slightest interest in protecting the rights of the steel workers on strike which have been so flagrantly disregarded. Violations of the national statutes, such as the national Fire Arms Act, by the steel corporations have produced no activity on the part of national officials."

The action taken by the Executive Board of the United Mine Workers upon this report is well known. It "condemned" the anti-labor practices and policies of the local and state officials who did the work of Girdler and Grace; it "protested" the complete lackadaisical and unconcerned attitude of the national and state authorities; and it "demanded" that these authorities bring to justice all those

responsible "for the wanton murder of the seventeen steel workers."

Important as these actions are by themselves, they could not and did not close the question. For one thing, the federal authorities still are not moving in the direction called for by the decisions of the United Mine Workers, decisions which received a sympathetic response and support in the entire labor movement and among all genuine progressive forces. The best that could be said about the federal authorities is that they are still hesitating. Second, there is the more general question agitating the minds of the workers. How can the federal government (and the local and state governments) be made *more responsive* to the needs, rights and just demands of labor?

Ever since the great strikes in the auto industry, labor has been growing more conscious of the *exact nature* of its relationships with the Roosevelt administration. Labor has been steadily shedding the illusion that the Roosevelt administration was the genuine class representative of labor, that Roosevelt was the leader of labor and its political spokesman. While steadily parting with these illusions, labor at the same time was gaining consciousness of its *true* relationships with the Roosevelt administration, which have been developing in practice as relationships of alliance and coalition for specific purposes and specific aims. An alliance of the working class as a distinct and independent political force with the outstanding spokesman of bourgeois democracy (without the capital "D") for a joint fight against the economic royalists and the reactionaries.

To become *fully* conscious of the fact that this is the exact nature of labor's relationship with the Roosevelt administration (an alliance of separate and independent class forces), *and to act upon this understanding*, is the imperative need of the present hour for the labor movement. Only in this way will the correct practical answer be found to the question of the masses as to how to make the government more responsive to their needs, rights and just demands. This is also the only way to counteract effectively the provocations of the reactionaries to bring about a break between the Roosevelt administration and labor.

We know of two wrong reactions to the failure of the federal government to fulfil its responsibilities to labor. Both of these wrong reactions are rooted in the remnants of the illusion that the Roosevelt administration is the political representative and spokesman of labor. Stated in their extreme forms, one reaction is: Roosevelt has ceased (or is ceasing) to be our spokesman, therefore our relations with him must come to an end. The other reaction is: though Roosevelt has not fulfilled all his obligations to us, nevertheless he is still our political representative; therefore we must continue to treat him as our spokesman and leader.

The practical consequences of such wrong reactions, if not counteracted by a correct class policy of a labor-Roosevelt alliance, are bound to be extremely harmful to labor and to the whole camp of progress. It is clear that the process of disillusionment in Roosevelt as "labor's leader" is a progressive process, one that is good for the working class and its allies;

provided, however, that this process of disillusionment is made to lead to more *class consciousness*, to more political independence and organization by labor and its allies, and, consequently, to a *more* conscious and *stronger* alliance between labor and Roosevelt as separate class forces yet fighting together against reaction and fascism. This is the direction in which the Communist Party has been exercising, and continues to exercise, its influence and work in the mass movements. This was the line freshly restated and further developed by the June meeting of the Central Committee of our Party. This is the way at the present time to push forward the building of the People's Front and the eventual crystallization of the national Farmer-Labor Party.

On the other hand, if the disillusionment in Roosevelt as "labor's leader" is not made to grow over into a *conscious class position and policy* of alliance with Roosevelt, then the consequence may be far from progressive. It may for the moment dampen interest in politics among certain sections of the masses and cultivate tendencies to political passivity and indifference. It may create favorable conditions for semi-fascists and fascists to divert the disillusionment into reactionary channels; it has happened before and it may happen again. In either case, it would play directly into the hands of resurgent reaction which today seeks nothing so anxiously as to bring about a break between Roosevelt and labor.

Similarly with the attitude which still persists of viewing Roosevelt as labor's "leader" and of acting upon this view in practice. Seen in retro-

spect, it was perhaps inevitable (given the relation of class forces) that labor should pass through a stage in which it followed Roosevelt as the "leader." We say "perhaps" advisedly; because even with the situation as it was shaping up between the middle of 1935 and election day in 1936, it was fully possible to achieve the defeat of the Liberty League and the re-election of Roosevelt and, in addition, *to elect a more progressive Congress* by following a *more* conscious class policy of alliance with Roosevelt (instead of following the "leader") and by building up the independent political power of labor and its allies in a more determined and consistent way. This was what we advocated. It is now even clearer how correct and possible such a policy was. But, at the time, the "leader" policy prevailed in the labor movement. Hence the masses had to go through a certain development and learn from their own experiences.

Now they are beginning to learn and are becoming ready to accept and follow a conscious policy of alliance *resting upon the independent political class line and organization of labor*. Therefore, to insist *now* upon continuing the old "leader" orientation is objectively to push the movement backward. This is bad enough. But it also militates against the building up of labor's independent political strength and activity which is today the most effective means of strengthening Roosevelt's hands against the fierce attacks of reaction. This can be stated even more plainly: those who are reluctant to build labor's independent political strength and organization are in fact, and despite their wishes, weakening Roosevelt and

strengthening his reactionary adversaries. And, finally, by failing to take proper note of the process of disillusionment in the "leader" orientation taking place among the workers, by failing to help this process grow over into a position of political class independence and alliance with Roosevelt, those who continue to persist in the "leader" orientation are actually fostering that extreme attitude which tends to accept as desirable the ending of *all* relations with Roosevelt.

We repeat: these are extreme reactions to the failures and weaknesses of the Roosevelt administration. The dangers that these wrong attitudes carry arise not so much from their own strength as from the still insufficiently clear political class line and orientation of organized labor, although labor is moving steadily in the direction of such a line. This line is: independent political organization and program, correct relations with labor's allies among farmers and middle classes, collaboration with and support for the progressive forces in the Democratic Party (in some places, among the Republicans), active support of Roosevelt's measures against reaction, coupled with criticism of his weaknesses and shortcomings (for example, the resolution of the United Mine Workers on the steel strike), and a conscious orientation towards the building up of the People's Front and the eventual national Farmer-Labor Party.

Labor's Non-Partisan League, the unions of the C.I.O. and the progressive forces in the A. F. of L. are beginning to give the correct answer to the question of how to make the government more responsive to the needs

and demands of the people. They give this answer in the preparations for the fall elections this year and for the forthcoming Congressional elections in 1938. In New York, the American Labor Party is entering the crucial Mayoralty elections as an independent political force, joining hands with all other progressive forces in the building up of a people's ticket to reelect La Guardia and to defeat the concentration of the Liberty League forces around Copeland and Al Smith. This is universally recognized as of national significance. What is absolutely necessary is that the leaders of the American Labor Party demonstrate a more independent political line and program in relation to its progressive allies. This will strengthen the people's combination, not weaken it.

There is also taking place intense political activity by labor in the one-industry towns: mining, steel, rubber, textile, auto, etc., in preparation for the fall elections. In most of these places, Labor's Non-Partisan League is entering the fight seeking to crystallize progressive tickets through the primaries in the Democratic Party. The latest news from Akron and Canton shows how successful this policy can be. It is necessary, however, to emphasize that this participation in the Democratic primaries has to be carried on *in a certain way*, if labor is to derive the utmost advantage from such a policy.

The June resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party formulates this certain way as follows:

"Insofar as mass trade unions and other progressive groups, politically active in the

direction of the People's Front platform, are not ready at present to join in the formation of the Farmer-Labor Party, we should encourage them to systematic and organized activity within the Democratic Party, *with the utmost possible independent organization, making a common front with all Left forces to defeat the reactionaries and to strengthen the progressive forces in that party.*"

Utmost possible independent organization—this means largely building up the local bodies of Labor's Non-Partisan League in most cases. Making a common front with all Left forces—this means avoiding the pitfalls of narrow craft union politics which isolates labor from its progressive allies and thus makes labor the helpless plaything of capitalist politicians. This is why our Party's resolution urges upon labor the making of a common front with all Left forces in building up the program and *list of candidates* with which to enter and win the Democratic primaries (where such is the policy) and then—the elections.

Of exceptional importance are the political activities in Detroit where the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions are organizing to bring about a people's ticket in the city elections. There is no need to emphasize the tremendous significance of these activities. What has to be stressed, perhaps, is the utmost need of maintaining the political *unity of action* of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions in Detroit and the equal need of the *common front* of labor and all other progressive forces in the coming elections.

E. L. Oliver, executive secretary of Labor's Non-Partisan League, hailed the result of the Akron and Canton primaries as "an indication of what

labor can do when organized for political action" and as "a harbinger of what will happen in the 1938 Congressional elections." He said:

"Overwhelming victories for candidates of organized labor in the Democratic Mayoralty primaries in Akron and Canton are starters in labor's drive to elect progressive candidates to municipal offices this fall and to Congress in 1938."

Absolutely correct. Hence: more intensive organization and democratization of Labor's Non-Partisan League in accord with the decisions of the March national conference of Labor's Non-Partisan League.

* * *

SENATOR BLACK's nomination to the Supreme Court to fill the vacancy created by the retirement of Van Devanter can be made the opening of a new stage in the struggle for the reform of the Supreme Court. It is in this possibility, aside from the merits of the nomination itself which are considerable, that the chief significance and value of the Black nomination lie.

Reaction has already indicated its attitude unmistakably. Such hardened enemies of the people as Senators Glass, King, Burke, Vandenberg and Bridges, the coalition of reactionary Democrats and stalwart Republicans which brought about the defeat of the President's Supreme Court measure, were quick to make it known publicly "that they would oppose his confirmation" (*New York Times*, August 13). The *New York Herald Tribune* literally rages:

"The naming to the Supreme Court of Senator Black . . . is an affront to the Court

and to the people. It reveals the President not only as unable to brook criticism or opposition but as resolved to cast his lot against the overwhelming sentiment of the nation and with those extremists who care not how they gain their power so long as they have it. The nomination is as menacing as it is unfit." (August 13.)

We wish it were true that the nomination of Black reveals the President as being resolved to "cast his lot with those extremists" who are determined to realize the people's mandate regardless of how much it may hurt or enrage the Morgans, du Ponts, Girdlers—or Bernard Baruch, Garner and Hugh Johnson. We wish it were true. Yet it is possible to agree that the nomination of Senator Black may reveal on the part of the President a determination to resume the fight against Supreme Court dictatorship from a somewhat different angle and to do so in the only effective way possible, by leaning more definitely upon the progressive forces in his own party and in the country generally and by appealing to the people for support directly.

The response of John L. Lewis and of William Green was timely and effective. Lewis said: "Senator Black's appointment is one that will carry with it the confidence of the nation." Green said: "The appointment is pleasing and satisfactory to labor." It remains for the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to mobilize all their political strength and influence to make absolutely sure:

(1) That the maximum possible pressure is exerted upon the Senate to insure the confirmation of the appointment, and (2) That this appointment becomes *the beginning of a new stage* for the effective curbing

of the usurped powers of the Supreme Court.

In order to do so successfully, it is necessary to learn fully the lessons of the defeat suffered by the progressive forces in the first stages of the struggle for the reform of the Supreme Court, because a defeat, though temporary, it was, and not only for President Roosevelt.

A serious effort to learn these lessons, we find, was made by an important labor paper, the *Advance*, organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, in its August issue. The *Advance* poses the natural question of how was this defeat possible? It says:

"Only nine months ago the President was returned to office with the greatest majority the nation ever gave a Chief Executive. The campaign that led up to that election was waged with all the intensity of a civil war except for actual life taking. In that war in which no quarter was asked or given, the opposition was thoroughly routed. And yet—this result."

There is one thing wrong with this analysis. It is that the opposition was not routed, neither thoroughly nor unthoroughly. And here is precisely the rub. The Liberty League was frustrated in its effort to defeat Roosevelt and elect Landon. Here the defeat of the opposition was complete. But the Liberty League also sought, as all remember, to entrench itself *in Congress* and precisely *through the reactionary elements in the Democratic Party*. And in this the opposition was quite successful, as the defeat of the Supreme Court measure and the deterioration of the Roosevelt majority in Congress have amply proved. It is important to remember this fact, especially those labor groups that failed in the campaign of 1936 to pay proper

attention to the need of electing progressive elements to Congress. The leaders of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, for whom the *Advance* speaks, and some other progressive labor leaders, should feel the need of some self-criticism on this score.

The *Advance* says further:

"The interest of the people in the President's leadership in overhauling the obsolete parts of our political and industrial system has not fallen off nor have the people thus far gained the impression that some one else, not the President, would do all these things for them and even better. The President's failure on the Court reform issue, while sustained on a measure of very great significance, is largely due to the fact that most people have by no means realized the full significance of the Court issue."

Many things here are true. Roosevelt's popularity among the people has not fallen off. Yet this alone does not give the full picture of the situation. Together with the continuing popularity of Roosevelt among the masses, there is also a more conscious and more critical attitude to Roosevelt by ever growing sections of the more mature masses. Among these the "leadership" attitude is giving way to a more politically adult conception of working class independence and alliance with progressive forces. Had we had more of this maturer conception in *practical political deeds* in the past months, the middle classes of the cities and farms would have been held more firmly on the side of labor while the reactionaries in Congress (and outside) would not have dared to go as far as they did in defying Roosevelt and defeating his Supreme Court measure. The outcome of the steel strike would also have been different.

It is also true that "most people have by no means realized the full significance of the Court issue." Why was this so? The *Advance* does not answer this question. *Yet this is the question.* Why did not the people (workers, farmers, middle classes, Negroes, women, youth)—why did they not rally in *active support* to the Supreme Court measure? Why was reaction allowed to create the false impression that the people were actively opposed to this measure?

If you listen to Norman Thomas and the *Socialist Call*, who do not always agree but on this point seem to be in agreement, the chief trouble was with the Supreme Court measure itself. According to them, who always manage on such issues to give some little comfort to the reactionaries, a constitutional amendment would have been the thing, preferably the amendment which they themselves formulated.

Abstractly speaking, and working in a political vacuum, a constitutional amendment may have been better. But on this one can only engage in fruitless speculation. And who is interested in that? In practice, and in the situation which prevailed, Roosevelt's inadequate and very partial measure became *objectively* a most potent weapon for the struggle against Supreme Court dictatorship. On this point one does not have to speculate; life itself has shown this to be true. A potent weapon not only for the reform of the Supreme Court but for a successful advance of the whole camp of progress against the camp of reaction. To realize fully that this is so, one need only contemplate for a moment the situation that would pre-

vail in the country today had the Roosevelt measure (poor and inadequate as it is) been adopted by Congress. Why, we might have had the beginning of a rout of reaction. And what is equally important: the practical possibility of such a victory for progress was *inherent* in the whole situation and in the relation of class forces.

Only this situation was not utilized! Not fully, not effectively! And for this, it is not only Roosevelt who is to blame, although he must carry a major responsibility. Blame must be accepted by the progressive leaders of the people, by the progressive organizations of the people: the C.I.O., the progressive forces of the A. F. of L., Labor's Non-Partisan League, farm organizations, Negro organizations, youth, women, etc., and also by the Communist Party organizations.

Most people, says the *Advance*, have not realized the full significance of the Court issue. *It was our business to make them realize it and to mobilize them for active support of the Supreme Court measure.* This business our camp has not attended to properly and fully.

Of course, the weaknesses and shortcomings of Roosevelt's "middle-of-the-road" line made it more difficult for our camp to carry out a successful mobilization of the masses in favor of the Supreme Court measure. His failure to protect effectively labor's rights against the attacks of the Girdlers was bound to dampen labor's readiness to rally to the support of his Court measure.

A similar effect must have been exerted upon many of the victims of inadequate relief, the victims of

W.P.A. cuts. Neither could the toiling farmers very well be expected to display much *spontaneous* activity in support of Roosevelt on the Court issue, seeing what little effort was made in their behalf since the 1936 elections. The same with most other groups of the toiling people. All this, resulting from the weaknesses and inconsistencies of Roosevelt's political course, was making our job more difficult. But it did not and could not relieve us of the job. We could not allow the people to remain absorbed by these natural and justifiable feelings without endangering, not only the outcome of the fight on the Supreme Court issue, but the entire cause of labor and progress.

More difficulties were piled up for us by Roosevelt's failure to take the fight to the people (he started it, but did not follow it up), and by his failure to push forward the progressive and Left forces in his own party as against the reactionaries who were working with the Republicans for his defeat.

Yet this, neither, could be an excuse for not doing the job well. On the contrary, seeing all these difficulties (and they were seen plainly in the course of the fight), the progressive leaders of labor and its allies should have exerted themselves to the utmost *to deepen politically the content of the fight*, to show the masses what was involved in it precisely because the measure itself did not show it clearly enough, *to expose the maneuvers of the Court's "liberal" rulings*, to tie up the Court reform with the whole people's mandate and *with the legislative measures which the people demand*, to explain the origin

of Roosevelt's inconsistencies and to bring forward their own independent and consistent People's Front program and line, *and in this way to organize active pressure upon Congress in support of the Court measure.*

Yes, Labor's Non-Partisan League made some beginnings along these lines. Also Communist Party organizations, in response to Central Committee directives, engaged in various actions here and there. But the fact remains: our camp, the camp of labor and its progressive allies, did not do the job well. The *Advance* should have been able to see this fact and draw from it the necessary conclusions.

Now (with the nomination of Senator Black) the struggle for Court reform seems to be entering a new stage. And again: the concrete issue is relatively small; the confirmation of Black will not by itself curb the usurped powers of the Supreme Court. It will do that even less than the original Roosevelt measure could. To take away from the Supreme Court these powers and to restore the Constitution to the people, *a Congressional act to that effect is absolutely necessary.* A situation may even arise in the course of the struggle for the realization of the people's mandate which would make it necessary and practicable to fight for a constitutional amendment *supplementary* to direct Congressional action. This, events will show.

For the moment, it is not enough merely to ask: Will the President act? *It is necessary to organize the people and to lead them into action.* To lead them into organized action to press the Senate for the confirmation of

Senator Black, to lead them in the struggle for the demands of the people's mandate and against the reactionary Democratic-Republican coalition which is sabotaging and scuttling these demands, and to utilize the forthcoming elections to the utmost to strengthen the camp of progress and the independent role of labor in that camp. Labor's Non-Partisan League can and must play a significant part in unifying labor's political efforts along these lines (the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods) and thus build the People's Front on the road to the national Farmer-Labor Party.

* * *

CONGRESS may or may not be adjourned by this time, but the main role and contribution of this session can already be evaluated, even though briefly. On the side of positive contribution to the realization of the people's mandate, this session has very little to show. It can be said plainly: Congress did not go *forward* as the President said it should and as the people wanted it to. It can also be said that, on the whole, reaction was successful in hampering and sabotaging (if not in completely blocking) the realization of the people's mandate mainly through the rebellion of the reactionary Democrats in collusion with the Republicans. This is seen most outstandingly in the emasculation of such measures as Housing, Wages and Hours, Relief Appropriations, the Tenant Farmer Bill and, of course, in the defeat of the Supreme Court reform. Also it is seen in the failure to pass general

farm legislation, the threat of sidetracking the Wages and Hours Bill, and the sabotaging of the Anti-Lynching Bill.

That the weaknesses and inconsistencies of the Roosevelt administration have tended to make the road of reaction easier goes without saying at this hour. These columns have discussed the matter repeatedly (especially in August) and have done so again in the foregoing notes. Here it is necessary to draw certain conclusions as arising more directly from the Congressional situation as such.

Chief of these conclusions is that there is no dependable Roosevelt majority in Congress. This is the least that has to be realized. There is also a real danger of an anti-Roosevelt majority becoming crystallized, at least in the Senate. And if the important House Committees are not freed from the stranglehold of some of the reactionaries, the House too may become paralyzed as far as progressive legislation is concerned, even though the majority of its membership continues to support the President.

The President's "friends" from the camp of *The New York Times*, Bernard Baruch and Hugh Johnson, will again advise him to make "peace" with the reactionary Democrats and thus re-establish his majority. We hope the President is beginning to realize that this means his captivity and destruction. We also want to hope that his nomination of Senator Black is a gesture in the direction of a more Left orientation, an orientation that will result in bringing forward to position of power and influence the progressive and Left ele-

ments in the Democratic Party. Tactics are, of course, necessary but there must be a correct policy to govern tactics. And such a policy today can be but one: to the Left—more consistent progressivism and an appeal to the people.

The President, from the standpoint of carrying forward his own declared program, does not have to vacate his present position and lose the support of certain democratic bourgeois groups, as Hugh Johnson insinuates and threatens. Not at all. The President will be able to establish himself even more firmly in his present position (let alone not vacate it) and retain the support of these democratic bourgeois groups *only if he broadens out further to the Left*, if he champions more consistently the needs of the masses *at the expense of the economic royalists*, and if he brings forward in his own party the more progressive and Left forces.

For labor and its close allies certain tasks follow from the fact that there is no dependable Roosevelt majority in Congress today and that there is a danger of an anti-Roosevelt majority becoming crystallized.

What are these tasks?

1. To exert all efforts and to mobilize all available resources, in order *to demonstrate the power of the progressive camp* in the coming fall elections. The stronger the power demonstrated (in New York, Detroit, Akron, Canton, in Pennsylvania, etc.) the better the chances that Congress, when it reassembles, will be in a more favorable mood to listen to the voice and demands of the people.

2. To prepare in earnest for the 1938 Congressional elections. In these

elections the people will have their say on one-third of the Senate and on the full make-up of the House. This will be a grand opportunity. The policies are clear: the people's mandate and the People's Front to back it up.

Speaking on the successes in the Akron and Canton primaries, the executive secretary of Labor's Non-Partisan League, E. L. Oliver, said that these "are starters in labor's drive to elect progressive candidates to municipal offices this fall and to Congress in 1938." These are important words. They impose great and serious obligations.

If we carry out these obligations, the result of the elections this fall will lay the basis for the national rout of reaction, a rout to be initiated all along the line in the Congressional elections of 1938.

We should like to say in passing (reserving the matter for future treatment) that the controversy on the issue of cotton loans and crop control deserves a word from labor. And to this effect: that labor will support commodity loans to farmers and crop control (as proposed by the President), although realizing that the new problems and difficulties which crop control presents can be tackled effectively by much more radical measures against the monopolies and speculators than Roosevelt's present program calls for. Labor should be ready to support the President's program on this question *provided* (a) it takes full and adequate care of the interests of the farmers as distinguished from the rich cotton planters and agrarian capitalists; (b) it especially protects the interests of the sharecroppers and

tenants (remember what the A.A.A. did to them in the South); (c) it most particularly includes provisions for minimum wages, maximum hours, right to organize, collective bargaining, and other civil rights for the agricultural workers (remember the Wage and Hours Bill excludes these from protection); (d) it establishes machinery for genuine democratic control of the administration of loans and crop control; and (e) it embodies a declaration of policy by Congress that the rise in the cost of living which loans and crop control may bring about should be compensated by increased income to wage and salary earners.

There is no inherent contradiction between the interests of the toiling farmers and those of labor, such as Mr. Lippman and the reactionaries assert exists, in order to hamper the growth of the People's Front. Both of these groups can help themselves and the nation by fighting jointly for the improvement of their conditions *at the expense of the monopolies, speculators and economic royalists.*

* * *

UNITY of the trade union movement is becoming not only more urgent but also more possible. The great urgency and need of unity are evident to all who have the interests of labor truly at heart—a unity which the reactionaries of the A. F. of L., the Hutchesons and Freys are combatting with all their might. The urgency of unity is made especially clear by the resurgence of reaction in all fields.

The Central Committee of the

Communist Party has spoken of the matter in its July statement as follows:

"Capitalist reaction, assisted by William Green and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., is deriving great comfort from the division in the ranks of labor. It is exploiting this fact not alone to hamper the struggle of the workers for a better life, but also to arouse the middle classes against labor. It follows from this that, hand in hand with the building of the C.I.O. unions, the progressive labor forces must work most actively for winning the unions of the A. F. of L. to the principles of the C.I.O. and to the cause of genuine labor unity."

It is possible and necessary to say that the cause of labor unity is making considerable advance. The first and most important expression of this advance is the continued growth and strengthening of the C.I.O. Its present membership is upward of 3,000,000 organized in twenty-nine national unions, 438 local unions, and twenty-nine local industrial councils. Even more revealing is the importance of this growth when viewed from the industries in which the C.I.O. unions are organizing. Such unions as in the steel, auto, rubber and textile industries have already established their place and role in the labor movement. With them, new and powerful organizations are growing in city transport and other utilities, in agriculture, in marine and among various basic groups of white-collar workers. The most recent beginning in the field of communications is highly promising and significant.

This it is that makes the question of unity a *practical* task. The stronger the C.I.O. becomes, the higher its prestige grows among the masses generally and especially among the mem-

bership of the A. F. of L. and railroad unions, the sooner will the American trade union movement become united. This will, of course, come about not automatically. *Unity, like everything else, has to be made.* The increasing strength of the C.I.O., and the spreading of the C.I.O. principles in the A. F. of L. unions, create the most favorable conditions for the practical unification of the trade union movement.

That is why the June meeting of our Central Committee said in its resolution:

"Complete support of the C.I.O. is no contradiction to the policy of struggle for unity of the trade union movement. On the contrary, only through such support of the C.I.O. does the unification of the labor movement become a practical task."

This means that the struggle for trade union unity is a *special task* and must be treated as such.

How is the Communist Party handling this task?

First, by continuing to win wider masses for the complete support of the C.I.O., by contributing all in its power to help build the C.I.O. unions and to strengthen them.

Second, by supporting and helping the progressive forces in the A. F. of L. to combat in practice the splitting and strike-breaking activities of the Hutchesons and Freys, and by actively seeking to win the membership of the A. F. of L. and of the Railroad Brotherhoods to the principles of the C.I.O. and to the cause of unity of the trade union movement under the slogan of a national unity convention.

Third, by urging, encouraging and supporting *united action* between the unions of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L.

on the economic and political fields. Unity of action against the Girdlers and other open-shop employers, against injunctions, against strike breaking government officials and for all measures of benefit to the workers in all unions.

Fourth, by persistently propagating among the workers in all industries and unions the ideas of labor unity, as the chief strategic task of the proletariat in this period, and of trade union unity as a most basic phase of the unity of the working class.

This is the Party's policy and activity. It is necessary to intensify all phases of this work, especially as conditions are becoming more favorable.

Unity of action, in the face of common danger and the common enemy, between the unions of the C.I.O. and of the A. F. of L., is no longer a rare occurrence but is becoming more systematic and widespread. Recent weeks have seen such unity of action in New Jersey in the formation of the Anti-Injunction League; also in the formation of the Pennsylvania Joint Committee with the following important four-point program: (1) United action against company unions; (2) Organization in industries where unions of both organizations exist should be coordinated; (3) Jurisdictional disputes to be settled amicably; (4) Labor candidates in elections should be supported by both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions; also in the numerous joint political actions of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions through Labor's Non-Partisan League; and in similar developments.

These united actions are still embracing only a fraction of the labor movement. The opposition of the A.

F. of L. reactionaries to united action is still sufficiently strong in many places to thwart the unity efforts of the workers. Yet this movement for united action is spreading. And it is the task of all progressives to push this forward with all their might.

In the current weeks, many conventions of city and state federations of the A. F. of L. will be held. This presents a fresh opportunity for raising the issue of united action and trade union unity before wide circles of the A. F. of L. members and for crystallizing various forms of struggle for these objectives. The most recent effort along these lines was made at the convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor. The unity resolution introduced there by the secretary-treasurer of the Boston Building Trades Council and by the representatives of the Cambridge Central Labor body was defeated by the reactionaries; but the resolution reflected the genuine feeling of wide circles of workers in the A. F. of L. and thus served the purpose of strengthening the unity movement and of pushing it forward. Similar resolutions, taking note of the specific conditions and relation of forces, can and should be introduced and fought for at all forthcoming gatherings of A. F. of L. unions.

John Brophy, director of the C.I.O., was fully right when he said on the first anniversary of the C.I.O.:

"Looking back over the year that has passed since the A. F. of L. Executive Council split labor's ranks by suspending the C.I.O. unions, we in the C.I.O. can say that events have fully justified the course of action we adopted in forming the C.I.O. to promote industrial organization of the unorganized."

More power and strength to the C.I.O. More conscious understanding of the great importance of trade union unity for the working class and for the entire camp of progress. More intensive struggle for united action against the reactionary splitters in the A. F. of L. Executive Council, necessary for the fight against capitalist reaction generally.

* * *

THE Communist Party recruiting drive is on. Following out the decisions of the June meeting of the Central Committee on Party building, directives have been issued to the Party organizations calling for:

“. . . a two-month recruiting campaign to take place in September and October culminating in a National Party Builders Congress to be held in New York in November” (*Daily Worker*, August 10).

The directives are detailed and explicit. They constitute in fact a program of action for Party building in all its phases and ramifications, and the Party membership should master the directives from that point of view.

It is important to understand the true role of the two-month recruiting drive in the entire scheme of Party building. The latter, *i.e.*, Party building, is not a campaign affair. It is a permanent task to be carried on daily in the course of the mass work. This is one of the central ideas stressed by the June meeting of the Central Committee; building the mass movements and building the Party are two phases of one task to be carried out simultaneously and in organic connection with one another. Recruiting (and *Daily Worker* circulation) is a basic phase of Party building.

The two-month recruiting drive proposes to make a *great effort* in the direction of recruiting and absorbing the best elements of the working class. In this way, it is intended to bring into the Party by the close of September a large number of new members who are ready to come in and whom the Party needs at once, and at the same time to build up a tempo, experience, methods and a large corps of Party builders whereby we shall be able to carry on successfully the systematic work of Party building after the close of the drive.

The directives say:

“The two-month recruiting campaign is a drive for *mass recruiting*. Our Party everywhere has established close contacts with thousands of people who have cooperated with us in united front activity. *These elements can be brought into the Party.*”

Yes, they can be brought into the Party and they must be brought in. This has become a matter of duty and honor for every Party member and organization. It is a great opportunity and a serious test. We must make the most of the opportunity and pass successfully the test.

In the words of the directives:

“The two-month recruiting drive initiated by the Central Committee is the primary immediate task before the Party today. It must focus attention upon all the problems of Party building, and make maximum use of all available resources, experiences and forces. It must set the entire Party in motion, and lay the base for continuous mass recruiting by our membership in intimate relations to the mass work of the Party and the mass movements in which the Party participates.”

The Party will soon call the honor roll of Party builders.

A. B.

REVOLUTIONARY BACKGROUND OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

BY EARL BROWDER

FEW countries have a richer heritage of traditions of revolutionary struggle for human freedom than our own United States. Yet this heritage has been shamefully neglected by the modern fighters for liberation from oppression. By default, the reactionary camp has been permitted to claim for itself the championship of the preservation of the American tradition. It is only in the past few years that the Communist Party has broken with this neglectful attitude, foisted upon the radical movement some generations ago by the sectarian influences that dominated the Socialist Party, and, following the advice of Lenin, even if belatedly, began to develop the slogan "Communism is Twentieth Century Americanism."

The revolutionary gold in the ore of American history is so rich and abundant that even the reactionary miners digging here turn up a great wealth for us to begin to work on. This is why I spent many hours recently, while traveling, in a study of three books on American history (two of them recent publications), some material from which forms the basis of the present article. Needless to say, the authors of the books in question would probably object to the conclu-

sions which we draw from them. But the facts will speak for themselves, and, in our opinion, also for our conclusions.

The three books are: *Jefferson and Hamilton*, by Claude G. Bowers, a study of the first twelve years under the Constitution, the period of Washington's two administrations and that of John Adams; *Jefferson in Power*, by the same author, dealing with the ensuing eight years of Jefferson's presidency; and *Bulwark of the Republic: Biography of the Constitution*, by Burton J. Hendrick, a running account of the constitutional struggle from 1787 to the present time.

THE DILEMMA OF THE CONSTITUTION MAKERS

The United States Constitution was a product of the American Revolution, which separated the thirteen colonies from England, established them as independent states, and united them in a loose Confederation, not yet a united nation even in the most limited aspect of a customs union (such as for example later laid the foundation for the German national unification). Under the Confederation a single united policy in dealing with foreign relations was impossible; the

same thing was true of domestic problems affecting all thirteen states. The revolution which cut off the oppressive and economically strangling control of London had at the same time removed the unifying authority of Britain without substituting a new one, but set up instead thirteen authorities, all too often in sharp contradiction to one another. At the same time, the revolutionary war had loosed a democratic mass movement among the population, which was not at all welcome to the ruling circles in the thirteen states. In fact, it was the threat of the unruly democratic masses which, more than any other single factor, brought these ruling circles (aristocrats, landowners and slave-holders, and rich merchants) to a keen realization of the inadequacy of the Articles of Confederation, and gave birth to the Constitution.

Having participated in making the revolution, the problem of those interests which dominated the Constitutional Convention had become how to curb that revolution among the masses, how to harness it to their special class interests, and how to make the realization of national unity, a generally felt necessity, dependent upon the dominance of their class groupings in the central government. Their dilemma was that these aims brought them into conflict with the aroused and crystallized aspirations of the masses, which had been flamingly voiced in the writings of Tom Paine and in the Declaration of Independence. The struggle around the formation and adoption of the Constitution was the first great battle between democracy and reaction; it gave birth to the first national system

of political parties; it posed the essential questions which run through American history, in forms corresponding to the stages of social and economic development of various periods, down to the present.

The camp of privilege and reaction was apparently in the saddle. But the forces of democracy among the masses, though scattered and unorganized, were powerful and rising. This was the inevitable consequence of the revolutionary war, which Lenin had in mind when, in writing his *Letter to American Workers*, he said:

“The history of modern civilized America opens with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars. . . . It was a war of the American people against English robbers who subjected America and held it in colonial slavery. . . .” *

Everything that has marked off the development of America, as distinguished from that of Europe, finds its origin in this “great, really liberating, really revolutionary war,” which planted deeply in the American people the aspirations of democracy; its unexampled growth in wealth and productive resources, its welding of a population of manifold national and racial origin into a united nation, and its extension of the concept of the nation to embrace half a continent—all those features that made America preeminent among capitalist nations found their origin in the revolutionary war and the mobilization of the people to carry it to success.

This war unleashed incalculable forces among the masses, which operate down to the present day. The

* V. I. Lenin, *A Letter to American Workers*, p. 9. International Publishers, New York, 3 cents.

struggle between these forces of the people and the forces of property and privilege is the hallmark of constitutional history. The dilemma of the Constitution makers in 1787, who predominantly represented property and privilege striving to subdue the revolution and harness it, was that of finding out how far they could go without wrecking their whole plan upon the resistance of the people. Their task was to find the minimum to which they could keep the democratic achievements of the revolution without completely wrecking it.

This judgment is not confined to the radical, or popular, camp. It is agreed to by Mr. Hendrick who, on the whole, belongs decidedly to the Tory camp. He says:

"The underlying purpose was to keep political power, as far as possible, out of the hands of the masses. . . . They [the drafters of the Constitution] had before them a more difficult task even than framing a constitution; the more difficult job was to get it ratified. And the concessions gradually made to what today would be called the proletariat represented their ambition to establish a strong, effective government, and one that, at the same time, the propertyless, who then, as always, comprised the great majority of the people, would accept." (Pp. 92-93.)

The Constitution that emerged was thus a compromise. It was a compromise between conflicting regional interests of the bourgeoisie; it was a compromise between two antagonistic social-economic systems, the slave system of the Southern plantation owners and the budding capitalism of the Northern merchants and manufacturers; and, most basic of all and continuing to the present, it was a compromise between aristocratic and democratic principles of government.

It is not the purpose of this brief article to examine in detail the contradictions and compromises of the Constitution, and of its evolution. To the extent that they are essential to our argument, we will refer to them in relation to the great constitutional struggles that arose.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The first great constitutional struggle arose on the question of the adoption of the proposed document. As it affects the present day, the chief point of interest was the embryonic gathering of the democratic forces around the demand for a Bill of Rights, finally victorious in the first ten amendments which became a condition for the adoption of the Constitution. The democratic-minded people correctly recognized in the Constitution as drafted a victory for the Tories, for all its concessions to the revolutionary spirit of the time. At the same time, both camps were agreed upon the necessity for establishment of a government sufficiently strong to deal with difficult foreign relations and subdue divisionist forces, which threatened destruction to the fruits of the revolution. Thomas Jefferson, chief figure among the democratic forces, absent in France on a diplomatic mission when the Constitution was being drafted, nevertheless sent his criticism of the document and demand for a Bill of Rights by mail to Madison, Washington, and other friends, and he finally returned in time to play a leading role in the fight for the Bill of Rights and its adoption.

Tremendous significance attaches to this struggle and the Bill of Rights which it achieved. Not that the people

actually received those things ostensibly guaranteed by the first ten amendments. The fight for these rights was merely transferred to the separate states where the struggle for their realization continues down to the present, although it must be noted that a number of states such as Virginia and Pennsylvania had previously adopted highly progressive Bills of Rights. Even the negative gain of specifically prohibiting the national government from encroaching upon civil rights did not prevent the Adams administration (1797-1800) from adopting the notorious Alien and Sedition Laws (the predecessors of our modern criminal syndicalism and deportation laws), in the desperate struggle of the Federalist Party to crush the rising democratic trend, represented by the Republican Party which put Jefferson in power in 1800.

Notwithstanding the absence of enforcement of the Bill of Rights (which continues until today), the struggle for its inclusion in the Constitution crystallized an elementary program for the democratic camp which was gradually achieved in the separate states to a greater or lesser degree, began the organization of the democratic forces, and set the popular mind in a democratic direction. It was the first great victory in the constitutional struggle for the forces of the people, with not only national but worldwide consequences.

FEDERALIST PARTY RULE UNDER HAMILTON

George Washington, commander-in-chief of the victorious revolutionary armies, was the popular symbol of national independence, and of the na-

tional unity accomplished by the new Constitution. He inevitably became the first President, serving in that position for eight years, until 1797. His role in the creation of an independent united nation was unquestionably of the first order. The honorary title of "Father of his Country" given him by history is solidly based in historic fact.

It is of peculiar interest to note today that the theory of government embodied in the Constitution made no room for rival parties contending for control of governmental office. There were in fact no national parties, when the Constitution was drafted, nor were party struggles foreseen as a major instrumentality of government. Washington's Cabinet was theoretically chosen on the basis of picking the most qualified men for particular duties without thought of party divisions; and in fact, according to general agreement, by its inclusion of Hamilton and Jefferson, chief leaders of the two great parties which soon arose in opposition to each other, it had in this respect at least realized its theory.

Hamilton and Jefferson, the two intellectual giants of America's formative period, should, according to the theory, by their collaboration under Washington's presidency, have realized national unification by a permanent collaboration of the two basic camps which had produced the compromise of the Constitution. The camp of property and privilege had its perfect representative in Hamilton, founder of the American financial system, the first great manufacturing promoter, monarchist and anti-democrat in political tendency, and to this

day the hero as well as ideological guide and inspiration of the camp of reaction.

The democratic camp, that of the masses of the people (that meant), first of all, agrarian democracy), had an equally fitting representative in Thomas Jefferson, close friend of Tom Paine (the fiery revolutionary tribune of the people whose writings inspired the masses and the revolutionary army to the heroic effort required for victory), author of the Declaration of Independence in collaboration with Paine, student of progressive thought throughout the world, philosopher and statesman of democracy. But life quickly consigned to the waste-basket of history the theory of peaceful collaboration between these two antagonistic forces. Hamilton and Jefferson were soon engaged in a death-struggle within Washington's Cabinet for dominant influence in directing the course of government. Out of that struggle grew the Federalist and Democratic (officially then called Republican) Parties, and the first national party conflict.

Jefferson could not long remain in Washington's Cabinet, because Hamilton soon became the decisive influence, more and more winning dominance over Washington, and establishing the Federalist Party which reached out to control every office. Jefferson, in the few years he was Secretary of State, already had laid the foundations of one of the most cherished American traditions—active solidarity with the forces of democracy and progress in other lands—in the relations between the United

States and France.* Jefferson finally resigned this position to have his hands more free to organize the struggle against Hamilton and the Federalist Party, which he bodily labeled "monarchical" and "monocratic."

Democratic clubs sprang up all over the country to struggle against the oppressive and corrupt rule of Hamilton's party. They were stimulated by the example of the Jacobin Clubs of the French Revolution, with which the democratic masses of the United States were enthusiastically in accord. They found their leader in Jefferson.

The Federalist Party was alarmed by the signs of the rise of a rival party basing itself upon the "unruly masses" and democratic principles. It set out to crush these clubs before they could organize the majority. Then began the first "Red scare" in American history, which has served as a model for all others down to the present time. The democratic clubs were denounced as "alien and subversive influences" financed by "French gold," and all the powers of public authority and repression were brought into play to break them up. Even the aging Washington was drawn into this battle with a vitriolic denunciation of the democratic movement in one of his last presidential messages to Congress. It is one of the little ironies of history that Tammany Hall, which, through Al Smith and Senator Copeland, is staging a similar "Red scare" against President Roosevelt, itself originated in the last years of the eighteenth century as one of those "alien and sub-

* See pamphlet, *Lenin and Spain*, by Earl Browder, Workers Library Publishers, New York.—Ed.

versive" clubs denounced by George Washington.

During the eight years of Washington's presidency the struggle, while constantly sharpening, was held in some restraint by the President, whose authority among the masses was great, and who, while estranged from Jefferson, Paine and the other active democratic leaders, could never entirely forget their tremendously important role in founding the nation which he headed. But when in 1797 Washington was succeeded by John Adams all restraints upon Hamilton and the Federalist Party disappeared. Adams was a puppet in the hands of Hamilton, who controlled his Cabinet, taken over entire from Washington, through a secret party conspiracy. Hamilton in power rode hard and desperately to realize his dictatorial ambitions. In the four short years of Adams' term he unleashed the full fury of reaction. This was the period of the notorious Alien and Sedition Laws. Jefferson was patiently and stubbornly gathering the scattered forces of democracy into the new party. The very fury of Hamilton's offensive defeated his ends, and consolidated Jefferson's party, while disintegrating and preparing the downfall of his own. Apparently in complete control of all the agencies of the national government, with all the "substantial" citizens arrayed behind him, having betrayed his puppet, President Adams, and destroyed his authority to pave the way for naming one of his own close associates, Hamilton's schemes and his party were wrecked on the passions, greed and ambitions he had so recklessly unloosed. His own backers, especially

those speculators who had been enriched by Hamilton's financial policy, entered into a conspiracy to elect Aaron Burr to the presidency, in opposition to Hamilton's choice.

It is one of the few political services that Hamilton performed for his country that he steadfastly refused any association with Burr, sharply warned his party against that future traitor, and rather than submit to the conspiracy of his associates went down to defeat and retired from leadership of his party. For this service history must probably thank Hamilton's extreme arrogance and egotism as much as any political principles. His writings in this period had become incoherent and hysterical, and all the evidence indicates that he had lost his political bearings entirely. Jefferson was elected, after a long deadlock in the electoral college. Aaron Burr, according to the original constitutional theory, became vice-president. A few years later Hamilton fell before Burr's pistol in the famous duel that ended this historic political feud. The arrogant and powerful Federalist Party had fallen almost overnight. It never recovered. Going from bad to worse, it was soon to be involved in a series of treasonable conspiracies, including that of Burr, directed toward the dismemberment of the United States.

JEFFERSON AND THE SUPREME COURT

Jefferson and his party were in power. The Constitution, which had served to enthrone the counter-revolution of the privileged classes for twelve years, had failed its makers. The concessions won by the democratic masses in the first great fight over its adoption had left the door

open for the defeat of the reactionary party. Those who but a few short years before had been denounced by Washington himself as "subversive" were in control of Congress and the Executive.

But the Tories, though defeated, had no thoughts of surrender. They still had a powerful ace up their sleeve. The people had rejected them—but they still had the national judiciary, appointed for life and irremovable; especially, they had the Supreme Court. Not only that, but in the closing hours of their expiring administration they rushed a judiciary law, doubling the number of judges and courts, and issuing the certificates of office in the last moments before midnight of their last day in power. They had double-locked their control of the judicial power, apparently for a generation at least. It was one of the most shameless and brazen reactionary coups in American history. From that day to the present, the Supreme Court and the judiciary in general have been recognized by the privileged and property classes as their final and supreme stronghold, to maintain which they are ready to go to any length.

Jefferson's two entire administrations were carried through in constant struggle with the Supreme Court and the judiciary. The struggle continued long afterward, so long as the Jeffersonian tradition continued to dominate the government. Even though he followed up his first victory four years later with a smashing defeat of the Federalist Party, which was thoroughly discredited everywhere, the rejected Tories continued to hold the Courts in their hands, using them shameless-

ly as weapons of party struggle. It was not until ten years later, during Madison's first administration, that Jefferson was able to write:

"At length, then, we have a chance of getting a republican majority in the Supreme judiciary. For ten years that branch braved the spirit and will of the nation, after the nation had manifested its will by a complete reform in every branch depending upon them." (Letter to Wm. Gallatin, September 27, 1810.)

John Marshall, a leading Federalist, member of Adams' Cabinet, had been appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in the last days before Jefferson assumed office. He it was who molded that institution into an instrument of reaction which, in 1935 and 1936, could so arrogantly assume supreme power over Congress and legislation—and get away with it. But when Marshall took office, the Supreme Court was in low public esteem. He would never have dared assume the arrogance of Chief Justice Hughes, knowing that a political uprising of the aroused masses would have put an end once and for all to such pretensions. What he could not do directly, he proceeded to do by judicial trickery.

Jefferson, rightly indignant at the Federalists' packing of the courts after their defeat at the polls, had caused Congress to repeal that infamous measure, and refused to honor the notorious "midnight" judicial commissions. Marshall and his party were furious over this balking of their pretty scheme. It was a ruthless overriding of the Tory theory of the "inviolability" of the judiciary at the hands of democracy. They denounced the repeal as "unconstitutional." They played with the idea of having

the Supreme Court declaring it therefore invalid. Such a power is not granted in the Constitution, and in fact had been specifically rejected in the Constitutional Convention. But to the Tory mind it was an "implied power," a supreme power out of reach of the people, without which government was to them unthinkable. But, afraid of an open test of strength with the triumphant democracy, they abandoned their original intention for a more subtle road to the same end.

Choosing an obscure justice of a minor court, a certain Marbury, whose commission, granted by Adams and Marshall, had not been executed by Jefferson and Madison, they brought suit in the Supreme Court against Madison (Secretary of State) to compel the issuance of the commission, citing an existing law granting jurisdiction over such questions to the Supreme Court. Whereupon Marshall issued that historic decision upon which was later erected the whole structure of judicial dictatorship. He declared that Marbury was justified in his demand, that his commission had been wrongly withheld from him, but *refused his request* for a court order to enforce that right on grounds of *lack of jurisdiction*, declaring that the law passed by Congress creating that jurisdiction was itself unconstitutional and therefore void. Thus, the case was decided apparently *in favor* of Jefferson and his administration, but in reality affirming, in a form giving no opportunity for challenge, the power of the Supreme Court to annul acts of Congress.

This more than questionable doc-

trine, thus affirmed, stood upon such a flimsy foundation, was so alien to the American mind as dominated then and for years thereafter by the teachings of Jefferson, and was so fiercely attacked by Jefferson throughout his life that for over fifty years it was never again invoked in a major political issue. It was clear to all that any attempt to exercise this usurped power at that time would have caused a political upheaval and the shearing from the Supreme Court of its immunity from popular control. When, finally, in 1857, this doctrine was again invoked in a major political issue, in the Dred Scott Case, a revolutionary civil war was required to wipe out that decision and its consequences. It was only generations later, when the Supreme Court and the Tories found the democratic forces divided, that they dared to revive and apply this usurped power. And only in the past few years, when the country is in the deepest crisis of its history, the Supreme Court has found the desperate temerity to apply the judicial veto to a whole series of laws passed by Congress and affirmed at the polls by a renewed electoral mandate.

Jefferson was always outspoken in denouncing this usurpation of power by the judiciary. Here are a few of his typical expressions:

"Certainly there is not a word in the Constitution which has given that power to them more than to the executive or legislative branches." (Letter to W. H. Terrance, June 11, 1815.)

"The right they [the Supreme Court] usurp of exclusively explaining the Constitution." (Letter to Judge Roane, September 6, 1819.)

"A very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy." (Letter to Mr. Jarvis, September 28, 1820.)

"When the legislative or executive functionaries act unconstitutionally, they are responsible to the people in their elective capacity. The exemption of the judges from that is quite dangerous enough. I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves." (*Ibid.*)

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. . . . A judiciary independent of a king or executive alone is a good thing, but independence of the will of the nation is a solecism, at least in a republican government." (Letter to Thomas Ritchie, December 25, 1820.)

". . . The germ of the dissolution of our federal government is the constitution of the federal judiciary; an irresponsible body . . . working like gravity by night and by day . . . advancing its noiseless steps like a thief over the field of jurisdiction." (Letter to Mr. Hammond, August 18, 1821.)

"Let the future appointment of judges be for four or six years, and removable by the President and Senate." (Letter to Wm. T. Barry, July 2, 1822.)

These quotations, peculiarly enough, are not to be found in the popular histories. For access to the outspoken words of Jefferson, the student must dig into the libraries of collected works and original sources. And, of course, it is needless to say that for Al Smith, Carter Glass, and similar self-styled "Jeffersonian Democrats" of today, Jefferson's teachings about the Courts are to be carefully hidden. They have use for Jefferson's name only to cover up their own desperate Toryism which is the exact opposite to Jeffersonianism.

Chief Justice Marshall, next to Hamilton the chief hero of American

privileged classes, is extolled by them as the great protector of the Constitution and of national unity. This claim needs to be examined in the light of much-neglected historical facts which it is the merit of Mr. Bowers to bring out sharply. These facts are:

1. That Marshall, a fierce partisan, leader in his Federalist Party, was deep in the councils which plotted with the British to divide the United States, reclaiming the West and New England to the British Crown, as the only means of defeating the hated Jefferson and the Democrats;

2. That when Aaron Burr was caught in his treasonable expedition to separate the Louisiana Territory (which failed due to the double-treason of his chief military confederate, a United States Army General), it was Justice Marshall, presiding over Burr's trial, who secured his acquittal by a ruling which excluded the evidence in the hands of the government, a ruling which reversed a previous one of Marshall himself delivered not two months before, a ruling which has never been followed since by the Supreme Court or any other court in the world;

3. That while Burr was awaiting trial on the charge of treason, of which history has fully convicted him, Justice Marshall, knowing he would preside at the trial, openly attended a banquet given in honor of Burr by the treasonable circles of the Federalist Party aristocracy. Such a record is quite fitting for one of the chief founders of American Tory politics, but hardly squares with the boasts of the modern Hamiltonians of his loyalty to American independence and the Constitution.

SOME CONFUSION IN INTERPRETING
AMERICAN HISTORY

Much of the prevailing confusion among students of American history arises from the effort to interpret events as the working out of abstract conceptions and particular ideas in the world of reality. Real events refuse to fit into such schemes, for which the historians usually refuse to accept the blame, preferring to put the confusion to the account of history. A typical example is the effort to fit the history of the Constitution into the scheme of a struggle between state rights versus centralized national government, as the two constant poles of political struggle. In this idealistic conception, the name of Jefferson and the democratic camp is put forth as the classical champions of extreme state rights and the loosest form of national unity. Against Jefferson, the Federalist Party is supposed to have represented the principle of highest national centralization. Such a scheme, taken from a particular historical moment, is soon found in contradiction to the facts of a later moment; thus, the historian convicts the men who made history of "inconsistency"—"everybody is out of step but Jack (the historian)."

The facts are clear to everyone who can read the books of the same historians. Up until 1800, while the Federalists ruled the national government, the democratic camp headed by Jefferson fought against all their attempts to aggrandize their power, and played off the demands of local self-government against them. But when Jefferson's party came to power, and even long after Jefferson had retired

from office, by bringing the national government into harmony with the development of local democracy it largely reversed its attitude toward strengthening the national unity. Never before was such national unification achieved as under Jefferson, in his second election. And it was Jefferson who, to the horror of the Federalists, used the national power (in a way not provided by the Constitution) to secure to the United States the great territory of the Louisiana Purchase, and thus first opened up this nation to its continental perspectives, the highroad of national development. Those who had used national unity as an argument against Jefferson, the supposed champions of a strong central government—the Federalist Party—quickly became the plotters with foreign powers for dismemberment of the United States and the destruction of the Constitution, and the return of Louisiana Territory to foreign powers together with substantial sections of the original thirteen colonies.

The whole thing looks like a jig-saw puzzle when it is explained as the struggle between two hostile principles, in the abstract. But when we substitute living social and economic classes of men, and their interests, in place of these abstract principles; when we see these men voicing certain principles under one set of circumstances, and opposite principles under another; when we study these classes and interests in the first place, and the abstract principles only secondarily, then the chaos dissolves into a very definite and consistent picture. We see logic, consistency, and unifying principle which unite Jefferson's whole

career. He is fighting against vested interests and monopoly, and against financial control of government, for opening up the continent to the masses, and the fullest development of the economic life of the people as a whole, not merely of the rich and privileged. At one moment this called for opposition to the national government, at another for its unexampled use of power. If he had been true to abstract "principles," he would have betrayed his followers; being true to the people, he is accused by the historians of betraying the "principles" which they wish to use for interpreting history.

Similarly, it was the complete transformation of the country by the development of transport and industry, following the opening up of the continent for development, and the tremendous role played by the discovery of gold in the West, and the consequent "Gold Rush" that created an entirely new set of circumstances toward the middle of the nineteenth century, which again reshuffled the position of men and parties on all the abstract "principles" of Constitutional law.* A large part of the Democratic Party, and of the Whigs, revived the early-Jefferson "principles" for the emphatically anti-Jeffersonian purpose of extending slavery over the continent: the party of reaction, of the Tories, again came forward with the doctrine of state rights, masking their position with a hypocritical appeal to all the great founders of American democracy.

Again it was the Supreme Court

which was the last stronghold of Tory reaction within the Constitution; the notorious Dred Scott decision declared the American people without power to determine their own national destiny.* Again it was the forces of democracy, of the people, this time united with the rising industrialism of the North, which represented progress as opposed to the plantation-landlord slavery and their allies, that reasserted national unity and achieved it in four years of civil war, incidentally wiping out the slave system forever. Again it was demonstrated that national unity and a strong central government are not necessarily opposed to progress and democracy, but on the contrary may and do become essential instruments for their achievement.

* * *

We are now in the third great constitutional crisis, exemplified for the

* The decision in the Dred Scott case was handed down in 1857.

Dred Scott was a slave in Missouri whose owner took him to reside for a time in a free state and in free territory. Scott on this basis claimed his freedom after having moved back to Missouri. The Supreme Court decided that under the Constitution free Negroes could not be citizens and that the Congressional Act, the Missouri Compromise, prohibiting slavery in the Northwest Territory, was unconstitutional, because it deprived Southern citizens of their property if they moved into this territory. It was in this decision that Chief Justice Taney stated that the Negro has no rights which the white man is bound to respect.

As a result of this decision Congress from then on had no authority to regulate slavery in the great western territory extending south from Canada and west to the Pacific Ocean. In those states already admitted to the Union the regulation of slavery was under the jurisdiction of the individual states.—*Ed.*

* See quotation from Marx and Engels on pages 806-7 of this issue.—*Ed.*

moment by the fight around the Roosevelt proposal for reform of the Supreme Court. Again parties and men are being reshuffled in their relation to abstract "principles" of Constitutional law. Again we can find no clue to understanding the struggle in terms of these abstractions, nor in terms of old political labels. As in the previous great crises, the solution in all probability will require a new system of political parties, the old alignment having lost all meaning. Again we can understand the struggle, find our place in it, bring order out of chaos, only by seeing beyond and beneath all talk of abstract "principles" to the real forces which are struggling with one another—social and economic classes and groupings, in which the polar forces opposing each other are, on the one side Tory reaction—now materialized in finance capital, Wall Street, and the democratic camp of the people on the other side—now materialized in the organized labor movement, first of all the great movement of the Committee for Industrial Organization (C.I.O.) and the progressive movements led by middle-class figures within the old parties.

The modern crisis finds many of the social groupings formerly associated with progress, now occupying an extreme reactionary position. This has always been true, and will be so long as we are dealing with the development of a society based upon classes. A great part of the population are in the midst of political change and regrouping, which they understand only dimly or not at all. Individuals and groups grope their way blindly, sometimes on one side of the fight, then on

another. But in each of the main camps there is emerging a more or less stable core, with growing consciousness of what the struggle is about. On the democratic side today, this more conscious center is the progressive labor movement. The new alignment will draw the whole population before long into two main camps, which will constitute in essence two entirely new political parties. The reactionary side will be the American equivalent of Europe's fascism, the democratic and progressive side will be America's equivalent of the People's Front.

PLACE OF THE COMMUNISTS AND THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM

We Communists know quite well where is our place in this realignment of our country's political life. We know we belong in the camp of democracy and progress, as the most conscious and loyal fighters and organizers of the fight against reaction and fascism. We belong with the People's Front.

The program of the People's Front does not include the establishment of socialism. In the material aspect of our country's development it is fully and adequately prepared for socialism, the common ownership and operation by all the people of our country's unexampled economic heritage for the benefit of the whole people. But we also know that the overwhelming majority of the people, including the working class, does not yet understand the necessity, the inevitability, of socialism. The Tory camp, the reactionaries and fascists, the camp of Wall Street, have a well-defined program which would, by speculating

upon the ignorance and prejudices of the masses concerning socialism, and by making it seem a fearful thing to them, stampede the population onto the paths of reaction and fascism, to the destruction of the democratic and progressive heritage of our country. That is why we, as the Party of socialism, as the best exponents of socialism, as the Party of those who will lead in the building of socialism, declare the first necessity of our country's political development is the creation of the People's Front to guarantee against the victory of reaction and fascism in America.

We of the Communist Party never did and never will hold to a program of forcible establishment of socialism against the will of the people. While the majority of the people, and above all of the working class, do not yet accept the program of socialism, our program of socialist reconstruction of society is a matter for educational work to win the majority, while our practical and immediate political work is to be in the forefront in the organization of the majority of the workers and of the people generally, against the reactionary menace to their rights and interests, for a program of betterment of their lives such as the majority is ready to accept and fight for now—the program of the People's Front. If our understanding of history is correct, this is the surest and least difficult road to winning the majority for socialism in the long run. Those who do not believe in socialism have no reason, on account of our understanding of history, to fear our collaboration with them in the People's Front; if they believed with us that history itself will reinforce the

Communist Party program they would either join our Party or the fascists. So long as they think a democratic and progressive road short of socialism is possible, and will fight for it, they have the guarantee of our loyal cooperation so long as the majority of the people agree with them.

A hundred and fifty years have passed since the American Constitution was drafted. The world today presents a far different picture than in those early years of our national history. The struggle against fascism and for the extension of democracy is of worldwide significance. When we speak of the changes that have occurred throughout the world, we are most strongly reminded of the new Stalin Constitution which has been adopted in the Soviet Union, and whose foundations rest on the construction of a new social order, where capitalism has been abolished and socialism successfully established.

The Constitution which has gone into effect in the Soviet Union "proceeds from the fact of the abolition of the capitalist system, from the fact of the victory of the socialist system in the U.S.S.R."*

Stalin stated in his report on the Constitution:

"Bourgeois constitutions usually limit themselves to recording the formal rights of citizens without concerning themselves about the conditions of exercising these rights, about the possibility of exercising them, the means of exercising them. They speak about equality of citizens, but forget that real equality between master and workman, between landlord and peasant, is impossible if the former enjoy wealth and political weight in society, while the latter are de-

* *Stalin on the New Soviet Constitution*, p. 15, International Publishers, New York. 2 cents.

prived of both; if the former are exploiters and the latter are exploited."*

The material prerequisites for real democracy have been established in the Soviet Union because exploiting classes and nations have given way to a socialist society of equal nations and races. Democracy in the Soviet Union has more reality than is conceivably possible under capitalism because the right to a job and the right to leisure are maintained and guaranteed by the existence of socialism.

Thus, on a worldwide scale, as fascism drives to destroy democracy, not only in Spain and China, but throughout the world, the Soviet Union, under its new Constitution, gives an unbreakable weapon to the masses who are fighting fascism in every land. The Soviet Constitution records what has been achieved in the U.S.S.R., namely, the construction of a socialist society. For the masses throughout the world, the Soviet Constitution is a program showing the way to the logical and most extensive application of democratic principles.

In forging a solid People's Front against reaction and fascism, a great role can and must be played by a revived and deepened understanding of the history of our country, and the wealth of revolutionary traditions with which it abounds. Far too long have we been neglectful of it. We have only begun its serious study, and its serious dissemination among the masses is hardly even begun. We are far too little armed with even the facts of this history, and our interpretation of it is still inexpert and un-

satisfactory. The anti-socialist progressives and the open reactionaries have far more command of historical fact than we, though it must be said they have grave difficulties in making use of this weapon effectively. We have something, however, that all others lack, the key to unlock these great treasures, in the scientific study of history, historical materialism, founded by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and Stalin. With this key, even our first tentative approaches to American history transforms it into a living thing, full of meat and meaning for today, throwing light and understanding upon every problem which our country faces at this time.

History marches toward socialism. The deep truth of this is witnessed by the way in which every honest and serious historical study of America, even by non-socialists, serves to give material to, and build a foundation for, the position of the Party of socialism, the Communist Party, for its practical program for the present day and for its ultimate aim of a completely socialized America. "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism."

* * *

[NOTE: *Following is the quotation referred to on page 803:*]

Marx and Engels in the *Neue Rheinische Revue*, on January, 1850, wrote the following:

"The most important event that has occurred here, more important even than the February Revolution, is the discovery of the California gold mines. Even now, scarcely eighteen months later, it can be foreseen that this discovery will have much more magnificent results than even the discovery of America. For three hundred and thirty years, the entire trade of Europe to the Pacific

* *Ibid.*

Ocean was conducted with the most touching patience around the Cape of Good Hope or Cape Horn. All proposals for cutting through the Isthmus of Panama came to naught because of the stupid jealousy of the trading nations. The Californian gold mines have been discovered for eighteen months now, and the Yankees have already begun a railroad, a great highway, a canal from the Gulf of Mexico; already steamboats are plying regularly from New York to Chagres, from Panama to San Francisco; already the trade of the Pacific Ocean is concentrating in Panama and the voyage around Cape Horn is antiquated.

"A coast thirty degrees latitude long, one of the most beautiful and fruitful in the world, hitherto as good as uninhabited, is transformed at sight into a rich, civilized land, thickly populated by people of all races, from the Yankee to the Chinaman, from the Negro to the Indian and Malayan, from the Creole and Mestizo to the European. California gold pours out in streams over America and the Asiatic coast of the Pacific Ocean, and sweeps the obstinate barbarian peoples into world trade, into civilization.

"For the second time, world trade receives a new direction. What Tyre, Carthage and Alexandria were in antiquity, Venice and Genoa in the Middle Ages, what hitherto London and Liverpool have been, emporiums of world trade, New York and San Francisco, San Juan de Nicaragua and Leon, Chagres and Panama are becoming now. The center of gravity of world commerce, in the Middle Ages Italy, in more recent times England,

is now the southern half of the North American Peninsula. The industry and trade of old Europe must make a tremendous exertion if it does not wish to fall into the same decay as the industry and trade of Italy since the sixteenth century, if England and France are not to become the same as Venice, Genoa and Holland are today.

"In a few years, we shall have a regular steam-packet line from England to Chagres, from Chagres and San Francisco to Sidney, Canton and Singapore. Thanks to Californian gold and the indefatigable energy of the Yankees, both coasts of the Pacific Ocean will soon be just as populated, just as open for trade, just as industrial as is now the coast from Boston to New Orleans. Then the Pacific Ocean will play the same role that now the Atlantic plays, and in antiquity the Mediterranean Sea—the role of the great water-highway of world commerce; and the Atlantic Ocean will sink to the role of an inland sea as is now played by the Mediterranean.

"The only chance, then, for the European civilized countries not to fall into the same industrial, commercial and political dependence in which Italy, Spain and Portugal now find themselves lies in a social revolution which, as long as there is still time, transforms the method of production and distribution in accord with the needs of production itself proceeding from the modern productive forces, and thereby makes possible the creation of new productive forces which secure the superiority of European industry and thus equalize the disadvantages of its geographical position."

THE VANGUARD ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

ON THE OCCASION OF THE EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE C.P.U.S.A.

BY ALEX BITTELMAN

I. THE VANGUARD ROLE OF THE C.P.

IT DOES not require much investigation for us to see that never in the history of the Party was the situation so favorable as it is today for the Communist Party to function successfully as the vanguard of the working class. And for the following reasons: the working class is in motion. It is organizing economically and politically. It has come into life as a class, becoming a leading political factor in the country and reaching out for correct relations with its allies among the farmers, city middle classes and Negroes.

And where does our Party find itself in relation to these big progressive movements of the working class and of the people? Not outside but inside, in the very thick of them; not as observers but as active participants; not in conflict with these movements but as close collaborators. Clearly, this is a most favorable position from which to build the Party as the true vanguard of the working class. Never as yet has our Party found itself in such a favorable position.

This, of course, did not come about automatically. Given the objective

conditions which characterize the present situation, nationally and internationally, it was our correct line and the struggle for it among the masses that placed our Party in this position. It was our correct struggle for unity of the working class and for the People's Front that brought the Party to this advanced position.

Is it true, then, or is it not true that the present position of our Party in the mass movements of the working class and its allies is most favorable for the fulfilment of our historic role as the vanguard, for the building up of our Party as the true advanced detachment of the American working class? It is absolutely true. The whole previous history of our Party has prepared us for that. I refer especially to the following: our constant devotion and loyalty to the class interests of the workers and their allies; our self-sacrificing struggles in defense of these interests; loyalty to our revolutionary principles, to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin under all and every circumstance; our pioneering work in all fields of working class organization and struggle; similar historic pioneering activities among the Negroes, farmers, women

and youth; our struggle against opportunism and sectarianism in our own midst; our readiness to admit errors and to correct them publicly and with the help of our class; our devotion and loyalty to our Party and to the Communist International—to its principles, discipline and leadership—all these vital achievements and experiences in the history of our Party, which we placed at the service of the line of the Seventh World Congress, for the struggle for the united and People's Front, have helped to bring about the present forward march of labor as well as to place our Party in the present favorable position in the mass movements.

Favorable in what sense? In the sense of being able to render *greater* service to our class and to our people in the struggle against their exploiters; in the sense of being a *more* effective force in the struggle for the unity of the working class and for the People's Front against reaction, fascism and war; in the sense of being able to help *the whole class* and its allies to proceed from lower to higher stages of struggle and to the socialist revolution; in the sense, in short, of building up our Party as the true revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

How does the Party build itself as the vanguard of the working class? Comrade Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism** gives us the answer to the question. He says: "The Party must absorb all the best elements of the working class, their experience, their revolutionary spirit and their un-

bounded devotion to the cause of the proletariat." (P. 38.)

That means, first, *recruiting*. Without day-by-day recruiting by which we seek to absorb into our midst "all the best elements of the working class," our Party cannot become the vanguard. He who talks about the Party being the vanguard but does not exert himself to stimulate and help recruiting is merely a phrasemonger and a chatterer.

That means, second, to cultivate and enrich the experience, the revolutionary spirit and proletarian devotion of the new members. The Party builds itself as the vanguard of the class only by absorbing continually the experience, the revolutionary spirit and proletarian devotion of the new members which it recruits. We continually seek new members because we want more of this experience, spirit and devotion. New members have a good deal to contribute to the building of the Party as the vanguard, that is, when we recruit the best elements of the working class. Therefore, we must create for the new members the most favorable conditions to transmit to the Party their experience, their revolutionary spirit, and to demonstrate their proletarian devotion. And *on this basis* we undertake to transmit to them our experience, our principles, our theory.

In other words, recruiting (without which there is no building of the Party as the vanguard) is not a mere formal act of bringing in a new member, but is a process of absorbing his experiences and revolutionary spirit, thus enriching the Party's own experience and revolutionary spirit, and, at the same time, of enabling the

* *Foundations of Leninism*, by Joseph Stalin. New York, International Publishers. 10 cents.

new member to absorb the Party's experience, its traditions, its theory, principles and organizational practices.

This is the most fundamental way of building the Party as the vanguard of the working class, that is, by absorbing *continually* all its best elements, their experience, revolutionary spirit and proletarian devotion.

Are the circumstances today more favorable or less for such work? More favorable, of course. Why? Because the best elements of the working class are coming forward now by the thousands in all the big mass movements (which was not the case when the working class was not as actively in motion, as today), you can literally point these people out with your finger; because, being in the midst of these mass movements and in the front lines, we are daily rubbing shoulders with these people, associating with them, working with them in all fields, gaining their confidence; and because, finally, the prestige of Communism and of the Communist Party is growing day by day.

Hence the conditions are most favorable for recruiting the best elements of the working class and thus building the Party as the vanguard.

How do we fulfil the role of vanguard? Comrade Stalin formulates two fundamental Leninist principles governing this question. I shall quote them.

"1. The Party must be armed with a revolutionary theory, with a knowledge of the laws of the movement, with a knowledge of the laws of revolution. Without this it will be impotent to guide the struggle of the proletariat and to lead the proletariat. The Party cannot be a real Party if it limits itself to registering what the masses of the work-

ing class think or experience, if it drags along at the tail of the spontaneous movement, if it does not know how to overcome the inertness and the political indifference of the spontaneous movement, or if it cannot rise above the transient interests of the proletariat, if it cannot raise the masses to the level of the class interests of the proletariat." (P. 38.)

Stated even more concisely:

"The Party must take its stand at the head of the working class, it must see ahead of the working class, lead the proletariat and not trail behind the spontaneous movement." (*Ibid.*)

"2. It must at the same time be a unit of the *class*, be part of that class, intimately bound to it with every fiber of its being. The distinction between the vanguard and the main body of the working class, between Party members and non-Party workers, will continue as long as classes exist, as long as the proletariat continues to replenish its ranks with newcomers from other classes, as long as the working class as a whole lacks the opportunity of raising itself to the level of the vanguard. But the Party would cease to be a party if this distinction were widened into a rupture; if it were to isolate itself and break away from the non-Party masses. The Party cannot lead the class if it is not connected with the non-Party masses, if there is no close union between the Party and the non-Party masses, if these masses do not accept its leadership, if the Party does not enjoy moral and political authority among the masses." (*Ibid.*)

There is nothing to add to these principles. They have stood the test of time and have proven invulnerable. What has to be discussed at vital turns in the class struggle is the *concrete ways* in which these principles can find their best and most effective expression. These concrete ways are not always the same. They depend upon many factors, among them the maturity of the class struggle, the relation of class forces, the degree of

“moral and political authority” which the Party enjoys among the masses, etc. Taking this into consideration, the Seventh World Congress defined these concrete ways of realizing the vanguard role of the Party as follows:

“The Congress emphasizes with particular stress that only *the further all-round consolidation of the Communist Parties themselves*, the development of their initiative, the carrying out of a policy based upon Marxian-Leninist principles, and the application of correct flexible tactics, which take into account the concrete situation and the alignment of class forces, can ensure the mobilization of the widest masses of toilers for the united struggle against fascism, against capitalism.”

Let me draw your attention to the essentials of this very important statement on the concrete ways of building the vanguard *in the present period*.

(a) Party initiative; (b) policies based on Marxist-Leninist principles; (c) correct flexible tactics, *taking into account the concrete situation and alignment of class forces*; (d) the aim being the mobilization of *the widest masses* of toilers for the united struggle against fascism, against capitalism.

This is our guide. First comes Party initiative. This is fundamental. Without it, there can be no building of the revolutionary vanguard, there can be no mass mobilization of the widest scope for the fight against fascism and capitalism. This means that we continually have to discover the best policies for the mobilization of the masses for this struggle and to bring these policies to the mass movements and to win them for these policies.

* *Resolutions, Seventh Congress of the Communist International*, p. 36. New York. Workers Library Publishers. 10 cents.

This is the duty of every Party organization and of the Party as a whole.

Second, we must initiate *correct* policies. Initiative is good provided it produces good policy and good policy is one that mobilizes the widest masses of toilers for united struggle against reaction, fascism and capitalism. To be so, policy has to be based on Marxist-Leninist principles.

Third, good policy brought to the masses by Party initiative is good for the masses and good for the vanguard. Yet this alone is not enough. Just as good initiative can be ruined by bad policy, so good policy can be ruined by bad tactics. To prevent this, we need correct flexible tactics. This, however, is not and cannot be given once and for all because correct flexible tactics must take into account “the concrete situation and alignment of class forces.” These, as we know, vary and change and hence tactics must vary and change. It is therefore incumbent upon every Communist and Party organization to be constantly alive to the problem of “correct flexible tactics” because this is just as decisive as timely initiative and good policy. In fact, when these two are given, correct flexible tactics will decide everything. And remember: to be correct and flexible, tactics must take account of the *concrete* situation and of the alignment of class forces.

Compare, for example, some of our policies and tactics prior to the Seventh World Congress and subsequently. During the years prior to the Seventh Congress, we fulfilled our role as vanguard by propagating the final aims of our Party, by pointing out the next steps in the daily mass struggle for partial demands and by

independently organizing masses of toilers to fight for these demands, independently, that is, from those mass organizations of the workers and other toilers in which the reformists were successful in preventing the workers from struggling and expelling the militant forces from the organization. We fought for the united front all through these years but, because the objective conditions were not as favorable, because of our sectarian habits and practices, and because of the splitting tactics of the reformist leaders, we were making relatively little headway in bringing about the united front. But we couldn't, because of that, give up the fight and capitulate to capitalism as the reformists did. This we never will do. We will always defend the interests of the masses against their exploiters, regardless of the forms and methods which conditions may dictate. We were forced to lead minority movements and minority struggles.

Thus, in the former period, we resorted as a rule to the tactic of organizing mass struggles independently, of leading them largely ourselves and of raising the movements from lower to higher levels at a comparatively fast tempo.

On the whole, barring the sectarian and Right opportunist errors which distorted this line and militated against its greater success, this was a correct tactic. It laid the groundwork in part for the present advance of the mass movements. It helped prepare many of its cadres. It popularized many of our slogans which in the past were either slogans of agitation or demands of minority movements and struggles but which are today slogans

of action of large mass movements (unemployment relief, organize the unorganized into industrial unions, trade union unity, Negro rights, farmer demands, youth demands, independent working class political action, alliance with farmers and middle classes, etc.). It served as a check upon the capitalist offensive in many crucial instances and also as a check upon the extent and scope to which reactionary reformists were able to betray the masses. It actually succeeded directly and indirectly in securing important concessions for the masses from the exploiters. It—this tactic of independent leadership—strengthened our Party and prepared us for the vanguard role in the present period.

Those who would negate in our past not only the sectarian and Right opportunist errors but also our struggles against these errors and with that would cancel our achievements in helping to bring about the birth of the American working class as a class—the propaganda of revolutionary socialism and the leadership of minority movements and struggles—those who would knowingly want to do that are in danger of ceasing to be good Communists nor would they be dependable fighters for the vanguard role of our Party in the present situation.

What is the situation today? The working class is moving. The masses are moving. The unity of the working class and the People's Front is being cemented in the heat of major economic and political struggles. The objective conditions and our past struggles are moving the masses forward. And we are in the very midst of it all. Where thousands would rally

around our slogans in the past, hundreds of thousands are doing it today. From this, certain important tactical changes had to follow. We are now in a position to place before ourselves tasks of major magnitude in the struggle for the united front and for the People's Front. Instead of being forced to lead minority movements and struggles independently, we are getting into a position of collaborating with big progressive majority movements of the working class and its allies, of actively participating in these movements and establishing ourselves as a vanguard of the class. For the first time in the history of the United States, the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat—the Communists—are able to begin to function within the class and its mass movements in the way in which *The Communist Manifesto* envisaged it, namely:

“They have no interests apart from those of the working class as a whole. . . . The Communists are practically the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; and 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 movements.”*

This is the way in which we have begun to function and to build ourselves as the vanguard of our class. The present way differs in many essential respects from the old way. And necessarily so. As a rule we seek to fulfill our function as vanguard within

and in the front lines of the mass movements of our class and its allies, in line with the policy of the united and People's Front, instead of being forced (as in the past) to lead by ourselves minority movements and struggles. This is clearly more advantageous to the class, as well as to ourselves as its vanguard. It is more advantageous for the needs of the day, as well as for the ultimate socialist liberation.

At first glance it might appear as though the tempo of transition from lower to higher stages of class struggle must necessarily be slowed down because of the new relationship between the revolutionary vanguard and the mass movements. This is not absolutely so. The tempo of transition need not necessarily be slowed down if the relationship of class forces continues, nationally and internationally, in a direction favorable to our camp. But even if, at one point or another, this tempo of transition from lower to higher stages of struggle should have to slow down as compared with past years, this would be only *relative*; because in compensation for that we would have the decisive fact that the transition, when made, would be made not only by ourselves and minority movements led by us, but by great mass movements, *by the class*. In other words, not only minorities would be marching forward, but the decisive sections of our class and its allies. In the past we could dream of that, propagate the idea and unfold the perspective; today it has become a practical task and a practical possibility.

Does it follow from that that in the present situation, with the new rela-

* *The Communist Manifesto*, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. New York, International Publishers. 5 cents.

tionship stressed so well by Comrade Dimitroff in his May Day statement, the Communists should permit themselves to become dissolved in the mass movements, should cease to function within them as Communists and Marxists, should cease building the Communist Party? Does it follow that the Communist Party and its organizations have no independent activities to carry on aside from the activities of Communists as participants of the mass movements? Of course not. Such conclusions have nothing in common with Communism. Recall once more the two principles of Stalin governing the role of the vanguard. *With the class and at the head of it.* The June meeting of the Central Committee has concretized these principles fully in application to the present situation. It warned against the danger of dissolution and indicated the ways of guarding against it. The plenum resolution puts it to us:

"Working on the basis of this democratic People's Front platform, the Communist Party should in no way lose its identity or slacken in the task of strengthening its role as the most advanced and revolutionary section of the People's Front movement. This means that, in the midst of these mass movements, the Communist Party membership and organizations, must:

"(a) Build the Communist Party into a mass Party;

"(b) Carry on mass propaganda for its final aims of working class power and socialism.

"(c) As the vanguard of the mass movement, point out the next steps of the struggle, initiating and supporting the progressive demands of the movement."

In broad outline, Comrade Dimitroff elucidates the same task as follows:

"When we carry on a resolute struggle for the defense of democratic rights and liberties, against reaction and fascism, we do so as Marxists, as consistent proletarian revolutionaries and not as bourgeois democrats or reformists. Where we come forward in defense of the national interests of our own people, in defense of their independence and liberty, we do not become nationalists or bourgeois patriots; we do so as proletarian revolutionaries and true sons of our people. When we come forward in defense of religious freedom, against the fascist persecution of believers, we do not retreat from our Marxian outlook, which is free of all religious superstitions."

Thus we have the correct answer to the task of building our Party as the true vanguard of the working class in the struggle for the united front and People's Front, for the struggle against reaction, fascism and capitalism.

II. RECRUITING AND DAILY WORKER CIRCULATION

Recruiting is a central, fundamental and permanent task. It is a task of each individual Party member as well as of each Party organization. We must begin to measure the usefulness of a Party member and of a Party organization by the quality and quantity of recruiting that they are carrying on.

The same must be said of *Daily Worker* circulation. This has to be said especially in New York, where the Party's central organ is located and where we must look for the main source of our paper's circulation. A self-critical estimate will produce the admission that the New York Party organization has woefully underestimated the importance of building the *Daily Worker*.

Both of these activities, recruiting

and circulation, are fundamental phases of Party building. This is so plain that one feels embarrassed to have to argue for it. Yet the need for persuasion and argument is still with us. I hope the time is coming when it will no longer be necessary to argue the vital importance of recruiting and *Daily Worker* circulation.

First, some important aspects of recruiting and *retaining* new Party members. Let us retain firmly in our minds that recruiting means, in Comrade Stalin's words, to "absorb the best elements of the working class. their experience, their revolutionary spirit, their unbounded devotion to the cause of the proletariat." Wherever they are, whatever they do, Party members must seek to attract to themselves these best elements, to win their confidence and respect, to bring them into the Party, to see to it that these new members are surrounded with most favorable conditions for transmitting to the Party the best that is in them as well as to receive from the Party all the best that we can give.

The surest way to accomplish these results is to be a good Communist in the mass movements; to be the best member of these movements, most devoted and self-sacrificing, most helpful, most experienced, most politically mature. In short, an advanced fighter. This is basic. When this is done, our comrades will continue to gain the confidence of the best elements of the mass movements. Without such confidence, recruiting will be difficult. But confidence in Communists by non-Party workers does not automatically produce new members. Some of our people may think so, but they are mistaken. Confidence gained by Party

members among non-Party workers creates the prerequisites for successful recruiting but not recruiting itself. This has to be carried on, consciously, deliberately, planfully, and in an organized way, by the individual Party member under the direction and control of Party organizations.

There are a number of negative methods and characteristics of approach that are today militating against successful recruiting and retaining of new members. Comrade Browder has spoken repeatedly on some of these negative habits and attitudes of old Party members. I should like merely to list them. You will recognize them at once, and you will agree that these are negative and harmful attitudes.

Here is a partial list: vanity; boastfulness; we know it all, the non-Party worker knows nothing or very little; a wholesale, mechanical approach to all non-Party workers instead of an individual and differentiated one; disregard of individual traits of character; an over-exaggerated air of secrecy, something that might be called an "illegality" complex; failure to consider the family position of the non-Party worker and how that may affect his coming into and remaining in the Party; insufficient regard to the ability of the Party candidate or new member to fulfil the financial obligations arising from Party membership; a good deal of indifference to the development of a politically rich and interesting inner life in our units; lack of encouragement of the initiative of the new Party member (and of the old one), lack of proper attention to and respect for his views and proposals, and not enough systematic de-

THE COMMUNIST

velopment of inner Party democracy; and last, but not least, the off-hand manner of making assignments without due regard to the inclinations, abilities, experience or circumstances of the comrades.

Such negative habits, sectarianism of the worst kind, still exist among many Party members and functionaries. And can there be any doubt that these are in part responsible for the slow rate of recruiting and for the high rate of fluctuation? No doubt at all. It is therefore imperative that each Party comrade, especially leading ones and functionaries, examine themselves from this angle. Have you got some of these bad habits? Do you practice some of these impermissible approaches? If so, take them under observation, check them, and work upon yourself to eliminate them from your system. It will make of you a better Communist, more liked and more respected by Party and non-Party workers alike. It will surely help recruiting and reduce fluctuation.

Let no one get the impression that we are urging Communists to display a false and hypocritical humility, or to behave like blushing violets. What we urge upon the comrades at this moment is to give life and blood to the words of Stalin that recruiting means absorbing into the Party the best elements of the working class, their experience, their revolutionary spirit, their devotion to the cause of the proletariat. A new Party member, or a candidate for membership, is not a dead number to be added by way of arithmetic to the numbers already on the Party rolls. Numbers are of tremendous importance. We want numbers. We want a numerically strong

Party—a hundred thousand, two hundred thousand—as a practical perspective and possibility. But we will not get these numbers, and we will not retain them even if we do get them to apply for membership, if we view them merely as numbers. I think practice has proven that already. The high and continuous fluctuation is proof.

A candidate for membership is a living worker, with valuable experience, with revolutionary spirit, with devotion to the cause of the proletariat. That's why we want him or her in our Party. This means we have something precious to learn from these people. Does that mean that we have nothing to teach them? The Party has a whole lot to teach them and to give them. That's why they want to come in. But they also have a lot to teach us and to give us. And this is the point I am trying to make now especially.

Naturally, this question of recruiting the fluctuation is a matter to be handled not only by each individual Communist adopting correct attitudes and approaches to the non-Party workers and to the new members, decisive as that is. It is the Party organization as such that *must improve all its organizational methods and conditions* as called for by the resolution of the June meeting of our Central Committee. This resolution you want to restudy very carefully. You will find in it the weapon you need at the present time for effectively arousing and mobilizing the Party for the task of building itself in the process of struggle for the unity of the working class and for the People's Front against reaction and fascism.

Secondly, on some aspects of *Daily*

Worker circulation. You have begun to build it. The problem is to extend and intensify this work.

Need I say here that we have today one of the best newspapers in the country? There was a time when we couldn't say that, but now we can. That does not mean that there is no more room for improvement. No. There is plenty of room. And the help and urging that you can give for further improvement will be more than welcome.

We have to improve the political initiative and fighting qualities of the paper; we have to enrich, make more popular and attractive the educational features of the paper—in economics, politics, culture, etc.; we must have more theoretical articles; more effective advocacy of our final revolutionary aims; we must have more leadership by the *Daily* in the work of Party building, this being a central point; more attention to Negro struggles, and farmers, etc. The *Daily Worker* has such a program of improvement. As we go along, we shall have to provide for more adequate treatment of the life in New York City and state (all phases), and also of the regions nearest New York, such as Jersey, Connecticut, New England and especially Pennsylvania. But is it not clear that a greatly increased circulation, in New York and vicinity, will make sure that these improvements can be made to the extent necessary?

There is all too little evidence that you, comrades, feel sufficiently your obligations to the building of the *Daily Worker* circulation. If I am wrong, you will correct me. But from

the facts as known, this is the impression that one is bound to get.

What is today the main problem in extending the *Daily* circulation? It is, in my judgment, the problem of making the wide masses acquainted with the *Daily Worker*. Just find ways and means of bringing the *Daily* to these wider masses, so that they get to know that there is such a paper as ours, and you have solved a good part of the task. If we could spend as much as bourgeois papers do for promotion and advertisement, our task would be much easier. But we can't. Hence, the Party membership and organizations must undertake to do the job, supplemented by as much promotion as the *Daily Worker* itself can and must do.

Again, I say: we have a good newspaper. It can be sold. *But it has to be sold.* And the New York Party bears the major responsibility for that.

Another aspect of *Daily Worker* circulation, and one that is quite often overlooked, is the role our paper plays in making friends for the Party and thus even indirectly paving the way for recruiting. It is no exaggeration to say that the *Daily Worker* is our best recruiting agent and with improvement in its handling of Party building, we can make the *Daily* the most effective Party builder—provided, however, that the *Daily Worker* gets into the hands, day by day, of larger masses. The *Daily Worker* becomes a power only when it is read by the masses. One of our major tasks is to bring it to the masses. That is why the June meeting of the Central Committee coupled organically the two tasks: recruiting and *Daily Worker* circulation. They are two

phases of one task. And in this manner it must be handled.

III. INDEPENDENT ACTIVITIES BY THE PARTY

Because our major policy today is the united and People's Front, some comrades may have gotten the notion that there is no room or need for any independent activities by the Party. What is worse, many Party organizations actually display insufficient independent activity. This, comrades, is bad. It hurts the united and People's Front. It militates against the building of our Party into a mass Bolshevik Party. Concretely: its militates against more successful recruiting as well as against building *Daily Worker* circulation.

A few examples will be helpful.

The economic struggles of the workers are carried on by the unions, of which the Communists are an inseparable part. We do not, at the present time, organize economic struggles in the industries independently of the unions, or in opposition to leaders who practise class collaborationism and reformism. We do not do it, because the masses are in motion, because reformism can no longer keep the masses in check. The masses are becoming more class conscious, they are being organized into powerful unions—majority movements—of which we are a part, and in which we are doing our duty as class-conscious workers and Communists. It is the working out of our fundamental policy of the unity of the working class and of the united front.

That does not mean, however, that Party organizations as such should

cease to do all in their power to support the struggles led by the unions, to rally support of the working class generally for such struggles, to rally the support of farmers and middle classes. But as a matter of fact, many Party organizations behave as though they thought that they had nothing to do in the matter *as Party organizations*. Just review the recent activities of your own Party units and sections from the point of view of the supporting actions organized by them during the strikes in the auto industry, in steel, in the marine industry, in the shipyards, etc. And if you do so, you will find that they have done very little.

Then review the Party organizations from another angle. How much have they done in connection with these economic struggles *to educate the masses politically*, in their respective territories and shops and industries, on the political significance of these strikes, the role of reaction, the role of the Roosevelt administration, and the role of the local and state administrations, pointing out the need of a united People's Front and how to work for it? Very little has been done on that. Yet this is one of our main tasks as the vanguard: to make the masses conscious of their struggles, the class nature of these struggles, and the political lessons and conclusions to be drawn from them, all of which must lead to winning the masses for our political line. When our Party organizations do not fulfil this task, they do not function fully as Communist organizations.

Another example is the campaign for Supreme Court reform. The Party correctly decided to support the pro-

posals of Roosevelt, even though they were only partial, and to work among the masses, to rally organized support for Roosevelt's measure and to popularize our full position on curbing the Supreme Court. Here was an obligation and opportunity for the Party organizations. How much have they made of it? The answer is, very little.

Take the Scottsboro campaign in its most recent phase. The Party as a whole was very deeply and actively in it, through the Communists in the International Labor Defense and through the Scottsboro Defense Committee. But how much supporting and educational activity have Party units and sections carried on in the recent phase? I mean activities that would mobilize the masses in support of the concrete measures of the Scottsboro Defense Committee and educate the masses to the Communist position on the Negro question generally and especially on the Party policy of building a Negro People's Front. How much of such activities have the Party organizations carried on? Very little.

Or take the rise of vigilante bands. Our policy, as made known publicly, is to help bring about joint action by labor, the middle classes and the farmers, through local anti-vigilante conferences, for common action to combat this vigilante outbreak. Our policy is *that the decisive sections* of these groups should come together for this purpose, and not only the most advanced organizations. But for this we must agitate, we must convince the masses of the need of it. Yes, we must mobilize pressure of mass public opinion to convince certain leaders of mass movements to undertake such united action against vigilantism. We

cannot say that Party organizations have carried on such activities of the necessary scope and intensity.

One could list many more examples (Spain, peace, China), but the above are sufficient to illustrate the point that the Party organizations are not fulfilling their task satisfactorily in the matter of initiative, in the organization of independent actions under Party auspices. The immediate results are obvious. They are two: (1) The united front mass movements are not receiving the necessary aid and stimulation from the vanguard Party and thus they are not growing as strong as they could; (2) The Party organizations as such do not appear sufficiently before the masses as independent bodies and thus Party building is hampered, its vanguard role is not sufficiently displayed.

Seeking apparently to avoid "independent" actions of the wrong kind (and there may be such), some Party comrades tend to hesitate in the whole matter of independent actions, even good and needed ones. Surely, independent actions by Party organizations *in conflict* with united front movements, in *opposition* to them—such actions our policy excludes without qualifications. And those, if there are such, who tend to favor this kind of independent action had better re-study the Party's main policies and practices. But to reject independent actions altogether is a bad mistake.

We should say this: independent actions of a *supporting* character (not opposing or conflicting) to the activities of the united front mass movements; independent actions of a *stimulating* character (not to be confused with a provoking and disorgan-

izing character) to the mass movements; independent actions of an *educational*, politically enlightening, character, which would draw the class lessons before the masses from their daily struggles in the mass movements; independent actions designed to bring before the masses our Party's *initiative* in the formulation of policies and demands which we seek to have the mass movements adopt; *such* independent actions our Party organizations must engage in *always*. I am not speaking here of the manner and conditions under which our Party engages in such independent activities as placing its own candidates on the ballot in election struggles. This is governed clearly in Party resolutions and decisions. But even where we have no Party candidates as such, where we succeed in helping to bring about farmer-labor and other People's Front formations, as in our main policy, the field is broad for independent Party activity—to bring before the masses the face of the Party, its political line and its revolutionary aims.

The resolution of the June meeting of our Central Committee is clear and outspoken on this question. It says:

"As the vanguard of the mass movement, point out the next steps of the struggle, initiating and supporting the progressive demands of the movement."

Analyze it and you find the following:

"Point out the next steps of the struggle"—this means formulating such steps *and bringing the message to the masses*, winning them for such steps. It does not mean making up our own minds about these steps and

letting it go at that. To carry our message, pointing out the next steps to the masses, not in an academic way, but in the process of rallying support for their daily struggles, this is the task of our Party organizations.

"Initiating progressive demands of the mass movement"—this means again formulating such demands and bringing them to the masses in order to create a *mass public opinion among the toilers* that will win the mass movements to make these demands their own. This is the task of Party organizations. This is how we function as vanguard and help the whole movement (not only ourselves) to march forward.

"Supporting the progressive demands of the movement." This does not mean merely to adopt a resolution favoring this or that demand of the mass movement. No, it means that the Party organizations as such must step forward and help rally the masses in active support of such demands. This is how we stimulate the mass movements and help make the steps stronger.

In short: this is how we build the mass movements and the Party.

IV. PROPAGANDA OF MARXISM AND ADVOCACY OF SOCIALISM

The starting point here is that the situation is extremely favorable for the mass propaganda of Marxism, for the widest advocacy among the masses of our final aims of working class power and socialism. We must organize to utilize these favorable opportunities to the utmost.

The *Daily Worker* and *The Communist* have a great job to do in this field. I am able to say that the com-

rades engaged in this work are alive to the task and are undertaking to tackle it under the guidance and with the direct help of the Central Committee, in line with the decisions of the June meeting.

It is nothing new to say that the masses of the American toilers have been deeply stirred by the suffering of the crisis years, by the apparent breakdown of the capitalist economy, by its obvious inability to provide work for almost 10,000,000 workers even today, in its phase of cyclical recovery. Such facts as these: that at the very beginning of recovery, fears are already freely expressed by capitalist spokesmen themselves of the menace of another crisis. Or the constant menace of a new world war (with two wars already being waged by the fascist powers in China and Spain), which again capitalist spokesmen are forced to admit is being caused by "economic" causes—a euphemism for capitalism and imperialism, with their fascist storm troops. Or the obvious contradiction, which the masses cannot fail to sense, between the forces of production, what the capitalists call "technological advance," and the social relations, the capitalist monopoly over these forces of production; something they call euphemistically "the lag" between technological advance and social advance; a contradiction with which the President's commission on technological developments has struggled so helplessly. All this makes the masses highly receptive to the Marxian message, to its theory and practice, to our program of working class power and socialism.

But there is more to it than that. The hatred for fascism, which it is

now our main task to help organize into the united and People's Front, is opening the way for the hatred of capitalism. Because, what sort of system is it that produces fascism? What sort of system is it that fascism seeks to save? Capitalism. This conclusion the masses will not make automatically. We have to help them make this conclusion. And this means: propaganda of Marxism, of our final aims of working class power and socialism.

As to socialist successes of the Soviet Union. At times it seems as though some of us still underestimate the revolutionizing role of these successes. The contrast between capitalism, as the masses here know it, and socialism, as it is built in the Soviet Union—this contrast is making its way surely and deeply into the minds of millions of American toilers. This means more favorable opportunities for us to win converts to our final aims of working class power and socialism. There is no doubt that the epoch-making flights of the Soviet airmen to the United States opened up a new chapter not only for closer all-around collaboration between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. but also created new favorable opportunities for our advocacy of socialism.

Even the illusions which are prevalent among wide masses that the United States will not need working class power and socialism in order to achieve security, prosperity and happiness for the masses, on the ground that this country is rich enough (in natural resources and technical skill) to provide both profits for the capitalists and a good life for the masses; I say, even such illusions as these offer a favorable ground *for dissipating*

such illusions, and for the propaganda of Marxian socialism. Because in these illusions there is already present a *critical view* of capitalism as it is, an urgent desire for fundamental change (for security, for happiness), a demand and expectation that society (the federal government) must, *as a matter of duty*, provide the masses with security and happiness. True, there is still a belief that you can have a good capitalism, or that you can have something that is neither capitalism nor socialism but which is good and satisfactory. This is an illusion which we must dissipate. But when the masses think of and want fundamental changes, when they begin to feel that they cannot and will not live as of old, then the situation must be considered highly favorable for the mass propaganda of the Communist program for fundamental changes, for the propaganda of our slogan that "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism."

The New Deal, especially as understood by the sincere New Dealers, aims essentially to save capitalism, but by certain concessions to the masses and by democratic means. That's why it has aroused such antagonism, opposition and hatred on the part of the economic royalists and fascists. But the experimentations with the New Deal (NRA, AAA, and subsequent plans) not only foster illusions as regards the possibility of a "good" capitalism, a regulated one, an "organized" one, but they also give the masses practical object lessons in the correctness of our theory that there is no such thing as a "good" capitalism. In this way these experimentations result in mak-

ing the masses more receptive to our message of Marxism, working class power, and socialism. Not automatically. The New Deal experimentation creates both: new illusions and new experiences for the masses. It is our task to utilize these experiences in order to dissipate the illusions.

By way of self-criticism it should be said that we have not produced enough popular Marxian literature dealing with these questions. We have made the analysis, discussed the questions in our press, turned out some pamphlets, *but we need more popular literature for the masses*. A little reminder from the Party organizations, especially when coupled with suggestions as to what particular questions should be dealt with and how, would be helpful.

We also need more forums, more lectures, more public discussions of these fundamental questions. Here is where our Party organizations could do an important and valuable job in spreading Marxism among the masses and in advocating our final aims of the proletarian dictatorship and socialism.

And finally our criticism of reformism. I have in mind now especially the Thomas "school" of Socialism, the school which combats our policy of the united and People's Front against fascism "in the name of Socialism." Our criticism of this variety of reformism is a most fruitful field for the propaganda of Marxism and revolutionary socialism. Comrade Browder has on many occasions dealt with this "school of Socialism" in a most effective way. Utilize these speeches and spread them among the masses, especially among the Social-

ists. In criticizing the Thomas reformist conceptions we are enabled to accomplish two tasks. We are enabled to win converts to our policy of the People's Front as well as to the only possible socialism—the socialism of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The theoretical and political line we have: *the road to the socialist revolution lies through the unity of the working class and through the victory of the People's Front against capitalist reaction and fascism.* This is where the road lies today and this road we must follow.

Let us take this theoretical and political line and elaborate it, and discuss it among the masses, and among the Socialists. In this way we

shall also be immunizing the immature Socialist elements against the poison of Trotskyism which is today identical with fascist banditism, as well as against the ideological corruption of Lovestoneism, which is becoming less and less distinguishable from Trotskyism.

All of which is intended to make you, comrades, realize more fully the tremendous importance of the decisions of the June meeting of the Central Committee and to help you mobilize the Party for the successful fulfilment of these decisions along the lines of the decisions of the Central Committee and of your State Committee in the Party building drive.

THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

BY LAWRENCE HEARN

THE new climax in the war of the Japanese militarists upon China intensifies the need for strengthening all forces of peace and democracy and bringing them to bear against Japanese fascist aggression. The possibilities of tipping the Far Eastern scales in order to provide security and peace through the establishment of a united, democratic China have not been so great since the outbreak of the hostilities in September, 1931.

While the Japanese militarists have relentlessly pursued their grandiose visions of continental expansion, China has steadily strengthened internally until today she is on the verge of turning back the invader. However, during a century and a half of imperialist rivalry, European imperialist powers and the United States have so penetrated the economy and body politic of China that, whether they wish it or not, it is now to a considerable degree up to them to determine the outcome of the present war. Inaction on their part will operate in favor of Japan, as it has during the last six years. Collective pressure against Japan and in support of Chinese salvation, on the other hand, will mean a big setback to the Jap-

anese policy which now threatens the peace of the world and aims to reduce China to vassalage.

An analysis of the Far Eastern situation shows: (1) that Japan is steadily becoming more fascist, and, in consequence, its foreign policy more relentlessly aggressive; (2) that internal unity in China is almost accomplished with the Kuomintang gradually adopting the broad policies of national salvation long advocated by the Chinese Communist Party; (3) that, nevertheless, treacherous elements within the Kuomintang are still attempting to hold the Nanking government to a weak, wavering line of policy; (4) that simultaneously the united front of all groups for democracy and for resistance to Japanese aggression advances; (5) that, although the international setting of the Far Eastern conflict becomes increasingly important, the United States and Great Britain fail to take a firm stand against Japan's treaty-breaking advance, and, finally (6) that the determined peace policy of the Soviet Union and its powerful defense of the Siberian borders remain the greatest bulwark of strength in the entire situation.

OBJECTIVE AND STRATEGY OF THE
JAPANESE MILITARISTS' POLICY
OF CONQUEST

The classic formulation of Japan's imperialist aims remains the Tanaka Memorial, formulated by the principal advocate of the "positive foreign policy" in the middle 1920's, Premier General Tanaka, in a memorial to the Emperor. While the legal authenticity of this document as an actual memorial to the throne has been questioned, there has never been any doubt that it represented the most authentic description of the "strong" Japanese foreign policy available. Under the heading "General Considerations" the Tanaka Memorial said:

"For the sake of self-protection as well as the protection of others, Japan cannot remove the difficulties in Eastern Asia unless she adopts a policy of 'Blood and Iron.' . . . In order to conquer China we must first conquer Manchuria and Mongolia. In order to conquer the world, we must first conquer China. If we succeed in conquering China, the rest of the Asiatic countries and the South Sea countries will fear us and surrender to us. Then the world will realize that Eastern Asia is ours and will not dare to violate our rights.

"The way to gain actual rights in Manchuria and Mongolia is to use this region as a base and under the pretense of trade and commerce penetrate the rest of China. . . . Having China's entire resources at our disposal we shall proceed to conquer India, the Archipelago, Asia Minor, Central Asia and even Europe."

The gross conceit of such utterances would seem fantastic, were it not for the fact that in the decade since the Memorial was formulated the action it advocated had been so faithfully followed. If any doubts once existed that the annexation of the whole of

China was the great objective of Japanese foreign policy, to be followed at a later stage by even more ambitious conquests, the events of the last six years have dispelled them.

Including the earlier phases, the progress of the Japanese imperialist invasion of China has been as follows:

1894: Following the Sino-Japanese War, Japan annexed Formosa and prepared for the annexation of Korea through forcing Chinese recognition of its independence. She obtained, also, the Kwantung Peninsula, but was forced by other foreign powers to return it to China.

1905: Following the Russo-Japanese War, Japan secured the lease of Dairen, the Kwantung Peninsula, and railway rights in South Manchuria.

1910: Japan annexed Korea.

1915: Japan seized most of Shantung Province previously under German domination, but by the Washington Conference was forced to return the area and its railway concessions to China. Japan presented China the notorious Twenty-one Demands of which the only immediate result was the extension of railway leases in Manchuria and the extension of the lease of Kwantung.

1931: Japan invaded all of Manchuria and in 1932 set up the puppet state of Manchoukuo.

1932: Japan invaded Shanghai and, after crushing strong local resistance, forced upon China a demilitarized zone.

1933: Japan invaded Jehol Province and added it to Manchoukuo. Japan began the gradual invasion of Chahar Province. By the Tangku Truce Japan established a demilitarized zone in North China extending

from the south of the Great Wall to Peiping and eastward to Tientsin.

1935: Japan invaded the Peiping-Tientsin area and forced upon China the Ho-Umetzu Agreement. The five-province (Chahar, Suiyuan, Hopei, Shansi, Shantung) autonomy movement failed, but Japan managed to establish the East Hopei Autonomous Anti-Communist regime, consisting of twenty-two districts, and was strongly influential in setting up the Hopei-Chahar Political Council.

1936: Japan invaded Suiyuan Province but was repulsed. Further Japanese encroachments in Hopei also failed, temporarily.

1937: Japan again invaded Hopei, Chahar and Suiyuan, and at the time of writing is beseiging Shanghai and the Yangtze Valley as well as practically the whole of North China. To date Japan has obtained complete control of a wide area around Peiping-Tientsin.

FACTORS IN JAPAN'S POLICY OF EXPANSION

The conspicuously aggressive character of Japanese imperialism which leads to the violent invasion of China springs from the peculiar socio-economic structure of the country. The basic socio-economic structure of Japanese society is capitalistic, but, unlike the capitalism of the bourgeois-democratic countries of Europe, which grew out of the collapse of feudal society, the capitalism of Japan was grafted upon its feudal structure. The strong feudal element in Japanese society has resulted in excessive burdens upon the peasantry and upon the workers who come from that peasantry which furnishes a constant

labor reservoir. If we recall that it was the emancipation of the peasant-serf that provided early Western capitalist enterprise with an internal market, we see the acute problem with which Japan has been confronted by the introduction of capitalist industry unaccompanied by the liquidation of the feudal peasantry.

The problem of markets is particularly severe and the urge for expansion particularly strong in Japan. Even more conspicuously than in other capitalist countries, Japan's pursuit of foreign markets takes precedence over attempts to develop its internal market by raising the standard of living of its workers and peasants.

Japan's policy of attempting to solve its internal problems by expansion has been further aggravated by its lack of the most important raw materials of industrialization. Both as a result of world imperialist rivalries and as a consequence of the nature of its own internal development, Japanese imperialism is forced to fight for colonies.

Japanese expansion follows a familiar pattern.

The general strategy of Japan's present occupation of Chinese territory has involved the following steps:

1. The manufacturing of an incident;
2. The dramatization of the incident on the basis of some previously claimed or acquired right, actual or alleged;
3. Widespread publicizing of the event to justify further action at home, to delude the Chinese masses as to the true facts of the situation, and to confuse the issue abroad for as

long as possible under the guise of "national honor," "self-protection," or "just punishment" for an insult;

4. Rapid military action;

5. The simultaneous presentation of demands which far exceed retribution for the alleged incident and which are purposely couched in such vague terms as to permit almost any interpretation at a later date;

6. Insistence on "localizing" the dispute, that is, on dealing solely with local authorities and the promotion of separatism. This last maneuver is intended, first, to discredit the Chinese National government in the eyes of Chinese and foreigners; second, to force under military pressure a quick capitulation by local authorities so that the National government will be confronted with a *fait accompli* by the time negotiations become generalized;

7. Consolidation of the new position;

8. Provocation of another incident and a repetition of the entire process based upon some right allegedly gained in the previous one.

This strategy may be precisely illustrated by referring to the present large-scale invasion of North China. The alleged basis for Japan's position in North China was the illegal Ho-Umetzu Agreement of June, 1935, which in turn was forced on China on the basis of incidents based on the illegal Tangku Truce of 1933, which in turn arose from Japan's alleged need for protecting the illegally-acquired puppet state of Manchuoko which, in turn, was seized because of alleged infringement of alleged treaty rights previously acquired. And so on, *ad infinitum*.

The Ho-Umetzu Agreement* reveals the Japanese imperialist objective of cutting off the northern provinces from the rest of China. The Agreement stipulated the discharge of Chinese northern officials hostile to the Japanese policy; the withdrawal of certain specified troops from a restricted area around Peiping and in certain cases from Hopei Province (this has since been "interpreted" by Japan to forbid the entry of any Nanking troops into areas north of the Yellow River); the suppression of Kuomintang activities, of political military training, the dissolution of the Blue Shirts Organizations, etc., in Hopei; and the prohibition of all anti-Japanese and anti-foreign activities in China.

It very shortly became apparent that the purpose of this so-called agreement, as of all others similarly forced upon China, was to establish another stepping-stone towards the formation of a North China puppet state similar to, and allied with, Manchukuo. In the fall of the same year, under the personal supervision of Japan's leading intriguer, Colonel (now General) Doihara, Japan instigated the "North China five province autonomy movement" designed to complete the transfer of all of China north of the Yellow River to Japanese control. It was at this stage that the Japanese advance first felt the impact of the heroic Chinese struggle for defense. The North China five province autonomy movement collapsed and with it Japan's immediate designs.

Ominous events in the background,

* Published in the May, 1936, issue of *China Today*.

however, pointed with certainty to the early renewal of the Japanese push. Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia and Hitler's arrogant bludgeoning revealed the essentially weak position of the League of Nations under the tutelage of such compromising leadership as that of the British Tory government. The advance in the United States of the isolationists, under the cloak of neutrality, further weakened the anti-war front. The fascist invasion of Spain by Italy and Germany, the well-nigh fatal duplicity of the British-led policy of non-intervention, and the move of the United States in boycotting the Spanish government while permitting aid to the fascist belligerents through trade with Nazi Germany and fascist Italy, lent further encouragement to Japanese imperialism. The German-Japanese Anti-Communist Pact of November 25, 1936 (probably initialled the preceding January), simply proved to an unsurprised world the advantage being taken by the fascist states of the chaotic nature of the opposition to them.

The early months of the year witnessed political confusion in Tokyo making it impossible for the militarist-fascists to push forward on the continent with the speed and on the scale required to forestall the rapidly increasing internal strength of China. Members of the Japanese Diet launched outspoken attacks on the military policy, and the power of the proletarian parties showed startling gains. General Hayashi's cabinet, openly military in complexion and fascist in intention, failed to secure the cooperation of important capitalist groups required to carry out an

expansive foreign policy. A wave of strikes, the worst trade balance in years, the rapid depletion of gold reserves, and the alarming rise in the cost of living made it apparent that a cabinet commanding greater confidence from all capitalist groups was required both to meet the domestic emergencies and to cope with the failing policy toward China.

The elections of April 30 repudiated the government, but with a total disregard of parliamentary procedure it attempted to remain in power. Finally, on May 31, in the face of the combined opposition of the Minseitō and Seiyūkai Parties and of the newly prominent Social Mass Party, the Hayashi Cabinet resigned.

While making several adroit concession to parliamentary sentiment—appointing three party men to the Cabinet, reviving a system of party vice-ministers—the new government formed by Prince Konoe, retained the worst features of the old Cabinet, namely, War Minister Sugiyama and Navy Minister Yonai, and brought back to Foreign Ministry the notorious warmonger, Koki Hirota.

The stage was set for another China incident—it occurred in the small town of Lukouchiao a few miles southwest of Peiping, on July 7. Japanese troops, illegally maneuvering in the vicinity of Lukouchiao sent a few soldiers into the town to search for one of their men alleged to have been lost. An incident was provoked and the entire pattern of invasion set in motion.

A month later, on August 9, a Japanese naval officer and his driver in attempting to enter the Hungjao Airport outside Shanghai—where Jap-

anese military men had no business to be—were shot in another inspired-incident, thus spreading the present warfare to Central as well as North China.

CONTRASTING POLICIES OF THE KUO-MINTANG AND THE COMMUNISTS.
TOWARD JAPANESE INVASION FROM
SEPTEMBER, 1931, TO THE SIAN
INCIDENT, DECEMBER, 1936

The history of these five years and three months was marked by two broad trends: on the one hand, under the brilliant leadership of the Chinese Communist Party the great masses of China and ever larger groups of leaders in all walks of life pressed with increasing vigor and effectiveness for internal unity and national resistance against Japanese invasion; on the other hand, the Nanking government, under the dictatorship of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, under the former influence, moved from an attitude of abject capitulation to the Japanese advance to one of military peace with the Red Armies, greater political freedom throughout the country, and open diplomatic resistance to Japan. At present the two broad trends have united in practical cooperation on the line of resistance consistently advocated by the liberal, patriotic elements. On August 13 and 14 Nanking armies for the first time fought the Japanese invaders at Shanghai.

The series of events listed below and Nanking's attitude towards them show the gradual defeat of those advocating a policy of non-resistance to the Japanese.

1931-1936: Nanking continually spends the country's energies on

internal fighting primarily against the Red Armies, but also in order to crush all other opposition to its foreign policy of capitulation. The policy completely fails because: the Red Armies emerge victorious from their long march, provincial rebellions continue in the face of ruthless suppression, Nanking's political base continually narrows because of the unpopularity of its policy towards Japan and of its fascist-like trend at home, and in the meantime a large section of the country is lost to Japan.

1931: Nanking offers no resistance, except in the diplomatic field, to Japan's invasion of Manchuria. Nanking is unable to secure any cooperation from provincial leaders whom it has previously alienated by its high-handed policies.

1932: Nanking fails to support the famous Nineteenth Route Army in the heroic defense of Shanghai; it agrees to the Japanese-dictated demilitarization of the Shanghai zone.

1933: Nanking fails to support the defense of Chahar Province undertaken by General Sung Cheh-yuan, and under the direction of the treacherous Foreign Minister, Wang Ching-wei, agrees to the Tangku Truce. Nanking actively opposes the efforts of the "Resist-Japan-Save-China Allied Army" of Feng Yu-hsiang and Fang Chen-wu to drive the Japanese invaders out of Chahar, and their efforts consequently collapse.

1933: Nanking crushes the Nineteenth Route Army in Fukien which had concluded an agreement with the Red Army in order to press Nanking to adopt a policy of resistance to Japan.

1935: Nanking capitulates to Jap-

anese demands in North China and signs the Ho-Umetzu Agreement. The Chinese signer, General Ho Yin-ching, is later made Nanking's Minister of War!

1935: Nanking ruthlessly suppresses nationwide student demonstrations in favor of the united front and national defense.

1936, June: In settling the Kwangtung-Kwangsi revolt carried out to press Nanking to reform its foreign policy, the National government, for the first time, recognizing the unpopularity of its attitude, does not resort to force, but instead accepts a compromise with its own people.

1936, summer and fall: For the first time Nanking flatly refuses Japan's demands and lets it be known that it will fight to resist any further encroachments on China's sovereignty.

1936, December: Nanking again avoids using force in an internal dispute to settle the Sian incident. Chiang Kai-shek begins a series of personal conversations with Communist leaders and agrees to a cessation of Kuomintang military attacks on the Red Armies, pending united front negotiations. Following this incident, while Nanking continues to infringe on civil liberties throughout the country, there is a marked liberalization of the strict censorship on newspapers, public discussion and political freedom heretofore enforced.

Up to the last six months of 1936 it had been evident that the pro-Japanese clique dominated Nanking policies, even though an increasing number of government officials were becoming openly hostile to non-resistance, and it had been evident that Chiang Kai-shek and his entourage had been

convinced that China could not defend itself against the greatly superior technical advantages of the Japanese army.

What brought about the change in policy and attitude? The answer lies in the new conception of the problem and in the convincing solution of it consistently put forward under the leadership of the Communist Party. The Party pointed out that the defense of China must be undertaken by the people as a whole in a vast national movement coordinated at, but not imposed from, the top. A democratic movement rallied under the patriotic slogan of internal unity and national defense was the only possible way of achieving internal unity and effectively combatting an invading army technically superior.

What has been the cause of the successful piecemeal invasion of China? The basic factor has been the lingering feudalism which has retarded the political unification of the land, thus laying open to foreign imperialist incursions and conquests, first by one power, then by another.

The result of the course Nanking was following would have been an indefinite prolongation of disunity while piece by piece the territory of China was being sliced off by militarist Japan.

Immediately after the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, therefore, the Chinese Communist Party launched the united front movement by publicly announcing its intention to join with any and all groups in the country in a People's Front against Japanese imperialism. Until the spring of 1936 the Party retained an anti-Chiang Kai-shek slogan as well in

order to focus mass pressure on the problem of resisting Japan through completely changing the Nanking policy. But by that date the movement had grown to such dimensions and had already had such effect in government circles that the pro-Japanese groups had become narrowed and isolated. While these groups still maintained a strong influence in Nanking it was possible to drop the anti-Chiang slogan and thus practically universalize the united front within China, excluding only outright traitors.

The prominent steps in the development of the united front position were these:

1931: The Communist Party proposes the organization of a united front of all patriotic Chinese for a revolutionary war of liberation.

1932: Red elements in Shanghai actively assisted the Nineteenth Route Army in the defense of Shanghai.

1932: The Soviet government of China declares war on Japan.

1933: Soviet China declares itself ready to enter into agreements to fight against Japanese invaders with any other Chinese military group under three conditions: cessation of civil war, granting of democratic rights, and arming of Chinese people for an anti-Japanese war. This offer made in January is repeated in April.

1933: The conclusion of a united front agreement between Soviet China and the Nineteenth Route Army.

1934: On August 2, Madame Sun Yat-sen and over 3,000 other prominent citizens issue a document entitled *The Basic Program of the Chinese People in a War Against Japan*, calling for the arming of the whole population and the mobilization of all re-

sources for a struggle against Japanese invasion.

1935: At the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, Wang Ming and other representatives of the Chinese Communist Party make emphatic appeals for a unified People's Front of all groups and parties within China, against Japanese imperialist aggression.

1935: On August 1, the Chinese Soviet government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issue joint manifestos to the Chinese people making a broad appeal to resist further invasion and recover lost territory and proposing the formation of a government of national defense and a united anti-Japanese imperialist army.

1935: In December the great student demonstrations occur in Peiping and elsewhere.

1935-36: During this winter numerous articles and statements appear elaborating the liberalization of the program in the Soviet areas in the interests of the united front and explaining in detail the united front policy and strategy.*

1936: In the spring the Communist Party of China withdraws the anti-Chiang Kai-shek slogan in the united front program and appeals for the ousting solely of the pro-Japanese clique.

1936: In June the Kwangtung-Kwangsi rebellion is launched to force Nanking to fight the Japanese aggressor.

1936: In August the Chinese Communist Party sends a letter to the

* See especially *The Communist International*, *International Press Correspondence*, and *China Today*, for that period.

Kuomintang demanding the cessation of hostilities and the formation of a united anti-Japanese-imperialist front.

1936: In September the Chinese Communist Party issues a resolution for the democratization of the Chinese government.

1936: In December occurs the Sian incident during which the Communists demonstrate the sincerity of their intentions by persuading the revolting section of the Kuomintang to liquidate the incident peacefully and return Chiang Kai-shek unharmed, and during which Chiang agrees to a military armistice.

Sian represented the culmination of the first stage in the formation of an internal united front; for it marked the formal cessation of military hostilities between the Kuomintang and the Red Armies. It represented the climax of the effort of the masses of the Chinese and most of their leaders to persuade Nanking to adopt a policy of resistance against Japanese imperialism. The incident was, according to an analysis by Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the People's Soviet government,* conditioned by the following influences: the growing anti-Japanese upsurge of troops under Chang Hsueh-liang and Yang Hu-cheng and of the people of the northwest; the growing anti-Japanese upsurge in Suiyuan Province and over the whole country; the development of the influence of Left elements in the Kuomintang; the demand of important groups of provinces for a stand against Japanese invasion and for national salvation; the successful development of the movement for an anti-Japanese united

front carried on by the Chinese Communist Party, Chinese Soviet government, and Red Army; and the development of the world front for peace.

Sian, therefore, marked the gradual shifting of the middle and reactionary groups (excepting the pro-Japanese clique) to the policy of internal peace so long advocated by all Left and liberal forces.

Chiang Kai-shek at Sian definitely promised to fulfil the following six terms:

The Kuomintang and the National government shall be reorganized, with the elimination of the pro-Japanese elements and the inclusion of the anti-Japanese-imperialist elements.

The Shanghai salvation prisoners and all political prisoners shall be released and the civil rights of the people shall be guaranteed.

The "Communist-suppression" policy shall be terminated and an alliance shall be made with the Chinese Red Army to fight Japanese aggression.

A national salvation congress of all parties, groups, armies, and circles shall be convoked to determine the anti-Japanese national salvation measures.

Cooperation shall be established with other countries sympathetic to China's resistance to Japanese imperialism.

Other measures for national salvation shall be put into practice.

FROM SIAN TO THE PRESENT CRISIS

If Sian marked the close of the first stage for a united front by establishing the conditions for internal peace, it also introduced the second stage during which the goal is to win internal democracy. The liquidation

* See *China Today*, March, 1937.

of the Sian incident was followed on February 15, 1937, by the Third Plenary Session of the Kuomintang Executive Committee. On February 10, the members of the committee had received from the Chinese Communist Party, on condition that the Kuomintang would support the promises made by Chiang Kai-shek at Sian, a pledge to carry out the following terms:

Stop organizing armed uprisings for the overthrow of the Nanking government.

Change the Soviet government to the government of the Special Region of the Republic of China and the Red Army into the National Revolutionary Army under the direct leadership of the Central government and the Military Affairs Commission in Nanking.

Enforce a thorough democratic system of universal suffrage in the regions under the government of the Special Region.

Cease expropriating the property of landlords, and execute persistently the common program of the anti-Japanese united front.

The reply of the Kuomintang, issued in the form of resolutions, was evasive, but nonetheless left the way open for united front negotiations. In a recent statement (*China Today*, August, 1937) Mao Tse-tung analyzes the Kuomintang position and points out the cardinal importance of now concentrating on winning democracy:

"The Third Plenary Session of the Kuomintang, owing to its inclusion of pro-Japanese and vacillating elements, did not make a clear-cut and thorough change of Kuomintang policy and failed to solve the various problems concretely. Yet on account of the mass pressure and its own internal

change, the Kuomintang began to correct its erroneous policies of the past ten years—dictatorship and non-resistance. From these past policies the Kuomintang is turning toward peace, democracy and resistance and is beginning to accept the policy of the anti-Japanese national united front demanded urgently by us and by the people of the whole country, as was also noted in its Third Plenary Session. The problem hereafter remains: whether or not the Kuomintang will make a thorough change. The achievement of our goal, therefore, requires a bigger and bigger development of the anti-Japanese and democratic movements by us and by the people of the whole country. The Kuomintang must be further criticized, encouraged and promoted. Its elements who are for peace, democracy and resistance must be consolidated, its vacillating and hesitating elements must be led toward courage and firmness and its pro-Japanese elements must be repulsed.

"The present stage, from the Third Plenary Session to the realization of war of resistance of a national scope against Japan, is the second stage of the new era of the Chinese revolution. Both the first and second stages are transitory periods to carry China over to such a war of resistance. If the main task of the first stage meant the acquisition of the first prerequisite for the establishment of the anti-Japanese national united front, then the winning of democracy in the second stage will mean the acquisition of the second prerequisite for the same purpose. The building of a real and strong anti-Japanese united front for the general goal of anti-Japanism and national salvation will be impossible without both internal peace and democracy. So to win democracy is one of the central purposes of the revolutionary task at the present developing stage. We cannot build a strong and real anti-Japanese national united front, bring about a war of resistance national in scope against Japan and carry it through to complete success so as to defend China and to recover the lost territory if, failing to see the importance of the task of establishing democracy, we strive less energetically to win democracy.

"Under the slogan, 'For a Democratic Re-

public', China should immediately begin with the following democratic reforms on two fronts. On the one hand the aristocratic dictatorship of one party and one class should be displaced by a democratic form of government representing the cooperation of all parties and classes. The Election and Organization Laws of the People's Congress that are contrary to democratic practices must be displaced by real democratic election. The free assembly of the Congress must be guaranteed. Then a real democratic constitution must be worked out, a real democratic congress convoked, and a real democratic government elected to carry out real democratic policies. In this alone can internal peace be consolidated, internal opposition removed and internal unification strengthened to facilitate preparation by a united nation for resisting the external aggressors."

NANKING AND THE PRESENT CRISIS

On July 19 Chiang Kai-shek announced four points on which he said China would take a clear stand:

Any settlement must not infringe on China's territorial integrity or sovereign rights.

The status of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council having been fixed by the Central government, illegal alteration would be intolerable.

China would not agree to removal by outside pressure of the local officials appointed by the Central government, such as the chairman of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council.

China would not allow any restrictions to be placed on the positions now held by the Twenty-ninth Army outside Peiping.

As a result of the successful carrying out of the first stages of the united anti-Japanese front China's response to the present crisis has been altogether different from her response to the invasion of Manchuria in 1931. It is now certain that if Nanking con-

sistently leads the nation in a war of resistance it will receive no internal opposition. No group can take advantage of the situation for its own aggrandizement. The nation is becoming more united in its opposition to the militarist invaders. The people are ready to respond to decisive leadership in defense of their land and freedom.

POLICIES OF THE FOREIGN POWERS

In the present Sino-Japanese war it is necessary to distinguish among the foreign imperialist countries. While it is true that historically all imperialist countries have exploited China, the policies of some may now assist China against the policy of others. In isolating Japan as the present imperialist enemy of China, the leaders of the united front movement have not overlooked the fact that Japan is actively aided by Nazi Germany and only in lesser degree by fascist Italy. Those three fascist powers stand together and under their present governments must be counted as unalterably hostile to China's national salvation.

The other imperialist powers, however—Great Britain and the Dominions, the United States, and France—are at the present stage more hostile to Japanese ambitions than they are opposed to seeing the development of a strong, united, and democratic China. If China successfully turns back the Japanese invasion these powers have much to gain or much to retain, as the case may be, in the Chinese market; if China falls further under Japanese domination these powers are not only permanently expelled but also risk the loss of their own colonies

and of other markets and sources of raw materials in Asia and the Pacific area.

Of these democratic imperialist powers Great Britain is the most uncertain. Traditionally an ally of Japan, Great Britain is alert, however, to Japan's increasing encroachments on Chinese sovereignty. As the Open Door is shut and locked wherever Japan advances, it is logical to suppose that Great Britain could see Japan along with Germany and Italy as her immediate competitor. The completion of the Singapore Naval Base, the rapid strengthening of the Hongkong fortifications, the effective activities of British financial agents in China, and the outspoken support given by the British to Nanking's efforts at reconstruction and unification support this logic.

Nevertheless, the alternatives open to a British Tory government have been well, if tragically, illustrated by its policy toward the Spanish situation. One of the alternatives, which must be considered in the present Far Eastern War, is that Great Britain will take no clear stand, with the result, as in Spain, of heavily favoring the aggressor. The affectionate passes which Mr. Chamberlain has recently been making toward Hitler and Mussolini, and the widespread misinterpretation which has been given in England to developments in the Soviet Union make it clear that Great Britain is not a factor to be strongly counted on in the Sino-Japanese war.

Great Britain, nevertheless, is a factor of importance in that situation, for, as has been remarked earlier, it may, along with the other democratic capitalist powers tip the Far Eastern

scales in China's favor. It is vitally important to note, therefore, that as the British position is in the balance strong and persistent pressure can throw it on the anti-Japanese side. Much of this pressure must and will come from liberal groups within the British Empire. Some can also come from this country. The policy, therefore, that the United States takes will tend to be crucial.

American policy in the Far East was originally formulated at a time when other imperialist powers had already established themselves there. It was designed to combat their position, not in order to preserve China from exploitation, but solely in order to give Wall Street an equal opportunity to exploit China along with Great Britain, tsarist Russia, Germany and France, and, later, Japan. Our famous Open Door policy contained no touch of altruism; it was as thoroughly imperialistic as was the policy of any of the other powers. The Open Door formula has since remained the keystone of the United States Far Eastern policy, for it was found to be sufficiently general to cover all the eventualities of imperialist exploitation. It consisted of three mutually supplementary parts: equal trading opportunity for the nationals of all countries in China; the most-favored-nation clause, whereby any imperialist advantage gained by one of the contestants immediately accrued to all; and preservation of the territorial and administrative integrity of the Chinese nation.

The objective situation in which this policy has operated has so completely changed in recent years that the Open Door policy is now a positive factor on the anti-war, anti-

imperialist front. The rapid ascendancy of Japan during the last twenty-five years has completely altered the scene for which the Open Door policy was originally drafted, with the result that its strict application today would operate unequivocally in favor of Chinese resistance to the Japanese invasion.

The ascendancy of Japan is not the only change in the Far Eastern scene; a more important long-term change is the emergence of a modern Chinese nation, rapidly becoming capable of taking care of its own defense, and under the influence of powerful liberalizing groups within the country. Indeed, the American bourgeoisie cannot forget that no other development would so favorably affect its trading and investment interests in Asia as the establishment of a powerful Chinese nation.

The Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 represents the historic embodiment of the Open Door policy, for it explicitly binds the signatories to respect Chinese sovereignty and provides for mutual consultation whenever one of them infringes upon Chinese rights. The Treaty was supported by two other pacts at the time, one providing for naval limitation to prevent aggressive acts and the other providing for the non-fortification of Pacific Islands. Three years later the Kellogg-Briand anti-war pact further strengthened the peace front.

Since 1931 Japan has directly and repeatedly violated both the Nine-Power Treaty and the Kellogg pact. It is significant that the United States has only once invoked them since 1931, and that was in the winter of the first year of fighting.

How can this be explained? The explanation lies in the State Department's erroneous interpretation of the Japanese situation, an interpretation which has been basic to America's recent feeble policy. Japan, according to the United States Department, is torn asunder between a wicked military group that wants to grab China by force and an upright civilian group that wants simply to exploit China commercially. The civilian group is not the Social Mass Party, or the other peasants' and workers' organizations that want cessation of *all* imperialism.

The period from December 1931, when Secretary Stimson clearly saw the fallacy of counting on Japanese industrialists (as he frankly admits in his book *The Far Eastern Crisis*), until November 1932, when his government was repudiated at the polls, marked an exception to this policy. During this exceptional period the United States invoked the treaties which Japan had violated, seriously considered economic boycotts, and probably would have moved to them, had not London double-crossed Washington. The American State Department formulated the censorious Non-Recognition Doctrine. Stimson's successors, in handling United States relations with the Far East, reverted to the earlier policy. Thus, the United States government fails to use these pacts in the interests of the peace purposes it so repeatedly avows.

The Roosevelt administration faithfully inherited one of the worst features of the Stimson period, namely, the collapse of British-American cooperation. The basic importance of confronting the Japanese militarists with a common policy of the two

countries, remains unrecognized. As a result, the United States fails to cooperate with the British Left forces in order to force the Tory cabinet in the correct direction, or make this question another factor in its overthrow.

The Soviet Union has been the one consistent factor for peace in the Far East. By announcing with no uncertainty its determination to resist aggression, by fortifying and industrializing its Far Eastern sector and manning it with a perfectly disciplined army, by entering into a pact of mutual assistance with the Outer Mongolian People's Republic, and by laboring on every occasion to build the anti-war front among the democratic countries, the Soviet Union has been the cornerstone of world pressure against Japanese fascism.

The peace forces of the United States and of Great Britain must make demands on their governments to cooperate with the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

Collective action by Great Britain, the United States, France, China, and the Soviet Union for peace and security in the Pacific, for frustrating Japanese militarist-fascist aggression and for the support of the Chinese people, is one of the first demands

which must be advanced by the American people.

All supporters of peace must demand the immediate invocation of the Nine-Power Treaty and the implementing of the Kellogg-Briand Anti-War Pact.

The American people must demand the repeal of the false neutrality law so that it will not operate in favor of Japanese aggression and against Chinese resistance, and so as to stop its operation against Spanish democracy.

We Communists must be especially active in building a vast, mass movement involving millions of American people against Japanese aggression and for Chinese salvation. Toward this end we must support intensively the campaigns of the American Friends of the Chinese People, and help to build up the broadest campaigns on the part of the American League Against War and Fascism. The circulation of *China Today*, and of *Fight* should be pushed into new and broader circles.

The ground must be laid for the organization of extensive technical and medical assistance for the Chinese people.

We must, throughout our work of assisting the Chinese people and curbing the Japanese fascists, benefit by our experience in aid of Spanish democracy.

SCOTTSBORO IN THE LIGHT OF BUILDING THE NEGRO PEOPLE'S FRONT

BY JAMES W. FORD and ANNA DAMON

AFTER six and a half years of hard struggle, four of the nine Scottsboro boys have been set free.

This victory—and it is a distinct victory, although it is partial—must serve as a lever to pry loose the five remaining boys. At the series of trials, that ended on July 24 when Roy Wright, Olen Montgomery, Willie Roberson, and Eugene Williams were set free, the state of Alabama meted out the following sentences to the remaining five boys: Clarence Norris was sentenced to die in the electric chair. Andy Wright was sentenced to 99 years in the penitentiary. Haywood Patterson was given 75 years. Charlie Weems received a 75 years' sentence.

And Ozzie Powell, who was shot in the head by a drunken deputy sheriff on the high road between Decatur and Birmingham, Alabama, following the last trial, January 24, 1936, was suddenly, on July 24, 1937, found not guilty of rape, but sentenced to twenty years in the penitentiary for "assaulting" the deputy sheriff.

That is how the Scottsboro case stands now. During six and a half years the Scottsboro case attracted worldwide attention. Millions of people in every part of the world, of all

nationalities, of all religions, of every political viewpoint; people of all classes—writers, lawyers, doctors, artists, workers, trade union leaders, men and women of every walk of life—took part universally in this struggle to free the Scottsboro boys.

"The Scottsboro Boys Shall Not Die!" "The Scottsboro Boys Must Go Free!" "Help Save the Scottsboro Boys!" These slogans have been written and read, spoken and sung, carried through the streets, painted on walls in almost every language known to man. It has been one of the most profound expressions of the better human conscience against injustice and persecution.

Why has the Scottsboro case aroused such wide social interest? Because the destiny of a people is involved. Scottsboro symbolizes a colossal struggle of the Negro people, their friends and their allies. Scottsboro has smashed the "rape" libel of the ruling class against the Negro people.

The Scottsboro case has established a sharp dividing line between two camps; those who would perpetuate the degradation of the Negro people and keep up endless exploitation and oppression, and those who are organizing to end this oppression

and establish equality and freedom for the Negro people. Rival forces—justice against inhumanity, liberty and democracy against enslavement and reaction—fight for mastery in the Scottsboro case. The Scottsboro case held the attention of the Negro people because it awakened in them a fundamental understanding of discrimination, segregation, denial of civil rights and liberties, lynching, general exploitation and terror.

The Scottsboro frame-up was designed by the reactionary section of the officialdom of the state of Alabama as a signal for an intense terror campaign to frighten the Negro people. Every act of the prosecution in the case gave that signal. Each move was aimed to develop psychological intimidation. It was the intent of the reactionary Alabama officials in the mass murder of nine Negro youths to stifle the spirit of struggle of the Negro people, to mortify their dignity and crush every noble, honest and forward-looking aspiration they might have.

The first trial in the little town of Scottsboro, Alabama, was held in the midst of a raving mob atmosphere, deliberately planned and executed. A band played "There'll be a hot time in the old town tonight" as an accompaniment to the death verdicts the jury brought against one after another of the boys.

The incitements in the Scottsboro case were clearly for the purpose of developing a monstrous psychological setting to overawe the Negro people, to "keep them in their place."

But, moreover, Alabama jurisprudence, which was dominated by the reactionaries, took upon itself the

historic mission of the Ku Klux Klan, that is, to help maintain the dog-eat-dog economic basis in the South. The Governor, most of the judges, and the courts in Alabama design not only to terrorize the Negro people, but to sow hate and distrust between poor whites and the blacks so that exploitation may continue.

Alabama reactionaries posed as defenders of "white womanhood." They raved about saving the South from Bolshevism, and against "Jew money from New York." They did everything possible to stir into a conflagration sectionalism and the basest racial passions. The staging of the Scottsboro case was aimed to throttle the emerging organization of Southern labor; especially since the protests and the organization of black and white labor were rising against economic slavery and feudalistic remnants. This trial was to serve as a springboard to attack trade unions and all other forms of organization of black and white labor. But the reactionaries reckoned without considering things that would prove their undoing.

They failed to reckon with the strength and indignation of the mass movement that would arise among the people who stand for justice and civil liberties in the United States and particularly the progressive forces in the State of Alabama. They ignored the maturing political consciousness among the Negro people and their determination to struggle for their rights. They had not foreseen that the Communist Party would arouse a mighty movement to free the Scottsboro boys.

Whence come the power and

strength of the Communist Party, its methods and tactics in defense of political prisoners?

METHODS OF STRUGGLE

One here has to speak of the methods of struggle followed by the Communist Party in the fight against reaction, and national oppression, methods and forms that have grown up out of the experiences of the international working class, that have proved successful in China, Japan, Germany, Italy, Poland, Hungary, Brazil, in countries where the rank-est forms of persecution are carried out by powerful ruling reactionary cliques. The method consists in involving millions of workers, farmers, small business people, working intellectuals and all those in whose interest it is to unite against reaction and fascism.

We applied our methods and experiences to the Scottsboro case. Our forces required international unity and leadership. It is this that distinguished our activities from all others. We fully realized that only struggle on a mass basis, only slogans supported by millions could bring success. Adhering to this policy from the very beginning, we evolved those forms that had proved effective in practical work in all parts of the world. In the main these forms of struggle may be summarized as follows:

1. The conduct of international campaigns of protest.
2. The conduct of national campaigns of protest.
3. The organization of committees applying the tactic of the united front, drawing in representatives of

various organizations of the toilers (trade unions, cultural organizations, organizations of Negro people, etc.)

4. The organization of mass conferences, parades and demonstrations.

5. The sending of delegations to protest and to investigate the conditions of the prisoners.

6. The circulation of petitions, signed by thousands of people, demanding the freedom of the victimized.

7. The publication of facts, and the exposure to the public at large of the whole system of terror.

8. The enlistment of scientists, writers, artists, etc.

9. The popularization of the work rendered by the International Labor Defence in order to win wider and wider masses.

These fundamental forms of struggle of both the Communist Party and the International Labor Defence have not been resorted to just when "something happens," but have been a part of day-to-day work and activities.

THE FACTS AND ISSUES

On March 25, 1931, the nine Scottsboro boys were arrested in Paint Rock, Alabama. They were charged with rape of two white girls on a freight train, and railroaded through lynch trials. Eight successive death sentences were handed down. The boys were not permitted proper counsel. They were indicted by a grand jury, tried before a petit jury, on which no Negroes served, as no Negroes had ever in the memory of living man been permitted to serve on an Alabama jury. There was a mistrial in the case of the ninth boy.

On April 1, 1931, the International Labor Defense stepped into the case. Combining its two-fisted tactics of the best court defense with the best mass defense, it challenged the whole Bourbon South over these convictions. The Communist Party developed the campaign nationwide, and beyond the borders of the country, supporting the fight for the freedom of the boys, for vindication and defense of the whole Negro people.

Joseph Brodsky, chief International Labor Defense counsel, went to Scottsboro to demand retrial of the boys. This was denied. Appeals were taken to the State Supreme Court.

The Alabama State Supreme Court upheld the verdict against seven boys, remanded the other two to the custody of the Probate (juvenile) Court.

The roar of protest rose, and extended around the world. Tours were organized for the Scottsboro mothers. One of them, Mrs. Ada Wright, toured not only the United States, but, in company with the late J. Louis Engdahl, chairman of the International Labor Defense and veteran Communist Party leaders, toured through twenty-six European countries. Millions the world over participated in the struggle. In Chemnitz, Germany, police fired upon a demonstration called by the Communist Party and the I.L.D. of that country, resulting in the death of a Communist. A martyr to the Scottsboro cause, Engdahl collapsed from the strain of the tour, contracted pneumonia, died in a Moscow hospital on November 21, 1932.

On November 7 of that year the United States Supreme Court, to which the I.L.D. had appealed the

case, retaining Walter Pollack, noted constitutional attorney, to make the argument, reversed the death sentences on the ground that the Scottsboro boys had been deprived of proper counsel in their trial.

New trials followed, this time in Decatur, Ala., following a change of venue from Scottsboro secured by the I.L.D. Ruby Bates, one of the white girls whom the boys were charged with having violated, dramatically appeared in the middle of the trial. She repudiated all charges, and told a damning story of having been forced to testify to a lie in the first trial. From her experiences she learned of the trickery and deception used by the white ruling class to divide and exploit both the Negro and white working people. She saw these Bourbons ready not only to sanction but to organize the mass murder of innocent boys in order to further their selfish interests. Her experiences have made a working class fighter out of Ruby Bates.

Under the direction of the International Labor Defense, Samuel S. Liebowitz, chief defense counsel, raised the issue of the exclusion of Negroes from Alabama juries, proved that they were systematically and illegally excluded, in violation of the United States Constitution.

Haywood Patterson and Clarence Norris were again condemned to death in a lynch atmosphere created by the now deceased Attorney-General Thomas E. Knight of Alabama, who took personal charge of the prosecution. The campaign mounted to new heights of protest, under the leadership of the Communist Party and the International Labor Defense. On

June 22, 1933, trial Judge E. Horton set aside the verdicts on the ground that "the evidence preponderates greatly in favor of the defendants."

For yielding to the dictates of justice expressed by the protest movement, the state put pressure against Judge Horton, who was defeated in the next elections. Judge William Washington Callahan, Ku Klux Klansman, succeeded him in the new trials. Once again Patterson and Norris were condemned to death. And again the International Labor Defense appealed the case.

A second time, with the campaign mounting and rolling on, the United States Supreme Court reversed the sentence, this time on the grounds of illegal exclusion of Negroes from the jury. The lives of the Scottsboro boys had been saved again, and a major victory won for and by the Negro people, whose right to serve on Southern juries was established for the first time by this decision.

In December, 1935, the International Labor Defense, following out its policy of broadening and extending the defense on a united front basis, initiated the formation of a united Scottsboro Defense Committee, which was then formed. It includes the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Church League for Industrial Democracy (Episcopal), the International Labor Defense, the League for Industrial Democracy, and the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and has the support of thousands of organizations, millions of people, throughout the country.

The fourth trial opened in January,

1936. Judge Callahan and Knight, by now Lieutenant-Governor of Alabama, sped through the trial of Haywood Patterson, excluding all vital defense evidence by pre-arrangement. Patterson was convicted, and was sentenced to 75 years in prison. The united front campaign had forced a break in the series of death sentences. The other trials were hastily adjourned.

Next day, as the boys were being taken back from Decatur to prison in Birmingham, a deputy sheriff beat and taunted Ozzie Powell, one of the boys, until in self-defense Powell struck back, scratching the deputy's throat with a small knife. Sheriff Sandlin of Morgan County, who was in the car, got out, and deliberately put a bullet in Powell's head, which has paralyzed and crippled him for life.

On July 12, 1937, the trials opened in Decatur once more. Knight, who had died a few months before, was replaced as prosecutor by Assistant Solicitor Tom Lawson. Liebowitz was chief defense counsel. Callahan began to grind through the trials again.

In a sudden move, the state dismissed the rape charges against five of the Scottsboro boys, explaining that the evidence against them was doubtful. In doing so, the State of Alabama indicted itself of murderous false prosecution against the four who had been sentenced, since the evidence in every case was precisely the same. It depended entirely on the perjury of Victory Price, who had eighteen times sworn on the witness stand that she was raped by every one of the nine boys.

Four boys, Eugene Williams, Roy

Wright, Olen Montgomery and Willie Roberson were freed, under condition of exile from the State of Alabama.

The first partial victory in the Scottsboro case was won.

The basis was laid in this victory, for the greatest campaign of all in the history of the Scottsboro case, which can free the other five boys, make the victory complete.

LESSONS OF DEFENSE UNITED FRONT ACTIONS

The Scottsboro case contains the most definite lessons of our united front experience in defense work, and of the role of the International Labor Defense in the development of the People's Front. The partial victory in the Scottsboro case is proof of the correctness of our united front policy.

The concrete and positive lessons in united front in defense go back to the San Francisco general strike in 1934. At that time the International Labor Defense for the first time successfully initiated a united front of the most varied elements in the fight against vigilantes. A united committee, including the American Civil Liberties Union and Socialist organizations, was formed on the initiative of the I.L.D., as a national center for the fight against the vigilante terror which was unleashed against the strikers. This was the first step in the series of developments which have reached their greatest heights so far in the Scottsboro fight. For the first time the most diversified elements, some of them representing fundamental divergences in political viewpoints, were united on a specific defense issue.

The most outstanding complete

victory of the united front we have experienced has been the freeing of Angelo Herndon. Except for the Scottsboro and Mooney-Billings cases, broader forces, involving literally millions of people in specific united action, through their organizations and individually, were brought organically into this united front than on any other issue with which we have been faced.

It was this campaign, brought about by unity, which forced the United States Supreme Court to free Angelo Herndon, and nullify the Georgia slave insurrection law under which he had been sentenced to eighteen to twenty years on the Georgia chain-gang. The national tour of the chain-gang cage organized by the I.L.D.; the circulation of the Herndon petitions, which were signed by two-million people, through the agency of scores and hundreds of the most diverse organizations, involving the Socialist Party in united action with the Communist Party, the Young People's Socialist League with the Young Communist League, the American Federation of Labor, the National Negro Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, all unemployed organizations, church groups and organizations, the Y.W.C.A., the monster mass meeting, held for Herndon in every part of the country; the formation of local Herndon committees on a scale even broader than the National Committee to Aid the Herndon Defense—are highlights in the Herndon campaign which illustrate in the most graphic, dramatic manner the power of the united front.

The Mooney-Billings case is an-

other outstanding example of the unifying character of defense issues. In this case the I.L.D. has acted as a basic moving force in developing the campaign which has joined the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. forces, together with liberals and professionals in struggle. In the recent struggle against the mistreatment of Tom Mooney in San Quentin prison, the I.L.D. was one of the main agencies through which a nation-wide campaign was organized which forced the prison authorities to change their tactics, although they had already mistreated him to the point where his life was in danger. As this is written, the I.L.D. is again, in close cooperation with the Mooney Molders' Defense Committee, organizing a new campaign to force action by the Governor and the State Supreme Court of California for Mooney's freedom. The recent visit of Vito Marcantonio, president of the I.L.D., to California, on invitation of the Mooney Committee, did much to crystalize and unify the fight for Mooney in that state.

The Sacramento and criminal syndicalism campaigns, the de Jonge, Butash, and Simpson cases, are outstanding examples of the power of the I.L.D. as an independent organization for initiation and development of the united front, of the correctness of its two-fisted policy of mass defense combined with legal defense, and of our correct united front policy.

Other examples can be found in the united front in New Jersey against injunctions, in Philadelphia against vigilantism, where A. F. of L. and C.I.O. union leaders are joined to-

gether through the initiative and action of the I.L.D., and to them are linked organizationally the allies of the working class among the liberal and progressive middle class groups. There are many other examples, illustrating the united front lessons in varying forms. Outstanding among these are the trade-union defense committees, such as the King-Ramsay-Conner Committee and the Modesto Committee in California, in the formation and work of which the I.L.D. played an important role.

In the Scottsboro campaign we have an outstanding example of the effectiveness of united action in winning victory. The united Scottsboro Defense Committee undertook responsibility for the joint work of conducting the defense. The organizations supporting this committee, although with varying degrees of energy and initiative and at times with hesitations or reservations on concrete measures, brought much wider circles into concerted effort which has resulted so far in the freedom of four of the boys.

This united action continued, developed and extended with renewed vigor, is necessary for the winning of the freedom for all the remaining boys. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People branches throughout the country, many of which were already involved in the campaign, were moved in larger numbers by the establishment of the united committee. Socialists, liberals, civil liberties groups, trade unions, fraternal organizations, church and religious organizations, and many others within and without the sphere of influence of the organizations in

the Scottsboro Defense Committee were brought into action through the establishment of the united front.

Through all these and other united front actions, the I.L.D. has established closer links with the trade union movement and with the organizations of Negro people, with the liberal groups and movement. The working relationship with the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, established in the Scottsboro case, is an outstanding example, and it has been the N.A.A.-C.P. and its speakers who in many cases have put forward before the masses the key role of the I.L.D. in the Scottsboro case.

The most important lessons to be learned from our united front experiences in defense are the necessity for alertness and vigor in conducting this work, the need for patient, untiring effort to win to united action on specific issues the broadest elements of the people, no matter how sharply they may differ from us on other questions, and the importance of a conviction of the correctness of our united front policies. These policies have been proven in action. The victories of united action in the Scottsboro and other cases have not been accomplished overnight, nor was the work easy.

A weakness in application of our policies which has been evident in many instances and on many issues has been an underestimation of the possibilities for extending and broadening the united front, and a certain lack of faith in the ability of an organization such as the International Labor Defense to initiate and carry through the united front program.

This has been true especially in regard to defense issues, where frequently we have failed properly to support the I.L.D. and to give it the necessary political and organizational assistance for the development of the united front on specific issues. In his report to the recent plenary meeting of the Central Committee, Comrade Browder pointed out the important role of the I.L.D. in building the People's Front. Comrade Browder said:

"Among the manifold organized expressions of the growing moves toward unity, the International Labor Defense is coming forward more and more to an important role."*

There must be no hesitancy on the part of our comrades in the furthering and development of this role. Experience has shown us that around defense issues we can weld together unity of all progressive forces.

THE CHANGING SOUTH

The partial victories stand before us. The results represent marked achievements for the Negro people. The Supreme Court was forced to affirm the right of Negroes to sit on juries although this is still denied in practice and can only be realized by the united struggle of progressive forces. We think nobody can deny that there is a breaking down of the Jim-Crow lynch spirit, that among the masses there is growing tolerance on the Negro question, that among large sections of whites the persecution of the Negro people as exemplified in the Scottsboro case has awakened strong humanitarian ideals and a feeling that the suffering and priva-

* Earl Browder, *The Communists in the People's Front*, p. 55. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 10 cents.

tion of the colored people is a blot on their conscience. Moreover, they are beginning to see the Negro people as a noble and great people.

The Communist Party is proud of the leading part it has played in these achievements. Credit is due to those forces that have responded to an understanding of the issues involved and united to fight for victory.

Few have understood the contribution and the change that came over large sections of the South and particularly in Alabama. The best opinion of Alabama and of all of the South was not represented in the prosecution of the reactionaries. We must give credit to a change in attitude of an influential and large section of Southern opinion—workers, farmers and intellectuals, who finally saw through this shameful frame-up, and out of decency and honesty brought pressure to bear on the state and the courts, which helped to make possible the victories in the Scottsboro case.

Even the transformation in the life and outlook of Ruby Bates who was born in an atmosphere of intolerance and prejudice is a plainly evident example of a maturing new attitude in the South. Those unfortunate utterances of Mr. Samuel Liebowitz at the conclusion of the first trials at Decatur, reflecting on the Southern people as a whole, were certainly unjustified.

An important indication of this trend is the fact that the C.I.O. is putting into practice in the South a policy of abolishing Jim-Crow trade union locals and organizing the Negro workers on a basis of trade union equality.

Following the freeing of four of the

Scottsboro boys, the *Birmingham Age-Herald* said, on July 26:

"The statement asserts that the prosecution is convinced of the guilt of the four Negroes who have been tried again and convicted, but in the view of the *Age-Herald* the doubt of the guilt of those who have been convicted will be greatly increased by the action of last Saturday, despite this statement of the prosecution and without questioning the good faith of those who issued it . . . that admission will inevitably deepen the opinion of many fair-minded citizens that the possibility has been more than 'mistaken identity' in the cases of those who have been convicted."

This the admission will certainly do. The courts of Alabama stand convicted by their own statement of having tried to execute five Negro boys on a false charge. Why are not the others innocent, who were convicted on the very same perjured testimony? This must be asked of Alabama justice! This question must ring throughout the land!

A most significant development has been the expression organizationally of the liberal and progressive sentiment in the South. The Scottsboro Defense Committee has formed in Birmingham a Southern committee, in which outstanding liberals and trade unionists in the South are joined together. This coming together of progressive Southern forces contributed a powerful lever to force the Bourbon reactionaries in their subsequent retreat in the Scottsboro case. It should be further developed into a broad movement for progress against reaction and for full rights for the Negro people.

IMMEDIATE TASKS

The Scottsboro victory is not complete. The freedom of the remaining

boys must be gained. The Scottsboro Defense Committee, the International Labor Defense, the Communist Party and all other organizations and the millions of supporters of the Scottsboro boys and the Negro people have said clearly and unalterably—the fight is not ended. It will never end until all the nine Scottsboro boys are free.

Appeals have been taken in all the cases. Petitions will be circulated throughout the country. Mass meetings should be held everywhere to mobilize and unite that public opinion which has always believed firmly in the innocence of the boys, and add to its ranks the new millions who are now convinced and ready to help win the fight. Moreover, these millions must be welded into a mighty unity in defense of the oppressed Negro people as a whole.

Broad united front conferences need to be organized. The Negro people in every Negro community should be organized around the Scottsboro case as an active force and main lever in the campaign. A wide campaign will be developed to send telegrams and letters of protest against the sentences meted out to the remaining five boys to Governor Bibb Graves, Montgomery, Alabama, demanding the release of the boys, and to the Supreme Court of the United States. Letters and telegrams should be sent to the Congressmen from their constituencies demanding that they take a stand for the freedom of the Scottsboro boys.

Appeals must be made to President Roosevelt demanding that in the fight against the reactionary Supreme Court, adequate protection be made for the constitutional rights of

the Scottsboro boys and the entire Negro people.

We cannot stop here. Scottsboro is a much broader issue. The Scottsboro fight and the issues around the Scottsboro case and the tremendous lessons learned in this struggle must be made a basis for a fight for the larger interests of the Negro people.

A fight against lynchings, mob violence and police brutality; for the enactment of a federal anti-lynching law; for the right to vote, serve on juries, and enjoy complete civil liberty—these are a part of this great struggle developed around Scottsboro.

The right of Negro youth to equal opportunity in education and in the economic and social life is part of this struggle.

Complete equality for Negro women, their right along with all women to equal pay for equal work, their right to a suitable environment for themselves and their children—an environment which demands adequate housing, good schools and recreational facilities—is a part of the struggle around the Scottsboro case.

The fight for the freedom of the Scottsboro boys still imprisoned is not an isolated battle. It must be considered and organized as a campaign around the fight for the democratic rights of the Negro people, the safeguarding and extension of the democratic rights of the people as a whole, and against all forms of vigilantism, discrimination of Negroes, against fascist tendencies everywhere. It must be so organized as to develop the unity of Negro and white in the common struggle against reaction, for progress, and so as to bring the Negro people unitedly into the People's Front in the United States.

AN OPEN LETTER ON COMMUNIST-SOCIALIST UNITY IN SPAIN

(From the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Spain to the Executive Commission of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, making an official and concrete proposal of unification.)

[This document contains the practical proposals for the fusion of the Spanish Socialist and Communist Parties. It explains clearly the reasons why this fusion is desirable, and lists the points probably to be included in the program of the proposed united party.—THE EDITORS.]

DEAR COMRADES: The recent plenum of the Central Committee of our Party, in the session held on June 18, carefully examined the different aspects of the problem of the political unity of the proletariat of Spain. Comrade Dolores Ibarruri (La Passionaria) gave a special statement on the question. The plenum of the Central Committee unanimously approved the line taken in this statement, and with great enthusiasm passed the following resolution:

"The Political Bureau is asked to communicate at once with the Executive Commission of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, in order to examine together the program, tactics and practical methods for the quickest possible realization of the fusion of the two workers' parties."

In accordance with this, the Central Committee of the Communist Party now makes, in a public and official form, the concrete and practical proposal for the unification of the Communist Party of Spain with the Socialist Workers' Party of Spain.

It is not necessary to insist that the problem of the political unity of the Spanish proletariat has been for a very long time, and particularly since July, 1936, the question of the most importance to the conscientious workers of our country.

The fusion of the two parties in one united party is awaited with impatience by the revolutionary proletariat of Spain.

THE CONDITIONS DEMANDING THE IMMEDIATE CREATION OF THE UNITED PARTY

The conditions in which we live, and the necessity of winning the war as quickly as possible, make this unity an absolute necessity. The single action of the founding of the united party of the proletariat will have an extraordinary significance; will multiply tenfold the fighting power of the republican army; will to a great extent speed up the decisive victory of the people of Spain over the military forces of the national and German and Italian fascists; and will help the complete triumph and consoli-

dation of the Spanish popular revolution.

The carrying out of political unity among the workers of Spain imposes itself as an urgent necessity, as much from the military point of view as from that of the organization and direction of the economy of the country; as much from the point of view of safeguarding public order as from that of strengthening the Popular Front. At the same time the achievement of this political unification will constitute the most powerful factor in favor of the unification of the workers' trade unions of our country, without which it is difficult to conceive the economic and social organization of the new Spain.

The urgency of the unification of the two parties is as evident to the Communists as it is to the Socialists. In this respect there are not and there cannot be either doubts or hesitations. The Socialist workers and the Communist workers understand the realities of the situation; the immensity of the difficulties that still remain to be conquered; the number of tasks that remain to be accomplished before victory can be achieved. Both Communists and Socialists understand the immensity of the constructional and organizational tasks—economic, political, military, social and cultural—that the Spanish people, and more particularly their leaders, the workers, will be faced with twenty-four hours after victory. The execution of these tasks, which are of such historical significance, nationally and internationally, appears to be impossible if the political unity of the proletariat has not been accomplished first of all. This unification, guarantee of certain mili-

tary victory and essential condition for the consolidation of the popular revolution, must be realized, cost what it may, and must be realized at once, or as quickly as possible. Every delay, every postponement, increases the military, economic and political difficulties, complicates the practical tasks, prolongs the efforts and sufferings of the war, and weakens the fighting potentialities of the people.

The hour is grave, the great struggle being carried on by our people has entered its decisive phase; we are passing through the most critical, difficult and responsible of moments. The fate of our soldiers, of all the workers of our country; the fate of the Spanish people; of our independence and of the territorial integrity of Spain; the fate of our revolution is at stake and depends, fundamentally, on the manner and rapidity with which Communists and Socialists come to an understanding in order to forge the political unity of the proletariat.

The responsibility we bear is immense. It is necessary to bring about the political unity of the proletariat of Spain; to create the powerful united party by the immediate fusion of the two workers' parties. This is the task that history has confronted us with. This is the ardent desire, the firm will, and the unanimous imperative demand of the Socialist and Communist workers.

The organizations of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party have for some months followed the road toward the practical realization of harmonious political unity. The Unifying Committees of the two parties already constitute a real system, and their work has served and will serve

for a base, every day firmer, for the drawing together of the two parties. The relations of contact and of mutual and fraternal consultations that exist between the Executive Commission of the Socialist Party and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party are one proof more of the real possibility of working in common for the practical realization of political unity.

THE SOLID BASE, FOR THE PROGRAM AND TACTICS FOR THE UNIFICATION OF THE TWO PARTIES IS ALREADY IN EXISTENCE

It is certain that the political union of the proletariat, to be effective, must be built on a solid base of fundamental principles. On this essential question difficulties do not exist, neither can they exist; there are no divergences of principle between the two parties. Both are inspired by the Marxist-Leninist ideology, whose best exponent and upholder today is Comrade Stalin; both regard as their historic mission the destruction of capitalist exploitation, of all exploitation and oppression of man by man, or of one nation by another, and the building of the socialist (communist) society, without classes, without exploitation or oppression of any kind.

To this identity of ideological conception is added the identity of attitude of the two parties toward the great proletarian revolution and the triumph of socialism in the U.S.S.R. The Socialists and the Communists recognize, in agreement with the proletariat of all countries, that the Soviet Union constitutes the first great victory of the world proletariat; that

the U.S.S.R. represents the common fatherland of all the workers of the entire world; that the interests of the U.S.S.R. are identical with the interests of the workers of all countries and that, in consequence, the defense of the U.S.S.R. against all its enemies is a sacred duty for the Spanish proletariat, as it is for the proletariat of the rest of the world.

The two parties, defenders to the end of the national independence of Spain and of the territorial integrity of the country against national and foreign fascism, will rise solidly at the correct time for the terrain of proletarian internationalism.

If we take into account at the same time that the parties share a common point of view on the character, the particulars and perspectives of the Spanish revolution in progress and on the tactics of the Popular Front, it can be categorically affirmed that there already exists the concrete base for the program and tactics for the unification of the two parties, and the only thing lacking is to initiate the practical work so that this unity may be made an accomplished fact.

Is it necessary today, before we have united and before we have won the war, to elaborate a complete and detailed program for the united party? It seems to us that it is not necessary.

The problems and the obstacles that will arise after victory over the enemy will be so numerous, of such a nature, so different from those that we are faced with today; they will arise in conditions so different from those of today, that it would be foolhardy and incorrect to try to settle now the post-war program of the united party.

AN INDISPENSABLE WAR PROGRAM; THE
ARMY, INDUSTRY, TRANSPORT
AND FORTIFICATIONS

More essential and indispensable than a general program for the united party is a program of war, a program of action adequate to the conditions and necessities of the war. To win the war means to assure the triumph of the popular revolution and the favorable conditions for its consolidation and its ultimate development. To assure the decisive victory of the republic over national fascism and to drive the German and Italian fascist invaders from our country are the central political task of the present period, the task that towers over all others, over all problems, all questions, all preoccupations. This task, therefore, must be the axle of the united party's program of action.

This program must embrace the stabilization of the principles, conditions and tasks that will carry the war rapidly to a victorious end. The following are therefore essential points:

1. *Strengthening of the fighting power of the popular regular army of the republic*, the regular unified army and the suppression of the militia or of autonomous sectors of the front; better application of the decree on obligatory military service; steady increase of the number of well-trained, well-armed and well-disciplined reserves; energetic and methodical purge to cleanse the military apparatus of traitors, saboteurs and incapables; a fearless policy of promoting to the high command the leaders who have sprung from the people and have received their training in the fire of battle; supreme unified

command, which will effectively direct the army and the operations on all fronts; practical and moral help to raise the prestige of the war commissars in their extremely responsible work; military vigilance against the agents of the enemy; pre-military organization of the working class youth; practical, political and moral help for the strengthening of the fighting ability of the navy, the air force and the specialized sections of the army; constant attention to the living conditions of the soldiers of the great Popular Army, who comprise the most heroic and self-sacrificing fighters and who must therefore be the object of special attention; attention to their conditions of diet, hygiene, medical service, clothing and pay; pensions to the families of those who have been killed in battle, and pensions for invalided soldiers, as well as professional and technical re-education for these disabled men.

2. *A powerful war industry*: Organization and development of a powerful war industry that will produce in sufficient quantities all kinds of arms and munitions necessary for the fronts and for the reserves. To attain this objective it is necessary to ask the government to proceed immediately with the nationalization and militarization of all existing war industries; to attend to their increase and perfection; to undertake the organization of new factories for the war; intensification of production and control of the quality of the things produced; the handing over to the authorities for distribution to the army of all the arms and munitions existing in the rearguard in the hands of groups or organizations; severe punishment for

the hiding of unauthorized stores of arms; a campaign carried on for the workers, in the factories and in the trade unions, to develop the spirit of emulation and initiative in the intensification of war production and in the discipline of work in the war industries.

3. *To contribute actively to the organization and rapid functioning of transport at the service of the fronts and of the army, carrying on a continuous policy of public works on the construction of new strategical roads and the repair of present highways.*

4. *Active assistance for the organization of fortification works and the construction of refuges for the fighters and the civilian population.*

COORDINATION OF ECONOMY, IMPROVEMENT OF WORKING CONDITIONS, INTENSIFICATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

5. *Coordination and planning of economy.* Policy of centralized coordination and planning of the national economy by means of the National Council of Economy, in which the representatives of the trade unions and the cooperative workers' organizations and of the autonomous regions must participate; municipalization of the public and urban services; appropriate means to prevent mismanagement and other abuses of primary materials and manufactured goods.

6. *A practical policy of systematically and seriously improving the material situation, the conditions of work, life and culture of the urban and rural working class.* The demands of the war, the lack of certain products, the necessities of sacrifice for

everyone while the war lasts, are perfectly understood by our admirable working class. Nevertheless, if this is certain, it is no less certain that with better national economy and with a better understanding of the equitable distribution of sacrifices and of efforts it would be possible (and is necessary) rapidly to improve the conditions of the workers. To equal work, equal pay, without distinction of age or sex; differentiation of salaries to ensure a just remuneration of work according to the amount and quality produced and effort spent; adequate means to lower the high cost of living.

7. *Policy of the intensification of agricultural production* and of strengthening the unity of the urban and rural proletariat with the peasant workers, not only during the war, but after the victory. For this it is indispensable effectively to guarantee the soil to those who work it, to the agricultural workers and to the peasants, recognizing fully the peasants' right of choosing freely, without any form of violence, the collectivized or individual form of work, and respecting the rights of the peasant to his own produce, financial, technical, agricultural and commercial help, as well as assistance in such matters as exportation, to the freely formed collectives and to the individual farmers; active assistance to inspire and to give practical help to the agricultural cooperatives for production, buying and selling.

RECOGNITION OF THE RIGHT OF INDEPENDENCE FOR CATALANS, GALICIANS, BASQUES; THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE; RIGOROUS PUBLIC ORDER

8. *Recognition of the democratic right of national independence* for

the Catalans, Basques and Galicians, national independence that can and should assure the real and lasting union, close and fraternal, and the common fight of all the peoples of Spain against their common enemy, against the Spanish fascists and the German and Italian fascist invaders.

9. *Policy of maintaining good relations between the petty bourgeoisie, both industrial and commercial, and the workers.* It is necessary to take into account that in the system of co-ordination of the principal branches of the economic life of the country the free functioning of private commercial and industrial enterprises is indispensable for strengthening the national economy. On the other hand, this attitude will also serve to strengthen and safeguard the bonds of the Popular Front with the masses of the petty bourgeoisie.

10. *A war policy of supply* that will assure in the first place the supplying of the combatants at the front and in reserve, and the workers of transport and war industries; appropriate means to ensure that this will be done in a rational manner and without interrupting the supplies for the civilian population.

11. *Rigorous public order in all the Republic's territory.* The maintenance of public order, as an affair to be kept exclusively in the hands of the authorities. Dissolution of the remnants of committees or patrols of control existing on the initiative of any organization whatsoever; severe penalties, scaled according to the demands of war, against any person or organization that prepares or executes armed acts against the Republican authorities; political and administra-

tive means to purge the rear guard of spies, enemy agents and saboteurs; campaign of enlightenment for the masses in order to create a spirit of true vigilance against the enemies of the people.

No doubt these essential points from the program of action, briefly expressed, do not constitute the complete and definitive formula for a planned program of action. We present this to you, not as a cut-and-dried proposal, but as material that conforms to the general line of the statement made by Comrade Dolores at the plenum of the Central Committee. We are informing you of our exact position in order that the question can be examined carefully.

We are absolutely convinced that by following a program of action, Socialists and Communists can come to an agreement, and we are sure that we are on the way to that agreement. Socialists and Communists, we shall reach an agreement on the question of policy to follow with regard to the trades unions, the U.G.T. (Socialist Trade Unions) and the C.N.T. (Anarcho-Syndicalist Trade Unions); to the J.S.U. (United Socialist Youth); and with regard to many other problems it would be superfluous to enumerate.

Socialists and Communists, we bear in mind the experiences of other countries, but we also take into account the particulars of the workers' movement in Spain, and we are in agreement in recognizing the essentially revolutionary part that the workers' unions play and ought to play in contributing to the victorious direction of the war and the direction and organization of the economic

and social life of the new Spain. It is certain that the Socialists and Communists will be completely in accord when it comes to working in common and with the greatest enthusiasm for the strengthening of all the organs of the U.G.T. and in helping to bring about a fraternal and continuous collaboration, during and after the war, with the C.N.T.; and that we will make every effort to bring about trade union unity as soon as possible.

PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATION

On the question of the principles of organization of the united party, and of the fundamental rules of its internal life, we shall do no more than enumerate, simply, the most important points:

To consider the party as the solid organized fighting vanguard of the workers, with a single will: democratic centralization and severe, voluntarily imposed discipline, right of criticism and discussion and duty of self-criticism, but, when a decision is taken on a question discussed over an action to be carried out, the agreement must be obligatory for everyone: obligatory respect for all the leaders of the party (Cabinet Ministers, Deputies, Governors, newspapers, etc.), and for the decisions and directions of the supreme leading body of the party, methods of organization that ensure the expulsion and public condemnation of all those who disobey revolutionary law, against those who commit acts of treason, or who discredit or sabotage the actions of the party, methods of organization who carry out a work of disintegration that threatens the unity of the Party.

Finally, we should like to point out the enormous importance of the problem of the working groups of the future united party; a problem whose solution is urgent in order that we may end the campaign of the adversaries of unity, whose efforts are in vain, for they endeavor to present the zeal of the Communist Party for unity as a maneuver to absorb and liquidate the Socialist groups. Our firm conviction is that all the actual working groups of the Socialist and Communist Parties are able to feel completely sure that the creation of the united party of the proletariat not only will *not* result in the depreciation of these groups, but will actually raise both their value and the responsibility of the work that they carry out in their present positions. The most varied tasks in every branch of the political, administrative, syndical, military, industrial, cultural, etc., life; the internal tasks of the direction of the Party, are of so many different and important kinds, and grow so constantly that, without any doubt, the utilization of all the groups existing in the two parties will not be enough to constitute more than a fraction of the required groups. It will be necessary, indispensable, to learn a policy of formation of groups on a grand scale. We repeat this. We intend the unity of the Communist Party with the Socialist Party to be done in a complete, integral and indissoluble manner; an organic unity that will respect and embrace the different shades of thought of the party and of the militant Socialists without excluding anyone; an organic unity that will respect and value even more than before the position and the experi-

ence acquired by the responsible militants of both Parties.

Concerning the name of the future unified party and its international relations, we consider, in spite of the fact that we are dealing with a huge question, that after a common examination we shall arrive at an agreement, as we have already, to some extent, come to an agreement about the problems of program, tactics and formation of the new party.

At the end of this letter we want to point out again that the important thing at the present moment is the urgent necessity of ceasing to be contented with mere propaganda for unity and tackling energetically the problems of practical realization.

Since the situation is completely ripe for unity, and since there is already full agreement on the principles and tactics; and since the conditions of war demand it, no one can argue against the leaders of the two Parties starting immediately on the work of creating the common organization to decide on the concrete procedure of unity and at the same time to form committees of unification or fusion among the Socialist and Communist organizations all over the country.

Here, dear comrades, are briefly expressed some of the most important considerations with regard to the po-

litical unity of the working class of Spain. We present them for your attention and examination. We do not pretend to have originated the idea nor to have raised the problem that confronts us, in all its aspects. The problem of the unification of the two workers' parties of Spain is so serious, and at the same time of such breadth, that for its positive solution it is absolutely imperative that the Communists and Socialists in common examine it carefully with the maximum of reciprocal sincerity. We are not in ignorance of the many difficulties it will be necessary to overcome. We understand perfectly that the work of unity from its first stages will encounter a certain resistance. Nevertheless, we have the firm conviction that unity will sweep away all the difficulties and obstacles and will triumph more quickly than we imagine, for the good of the proletariat and all the people of Spain.

In the hope of your positive reply, please accept, dear comrades, our fraternal Communist and unitarian salutes.

FOR THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
SPAIN (SPANISH SECTION OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.)
THE SECRETARY GENERAL.

THOUGHTS ON PEACE AND THE PROBABLE ADVANTAGES THEREOF

BY THOMAS PAINE

[Hardly had the clouds of battle cleared from Concord and Lexington, when Thomas Paine published his *Common Sense*, which put forth independence as the pivotal slogan of the revolution against England. His was the first major agitational pamphlet of America and Paine became the chief propagandist and agitator of the American revolution. Each critical point in the hard struggle against the British autocracy drew a new pamphlet from Paine. These pamphlets he called the *American Crisis*. His first *Crisis*, beginning with the oft-quoted words—"These are times that try men's souls"—was written on a drum head in General Washington's camp during the retreat into New Jersey and inspired the much needed victory of the revolutionary army at Trenton. . . .

The *Crisis XIII*, reprinted here, is one of a series of sixteen. It was issued after the surrender of the British and their recognition of American independence. The revolution had been won, but it still had to be consolidated; the particularism of the separate states hindered the establishment of a strong, centralized union which would be able to maintain the independence won in war and solve the numerous problems which faced

the new nation. It is of special interest today, because it contains one of the earliest and best formulated attacks upon the theory of state rights. Here Paine argues vigorously that the Union of the States is indispensable for further progress and growth. He foreshadows the whole struggle which was to arise in the Constitutional Convention and which was to break out in even greater force later. The doctrine of state rights as opposed to the federal authority has as a rule worked in the interests of reaction just as the present-day support of state rights by the Liberty League is a part of its attack upon all progressive legislation.

The short piece reprinted here hardly does justice to Thomas Paine, so extensive was his work as the foremost spokesman of the democratic and republican enlightenment in Europe and America. But it serves to draw attention, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the American Constitution—which he helped to inspire—to the significance of the man and his work, at a time when all the principles he enunciated and fought for are being threatened by the Tories and economic royalists of today.

The document printed here belongs to the literature of historic tradition inspiring the struggle of the



THOMAS PAINE



THOMAS PAINE

American masses today and the building of the American People's Front for preserving and extending our democratic rights.—The Editor.]

THE AMERICAN CRISIS XIII

THE times that tried men's souls" are over—and the greatest and completest revolution the world ever knew, gloriously and happily accomplished.

But to pass from the extremes of danger to safety—from the tumult of war to the tranquility of peace, though sweet in contemplation, requires a gradual composure of the senses to receive it. Even calmness has the power of stunning, when it opens too instantly upon us. The long and raging hurricane that should cease in a moment, would leave us in a state rather of wonder than enjoyment; and some moments of recollection must pass, before we could be capable of tasting the felicity of repose. There are but few instances, in which the mind is fitted for sudden transitions: it takes in its pleasures by reflection and comparison and those must have time to act, before the relish for new scenes is complete.

In the present case—the mighty magnitude of the object—the various uncertainties of fate it has undergone—the numerous and complicated dangers we have suffered or escaped—the eminence we now stand on, and the vast prospects before us, must all conspire to impress us with contemplation.

To see it in our power to make a world happy—to teach mankind the art of being so—to exhibit, on the theatre of the universe a character

hitherto unknown—and to have, as it were, a new creation intrusted to our hands, are honors that command reflection, and can neither be too highly estimated, nor too gratefully received.

In this pause then of recollection—while the storm is ceasing, and the long agitated mind vibrating to a rest, let us look back on the scenes we have passed, and learn from experience what is yet to be done.

Never, I say, had a country so many openings to happiness as this. Her setting out in life, like the rising of a fair morning, was unclouded and promising. Her cause was good. Her principles just and liberal. Her temper serene and firm. Her conduct regulated by the nicest steps, and everything about her wore the mark of honor. It is not every country (perhaps there is not another in the world) that can boast so fair an origin. Even the first settlement of America corresponds with the character of the revolution. Rome, once the proud mistress of the universe, was originally a band of ruffians. Plunder and rapine made her rich, and her oppression of millions made her great. But America need never be ashamed to tell her birth, nor relate the stages by which she rose to empire.

The remembrance, then, of what is past, if it operates rightly, must inspire her with the most laudable of all ambition, that of adding to the fair fame she began with. The world has seen her great in adversity; struggling, without a thought of yielding, beneath accumulated difficulties, bravely, nay proudly, encountering distress, and rising in resolution as the storm increased. All this is justly due to her, for her fortitude

has merited the character. Let, then, the world see that she can bear prosperity: and that her honest virtue in time of peace, is equal to the bravest virtue in time of war.

She is now descending to the scenes of quiet and domestic life. Not beneath the cypress shade of disappointment, but to enjoy in her own land, and under her own vine, the sweet of her labors, and the reward of her toil. In this situation, may she never forget that a fair national reputation is of as much importance as independence. That it possesses a charm that wins upon the world, and makes even enemies civil. That it gives a dignity which is often superior to power, and commands reverence where pomp and splendor fail.

It would be a circumstance ever to be lamented and never to be forgotten, were a single blot, from any cause whatever, suffered to fall on a revolution, which to the end of time must be an honor to the age that accomplished it: and which has contributed more to enlighten the world, and diffuse a spirit of freedom and liberality among mankind, than any human event (if this may be called one) that ever preceded it.

It is not among the least of the calamities of a long continued war, that it unhinges the mind from those nice sensations which at other times appear so amiable. The continual spectacle of woe blunts the finer feelings, and the necessity of bearing with the sight, renders it familiar. In like manner, are many of the moral obligations of society weakened, till the custom of acting by necessity becomes an apology, where it is truly a crime. Yet let but a nation conceive rightly

of its character, and it will be chastely just in protecting it. None ever began with a fairer than America and none can be under a greater obligation to preserve it.

The debt which America has contracted, compared with the cause she has gained, and the advantages to flow from it, ought scarcely to be mentioned. She has it in her choice to do, and to live as happily as she pleases. The world is in her hands. She has no foreign power to monopolize her commerce, perplex her legislation, or control her prosperity. The struggle is over, which must one day have happened, and, perhaps, never could have happened at a better time. And instead of a domineering master, she has gained an ally whose exemplary greatness, and universal liberality, have extorted a confession even from her enemies.

With the blessings of peace, independence, and an universal commerce, the states, individually and collectively, will have leisure and opportunity to regulate and establish their domestic concerns, and to put it beyond the power of calumny to throw the least reflection on their honor. Character is much easier kept than recovered, and that man, if any such there be, who, from sinister views, or littleness of soul, lends unseen his hand to injure it, contrives a wound it will never be in his power to heal.

As we have established an inheritance for posterity, let that inheritance descend, with every mark of an honorable conveyance. The little it will cost, compared with the worth

of the states, the greatness of the object, and the value of the national character, will be a profitable exchange.

But that which must more forcibly strike a thoughtful, penetrating mind, and which includes and renders easy all inferior concerns, is the UNION OF THE STATES. On this our great national character depends. It is this which must give us importance abroad and security at home. It is through this only that we are, or can be, nationally known in the world; it is the flag of the United States which renders our ships and commerce safe on the seas, or in a foreign port. Our Mediterranean passes must be obtained under the same style. All our treaties, whether of alliance, peace, or commerce, are formed under the sovereignty of the United States, and Europe knows us by no other name or title.

The division of the empire into states is for our own convenience, but abroad this distinction ceases. The affairs of each state are local. They can go no further than to itself. And were the whole worth of even the richest of them expended in revenue, it would not be sufficient to support sovereignty against a foreign attack. In short, we have no other national sovereignty than as United States. It would even be fatal for us if we had—too expensive to be maintained and impossible to be supported. Individuals, or individual states, may call themselves what they please, but the world, and especially the world of enemies, is not to be held in awe by the whistling of a name. Sovereignty must have power to protect all the parts that compose and constitute it;

and as UNITED STATES we are equal to the importance of the title, but otherwise we are not. Our union, well and wisely regulated and cemented, is the cheapest way of being great—the easiest way of being powerful, and the happiest invention in government which the circumstances of America can admit of. Because it collects from each state, that which, by being inadequate, can be of no use to it, and forms an aggregate that serves for all.

The states of Holland are an unfortunate instance of the effects of individual sovereignty. Their disjointed condition exposes them to numerous intrigues, losses, calamities, and enemies; and the almost impossibility of bringing their measures to a decision, and that decision into execution, is to them, and would be to us, a source of endless misfortune.

It is with confederated states as with individuals in society; something must be yielded up to make the whole secure. In this view of things we gain by what we give, and draw an annual interest greater than the capital. I feel myself hurt when I hear the union, that great palladium of our liberty and safety, the least irreverently spoken of. It is the most sacred thing in the constitution of America, and that which every man should be most proud and tender of. Our citizenship in the United States is our national character. Our citizenship in any particular state is only our local distinction. By the latter we are known at home, by the former to the world. Our great title is AMERICANS—our inferior one varies with the place.

So far as my endeavors could go,

they have all been directed to conciliate the affections, unite the interests, and draw and keep the mind of the country together; and the better to assist in this foundation work of the revolution, I have avoided all places of profit or office, either in the state I live in, or in the United States; kept myself at a distance from all parties and party connections, and even disregarded all private and inferior concerns; and when we take into view the great work which we have gone through, and feel, as we ought to feel, the just importance of it, we shall then see, that the little wranglings and indecent contentions of personal parley, are as dishonorable to our characters, as they are injurious to our repose.

It was the cause of America that made me an author. The force with which it struck my mind, and the dangerous condition the country appeared to me in, by courting an impossible and an unnatural reconciliation with those who were determined to reduce her, instead of striking out into the only line that could cement and save her, A DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, made it impossible for me, feeling as I did, to be silent; and if, in the course of more than seven years, I have rendered her any service, I have likewise added something to the reputa-

tion of literature, by freely and disinterestedly employing it in the great cause of mankind, and showing that there may be genius without prostitution.

Independence always appeared to me practicable and probable, provided the sentiment of the country could be formed and held to the object; and there is no instance in the world, where a people so extended, and wedded to former habits of thinking, and under such a variety of circumstances, were so instantly and effectually pervaded, by a turn in politics, as in the case of independence; and who supported their opinion, undiminished, through such a succession of good and ill fortune, till they crowned it with success.

But as the scenes of war are closed, and every man preparing for home and happier times, I therefore take my leave of the subject. I have most sincerely followed it from beginning to end, and through all its turns and windings; and whatever country I may hereafter be in, I shall always feel an honest pride at the part I have taken and acted, and a gratitude to nature and providence for putting it in my power to be of some use to mankind.

COMMON SENSE.

Philadelphia, April 19, 1783.

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

P.O.U.M. HATCHERY OF SPIES DOES NOT DESERVE TO BE DE- FENDED BY ANY ANTI-FASCIST

Editorial, *Mundo Obrero*, Madrid,
July 3, 1937

RESPECT for all the parties, organizations and groups that defend the cause of the people, but implacable annihilation of all the allies of fascism.

A group of bands, who, in open criminal activity, fall into the hands of the police, does not deserve to have any anti-fascist voice raised in its defense. This is the case with the elements of the P.O.U.M. who have been held by the police as agents of the enemy. They have been imprisoned, not only for their activity in general for which they merit that treatment, but for concrete acts, for reasons of internal security, in order to avoid their being able to develop the monstrous work which they were carrying on. They are accused of the crime of espionage. The government has sufficient proof which it will disclose when it deems it opportune.

Do these people deserve to be defended? Every honest conscience, every anti-fascist will answer with us that such bandits do not deserve to be defended. Those who utilize the deceit of disguising themselves with revolutionary names in order to inform the enemy of the movement of our forces, in order to point out the vul-

nerable points of our fronts, in order to do disorganizing work among our troops, and in order to create conflicts in the rear-guards which weaken the power of the army, and of the Spanish people, deserve only inexorable punishment. And this is the case with the Trotskyite elements of the P.O.U.M. who today are submitted to the police and judiciary procedure for their criminal activities dedicated to espionage, to sabotage and betrayal in the interests of fascism.

But the Secretary of the C.N.T. [Anarchist-controlled National Confederation of Workers] perhaps because of misunderstanding, has thought it opportune to come out in defense of the group of adventurers who have been held by the police. In spite of the facts, the comrade or comrades who come out in defense of Trotskyites are not convinced that they are elements worthy of crushing punishment by the people. Their error arises from the fact that they consider the P.O.U.M. an anti-fascist party. We have said, numerous times, that we do not deny that there may be in the P.O.U.M. honest workers, deceived by the criminal demagoguery of the Trotskyite leaders. But that is no reason to consider the P.O.U.M. as an organization that carries out favorable work for the benefit of the people. In the same way as before the elections of February there were in the Spanish Phalanx [Falange Espanola, a fascist

group headed by the son of Primo de Rivera] some workers, some honest people who had gone into that fascist party—deceived by diverse motives. But not for that reason were we, all the anti-fascists going to stop fighting tooth and nail against the Spanish Phalanx. Very well, actually, the P.O.U.M., by dint of its activity and composition, does not differ greatly from the Spanish Phalanx of pre-war days. P.O.U.M. fights against the Popular Front, the P.O.U.M. is an element of disintegration in the heart of the proletariat. The P.O.U.M. fights against the Socialists, the Communists, against the Republicans, against the army. The P.O.U.M. in the field of action holds the greatest responsibility for the bloody events in Catalonia. All its activity is headed, in the interior, toward producing uprisings, to sabotage our victory. And its activity in the field of betrayal and of counter-revolutionary adventurism, has converted itself into an agency of espionage in the service of *Franco*, with whom one of the main leaders of the P.O.U.M. was in direct contact.

Note, therefore, how a party of bandits in the service of the enemy must not be defended. And don't come to us with the argument that so and so has had a revolutionary past. We are going to admit it. But that is just what the defenders of Doriot said in France. We could say the same of Mussolini before he was a fascist, the same could be said to every other person who has turned renegade on his past and has gone over to the enemy with arms and baggage. We suppose that those who direct the C.N.T.—shady lawyers in this case—will know many deeds of betrayal.

What danger does the punishment of the spies, traitors and saboteurs of the P.O.U.M. entertain? For the Republic, none; for the Revolution, none; for the Popular Front, none. For any party of anti-fascist organization, there is no danger. The argument that the punishment of the counter-revolutionaries of the P.O.U.M. points to a dangerous road, is completely absurd. The government shelters all tendencies. It defends all the parties, small or large; all the organizations, small or large; when the latter maintain themselves within the anti-fascist orbit. There is then no danger for any organization or party. But, yes, there can exist a warning for all the hidden enemies, for all those who in one way or another help the enemy, that the government will be inflexible in its punishment of all who do not march on the road to the revolutionary and popular victory, in its punishment of those who contribute an obstacle to the triumph of the Spanish people.

Those who were not convinced will be convinced. The P.O.U.M. is not an anti-fascist party. It is a group of adventurers without principle, of renegades of people of such abject countenance that do not find any difficulty in furnishing military secrets to Franco and his masters. It is a fascist salient in our rear-guard. And every honest person, every revolutionary, every anti-fascist has to demand inexorable punishment for those who deserve it.

We are at war. One cannot feel sentimental as those Socialist comrades of Paris who instead of spurring their government to help the Spanish people, and their International to

establish unity of action in order to help the Spanish workers, remember that the government has imprisoned a group of spies and ask clemency for them. Or like that of the national administration of the C.N.T., who, in these moment, in which it is necessary to cleanse our rear-guard of traitors and hidden enemies, of spies and saboteurs, of every class of turbid elements, to give more efficacy to the action of our army, remember that so and so, jailed as a spy, because he may have been different on another day, remember that they should be given judiciary guarantees for their defense. It would seem better to us that they contribute a little more, with the collaboration and loyal adhesion to the government, to forge rapidly all the conditions of triumph, to put the factories of war materials in the hand of the state, so that in the decisive moments, not one bullet nor one cannon projectile will be lacking to our combatants. This is why the agents of the enemy in our rear-guard cannot and should not be defended by anyone who calls himself an anti-fascist, by anyone who calls himself a revolutionary.

THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE ANTI-FASCIST FORCES

BY RUGGERO GRIECO

General Secretary of the C.P., Italy

(From *lo Stato Operaio*, Paris, May-June, 1937)

On the 10th of June, under the auspices of the Regional Committee of the French Communist Party, a meeting was held at Marseilles in

honor of Antonio Gramsci and in condemnation of his assassination.

Comrade Ruggero Grieco spoke on Antonio Gramsci, the part he played in the Italian workers' movement as a militant Marxist-Leninist leader of the working class, as founder and leader of the Communist Party, as organizer of the post-war revolution and—after the defeat—as organizer of the new struggle of the workers. In the second part of his speech Comrade Grieco, recalling the teachings of Antonio Gramsci, pointed out the duties of anti-fascist forces today. An excerpt is here given.

WE HOPE that the congresses and conventions of the parties and of the anti-fascist organizations, conscious of the great responsibility that weighs upon us all, will want to find with us the point of unification of democratic anti-fascism. United we can make ourselves the center of the unity and fraternization in the struggle of the Italian people.

Above all, we make an appeal to our Socialist comrades, that they take up with us the banner for the immediate constitution of the Popular Front. The Popular Front will be the organism of unification of all the democratic forces and will give direction to the struggle today, and tomorrow it will consolidate the democracy.

The example of the Garibaldi Battalion, the vanguard of the Italian Popular Front, must not and will not be lost to us. Those Socialist comrades who state that the hour for the constitution of the Popular Front has not yet been reached in Italy must be persuaded that the union of all the anti-fascist forces is urgent and

must not be delayed, because the situation will not await those who have lingered.

The social basis of the Popular Front must be very broad, as is the actual condition of a struggle of the masses for liberty, democracy and peace. Our task of unifying Italian anti-fascism is that of uniting all who wish to struggle to aid in any way the overthrow of fascism. As Comrade Dimitroff so justly stated, it is essential that in this Front the proletariat count above all on its own strength and realize its own unity.

I must say, therefore, a few words on our relationship with the Italian Socialist Party, to whom we have been bound by a three-year old Pact of Action and on the development of this relationship.

The Communist Party acknowledges with pleasure that in the current discussions within the Italian Socialist Party, in preparation for the congress, the great majority of those present demand the constitution of united action.

We think that the Pact of Action between the Italian Socialist Party and the Italian Communist Party has had several important results: it has allowed the greater unity between the Communists and Socialists, not only among the emigrants, but within Italy itself, a factor that has often served to help the work done in the factories and in the fascist mass organizations. It has permitted the two parties to take a united stand on agitation against the fascist African war, and to forge that magnificent example of military and political unity, the Garibaldi Brigade, uniting Republicans and an important group of Anarchists,

as well as the recent adhesion of a group of comrades from the "Giustizia e Libertà" movement. The united action of the Italian Communist Party and the Italian Socialist Party has aided the attempts toward united international action, for which Comrade Nenni took up a courageous defense at the last International Socialist convention held at London.

Nevertheless, the united action has not given all the results it should have given, especially in Italy, the cause of which we believe to reside in a lack of unity on the outlook of the Socialist direction, on the problems of the Italian political struggles, and with the Communist Party.

It is possible that we Communists have committed some errors, for which we have been reproved, and that sometimes we took certain political positions without having consulted our Socialist comrades. I believe that these criticisms are just, if they are limited to form. But does it seem to you, comrades, that we Communists would have voluntarily avoided the discussion of political problems with our Socialist comrades? No, comrades, we did not voluntarily wish to avoid the discussion of these with the Socialists. It is already a year and a half that we asked the adjournment of the Pact, in vain. In this year and a half many incidents have come up before which it was necessary that we, too, take a position.

There are, comrades, within the Socialist Party certain tendencies that are not convinced of the necessity of united action and that are not in accord on the very basis of the pact—that of action; and these tendencies are sometimes very active. Reading the

Nuovo Avanti one often has the impression that they decide the policies of I.S.P., which is fortunately untrue. Comrade Nenni has correctly written that the unity of action must be accepted, if it is accepted, in entirety, and only then it can strengthen the parties participating in the accord and be effective in the mass struggle—one position before all essential international problems. I assure you, comrades, that on these conditions the understanding between the two parties cannot be but a cordial one. The first obstacle to be wiped out in order to consolidate united action is the resistance to this unity by the Trotskyite counter-revolutionary pressure that operates within the ranks of I.S.P. and by the conciliatory spirit towards it.

We earnestly hope that the next congress of I.S.P. will answer the question: What are the political objectives of our common action? The 1934 Pact had all the timidity of a first agreement. It will be necessary to take some courageous steps forward and to formulate positive objectives.

The second great problem is that of the practical form of action. We hope that the I.S.P. congress will discuss this on the basis of the experience of practical action in Italy, the basis of action, and the reason for existence of every Italian political party. We are ready to discuss these essential problems with our Socialist comrades, and, once having fixed our aims, these decisive problems will be the basis for our united action.

The third question is the immediate formation of the essential nucleus of the Italian Popular Front. At this point it would be well to clear up a

confusion that, has been created by those who thought to see the same form of organization in the Popular Front as that of *L'Unione Popolare Italiano* (which also sought to mobilize the popular masses of Italy and is composed of masses of emigrant workers). The Popular Front, however, is an alliance of parties and of anti-fascist organizations within Italy, in which the associations maintain their autonomy, a condition for the success of popular anti-fascist action. The Popular Front is distinctly different from the defunct anti-fascist *Concentrazione* in which the proletariat was at the foot and not at the head of anti-fascism, and which had as its objective the return to the old democracy. Furthermore, the Communists take part in the Popular Front, an important factor in its existence, for without the inclusion of the Communists the Popular Front would inevitably be an anti-Communist front, popular in name only, and favorable to fascism. Who struggles against the Communists, whether he so wishes or not, struggles against a democratic revolution, as we have learned by experience.

UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS AN ESSENTIAL FOR VICTORY

The fourth question is the strengthening of our common action to accelerate the united international action of the proletariat against fascism and war—and, concretely, to give an immediate and favorable answer to the requests of the Spanish Socialist and Communist parties, and of the General Union of Workers [U.G.T.], that a meeting of the political and union Internationals be called to take up a

suitable measure to oblige the invading Italian and German troops to evacuate Spain. We believe that the I.S.P. will support this and will develop the positions sustained in London some months ago by Comrade Nenni that unity of international action is imperative at this time. Convinced of this, we must struggle with the maximum energy against those who would retard it or set obstacles in the way of realizing it.

We believe that on the basis of an understanding on the fundamental points here indicated that the adjournment of the old agreement with the I.S.P., an amplification of it, rendering it more concrete, giving it positive political objectives, is the task before us. After which it will be relatively easy to resolve a whole series of questions that were suspended, such as the question of the participation of the I.S.P. in all the mass initiatives that were taken by the emigrant Italians and others, so useful for the approach to masses of Italians living outside the country.

On the basis of practical and daily action a closer-knit relationship between Socialists and Communists can be achieved, within Italy and outside and in all degrees of our organization as well as bringing the hour of our organic unity nearer, the unity of the proletariat that is desired by them and which we desire as well. We will propose to the I.S.P. the constitution of a commission to study the problems of the unification of the two parties. If with conviction and reciprocal loyalty the two parties will achieve a practical ground of unified action, struggling against the enemies and saboteurs of united action, we believe

that the road to organic unity will be greatly shortened. We feel that a united policy is a necessity for the working class and a necessary condition for the success of the struggle for liberty and democracy.

We believe that had the organic unity of Red Spain been achieved before the insurrection, events in Spain would have taken a different path. The insurrection itself possibly would have been avoided.

The problem of unity cannot be postponed until the morrow of the great armed action of the masses of our country. We must unite now to work and prepare for the action when it comes.

PARTITION IS A CRIME AGAINST ARABS AND JEWS

The Daily Worker, London,
July 17, 1937.

[Statement of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Great Britain on the proposals of the Palestine Royal Commission.]

THE recommendation of the Peel Commission on Palestine constitute clearly a fresh endeavor of British imperialism to strengthen its position in Palestine. The Commission's Report shows that after seventeen years' trial British rule has failed to bring good government and peace to Palestine. It has admitted that under the mandate the problem of Jewish and Arab grievances cannot be resolved; it therefore recommends the termination of the mandate on the basis of partition. The proposed partition is a crime against both Arabs and Jews.

British imperialism is concerned not

with the interests of Arabs or Jews, but with rendering secure the vital strategic military and naval centers in Palestine. For this reason the Commission recommends that Haifa, an important naval base and head of the oil pipe-line from Kirkuk, should be retained under mandatory control for an indefinite period. By the recommendation that a permanent British mandate be established over an enclave running inland from Jaffa to a point east of Jerusalem, and a mandate over a second enclave on the northwest coast of the Gulf of Aqaba, Britain will have a firm footing in Palestine and control of access to the Red Sea.

"OFFER" OR THREAT

It is significant that the "offer" of partition is made with 18,000 armed forces standing by in Palestine, reinforcements ready to move, the battle cruiser *Repulse* at Haifa, and Communists imprisoned or deported as a precautionary measure. The Government's Statement of Policy announces that the Palestine Government will not hesitate to impose martial law should it be considered necessary.

The Arab and Jewish problem, which the British Government is concerned now to liquidate by partition, was created by the policy of British imperialism in its operation of the mandate. For centuries Arabs and Jews have lived together in harmony. Prior to the advent of British rule in Palestine, 60,000 Jews lived in friendly relationship with the Arab population. It is proposed now that the mandate be terminated. The problem is now to be solved by partition in complete disregard of the views and wishes

of the inhabitants of Palestine.

The proposal for partitioning Palestine does not provide a solution to the problem, neither is it workable. It denies the inhabitants of Palestine the right of national self-determination and puts obstacles in the way of Jewish development in common citizenship with Moslems and Christians. Partition is against the economic and commercial interests of both Arabs and Jews, and would aggravate and not diminish the tension. The creation of two separate states would produce friction over frontiers, tariffs, limited access to the sea.

The most fantastic and mischievous proposition, however, is the offer to forcible expropriation of almost a quarter of a million Arabs, although the Royal Commission admits that it is not known whether there is suitable land available to settle these Arabs. Furthermore, the wishes of the Arabs are not considered; just because they happen to be living within the territory assigned by the Commissioners to the Jewish state they are to be evicted.

The creation of a corridor dividing the Jewish state into two will undoubtedly provide a basis for friction. It is clear from the above few examples that, should partition be affected, Palestine, thus divided, would become a virtual powder magazine.

There is no justification for the denial of self-determination to the Arab people. At the same time it is incumbent on the Arabs to guarantee equal democratic, civil and cultural rights for Jews within an independent Palestine or wider Arab state.

The Communist Party fully sympathizes with the position of the Jews. For centuries the Jewish people have

been the object of vicious persecution in many so-called civilized countries. The whole situation has been aggravated since Hitler came to power. Anti-Semitism, the weapon of fascism, must be fought. Along with the working class of all countries, the Jewish people have played an heroic part in this fight.

The illusion of a national home for the Jews in Palestine is now exploded. Only the smallest minority of Jews could hope to escape from the terror of the fascist countries to Palestine. Immigration, therefore, is no solution.

The question of immigration can be dealt with only by a democratically elected government representative of the whole population of Palestine and cannot be forced upon the people against their will.

We therefore demand the termination of the mandate, the withdrawal of troops and garrisons from Palestine.

The proposal to partition Palestine against the wishes of both Arabs and Jews calls for the immediate cooperation of the people of Palestine, irrespective of religion, in the face of common danger:

Cooperation on the basis of the demand for the termination of the mandate; the recognition of an independent Arab state with full rights of citizenship for the Jews; and the institution of a democratically-elected legislative assembly.

SOVIET WOMEN TO THE FORE IN THE SOVIETS!

Pravda, Moscow, July 11, 1937.

THE Fourth Session of the Central Executive Committee of the

U.S.S.R., which has just ended, has unanimously ratified the new suffrage law of the Socialist state. This law, which for the first time in the history of mankind fully answers the needs of the broadest masses of the people, will translate into life the great principles of the Stalinist Constitution, will carry into practice an actual, genuine, universal suffrage, based upon the material economic and political setup of the new socialist order.

Presently, the Soviets will begin to prepare for the coming elections. And these elections will be as different from the sham elections of the capitalistic countries as night from day. There, criminal demagoguery, the most sordid machinations, the most involved intrigues contingent upon the age, sex, education and social and property status of the voter, are used by the cunning falsifiers of so-called universal suffrage, for the purpose of converting it into a vicious farce directed always against the interests of the mass of the people.

What question can there be of universal suffrage in the majority of capitalistic countries, when their women (that is, a good half of the population) are altogether deprived of these rights? It is only in the Soviet Union that a woman—a genuinely free citizen—enjoys the voting right on an equal basis with a man; nor is this right a fiction or a sham—it is a right fortified by the general position of a woman in the Soviets, where she is an active builder of socialism, a political force, and a happy mother of her children.

It was not without reason that Article 137 of the Stalinist Constitu-

tion, which deals with the equality of women, has been met with such enthusiasm and pride by the toilers of the entire world, and has aroused such bitterness and hatred among the foes of the Soviet country. The bourgeoisie, the fascists, and the Trotskyite-Bukharinist spies understand well the popularity, the full significance of the realization of the dreams of the multi-millioned masses of mankind for the first time, by the Soviet power.

WOMEN UNDER FASCISM

The fascist rulers, dreading more than anything else the masses of the people, frankly and cynically trample on all the rights of the workers. Fascist Germany, arming for the "Big War," needs cannon fodder. "Women should be servants of the nation and bear it soldiers"—the contemporary fascist vandals bellow.

Fascism and democratic representation are diametrically opposed concepts. One excludes the other. In fascist Germany representative bodies have been abolished. There, of course, there can be no question of women's rights. A woman has only one right: the right to a poverty which forces her to suicide when the sight of the suffering of her hungry children is no longer bearable. It is not for nothing that in Hitler Germany suicide has assumed the nature of an epidemic! In military-fascist Japan voting rights (which, by the way, are considered "universal") are denied above all to soldiers, women and students. The fascists want to reduce women to abject slavery; but women hate the fascist regime which inflicts war and destruction upon their children.

"They speak of equal voting rights for all citizens, but in the same breath they limit these rights by the issues of residence, of educational and even property qualifications. They talk about the equal rights of citizens, but immediately they make the reservation that these do not refer to women, or refer to them only in part."

The foregoing words of Comrade Stalin, in his Report of the special Eighth All-Union Congress of Soviets, refer to the constitutions of so-called democratic countries. An eloquent fact: There are 15,000,000 women in a population of 42,000,000 in present-day bourgeois-democratic France who, together with the army and navy, are completely deprived of the right to vote. It was only very recently that the People's Front government of France decided to include in its offices as Assistant Minister the daughter of the famous scientist M. and Mme. Curie, discoverers of radium. She herself is a world famous scientist. But in order that she might take the government office she was obliged, in conformity with French law, to receive permission from—her husband. In modern France the family right is to this very day regulated in essence by the Napoleon Bonaparte Code.

In England, where the bourgeoisie is especially boastful of its democracy, women received the right to vote only in 1918, and up to the late date of 1928 only women of thirty or over were allowed to participate in the elections. But even then, a woman, in order to vote, had to have "some property," or else be the wife of a person who had the vote.

But even where a woman is granted the right to vote, in actuality she cannot enjoy its advantages. In the economic and political sense, she remains

dependent—for “a genuine emancipation only exists where exploitation has been exterminated, where there is no oppression of man by man, where there are no unemployment and poverty, and where a man does not live in the day-to-day fear of losing his work, home and bread.” (Stalin.) Only the hypocrites and dissemblers of the Second International can praise the humaneness and democracy of the bourgeois order which is rotted through and through!

WOMEN UNDER SOCIALISM

It is only in the Soviet Union that woman lives a full political life. Having learned to utilize the rights bestowed upon her by the great October socialist revolution, she daily develops a broader initiative, creativeness and talent. In the Soviet Union the women are active participants in the social life of the country.

The Soviet woman takes interest and part in every enterprise of her country—from the organization of the creches and village libraries to government projects, gigantic constructions, and heroic ventures in aviation. The women learn through practice how to govern the country. Thousands of fine women-Stakhanovites, industrial workers, women collective-farmers, sports-women, brave, courageous young girls, youthful patriots who recently have gone to conquer the richest part of our country, the Far East—all have proved what the Soviet woman is capable of. It is not for nothing that the Soviet government guards her interests, that the

Party of Lenin-Stalin guides her.

The elections activities of the Soviet women are developing constantly. Already at present the women of collective farms, in their active participation in the elections, hardly lag behind the women in the cities.

There were 378 women delegates at the Seventh All-Union Congress of Soviets, and 419 participated in the special Eighth All-Union Congress of Soviets; whereas, at the First All-Union Congress of Soviets there were only 49 women delegates present. At present there are 101 women who are members of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. In what capitalist country do we see such a picture?

The Soviet women work with great enjoyment and enthusiasm in the most diverse fields of Soviet construction. Small wonder that 1,305 women in the U.S.S.R. have been awarded the highest order of the country—the Order of the Union; and 349 of these have been awarded the Order of Lenin!

Woman is a tremendous source of power for the fortification and betterment of work in the Soviets. A woman deputy justifies the faith of her voter. Now, as never before, we are facing the vital problem of more boldly advancing women into the leading ranks of the builders of socialism; into the very leadership. In this question, indecision or bureaucracy would prove most detrimental.

Make way for women in the Soviets—they are ardent patriots of the socialist fatherland!

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ACKNOWLEDGED

BOOKS

The Period of War Communism.

V. I. Lenin. International Publishers, New York. 460 pp. \$2.00.

The History of Anarchism in Russia.

E. Yaroslavsky. International Publishers, New York. 127 pp. 25 cents.

Technological Trends and National Policy. Report of the Sub-Committee on Technology to the National

Resources Committee. U. S. Government Printing Office. 388 pp. \$1.00.

Jefferson and Hamilton. Claude

Bowers. Houghton Mifflin. New Edition, \$3.75.

A World View of Race. Ralph J.

Bunche. The Bronze Booklets No. 4. The Associates in Negro Folk Education, Washington, D. C. 98 pp. 25 cents.

New Social Philosophy. W. Sombart.

Prince University Press. 295 pp. \$3.50.

PAMPHLETS

The Communists in the People's

Front. Earl Browder. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 10 cents.

Party Building and Political Leader-

ship. Foster, Bittelman, Ford, Krumbein. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 10 cents.

Problems of Party Building. Alex

Bittelman. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 5 cents.

Milestones in the History of the Communist Party. Alex Bittelman.

Workers Library Publishers, New York. 10 cents.

A Manual of Industrial Unionism.

William Z. Foster. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 10 cents.

Mother Bloor 75th Birthday Sou-

venir Book. Mother Bloor Celebration Committee. Workers Library Publishers. 15 cents.

Catholics Speak for Spain. North

American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, New York. 5 cents.

What's Happening in the U.S.S.R.?

Sam Darcy. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 1 cent.

The Scottsboro Boys. Four Freed!

Five to Go! Angelo Herndon.

Workers Library Publishers, New York. 1 cent.

Who Shall Rule Virginia, The People

or the Byrd Machine? Virginia State Committee, Communist Party. 5 cents.

Espionage. S. Uranov. Workers Li-

brary Publishers, New York. 10 cents

The Spy at Your Counter. Elizabeth

Lawson. Workers Library Publishers, New York. 5 cents.

NEW PERIODICALS

Photo History Quarterly. April Vol.

1, No. 1. "War in Spain." 35 cents.

July, Vol. 1, No. 2. 25 cents.

"Labor's Challenge." 155 East 44th Street, New York City.

Jewish Life. August, Vol. 1, No. 1.

50 East 13th Street, New York City. 10 cents.

Read More About

MARKISM-LENINISM

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

Aberdeen, Wash.: 115½ West Heron St.
Akron: 39 E. Market, Room 303
Baltimore: 501a N. Eutaw St.
Berkeley: 2475 Bancroft Way
Boston: 8 Beach Street
Buffalo: 61 West Chippewa
Butte: 119 Hamilton St.
Cambridge: 6½ Holyoke St.
Camden: 304 Federal Street
Chicago: 200 West Van Buren
2135 West Division St.
1326 East 57th St.
Cincinnati: 540 Main St.
Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.
Denver: 522 Mining Exchange Bldg
Des Moines: 218 Youngerman Bldg.
Detroit: 2610 Clifford St.
Duluth: 28 East First St.
Grand Rapids: 319 Bridge St.
Hollywood: 652 N. Western Ave.
Los Angeles: 226½ S. Spring St.
2411½ Brooklyn Avenue
Madison, Misc.: 521 State St.
Milwaukee: 419 West State St.
Minneapolis: 812 La Salle Ave.
Newark: 216 Halsey St.
New Haven: 17 Broad St.
New Orleans: 130 Chartres St.
New York: 50 East 13th St.
1001 Prospect Ave., Bronx
98 Fourth Ave., Brooklyn
1309—44th St., Brooklyn
Oakland: 567 12th Street
Oklahoma City:
129½ W. Grand Ave.

Omaha: 311 Karbach Block
Paterson: 201 Market St.
Philadelphia: 104 So. 9th St.
Pittsburgh: 607 Bigelow Blvd.
Portland, Ore.: 314 S. W. Madison St.
Providence: 335 Westminster St., Room 42
Racine: 205 State Street
Reading: 224 North Ninth Street
Richmond, Va.: 205 N. 2nd St.
Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.
St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.
St. Paul: 570 Wabasha St.
Salt Lake City: 134 Regent St.
San Diego: 635 E St.
San Francisco:
170 Golden Gate Ave.
1609 O'Farrell St.
121 Haight St.
15 Embarcadero
San Pedro: 244 W. Sixth St.
Santa Barbara:
208 W. Canon Perdido
Seattle: 713½ Pine St.
Spokane: 114 No. Bernard
Superior: 601 Tower Ave.
Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.
Toledo: 214 Michigan
Washington, D.C.: 1125 14th 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, N. Y.

NEW BOOKS

On the  **INTERNATIONAL** List

RECONSTRUCTION:
The Battle For Democracy
by James S. Allen

A new and challenging interpretation of a neglected revolutionary period in American history. **\$1.25**

•

ENGELS ON CAPITAL

Features a synopsis of Karl Marx's *Capital*. Contains also reviews, articles, prefaces, letters and supplementary material written by Frederick Engels. **\$1.25**

•

HISTORY OF ANARCHISM IN RUSSIA
by E. Yaroslavsky

During Tsarism and the Russian Revolution, with special reference to conditions in Spain today.
128 pages, \$0.25

•

THE FIRST AMERICAN REVOLUTION
by Jack Hardy

A Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the American struggle for independence
\$0.75

Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City