

000168

000168

The 1940
Elections

HOW
THE PEOPLE
CAN WIN

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

SOCIALIST - LABOR
COLLECTION

by Earl Browder

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

Five Cents

This pamphlet is the text of a report delivered at the meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party held in New York City, May 6 to 8, 1939.

PUBLISHED BY
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.
P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK, N. Y.
MAY, 1939.



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE 1940 ELECTIONS

HOW THE PEOPLE CAN WIN

By EARL BROWDER

THE WORLD ANTI-FASCIST FRONT AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE IN THE UNITED STATES

HITLER'S contemptuous rejection of the peace note of President Roosevelt, which was accompanied by tearing up two more treaties, and brusque territorial demands, has fully confirmed the need and appropriateness of the President's initiative. As Chamberlain is reported to have remarked, "This cannot be described accurately as peace time." No one can longer plead lack of clarity on the question as to whence comes the threat to world peace which has brought ten million men to arms in Europe and a major war in the Far East. Retreat and surrender before the threats of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis have been fully revealed as the source of the war danger and of the strength of the war-makers. The great merit of President Roosevelt's initiative, which demanded a halt be made to further aggressions, lies in the fact that its influence, combined with that of the Soviet Union, rallies the peoples of the non-fascist powers to force their governments into an anti-aggression bloc, and encourages the peoples under the scourge of fascist dictatorship to prepare their overthrow from within. Thus is taking shape the elementary organization of the world's peace forces, even if with great pains and difficulties, and at such a late hour that an enormous price is already being paid for the delays.

Let no one be permitted to forget that the latest war crisis was unloosed by the puppet Franco's military victory in Spain. When this agent of Berlin and Rome swept over Catalonia with

German planes, tanks and artillery, and Italian and Moorish troops, only then was the stage properly set for Hitler to obliterate the Czechoslovakian Republic from the map, for the Japanese militarists to seize Hainan and the Spratly Islands, commanding the approaches to French Indo-China, British Singapore and Hongkong, and the Philippine Islands. When the Casado-Besteiro Council of Capitulation opened the gates of Madrid to the fascists, who in two and a half years had been unable to capture that city, only then was the stage fully set for the Italian rape of Albania, the Nazi ultimata to Poland and Rumania, and the Franco signature to the "Anti-Communist Pact" with its accompanying boast that the old Spanish Empire in Latin America is to be reconstituted with the help of the Axis. Let no one forget that the fascist conquest of Spain, as of Czechoslovakia, would have been impossible without the aid of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier, and—shameful page in American history—the participation of the United States through the embargo that violated international law, violated specific treaties, and violated our own national interests. These bitter lessons have been paid for at such a monstrous price that we cannot afford to allow them to be forgotten.

For two years and eight months the Spanish people, with superhuman heroism and endurance, held back the fascist flood from the rest of Europe and the world. With horrible irony, those next in line as victims were the ones to strike the blows that broke the dike of the Spanish republic, and released the flood of fascist aggression now threatening every land. Only if and when the suicidal stupidity of that policy of the democracies toward Spain is fully realized is there any guarantee against new and more costly surrenders and betrayals.

From China comes news of growingly successful resistance of the Chinese people against the Japanese invasion. They are waging a people's war of independence, against terrible odds, abandoned in large part by those powers sworn to be their friends, assisted effectively only by the Soviet Union, and yet they have brought the Mikado's enormous military machine already to the point of exhaustion. If American markets were closed to the Japanese treaty-breakers and invaders, and opened to the Chinese people with adequate credits, that alone would

guarantee a quick victory to the Chinese republic, and thereby the peace of the Pacific.

Spain and China have shattered forever the myth of fascist strength and invincibility. They have proved that even unarmed peoples can meet and defeat the full force of the fascist war machines, if only the fascist powers are denied the help of the world democracies. The imposing superstructure of the Axis, that seeks to strike fear into the heart of all the world, is revealed as rotten to the core, being sustained only by the cheap and easy victories handed to it by cowardly or traitorous custodians of the interests of the democratic and non-fascist lands.

American leadership and initiative in organizing the peace forces of the world have become an imperative necessity for the simple national security of the United States. This national security is threatened by unrestrained aggression anywhere. This deep truth, of far-reaching import for the future of the world, has today entered the consciousness of a large majority of the American people. We Communists can welcome this development with the deepest sincerity, for we propagated and fought for this view for years, when this meant to go against the stream, when it brought upon us all the vilification and slander of those who pasted the label "warmonger" upon everyone who wanted to do something effective for peace, when "isolation" was still a popular word and "neutrality" was the dominant slogan.

Events have fully vindicated our analysis of world problems and the policies we have proposed and fought for. We have nothing to revise or modify in the reports and resolutions of our Tenth Convention and the meeting last December of our National Committee. Those documents have helped to make history and have been confirmed by history.

The fight for *social and national security* is being definitely established as a *single and indivisible issue* around which American political life is being realigned. The Tory camp, that coalition of reactionary Democrats and Republicans, which has fought so viciously against the *social security* program of the New Deal, is also revealing itself as equally the enemy of *national security*. It shamelessly steps forward in the role of at-

torney and advocate for Hitler in America, repeating and enlarging upon every argument and slander against President Roosevelt and American democracy that comes over the cables from the *Voelkischer Beobachter* of Berlin, while enriching the columns of that and all other fascist journals with their own contributions to the fascist ideological armory.

Hamilton Fish serves as the liaison agent to link up the Tory high command directly with its "Left-wing" agents, those who mask the same policy with "super-revolutionary" phrases, the Norman Thomas Socialists, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, who are gathered together in the self-styled "Keep America Out of War" and the "Ludlow Amendment" groupings. And in the last days, the unsavory combination has been joined by the dominant reactionaries of the American Federation of Labor Executive Council who, following the logic of their sabotage of the New Deal social security program, have calmly swallowed all their fine words and resolutions of years in support of a positive peace policy, by sending their spokesman to plead with Congress to preserve the moribund and discredited "Neutrality Act."

This unprecedented amalgam into the Tory camp of all those leaders, groups and forces, which can be united upon the common platform of opposition to *social and national security*, cannot obscure or halt the equally unprecedented swing of the majority of the people, especially of the working class, to a more conscious and consolidated support of the anti-fascist foreign policy of the New Deal. President Roosevelt, as opposed to the Tories, now has the country behind him as never before, since his foreign policy begins to take definite shape and harmonizes more fully with his domestic policy.

While vigorously supporting President Roosevelt's policies against his reactionary enemies and those who drag at their tail, we cannot fail to note and criticize those mistakes, weaknesses and inconsistencies in the Administration's execution of these policies in practical life. Gravest of these was the unforgivably stupid and criminal surrender to the Chamberlain "non-intervention" policy toward Spain, brought to a climax by the indecent haste with which Franco was handed unconditional recognition, the only thing he wanted from Washington. Thus did the

Roosevelt Administration gratuitously smear itself with complicity in the fascist aggression and destruction of democracy in Spain, the success of which brought the immediate war-crisis to a head; by this act, the Administration weakened and undermined its own prestige and moral authority, especially in Latin America, undoing much of the work begun at the Lima Conference and multiplying the dangers of fascist penetration against which the Conference was directed.

It is a real pleasure to register the great advances of the anti-fascist movement in Latin America and the Philippines, despite all weaknesses of Washington's leadership and other difficulties to be overcome. More profound in long-term significance than the Lima Conference was the Democratic Conference held in Montevideo in March. Three countries furnish, each in its own way and each effectively, a great stimulus and leadership to the Pan-American democratic movement—they are Chile, Cuba and Mexico.

A similar movement has arisen in the Philippine Islands. In each of these lands, there has arisen a national people's front that embraces all progressive and democratic forces, first of all the labor movement, powerful enough already to determine the course of national development.

Our brother Communist Parties in these lands, by bending all efforts to solidify the democratic national unity, are themselves becoming ever stronger and more deep-rooted among the population. It is not too much to say that without the work of the Latin American Communist Parties and the Communist Party of the Philippines, there could not possibly have arisen such powerful democratic movements in close contact with the broadest democratic masses of the United States. We may expect important steps forward in other Latin American countries, since their Communist Parties are also beginning to work fully in the spirit of the people's front and democratic unity.

If there is arising the promise of an effective anti-aggression and peace bloc in the world, this is due to the initiative and influence of the two greatest powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. Similarly, within every capitalist country, an effective peace front is built only where there is cooperation and common aims established between the labor and Communist

movements and the forces of bourgeois democracy that have refused to surrender to fascism.

The epochal Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union established, in the report of Comrade Stalin, the victory of the new classless socialist society, and the gradual transition from socialism to communism. The Soviet Union, from being economically among the most backward, has now definitely become first in Europe, and second in the world only to the United States. It is upon this solid and unshakable foundation that Comrade Stalin could enunciate the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, a policy which reflects the calm confidence and strength of the land of socialism, a policy which is the main foundation for rallying the peace forces of the world. That policy bears repeating again and again, until it has fully entered the consciousness of every fighter for peace. We quote from Stalin:

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

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

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

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

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

“Such is the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

"In its foreign policy the Soviet Union relies upon:

"1. Its growing economic, political and cultural might;

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

"3. The mutual friendship of the nations of our country;

"4. Its Red Army and Red Navy;

"5. Its policy of peace;

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

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

Truly, that is a clear and easily-understood policy, and one which arouses the response of the entire peace-loving world. Precisely for that reason, our American newspapers, whose owners are almost unanimously opposed to a peace-front against the fascist aggressors, have used up paper and ink by the carload to obscure, hide and distort this Soviet foreign policy. They have called to their aid in this campaign all their Trotskyite and Lovestoneite agents, and the muddleheads like Norman Thomas, to shout at the top of their voices against this policy of the Soviet Union.

But the measure of success of these reactionary efforts is to be found in this fact: that no people in all the world believes Chamberlain is serious in his proclaimed policy of halting aggression—*except to the extent that Chamberlain displays a serious interest in securing the cooperation of the Soviet Union.* That fact proves, with finality, that the great majority in all lands do understand and approve the foreign policy announced by Stalin.

Stalin's report, with its marshalling of irrefutable facts, with its calm and lucid arguments, has done much to dissolve the network of lies and intrigues, and bring out the true shape of world problems as the peoples of the world face them today. Stalin's report is a necessary document for every person who wishes to understand where we are going. The fact that two hundred thousand copies of this report have been sold in a few

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

weeks is only a small indication of the growing appetite of the masses for plain statements of facts and clear arguments, the best antidote to the poison of the fascist propaganda.

Today in the U.S. the Hoover-Garner coalition of Right-wing Democrats and Republicans are developing a foreign policy for our country which, if they controlled in Washington, would align the U.S. with the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis powers. They even go so far as to cry down any thought of danger to America, and declare the motivation of the rearmament program is "ballyhoo" to distract attention from domestic problems—an echo of the *Voelkischer Beobachter*. But the current of popular thought is all in the other direction, and by their openly pro-fascist arguments the reactionaries are separating themselves more than ever before from the majority of the American people.

The fact that Congress, with its Tory coalition which often swings a majority its way, has shown an inclination to sabotage measures of national as well as of social security, is a measure of the extreme danger that will become acute in the 1940 election. Reactionaries hope to control Congress and the Presidency after next year, and in this Congress they hope to block the tide of the popular will.

Thus it becomes of the utmost importance to rouse every mass pressure upon Congress to repeal the Neutrality Act, or fundamentally modify it to penalize the aggressor and aid the victim of aggression.

Thus it becomes a necessity of American national security to popularize the historic achievements of the Soviet Union, its great strength, and its consequent effective peace policy, in order to create a solid foundation for the inevitable cooperation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. which alone can guarantee world peace.

Thus it is an immediate and pressing task to rouse the masses of our country to close understanding and sympathy with the rising democratic movements of Latin America and the Philippines, and to press upon our government the fullest realization of the "Good Neighbor" policy, which means the complete eradication of the old dollar diplomacy and a drastic shakeup in our diplomatic personnel.

Thus it is not merely a humanitarian task, but a profound political duty, for the American people and the Washington Administration to give practical help to stop the fascist reprisals in Spain, and to transport the Spanish republican refugees to the United States and Latin American countries, and help to re-establish them there.

Thus, it is a political task to perpetuate and popularize the glorious history of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and support the organization of its friends.

Thus it is an immediate issue to secure a governmental embargo against Japan, and large credits to the Chinese republic; as well as to enlarge and extend economic sanctions against Berlin and Rome.

These are the immediate issues, in the realization of which will be registered in a practical way the course in foreign policy charted by President Roosevelt with the enthusiastic support of the majority of the American people. Victory on these issues will be the best possible preparation for victory over the Hoover-Garner coalition in the struggle for control of the U.S. in 1940.

Finally, a word about some international aspects of the problem of the working class unity to which we have given a great deal of attention as it presents itself in the United States. It is an international question, and the struggle for international working class unity is placed especially on the order of the day by the developing second imperialist war, particularly in its present stage. Workers' international unity is the aim toward which we must be working. In the American labor movement we must popularize the concrete proposal, that has been issued by the French Confederation of Labor, for an international workers' conference to meet the war question and the danger of fascist aggression. The French C.G.T. has officially made this proposal to the labor movement of the world. It has been endorsed by the Spanish trade unions while they were still functioning in the Spanish territory. It was one of the demands of the Spanish labor movement for the past two and a half years. It has been endorsed by the Latin American Confederation of Labor, which embodies the great labor movement of the countries to the south. There has been a solid foundation laid

for concrete proposals for the gathering of a general workers' international conference to take up the question of unitedly meeting the menace of fascism and war.

With this excellent foundation already made it should be possible for us, in spite of the traditional reluctance of the American unions, to involve them directly in the problems of initiating international trade union action, by taking part in the gathering of an international conference, a reluctance which is dissolving in the same degree that the isolationism that dominated the general American life is dissolving. It should be possible for us to make this one of the living issues of the day in the American trade union movement and we should set ourselves that task.

PERSPECTIVES OF THE 1940 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

A PROGRESSIVE AND DEMOCRATIC COALITION—THE WAY TO VICTORY

Since the Communist Party will apparently not be in a position to elect its own candidate to the Presidency in 1940, the alignment of forces in our country's political life which will determine our course as a nation for the next period must be studied in the broad fields outside the Communists' immediate influence, mainly in the Democratic and Republican Parties. We cannot be indifferent to this problem merely because our own Party is not an immediate challenger for power. It is of high importance for us fully to understand the relation of forces in the coming presidential struggle, to understand better than others in fact, for thereby we will find the possibility to assist the forces of progress and democracy, to the limit of our ability, to prevent the reactionary, pro-fascist, and warmongering interests from regaining complete national governmental power.

We have long noted the fact that, for the main body of the voting population, Republican and Democratic Party labels do not identify any consistent and homogeneous body of interests, ideas or political policies. These party labels are nominal, and

cover up widely disparate and conflicting interests, ideas and policies. This is especially true of the Democratic Party, the party of the Administration, which is sharply divided into two wings, the reactionaries and the New Dealers, engaged in a bitter struggle in Congress over legislation, and in the country for the control of the 1940 Party Convention which will nominate the candidate for the Presidency. Let us examine the Democratic Party more closely.

Since the Civil War, the Democratic Party has named only three successful candidates to the Presidency, each for two terms; they were Cleveland, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The first two were elected, for each of their terms, by a *minority* of the popular vote. Roosevelt was the first Democrat, since the Civil War, to come to the Presidency with a majority of the voters behind him, the first candidate to make the Democratic Party a *majority party* in the country. Cleveland's first election in 1884 was with a vote only 62,683 higher than Blaine, but over 70,000 less than a majority, out of a total of more than nine and a half million votes. In 1888, Cleveland received almost a hundred thousand votes more than Harrison, but lost, due to the uneven geographical distribution of the vote; but this time he received almost 400,000 less than a majority of the total vote. In 1892, Cleveland was again elected, but again lacking almost a half million votes of a clear majority. In 1912, Wilson was elected by a minority that lacked over 1,200,000 of being half the votes cast; while in 1916, he still lacked 135,000 of a clear majority.

The next important item to note is that the Democratic Party, always a minority since the Civil War until F. D. Roosevelt, made an especially weak showing when its candidate was a conservative; it dropped to 35 per cent of the vote in 1920, with Cox, and to 29 per cent in 1924, with the Wall Street lawyer, Davis; while in 1928, with Al Smith who was supposed to be a progressive in those days, it recovered only to a little over 40 per cent of the total. Between Cleveland and Wilson, Bryan was the candidate in three of the four elections, and twice came close to victory, always as a "radical," but in 1904, Parker, conservative, dropped far behind Bryan's strength. These figures show that the Democratic Party, always a minority, found

its only chance of victory in espousing the popular or "radical" cause; the only exception was in Cleveland's second election, when exceptional confusion in politics brought the popular vote to a candidate who had turned conservative after his first election.

The evidence is overwhelming that even before the crisis of 1929-33 unsettled all political alignments, the Democratic Party had the following of not more than one-third of the voting electorate, and that its rise above that proportion was *dependent upon forming a coalition with progressive revolters from the Republican camp, and with popular third-party movements.*

Turn now to the Republican Party. In 1912, Theodore Roosevelt's "Bull Moose Party" split-off showed that a distinct majority of the Republican voters were susceptible to the popular or progressive appeal, and when his vote is added to that of the Socialist Party of that year, it was over one-third of the total, as against the progressive Democrat, Wilson, while the reactionary Taft gathered less than one-fourth of the total. In 1924, the progressive Republican, LaFollette, gathered almost one-third as many votes as the regular Republican ticket for his independent candidacy *without a party organization.* In 1932 more than one-third of those previously voting Republican swung over to Roosevelt, while in 1936 the proportion was even increased.

The evidence is convincing that even before the 1929-33 crisis, but most certainly after the crisis, the Republican Party could depend with certainty upon the support of no more than one-third of the voting electorate, and that its rise above the proportion *depended upon the popular appeal of its electoral campaign and candidates.*

We can draw the conclusion from these facts that for a long time there have been taking shape, and since the 1929-33 crisis have become definite, three main voting groups, each representing at present almost evenly one-third of the voting electorate, one continuing to follow the Democratic Party whatever its political complexion of the moment, the other similarly continuing to follow the Republican Party, but the third turning to one or the other, or expressing itself in third-party movements, as it finds necessary to give expression most effectively

to its popular, progressive, democratic and "radical" demands, moods and aspirations.

President Roosevelt and the New Deal represents that middle-of-the-road path which has brought about a coalition between the Democratic Party and the third group of equal strength, a coalition that gathered the Administration's great popular majority in the country. This coalition represents the only possible basis for a Democratic Party victory in 1940.

But the Democratic Party, since 1937, has been sharply divided on the legislative program which is the foundation upon which this coalition has been built, and without which it cannot continue. The Garner-Glass-Wheeler wing of the Democratic Party set out to sabotage and defeat that program, and willingly paid the price of heavy losses in the 1938 elections to achieve their aim. They are now driving for control of the Democratic Convention in 1940, apparently prepared to face the inevitable defeat of their party in the Presidential election if thereby they can restore reactionary control and leadership over their party.

The Garner-Glass-Wheeler wing of the party holds the preponderance of organizational positions and power; the Roosevelt or New Deal wing holds considerable organizational position, but its main strength consists in its popular following and in representing the coalition with the third group of the electorate, which is the key to electoral victory, to office and power. The Democratic Party can almost certainly elect its nominee in 1940, if it names a candidate and writes a platform fully representing the New Deal coalition; it will with equal certainty go down to defeat if its candidate and platform conform to the wishes of the Garner-Glass wing of the party.

Much depends, therefore, upon the outcome of the Democratic Convention in 1940. The radical one-third of the electorate has no chance, nor any hope, of being represented by the Republican candidate and platform, which seems inevitably in the control of the Hoover-Dewey-Taft dominant leadership. It must therefore look for a victory of the Roosevelt New Deal wing in the Democratic Convention—or, failing that, face the alternative of break-up, dispersal, and defeat without a fight, or the launching of a new party of its own. Between a Garner-

Glass-Wheeler Democratic Party and a Hoover-Dewey-Taft Republican Party it has no choice.

The radical one-third of the voters find it necessary, therefore, to wish for and work for victory for the Roosevelt wing in the Democratic Convention. But, having as yet no guarantee of such a victory, it must prepare for alternative action in case of defeat at the hands of the Garner-Glass forces.

Conditions for New Deal victory in the Democratic Convention are not identical with the conditions for victory in the November balloting. Stating the problem in terms of the geographical distribution of forces, the difference can be put in this form: For victory in the Democratic Convention, the New Deal must depend mainly upon the North and West while fighting to gain as much support as possible from the South; for victory in the November election, the New Deal can fully depend upon the South (once it wins the Convention) and the West (under all circumstances) while fighting to gain as much as possible from the North. (In the North, according to this division, is included all states up to the Rocky Mountains.) Stating the problem in terms of the class distribution of forces, the New Deal must depend mainly upon labor and the farmers, by representing the basic interests of these groups, while fighting for as much support as possible from the professional people, small businessmen and independent industrialists, and exerting maximum influence among political-professional and party-worker circles by the inducement of holding the only possibility of their sharing in office and power. This last statement of the problem holds for both Convention and election, but the relative importance of the various factors varies as between Convention and election; the weight of the political-professional and party-worker circles is relatively high in the Convention and low in the election, while the weight of the labor and farmer masses is relatively low in the Convention and high in the election.

Given victory in the Democratic Convention, the New Deal coalition has before it a relatively sure road to victory in the election. It can count with a high degree of certainty upon the South, with 146 electoral votes, and the West with 65 electoral votes. That leaves a margin of but 55 electoral votes required to elect its presidential candidate, which could be provided even

by two states, such as New York and West Virginia, or Illinois and Michigan, or by a combination of three or four smaller states, assuming the most unfavorable conditions.

Although a section of President Roosevelt's party is to be counted among his most bitter enemies, and holds many positions of power in government and party, it remains more than ever true that the President's leadership has united the majority of the population in his support. Roosevelt may not have the enthusiastic support of the Democratic Party machine-politicians everywhere, but he unquestionably commands the allegiance of the overwhelming bulk of the twenty-seven millions who voted for him in 1936, and a clear majority of the electorate. Even the test polls of the Gallup Institute and *Fortune* magazine, certainly not loaded in his favor, reveal this fact clearly upon analysis. The going-over to coalition with the Republicans of a section of the leaders of the President's party reflects the preponderant sentiment of the upper classes, but is exactly contrary to the current among the toiling masses and the unemployed, and especially among the industrial workers, the largest single group of the electorate.

CANDIDATES AND THE "THIRD TERM" QUESTION

The progressive and democratic majority is a *coalition* between the Democratic Party and the independent radical one-third of the electorate. President Roosevelt has embodied that coalition, and by his leadership has consolidated and strengthened it. If the coalition is to continue through the 1940 election to victory, it can only be under the same type of leadership and policy. Both candidate and platform, to emerge from the Democratic Party Convention next year, must meet this test.

Inevitably there has arisen a rapidly growing **mass** demand that the President shall be the candidate to succeed himself. The critical condition of the world and of the nation, which demands continuity and stability of leadership of the government, which demands known and tested leadership, which renders especially dangerous any step which would break up the present *majority coalition*—these considerations have already brought millions to the conclusion that the tradition against a third term in the Presidency must be set aside, at least for the

present time of emergency, and that Roosevelt must be called again to that post. Since the issue is being raised so insistently by ever-growing masses, has emerged into public newspaper discussion, and is becoming of central importance to the alignments for 1940, the time has come when we also must begin to establish an attitude to the question.

The Communist Party, of course, is not and will not be committed to any candidate except its own. But there are millions of individuals, who are not prepared to vote for the Communist candidate, but who will want the considered opinions of the Communists as their most reliable aid in finding the most effective and practical course for themselves in solving this and similar problems. Therefore, we may submit for their consideration a few observations on the "third term" question, from the viewpoint of the masses who have united around the New Deal.

It would seem that the guiding thought, in choice of candidate, must be to find that individual who best represents, and who can best consolidate, that coalition of forces demonstrated in the twenty-seven million majority of the 1936 election. That leading consideration excludes immediately two types of candidate—one, the type of the Garner-Glass-Wheeler forces, which would unquestionably reduce the Democratic Party vote down to its normal one-third of the total; the other, such a candidate who, while acceptable to the broad radical wing, would be quite unable to gather the support of the South and the middle-of-the-road elements of the North. In short, the candidate who can continue and strengthen the coalition which Roosevelt has formed will necessarily be of the Roosevelt type. The issue of the "third term" has arisen in its insistent character precisely because there is not to be seen upon the political scene an obvious candidate of the "Roosevelt type" except Roosevelt himself. Perhaps such a candidate will come forward before the decision must be made, and that is to be hoped for, but certainly his shadow does not fall heavily upon the scene today.

Failing the materialization of such a candidate, possessed of all the essential attributes of Roosevelt, but lacking the eight years' experience in the White House which carries with it the tradition against the "third term"—what then? Shall the

twenty-seven million New Deal voters allow their unity to be shattered, with the inevitable consequence of handing a cheap victory to the Tory Republican Party, rather than break the tradition against a "third term"? Or shall they drive forward to victory again with Roosevelt, despite that tradition?

The anti-third-term tradition derives all its force from considerations of preserving democracy against the crystallization of a permanent ruling bureaucracy that might impose itself against the will of the majority. In this instance, however, the tradition would seem to be working in the opposite direction, namely, to deny to the majority the right to choose its preferred candidate solely because he had twice before been chosen, and to threaten the break-up and defeat of that majority, giving victory by default to the reactionaries. In the light of this situation, the tradition loses much of its popular appeal.

The tradition becomes a vital weapon for democracy when faced with a President who, removed from and out of sympathy with the masses, might wish to perpetuate himself by force of machine politics and governmental pressure upon a reluctant electorate. Roosevelt is accepted by the progressive forces as the extreme opposite of such a type. He stands on the same plane as Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, in his close and sympathetic connection with the masses. He is in sharpest conflict with the machine-politicians of his own party. He has made notable contributions in removing governmental pressures from the electorate. The New Deal forces are therefore led to the conclusion that if he is named for a third term, that will be an outstanding victory of the democratic masses over all the anti-democratic forces that hate him so bitterly precisely because of his characteristics. These facts also serve to remove much of the popular force of the old tradition.

All new and untried bourgeois-democratic republics have found it necessary to protect themselves against perpetuation in office of the chief executive, either by establishment of a strong tradition, such as that laid down by Washington and Jefferson in the youth of the United States, or by constitutional prohibition of even a second term, as in Mexico, on pain of paying for failure to do so with serious distortions of their democratic development. The United States is no longer, however,

in the category of a new and untested experiment. For one hundred and fifty years it has been gaining experience in democratic self-government; and it seems not unreasonable to think that this makes possible, in the exceptional crisis now facing the U.S. and the world, the suspension of this safeguarding tradition when it so obviously defeats the immediate democratic will, without too serious danger to the future of democracy. This consideration further detracts from the popular force of the anti-third-term tradition in 1940.

Among the working class, particularly that section with trade union experience, the anti-third-term tradition as a rigid dogma will have little force. The workers have learned in their trade unions that while they need frequent opportunity to change their officers, in order to put them to the test and eliminate the unrepresentative, incompetent and corrupt, yet they defeat their own ends when they bind themselves against re-election for any number of terms of the most tested, capable and popular officials. All experiments in anti-third-term or anti-second-terms traditions and rules in the trade unions have broken down because in the long run they have been found to defeat and destroy democracy. And so the working class voters will not be much disturbed by the appeal to the tradition against their desire for Roosevelt's re-election.

We may sum up this consideration of the third-term issue, from the standpoint of the New Deal, as it relates to the Democratic Party Convention, by saying that it seems advisable to find a new candidate of the Roosevelt type, capable of uniting all the forces of the New Deal *coalition*; but that failing the appearance soon of such a candidate in the field, it would be an anti-democratic stupidity to allow the tradition, however sanctified by age and progressive origin, to deny democracy the chosen leader necessary to victory in the most critical moment of national and world history.

The question becomes even sharper and clearer, in case the Democratic Party Convention is dominated by the Garner-Glass-Wheeler forces, and adopts a candidate and platform of their type. In that case the New Deal democracy, having nothing to choose between Republican and Democratic Parties and candidates, must have been prepared for, and will have no

choice but to launch its own new party organization—in which case Roosevelt will certainly be demanded by the masses as the candidate for victory. Any staunch New Dealer who can be named by the Democratic Convention can be elected, but against reactionary candidates on both old party tickets, the President, supported by a firm New Deal coalition, could provide the surest *guarantee* of victory.

Many progressives, steeped in the traditions of our American history, are still somewhat confused and embarrassed to find the Tories and reactionaries wielding the sword of an old democratic tradition as the sharpest ideological weapon of reaction at the moment. They should remember that the same sort of thing has often occurred at other times and with other issues. States' rights doctrine was one of Jefferson's chief ideological weapons, but after 1800 it was seized by the traitorous Federalists for anti-democratic ends; it became the flag of the reactionary camp against Andrew Jackson, one of the greatest American democrats; it was used to justify secession, and the break-up of the Union, by the slave-power of the South, in 1861; and today it is found in the arsenal of the Tory Republican high command directed against the New Deal. Similarly, the Monroe Doctrine, originally an instrument for advancing independence and democracy in the Americas, became transformed, at the turn of the twentieth century, into the very symbol of imperialist oppression and exploitation over Latin America by Wall Street, and is only now in process of being transformed into its opposite and original significance again.

The recent Chicago municipal election has demonstrated once more how important are all these local electoral battles. One by one the old political machines based upon patronage, finding their foundation undermined by the crisis and rising democratic mass movement, are breaking up; some of them, or part of the forces combined in them, try to find a new base among the masses; they have learned that this is only possible by a fundamental shift of policy and practice, to cease the mere lip-service to the New Deal and become its active exponents and practitioners in their communities. Every such development should receive the encouragement and cooperation of the entire progressive camp. The big change in the municipal life of Los Angeles

is a different form of development of the same movement to bring the New Deal into the cities as a practical matter. A number of important municipal elections are scheduled during 1939, in which proper and energetic work can greatly strengthen the foundations of the national democratic and progressive movement for 1940.

From the foregoing analysis of the relationship of class forces in the country the following can be safely concluded: The surest way for the democratic forces to prevent pro-fascist reaction from winning the government in 1940 would be with a New Deal candidate for the office of President, a candidate of the political position of President Roosevelt.

However, in saying this we have not said all. To insure such a victory will require the greatest exertion of effort by the masses of the people, by the independent mass organizations and mass movement of the workers, farmers and middle classes. It will require, in other words, a most serious and sustained political struggle against the offensive of Big Business reaction from now until Election Day. It will require concerted daily action by the masses themselves, at the bottom, in the localities and municipalities, on the major political issues facing the country, such as the struggle for jobs, security, democracy and peace. For it cannot be denied that the weakest spot in the armor of the progressive camp is the insufficient self-activity and struggle of the masses themselves for the realization of the major demands of the democratic front platform and in support of the progressive measures of President Roosevelt's Administration.

Particular stress at the present time must be put on the struggle against the offensive of monopoly reaction, on the issues arising from the economic crisis, on such questions as jobs for the unemployed, security of employment, economic help to the farmers and to the middle classes, as well as an intensified struggle for adequate relief to the unemployed. And it is evident that the country is coming to a point where drastic measures have to be taken by the government to check the offensive of the reactionaries on these issues and to open the way for economic recovery.

Already at the Tenth Convention of our Party we urged, together with the labor movement generally and the progressive

farm movement, a program of action looking toward the development of a national housing program, and the nationalization of the railroads, large banks and munitions industries. Life since then has definitely proved that only such measures as these could lift the country out of the economic crisis, check the sabotage of Big Business, and open the way to economic recovery in the interests of the people.

Therefore, we say that the surest way to prevent reaction from winning the government in 1940 is for the masses themselves and their independent organizations, economic and political, to unfold a sustained and concerted struggle, in the industries, on the farms and in the localities, for the major demands of the democratic front platform which undeniably express the wish of the majority of our people. This would mean, naturally, that the trade union movement would place the question of jobs and security of employment in the very center of their activities and struggles in the industries, carrying on such activities in closest contact with the political struggles of the masses in support of the progressive measures of President Roosevelt. This would mean, similarly, that on the farms and in the farm organizations, policies would be pursued to lead the farm masses in daily struggle for their economic demands on a local and state scale, again in closest contact with the political struggles on a national scale in support and for the improvement of the progressive agrarian plans of the New Deal. Similarly with the middle classes, and with the Negro people. In short, as we said at the Tenth Convention of our Party, the American people have not only the right to demand progressive measures; they also have the duty to fight for them, and this is today truer than it ever was before. It is the only guarantee for victory in 1940.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND THE ELECTION ISSUES OF 1940

The continued and deepening depression of the economic life of the country is the foundation for most of the issues of political struggle around which the population is realigning itself. For ten years United States economy has not even kept pace with the growth of population, while the maldistribution of the decreased production becomes ever more pronounced. Even

such recovery as took place from the depths of the crisis returned an ever smaller proportion of workers to their jobs, due to accentuated rationalization, mechanization and speed-up. The simplest and most immediate problems of life, how to keep a minimum supply of food, clothing and shelter at the disposal of the mass of the population, become ever more difficult and pressing. No political party, group or leader would think of denying these facts any more; all issues of domestic policy refer immediately to these facts as granted.

There are people who see the relation of economic activity to the political struggle of 1940 in a very simple and mechanical formula. They say, if there is economic recovery, that will turn the tide toward the New Deal and return it to power, while if there is continued or deepened economic stagnation, that will turn the rising discontent of the masses against those now in power and in favor of the reactionary Republican Party as the only practical alternative. But we must reject this short-sighted and abstract view, which leads to passivity and fatalism, playing right into the hands of the reactionary forces.

The renewed economic crisis from the middle of 1937, from which there has been only partial recovery, arose upon the basis of economic factors inherent in the capitalist mode of economy. But the time it occurred, its precipitancy and depth, were conditioned upon two major political influences; one, the "sit-down strike of big capital," the declaration of "lack of confidence in the government" on the part of monopoly capital, was the most important; the other was the weakening and partial withdrawal of governmental intervention in economy, the retreat made by the New Deal under the pressure of monopoly capital's attack.

The attacks by monopoly capital, whether these are economic or political, against the masses and the New Deal, need not and should not weaken the mass support of the New Deal; on the contrary, it should strengthen and consolidate that support. And to the extent that such attacks further depress the national economy, it should strengthen the determination and fighting spirit of the masses to enforce their program, which is being sabotaged by the reactionaries. The retreats and weakenings of the New Deal under these attacks, of course, are an entirely

different matter; such retreats unquestionably weaken and demoralize the mass support of the New Deal, and open the way for reactionary demagoguery. The answer, then, is that when and if the New Deal fights for measures in the interests of the masses, it strengthens its position politically, regardless of whether the economy is going up or down; and when it weakens in that fight, it weakens its mass support, again regardless of whether economy is going up or down.

Reactionary agents of monopoly capital, dominating the Republican Party and the Right-wing Democrats, raise the demagogic cry: "Are you satisfied to remain all your life on W.P.A. jobs at a starvation wage? Abolish the W.P.A. and other New Deal measures, and private employment at regular wages will come back." Obviously, this demagoguery flies in the face of well-known facts, such as the fact that the crisis came as the climax of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover regimes, of unconditional domination by finance capital, without any W.P.A. or any of the reforms of the New Deal, which did not prevent the throwing of fifteen millions out of private employment; such as the fact that Hoover prevented for three years of the crisis any governmental interference in economy, with the result that the economic life of the country came almost to a complete standstill; such as the fact that whatever degree of recovery there has been since 1933 came as a result of governmental intervention and New Deal reforms, that recovery weakened when the New Deal retreated, and gained when the government again strengthened its economic intervention. Facts are stubborn things, and these are obvious and undeniable facts. We must never allow them to be forgotten. In this issue we have the crux of the economic problems of the country, as they are being worked out by the great majority of the people who have not yet come to understand the advantage and necessity of an entirely new economic system, of socialism, and who will find that understanding only through struggle and experience.

It is a fact broadly recognized that private capitalist enterprise, unassisted by large-scale and increasing governmental intervention, cannot and will not bring about recovery of the nation's economy. Increasing accumulations of idle capital and idle manpower can be united in productive activity to increase

the nation's wealth and provide a measure of livelihood for the masses, not by removing the government from the economic field, but, on the contrary, only by constantly increasing governmental initiative, activity and control in certain specified branches of the national economy.

This is true not only of the accepted field of public works, which private capital never pretended to develop. It is especially obvious in the question of housing, to take one example. There is an acute housing shortage in the country, with the result of rising rents and deteriorating housing standards, and intolerable social and economic burdens growing heavier day by day. An expenditure of five billion dollars per year on housing designed for mass use would require many years to cover this shortage. Everybody knows that private capitalist enterprise cannot and will not carry out such a building program. Yet machinery, materials, capital and men are present in abundance within the country only waiting and anxious for the effective order to do the job. Obviously, such an effective order can come only from the government, based upon a large-scale and long-term program. Equally obviously, such a housing program would be the greatest stimulus to the national economy generally.

Of course, reactionary spokesmen for monopoly capital have many arguments against any such program, which they shout from the housetops and in the columns of almost every newspaper. Most of these arguments are bogey-men to cover up the real underlying motive, which is greed and desire for greater exploitation of the people. Let us examine one of these bogey-men in some detail, to expose its fundamentally false character. Take the argument that such a large-scale housing project, by further expanding the national debt, would lead toward national bankruptcy and financial collapse. Dig to the bottom of that argument, and what do we find?

Suppose that a private capitalist enterprise, a huge corporation, could be imagined to have been formed, raising five billion dollars capital each year for five years, a total of twenty-five billion dollars, for such a large-scale housing construction program as we have envisaged. It issues its capital obligations, certificates of one form or another, whether stocks or bonds is not

important; that is, it goes into debt to the amount of twenty-five billion dollars. At the end of five years, however, it holds assets, in the form of a great system of planned housing, to the value not merely of the twenty-five-billion-dollar investment, but that amount *plus the enormous super-profits of the extortionate rents now being paid for sub-standard housing*—a part of which could be passed on to the tenants in the form of lower costs, and a part of which could be capitalized by the corporation over and above its original investment, after paying normal interest on its capital.

Now, if that were done by a private capitalist corporation, would our reactionaries cry out that the twenty-five-billion-dollar capital debt would lead the nation toward bankruptcy and financial collapse? Of course not, they would hail it as a feat of capitalist genius, the source of true national prosperity, particularly if the corporation had passed on but a minimum of the benefits to its tenants and had capitalized the gains mainly for its owners to the tune of 25 or 30 per cent profit on the original capital.

If such an enterprise would be a great boon to the nation, when carried out by a private corporation, why would it not be an equal or even greater boon if carried out by the government, or by *a corporation organized and directed by the government*? What would make it a benefit in the one case and a disaster in the other? Clearly, the chief if not the only economic difference in the two cases would be that private enterprise would direct the benefits chiefly toward the capital investors, while governmental enterprise would direct the benefits chiefly toward the larger group of the consumers of the housing.

There is the further, and crucial, difference between the two opposing conceptions of how to carry out such a housing program. That is, that private capital is incapable of doing it, and even if it were capable would be entirely unwilling, because it has too many vested interests in the old sub-standard housing which would be retired from use; while the government would be entirely capable of doing the job in the most effective manner—provided only that in the governmental position of power were representatives of the people and not of the private capitalist interests.

Thus we find by the simplest and most direct examination of the reactionary arguments against a serious and large-scale governmental program for economic recovery, that these arguments are directed not at all to the protection of the national interest, but to the protection of monopoly capital interests at the expense of the nation.

There is the further argument that such a housing program, for example, would be the entering wedge of socialism, which by destroying the confidence of private capitalists would bring all the rest of economy to paralysis, and thus force either complete socialization or abandonment of the governmental project. Such argument is only a threat by monopoly capital that it will go on strike if the government undertakes any projects of which it disapproves. Actually, such a housing program would not be either socialism or its beginnings. It would take place entirely within the framework of the capitalist economy, according to its form and rules, and would no more be socialist than the governmental ownership and operation of railroads that has prevailed in most European countries for generations. It would merely supplement the system of private capital, by doing those things which private capital alone is unable or unwilling to do, and which are necessary for the continued existence of society.

A real socialist housing program would be an entirely different thing, and, may we add, a much better one, but since the great majority of the population of the U.S. is not ready for socialism, we cannot expect our socialist conception of housing to be adopted immediately. But the choice is not between no housing program at all, or the really socialist program; the immediate choice is between the present almost complete absence of an effective housing program, and a serious and large-scale extension of New Deal principles into the housing problem under the present capitalist system, which would have tremendous consequences in stimulating the whole economy of the nation.

The basic principles of this discussion on housing can be applied, with only minor modifications, to a few key points in the national economy, and also apply in the main to the whole question of public works also. There is not the slightest danger to the national economy in governmental debts which represent

the putting to work of idle capital and idle men in the production of socially necessary and useful things; on the contrary, that is the only possible road toward national salvation, short of the complete socialist reconstruction of the country.

Or, consider the problems of the farmers, in relation to the New Deal program.

The majority of farmers find their economic problems becoming more difficult, their share of the national income declining, and as a result they are stirred with discontent with the New Deal which failed to help them as much as it promised. The Republican Party has been speculating on this discontent, and turning much of it to their advantage, despite their complete failure to propose any counter-program to that of the New Deal. It must be said, in fact, that while the New Deal performed for the farmers much more than the Harding, Coolidge and Hoover Administrations, all its farm measures have had one fundamental defect—that they were merely improved versions of the same policies that were inaugurated by the Republican Party.

Hoover, when President, made the first proposals to “plow under every third row” as a measure of crop control, and McNary, Republican leader in the Senate, is the original father in Congress of export subsidies. The New Deal refined and improved the crude Republican measures and proposals, and eliminated some of their worst features. But it did not depart from their basic principles, and failed to find a fundamentally democratic basis for its farm program.

All New Deal farm measures passed their greatest benefits to the minority of well-to-do farmers, reached the middle farmers only with the crumbs and leavings, and actually helped to drive off the land a large part of the sharecroppers and poor tenants. Thereby they strengthened that stratum traditionally Republican and anti-New Deal, neglected the mass of New Deal farm supporters, and actually injured the lowest stratum which should have been the main support of the New Deal in the countryside. There can be no serious consideration of winning the farming masses back to the New Deal that does not begin with measures that build up the lower-income farm groups, not the higher-income groups. To neglect this means to

surrender domination of the countryside to the reactionary camp.

It seems absolutely clear, in the matter of program, that the New Deal coalition can maintain and consolidate its majority in the country, only by fearlessly *pressing forward* along the lines already indicated in established legislation but not yet fully realized, while any retreat or compromise on the key issues of this program can only weaken and undermine that majority. That is the answer to all the timid advice that is showered upon the New Deal leadership, advising it to go slow, to compromise, or to retreat. To follow a timid leadership now is the sure road to destruction for the New Deal coalition.

THE STRATEGY OF THE TORY CAMP

Now it is necessary to examine in more detail what is the strategy of the Tory camp, which in essential features is the same for the dominant Tory leadership of the Republican Party and the Garner-Glass-Wheeler Democrats. That Tory strategy hinges upon two main points; first, demagogic promises, based upon the formula "Give the big bankers and industrialists control of the government, and they will give the workers jobs again." And second, splitting the progressive camp, based upon Hitler's "Anti-Communist" formula, or the "red hunt."

Tory demagoguery may be expected to grow more and more extreme, until it reaches its height toward the end of the 1940 election campaign. Already we saw in 1936 and especially in 1938, how the Republicans did not stop short of actually writing into their state platforms the Townsend Plan of \$200 per month pension to every person over 60 years, although nowhere did they take a single step to legislate this demand. The Republicans of Minnesota won the state in 1938 from the Farmer-Labor Party, by actually promising more social legislation to the workers and farmers plus lower taxes, while accusing the conservative New Deal Farmer-Laborites of being "dangerous reds"; but what Minnesota has actually received from the Republican administration has been a sharp disillusionment about election promises. The Wisconsin Republicans didn't find it necessary to make promises to win that state from the LaFollette Progressives, because Phil LaFollette had gone anti-New

Deal, and all the Republicans had to do was to prove they were better anti-New Dealers than the Progressives could possibly be. But the fruits of that debacle, in the wiping out of most of Wisconsin's progressive social legislation, have been bitter for farmers as well as workers, and have brought a sharp awakening in both Democratic and Progressive ranks. Ohio and Michigan have had more or less the same experience, as a result of exchanging a Democratic for a Republican administration; although the first was anti-New Deal and the second was New Deal, it was demonstrated that Republicans can always wreck social legislation even more completely than Tory Democrats. In New York, the Republican Legislature, feeling its oats after 1938, has given an indication of how much further it would have gone if Dewey had become governor, by its reactionary budget in defiance of Governor Lehman, and its reactionary measures against civil and electoral rights. But such revelations of the hollowness of Republican promises will by no means end their demagoguery. They only claim more vehemently that their promises of jobs and prosperity depend upon Republican control of the federal government, Congress and the Presidency, in 1940.

Another trick of the Tory coalition is to put forward their Democratic Party wing as sponsors of reactionary legislation, while the Republicans sit back and merely furnish the votes to enact these measures. Then the Tory Democrats are paraded as "party comrades" of the President, who is made to appear more responsible for their measures than are the Republicans whose votes enact them. This leaves the Republicans more free for demagogic declamations and promises, and even to appear as "more Left" than the President's own party.

What puts some punch into Republican promises is the implied threat behind them, which is sometimes even openly made, and which will play a big role in 1940. That threat is implicit in the slogan of "lack of business confidence" as the explanation of unemployment and continued depression. It is the threat that if the government is not turned over to men chosen by or satisfactory to the big capitalists, then more and more enterprises will be closed down, capital will go on a sit-down strike. Such a threat, coming from men who own or control at

least nine-tenths of the basic productive economy of the country, is indeed a menacing one, and bears heavily upon all the politically inactive population. It is a powerful backing for the accompaniment of demagogic promises.

Main reliance of the Tory camp is, however, placed upon the weapon of splitting the progressive and democratic camp. For this purpose they have a very definite plan of campaign, which all hinges on the strategy of the "red scare," the "hunt for the Communists." They have taken this technique over complete from Hitler, who first developed it as the means to power within Germany, and then as the means to world conquest in the notorious "Anti-Communist Alliance" of Germany, Italy and Japan, and, in the last weeks, Hungary and Spain. The formula is: beat the drums loudly about the "red menace," get all the timid souls and the corrupt agents of reaction within the progressive organizations repeating the cry, then "reveal" the "red menace" at work within those organizations, and call for a "purge of the reds," especially the "masked reds" who are the more dangerous because they disclaim their reddish nature.

This process is guaranteed by its inventor to break up or paralyze any progressive and democratic organization to which it is systematically and persistently applied. It is now being used extensively in the Lawyers' Guild, the youth movement, the Teachers' Union, to mention but a few current examples. Homer Martin rode this red herring to death in the Auto Workers' Union, under the expert advice of Lovestone and Harry Bennett of the Ford Company. William Green of the A. F. of L. uses it as his chief weapon against the C.I.O., and to cover up his collaboration with the Manufacturers Association and the Republican strategy committee. Martin Dies, under the instructions of Garner, gathers all the threads together into a single network, which he weaves around President Roosevelt and the whole New Deal.

This "red-baiting" strategy has been carried so far that its agents have actually split the Workers Alliance of Illinois, on the grounds of fighting "Stalinist control"—the evidence being that the Workers Alliance in common with the entire trade union movement, both A. F. of L. and C.I.O., worked for the re-election of the New Deal Mayor Kelly of Chicago!

The charge of "Stalinist domination" in the New York Teachers Unions, when fundamentally analyzed, is seen to be founded on nothing more than that these progressive teachers supported the recovery program and the speeches on foreign policy of Roosevelt's Administration, and campaigned actively (too actively for the taste of some) for the rights and welfare of the teachers themselves. These are extreme examples, but they are by no means unusual, and the same technique is rapidly becoming a commonplace of American public life.

It is clear for any unprejudiced observer, regardless of his political opinions, that this great campaign which engages the major political forces of reaction in the country and every agency they can direct—a campaign which throws the spotlight of national publicity upon the Communist Party—is not directed primarily against the Communists, who after all are still an extremely small proportion of the American population, but has some other and more important immediate aim. And that other, and primary, aim can only be the splitting of the broad progressive and democratic camp for the purpose of ensuring the victory of the Tory Republican-Democratic coalition in the 1940 elections.

The unusual and spectacular hullabaloo against the Communists is most certainly not caused by any unusual and spectacular activity on the part of the Communists. On the contrary, in the past few years the Communists have completely dissolved the "Communist groups" or "fractions" within the trade unions and other organizations, which in Europe had been made the excuse of the "red scare." That excuse has been entirely eliminated in the United States. Only a few weeks ago we carried this a step further by ordering the discontinuance of all Communist papers which have been published by groups of Party members in shops and institutions, in order to dissolve every remnant of anything that could be interpreted as rivalry to the union publications and organizations, or which could be distasteful to the broad progressive movement; today the Party publishes only general political papers and magazines, and for its more intimate press contacts concentrates upon issuing small neighborhood papers. Communist Party members, far from striving for control of any trade union or other organization, direct all their energies toward gathering the broadest unity of

the progressive and democratic people of every shade of politics, upon the issues of the day and of the organization involved. It is really this *broad progressive policy of unity* which frightens and enrages the reactionaries, because this is shared by the Communists with the majority of the people, and spells defeat for the reactionaries everywhere.

Examine the problem of unity between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., in the light of the great problem of defeating the Tory strategy and returning the New Deal to power in 1940 upon a strengthened and developed program, and its full importance immediately becomes clear. Of course, this was a major motive for President Roosevelt, in his timely intervention which brought resumption of unity negotiations between the two big labor camps; it is a motive shared by the overwhelming majority of the members of both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. It is no accident that both Lewis and Tobin, outstanding champions of unity in the leadership of the two organizations, are both champions of the New Deal and contributed much to raise it to power and to put its program into effect. Neither is it an accident that the most stubborn enemies of unity in the A. F. of L. leadership are Woll and Hutcheson, both members of the inner councils of the Republican Party, and men who move freely in the circles of the Liberty League and the National Association of Manufacturers. It is clear that a united labor movement, combining the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., and also if and when possible the Railroad Brotherhoods and all independent unions, into one fraternal solidarity, is required not alone for the more narrowly practical trade union aims, which is important enough, but over and above that it is a *national interest* for the great New Deal majority of the population. It is needed to guarantee our country against the return to power of greedy, reactionary and anti-social forces representing Wall Street and monopoly capital.

The C.I.O. has consistently maintained its initiative in the struggle for unity, and stands upon a unity platform which commands by its merits the support of every progressive, as we fully analyzed the question in our December meeting.* This

* See: Earl Browder, *Social and National Security*, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

platform must with ever-increasing energy be taken up by the members, locals and lower councils of the C.I.O. as the basis from which to wipe out artificial differences with their brothers in the A. F. of L. unions, demonstrating upon the concrete issues of the day, in city, state and national political and economic life, the common interests of the members of both camps, and the vital concern which all have in achieving united action and eventual organic unity. All progressives outside the trade unions have the right and the duty to express the need for unity as a need of the whole democratic community, and to press this issue upon the trade unionists. If this is done consistently, there is no doubt that the great majority of A. F. of L. membership can be won to a practical unity position.

The reactionary majority of the A. F. of L. Executive Council, which criminally made the split to prevent the four million members of the C.I.O. from being organized, is today the chief obstacle to A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unification. But it is no longer enough merely to state that fact. More important is to understand why they are the enemies of unity. It is because they are moving toward alliance of the A. F. of L. with the Republican Party-Garner Democrat forces.

The fight for a unity policy inside the A. F. of L. is, therefore, a fight for the New Deal—and that means the National Labor Relations Board, the Wages-Hours Bill and Roosevelt's anti-fascist foreign policy, which the A. F. of L. Executive Council is sabotaging or betraying. The fight for a unity policy inside the A. F. of L. means a fight to prevent its leaders from tying it up to the Republican Party strategy board and Herbert Hoover. And if we are to obtain trade union unity, it can only be at the price of a much broader and sharper fight within the A. F. of L. unions against those leaders who betray unity and at the same time betray the immediate needs of the workers.

It would be a fatal mistake to fail to see the real danger of the reactionary strategy in the 1940 elections. It is based upon profound knowledge and study of American popular psychology, especially of the middle classes and farmers who have given the tone to most of American political life. It has enormous material resources in its support. It has a united, bold and daring leadership, to a much higher degree than has the pro-

gressive camp. The danger that it presents must therefore not be underestimated.

It seems, however, that it is already possible to point out a very big mistake that has been made by the strategists of the reactionary general staff. Basic to their strategy is to play up the South against Roosevelt and his coalition with the radical democracy of the North and West; but at the same time, they have rushed into head-on collision with Roosevelt's foreign policy, which has a greater majority support in the South than in any other region. Thereby they have raised a major contradiction in their strategical set-up for 1940 which may well become decisive for their defeat. They forgot that the South has always, and especially since the invention of the cotton gin, been economically dependent upon foreign markets far beyond any other section of the country, therefore keenly sensitive to world affairs, never isolationist and rarely "neutral-minded." It is entirely impossible for the South to go along with the foreign policy expressed lately by Senator Taft and Herbert Hoover, no matter how much "Cactus Jack" Garner and Carter Glass might try to drag it in that direction.

We may sum up this preliminary survey of the present relation of forces looking toward the 1940 elections, in a few simple propositions:

1. The Communist Party will be committed to no candidate except its own, although there is no prospect of being elected.
2. We share with the majority of the population the urgent desire to maintain and strengthen the unity of the majority, which is supporting President Roosevelt and the New Deal, against its reactionary enemies who are in a minority, but who hope to return to power by splitting the majority.
3. One of the most difficult problems is to obtain such a candidate that will be acceptable to the main groups composing the progressive majority. The ideal candidate, "Mr. Unity," is not likely to be fully satisfactory to either the conservative progressives or the radical progressives, but must be a middle-of-the-road figure of the type of Roosevelt, acceptable to both groups.
4. A prime condition for consolidation of the majority coalition is a militant fight for a recovery program in which governmental intervention at key points is exercised to stimulate

shrinking private enterprise, and contracts only to the extent that private enterprise expands, not as an inducement for a problematical expansion. A large-scale housing program, in billions of dollars, is obviously an irreplaceable major item in any real recovery program.

5. The farmers' problems, which have become more difficult, must receive major consideration from the progressive coalition, in measures which will immediately restore agricultural production, in the first place of the family-operated farm, to solvency, that is, to guarantee at least cost of production.

6. It is necessary to expose the false promises of the reactionaries, and to defeat the Hitlerite strategy of the "red hunt," under which the cry of "Communism" begins with actual members of the Communist Party only to extend to every fighting democrat, not excepting such a typical middle-of-the-road figure as President Roosevelt, and is designed chiefly to paralyze and split the progressive majority.

7. Unity of the labor movement, above all unity between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., is the first consideration for winning the 1940 elections for the camp of progress and democracy. The fight for unity is now, above all, a fight to win the A. F. of L. for the Labor Relations Act and the N.L.R.B., etc., a fight for the New Deal in both domestic and foreign policy, and to defeat the designs of Woll, Green, Frey & Co. to hitch the A. F. of L. to the Republican Party.

8. The Communists can make their greatest contribution to the progressive mass movement by explaining problems, clarifying the relations and alignments of various groups and leaders, by seeing further ahead than others and transmitting that foresight to the entire mass movement, thereby arming it for quick and correct decisions when the maturing struggle demands it. This is the best foundation for building our own Party, and winning the masses ultimately for our program of socialism, for it will win us the respect and confidence of the masses.

SOME PROBLEMS OF PARTY BUILDING

Building the Communist Party is a complex task, which requires constant study and planned activity, in closest adjustment to the political problems of the day and to the temper and level of development of the masses among whom we work. The particular function of the Party is that it is an organ of leadership; it must be in advance, and able to show the way to the masses, but it must never get so far in advance that its connections with the masses are broken. This Party of ours is itself a living, growing thing; it must be learning and relearning constantly the lessons of its own and of universal experience. It is constantly assimilating new recruits from among all sections of the population, chiefly from the working class, and constantly eliminating those elements in its midst which prove unassimilable.

It is criticizing itself constantly, testing and proving in the fire of experience every policy, every idea, every formula, every method of work, every habit and attitude, every member and every leader, passing judgment upon them according to their contribution in gathering the power of the working class, raising its consciousness, and gathering its potential allies around it, in the course of combatting and defeating its enemies.

As our Party membership approaches the 100,000 mark, we have noted a slackening of the rate of growth. This is an almost infallible sign of the accumulation of unsolved problems of adjustment of the Party to its tasks and environment. We must put our finger on these unsolved problems, drag them into the light, and find the collective answer of the Party to their solution.

Analysis of the Party composition and growth reveals an essentially healthy condition. We long ago put aside all idea of rapid multiplication of Party membership, in competition with the mushroom growth and equally rapid subsidence of the Huey Long movement, the Townsend movement, and the Coughlin movement, to mention some outstanding examples of the last few years. We have adjusted our expectations of growth to that which can reasonably be expected to be assimilated into long-term activity. Our immediate problem is revealed by the rate of growth beginning to fall even below this reason-

able expectation. Comrade Stachel is going to deal with this question in detail, and I will therefore speak only of a few conclusions which have crystallized from our study and experience.

More than a year ago we announced our decision to abolish the institution of "Party fractions," that is, of regular meetings of Party members who are members of other and broader organizations, for the purpose of securing united opinion and action among them. That decision marked a new stage in our work; it was made necessary by the presence of a movement much broader than merely our Party and its sympathizers, with which we have to work, and to the collective judgment of which the Communists must subordinate their activities. This broad democratic and progressive movement, it was found by experience, grew and consolidated itself best in the free working out of the democratic common life of these organizations as a whole, undisturbed by any special organized groupings of our Party or any other. In coming to this conclusion, we threw all our influence on the side of dissolving all special groupings, especially within the trade unions, but also in all mass organizations. Experience has fully proved the correctness of this decision. It was exactly suited to the conditions of this period, contributed to the healthy development of the mass organizations, and served to strengthen our own Party and its influence.

Now we have taken a further step in the same direction. The Political Committee in March announced its decision to abolish all special Party publications based upon shops and other institutions of employment; and instructed the lower Party organizations to substitute for them general community and neighborhood papers or the central publications of the Party. We are certain that this National Committee meeting will confirm that decision. It will contribute to the education of our membership in more effective methods of work, improve our relations with friends and allies, and thereby tend to restore our expected rate of Party growth.

Study of our shop papers and their results had revealed to us that on the whole they were serving to perpetuate a certain sectarian position of our Party members in relation to their fel-

low workers, tending to act as a wall between Party and non-Party circles rather than as a connecting link. Too often they were edited from outside, or else suffered from the opposite weakness of immersion in such detail in shop affairs as to lose political orientation, either become rival to union papers or fall into trivia, gossip and personalities. It had proved impossible to establish sufficient collective guidance and control to remedy these weaknesses and defects. Experiments served to demonstrate that where shop papers were abolished, it was easier to throw our members more fully into participation in the collective life of their institutions of employment. From this, after long and full discussions, followed the general decision to abolish such papers.

One of the most serious weaknesses of shop papers was their anonymous character, since, despite the complete legality of our Party, recognized and established by the government, this status has never been accepted by the big employers. Reactionaries are making desperate efforts to legislate against our Party's legality, and have seized upon anonymous shop papers as an argument that Communists themselves, by such publications, were admitting a conspiratorial character to their Party. We have taken this argument away from them, by the decision that every Party publication must carry the name of its responsible editor and the office of publication. Our Party is fully legal, has nothing conspiratorial about it, and we can afford to discard everything which can be seized upon by our enemies to create an opposite impression upon the uninformed public.

A really tremendous agitation and propaganda is being carried on against the Communists, compounded of slander and intimidation. Directed against the whole progressive camp, for the purpose of splitting and atomizing it, it also has the secondary result, of course, of driving away from Party membership all those who for various reasons feel unable to stand up against this pressure, despite their agreement with the Party. There are doubtless many tens of thousands of such non-party Communists, and their number multiplies.

Martin Dies, chairman of the "red-baiting committee" of Congress, revealed the naked un-Americanism of his purposes

when, in the course of committee hearings, he expressed in his questioning of witnesses the desire to make it impossible for anyone holding political opinions classed by him as "Communist" from holding any job, public or private—the intention, in short, to destroy Communist political opinions by starving all those who hold them. It goes without saying that Martin Dies will not succeed in this purpose in America, when even Hitler in Germany has miserably failed. And especially will Martin Dies fail, because not only is the democratic spirit rising in America, but the Communists themselves have learned how to fight effectively against the Hitlerite technique used by Dies and his fellows.

The more fully the Communist Party establishes itself in the American democratic tradition, in ideology and methods of work, the less satisfied with us are the gentlemen of the Dies Committee. Indeed, they are very angry about precisely this development, and they go to great lengths to prove their opposite pre-judgment. Thus, a few weeks ago, Congressman J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey, second in command to Martin Dies, declared over a nationwide radio hook-up that at the recent Nazi meeting in Madison Square Garden, while the storm-troopers inside were violently demonstrating their contempt for American traditions and institutions, the Communists were on the streets outside creating disorders and fighting the police with a similar purpose. Congressman Thomas lied to the nation when he made that statement, and is without the excuse of ignorance of its falsity. He cannot be ignorant of the fact that Trotskyites are highly-specialized anti-Communist fighters, trained to that single purpose in life by experts; he and his committee have demonstrated their full knowledge of this fact by blandly ignoring the inflammatory subversiveness of Trotskyite agitation while attempting to convict the Communist Party of identical views despite our complete repudiation of them.

There is no doubt that the Nazis were very happy about the Trotskyite disorders outside their meeting, and there is little doubt that the whole thing was, by mutual agreement, a mere division of labor. It was intended by the Nazis and Trotskyites that Congressman Thomas should make such a

speech, charging the Communist Party with the street disorders, and the Congressman performed according to expectations. But the facts, of public record, are that the Communist Party, while urging that the authorities should prohibit Nazi demonstrations, called upon the workers to follow Acting Mayor Newbold Morris's advice to boycott the meeting, to stay entirely away from it, once the authorities had authorized it and given it police protection. Facts, however, are treated with small respect by the red-baiters.

Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, spies, detectives and agents-provocateur are all merely specialized parts of one network of agents of the big industrialists directed against the labor movement and against the Communist Party. A growing volume of detailed evidence is providing a clearer picture of this important fact. The Auto Workers Union threw light on this political underworld, when it exposed the role of Jay Lovestone as directing agent of Homer Martin's liaison with the fascist Father Coughlin, with Harry Bennett as agent of Henry Ford of Nazi-decoration fame, and with all the anti-labor and anti-New Deal forces that rallied to Martin's infamous union-smashing effort. We have recently seen a proposal, signed by a group of active Trotskyites, directed to a vigilante anti-union organization, offering their services in setting up a company union against the bona fide unions in the industry. It is becoming more difficult to distinguish between Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, on one hand, and simple spies and provocateurs, on the other. They are all in the same network, strive toward the same ends, and work in the same manner.

Our Party is still insufficiently vigilant against the efforts of these enemy agents to penetrate the Party ranks to carry on their provocations. And yet we know literally millions of dollars are spent to promote such efforts. It is possible, from our study of the work of the spies and agents whom we have discovered, to describe rather fully their aims and methods and their specialized functions.

First, there are simple information agents. Their aim is to get the names of members in order that they may be discharged from their jobs, and to obtain organizational plans in order that

these may be circumvented and defeated. Such agents work as inconspicuously as possible, try to make themselves useful in technical capacities, and keep out of political discussions to avoid betraying themselves.

Then, there is the lowest grade of provocateurs. Their aim is to plant evidence, or to create it, for the purpose of feeding "red scares" or to frame up evidence against particular persons. Their "reports" are circulated confidentially among big employers to scare them into keeping the funds flowing into the office that organizes the espionage. They are particularly happy when they can get elected to the post of branch secretary or membership director, where they can get hold of Party membership cards, and then produce "evidence" against any progressive their employers wish to "convict" of being a Communist. They report elaborate "plots," which they usually copy out of detective story magazines or John P. Frey's testimony to the Dies Committee, which is a collection of such reports.

Another type of agent, recruited from professional criminals who gain release from prison or dismissal of charges as their reward, perform the first two types of espionage and provocation, and add a special angle of their own, when discovered in burglaries or hold-ups they explain to complaisant and confiding police who are in on the game, that the crimes were committed "for the cause," that they were only carrying out "party orders." A typical example of this was Arthur Scott, or Margolies, in California, but he was only repeating a pattern which your reporter first witnessed in the A. F. of L. back in 1915-16.

A higher type of provocateur is the one sent into the Party to obtain, or already equipped with, political training which he is instructed to utilize for creating differences and disputes, which he tries to lead toward the crystallization of factions. Such agents are always "more revolutionary" than the Party leadership and the members generally; they are impatient for "revolutionary action"; their talk runs to "blood and thunder"; they are the advocates of "violent overthrow of the government" who are Martin Dies' ideal of a Communist. Their special purpose, besides furnishing employers and police with "evidence," is to exert influence upon the activities of the Party

toward sectarianism, to create an atmosphere of conspiracy and suspicion, to appear themselves as "spy hunters."

A historical example was the government police agent, Morrow, who was sent to the Bridgeman Convention of the Communist Party in 1922, and cast the deciding vote between two equal factions that deadlocked the convention. Those two factions, as we learned later, were the work of more clever and subtle wrecking agents, who came to blossom later as the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, who were not cleaned out of the Party until 1928-1929. Since that time, this type of agent has had a more difficult job, but they abound in the trade unions and work among the newer, less-experienced organizations of the Party.

The most specialized and skilled types of spies and provocateurs are the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites. Their leading figures are highly-trained professionals, following their occupation as a sort of "free profession," selling their products in as many markets as possible at the highest market price. When they can get hold of a Homer Martin, they have "found gold" almost literally, and there is a "gold rush" of all their smaller fry to share in the riches. Their main occupation is furnishing "revolutionary" reasons for the performance of reactionary deeds. They are constantly searching for "contacts" among Party members, especially discontented ones, for whom they have an established technique to transform into active agents. Their main fields of work are in mass organizations of a progressive character, which the powerful reactionaries wish to see thrown into turmoil by inner conflicts, fights, scandals and splits. They have also kept some of their members within the Party purely as information agents, some of them ever since the formative days of the Party, posing over years as loyal Party men; we are beginning to find a few of these figures through new channels of information long hidden from us.

We have sufficient evidence to convince us that a number of these various types of agents hold Party membership books; we know that some of them have been or are members of state committees or work in state office technical staffs; some are found in section leading committees. This knowledge is the re-

sult of intensive investigation by the National Committee, without engaging the whole Party membership or even the leading cadres in a spy hunt. A considerable number of these enemy agents have been removed from the Party; others disappeared as they realized they were under suspicion. But the problem is still before us, and history teaches us that the supply of new ones will never end except with capitalism.

We can by no means ignore or hush up this problem, especially in these days of war preparations, and when we find concrete evidence linking up the anti-labor and anti-Communist espionage network directly with the consulates of the Axis powers—Germany, Italy and Japan—as well as with detective agencies and big employers. The Senate Civil Liberties Committee has helped to expose and thereby limit some of the espionage practices against the trade unions. But the problem remains, and will require increasing attention especially with the sharpening of the war danger.

How are we to locate, identify, expose, defeat and drive out the spies and provocateurs? Certain specialized investigations are, of course, required on the part of National and State Committees. But the basic measures are those which involve the entire Party, membership as well as committees, and they are measures that are intimately linked up with the solution of all our problems of Party building. They are measures of political education, of raising the level of political life of the Party, and of improving our methods of selection, promotion and education of the Party's leading personnel.

Enemy agents are not and cannot be in full and enthusiastic participation in the political thought and life of the Party and the mass movement. If they try to disguise themselves as loyal and active members, their masks never withstand a systematic observation and analysis. Their only possibility of continuing their work is to avoid observation and analysis. This possibility is given them only where and when the Party is careless, lacks vigilance, does not know its own members thoroughly, and does not seriously try to know them. This possibility exists only where the political thought and discussion of the Party lags, and where planned work and business-like check-up is lacking.

Thus we see that all those measures needed to sanitize the Party from agents and spies are at the same time the things we need to improve the Party's life and work in all fields, and to improve its relation with the masses. The heaviest blow we struck against spies was with the mass sale of the reports, resolutions and Constitution adopted at our Tenth Convention, in several hundred thousand copies, and their study by our members and sympathizers; this was at the same time the general lifting up of our Party and mass activities to a new high level. And now, with the further distribution of 100,000 copies of the great text-book, the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, and 200,000 copies of Stalin's report to the Eighteenth Congress, our members are equipping themselves as never before for all their present and future tasks.

Upon this foundation, and the improved position of our Party in relation to the masses, we are now engaged in a profound reconstruction and improvement of our mass education and also of our Party schools. A higher quality in all our work, political and organizational, is the indispensable precondition for our Party to defeat all its enemies, to gather all its forces, and to pass over to the next higher stage in its development. Some of the main features of this educational development were outlined in my report on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Workers School, published in the pamphlet entitled *Theory as a Guide to Action*.* That document should be considered as additional material to this report.

All of this must result in a considerable enlivening and strengthening of inner-Party democracy, expressed in increased initiative and self-activity of Party members and committees in carrying the Party policy into life among the masses. This must result in a considerable refreshing and strengthening of the Party leadership, national, state and local, as well as in the branches.

We have a great wealth of new and valuable forces in that half of the Party membership which has joined us in the past two years. We must treasure it and make the fullest possible

* Earl Browder, *Theory as a Guide to Action*, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

use of it. At the same time, we must give special attention to that growing core of the Party, members who have steadfastly performed their tasks over five, six, seven, and up to twenty years, the old members and leading personnel. Party building today is, in a special sense, the combining of the new with the old, the supplementing of the strong points of one by the strong points of the other, their fusion into a solid and homogeneous Party of Bolsheviks, capable of overcoming all difficulties and solving all problems.

We must fully equip our Party successfully to carry through a new period of growth. The goal of 100,000 members which we had hoped to exceed by this National Committee meeting will surely be realized before the next meeting, which we propose shall take place on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Party's founding, on September 1. Then we turn our efforts towards the second hundred thousand, which should be considerably easier to gain than the first one was.

The conditions for such growth were never better. Some people, it is true, are frightened away from us by the anti-Communist campaign with its vicious slanders and discriminations. But for every one who is frightened away, there are ten new persons brought closer to us, into sympathetic contact which can quickly ripen into active membership. And these persons are the most intelligent, most loyal and most active representatives of American democracy, workers and farmers, professionals and middle-class people, white and Negro, of old Anglo-Saxon stock as well as the later national groups, men, women and youth. They are inevitably and irresistibly attracted to the Communist Party, the only Party which gives them at once the most practical and effective program of action for meeting and solving immediate problems, and in logical and practical relationship to this immediate program, and growing out of it, the program for the complete remaking of our country on the basis of socialism. These people, in growing hundreds of thousands, belong to us—the moment we show them, by the work of every branch and committee and leader of the Party, that we have the Party for which they have been looking, a Party worthy of our great principles and aims, a Party worthy of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

ALSO BY EARL BROWDER

Social and National Security

What does the Munich Pact mean for the security of America? How can the American people meet the threat of reaction at home and fascist aggression abroad?

These questions are answered by the General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

48 pages, price 5c



The Democratic Front

FOR JOBS, SECURITY, DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

The main political problems confronting America today are discussed in this brilliant report before the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party. Such questions as the offensive of reaction, the development of the democratic front, labor unity, foreign policy, the Communist Party, the Soviet Union, etc., are extensively dealt with.

96 pages, price 10c



The People's Front

In this book, Earl Browder provides a masterly analysis of the People's Front movement as it is developing in the United States, the alignment of forces in the struggle against fascist aggression and predatory wars, and the various factors affecting the growth and development of this people's movement.

354 pages, price \$2.25



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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