
SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT IN THE UNITED STATES

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

popular movements so characteristic of American history.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That the growing American democratic masses possess the very impor-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In *The Communist* for February of

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

3. THE HIGH MILITANCY OF AMERICAN WORKERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE KEY TO DEMOCRATIC FRONT ORGANIZATION WORK

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

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

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

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

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

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