

For Working Class Unity! For a Workers' and Farmers' Labor Party!

By EARL BROWDER

*(Speech delivered August 11, 1935, at the Seventh World Congress
of the Communist International)*

COMRADES, the report of Comrade Dimitroff, and the resolution before us, give a clear and decisive answer to all the main question before the working class and toiling masses of the world.

I wish to concentrate my speech upon that point in the resolution which deals with a specific feature of the United States in relation to the forms in which the united working class front, and the broad anti-fascist people's front, can be realized. Paragraph 3 of Section II speaks of "the formation of lasting coalitions in the shape of 'Labor Parties' or 'Workers' and Farmers' Parties' (U.S.A.), etc." This point was further elaborated by Comrade Dimitroff.

Our Party has already laid the foundation for this policy in the decisions of our January Central Committee Plenum, and the work of the Party since then. This was not difficult, since there is a tradition among the American workers in this direction since 1920, since our Party had a big experience in a mass movement in this direction in the years 1922-24, and since the Sixth World Congress laid down a fundamental line on the question.

During the period of 1929-1934, there was no mass breakaway from the two chief capitalist parties which would give a base for practical work for a Labor Party. We therefore correctly declared against any attempts in this direction, and concentrated the Party upon its basic mass work, building united-front movements around specific issues: wages, hours, workers' rights, unemployment insurance, the League Against War and Fascism, etc., without having been able as yet to carry the united front on to the broad political field in the shape of a united-front party.

FACTORS FAVORING PRACTICAL WORK FOR A LABOR PARTY

But during 1934, and especially in the election period, it became clear that we must again review the whole question. Large masses, in hundreds of thousands and even millions, were breaking with

old leaders and programs, were being disillusioned with the New Deal of Roosevelt, were seeking for some new path, were beginning to move. This expressed itself often in bizarre and utopian forms, such as the movement of the Technocrats, the Upton Sinclair EPIC movement, the Utopian Society, etc., which had numerous local imitators over the country; it was shown in the formation of the Progressive Party in Wisconsin, which was a split of the LaFollette movement away from the Republican Party; it was seen further in the new strength taken on by the old Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. In the past year it has especially been seen in the spectacular rise of mass movements around the two outstanding semi-fascist demagogues, Senator Huey Long with his Share-the-Wealth slogan, and the radio priest, Father Coughlin, with his Union for Social Justice and a program of large-scale inflation, movements which claim their adherents in millions, and undoubtedly exercise broad mass influence.

In this situation, a new tactical program was undoubtedly called for. The Communist Party was growing, having doubled its vote in 1934, but this was in no relation to the mass movement away from the old parties. Further, our few efforts at united-front actions in the elections, had disclosed big possibilities (united workers' tickets in Southern Illinois), but at the same time a dangerous sectarianism in our own ranks (resistance to a joint election appeal by Socialist and Communist Parties, Trumbull County, Ohio, on the basis of an existing united front on current issues). We reopened the whole question of the Labor Party after the election and as a result came forward in January of this year with a broad campaign for the creation of a Labor Party, which we described in our first public appeal as:

“ . . . a fighting Labor Party, based upon the trade unions, the unemployed councils, the farmers' organizations, all the mass organizations of toilers, with a program of demands and of mass actions to improve the conditions of the masses at the expense of the rich, for measures such as the Farmers' Emergency Relief Bill, the Negro Rights Bill, and the Workers' Unemployment and Social Insurance Bill.”

We set ourselves especially the task to rally a trade-union base for the movement toward such a Party.

MISCONCEPTIONS THAT HAD TO BE CORRECTED

Two serious weaknesses in our policy were already being revealed by life itself in our half year's work, which we can now see very clearly in the light of the resolution and Comrade Dimitroff's report. Both were yet the result of the pressure of sectarian in-

hibitions and prejudices from which we are emerging. It was and remains clear that realizing a mass labor party depends in the first place upon our progress among the workers. We tended, however, to *limit* the conception of the Labor Party to its working class character, although this was in conflict with our simultaneous practical proposal to include farmers and all toilers; this served to obscure the necessary character of such a united-front party as a *lasting coalition* of workers, farmers and city middle classes. This unclarity made unnecessary difficulties in bringing our program to the farmers and city middle classes—a tremendously important question in the struggle against fascism. Second, and connected with the first, was the limited character of the program which we proposed for such a party, and our failure to face and answer the inevitable question from the masses as to our perspective for such a party when it should grow and attain political successes. Comrade Dimitroff's report has brilliantly illuminated these problems for us, and shown us the way to answer them.

The too narrow conception of the proposed united-front party was expressed in our categorical rejection of the name "Farmer-Labor", even though this has an established tradition especially in the agrarian Northwest. This was connected with past mistakes we made in 1925, when in summarizing the lessons of our participation in the Farmer-Labor Party movement of 1922-1924, we had been influenced by the Trotskyist anti-peasant theories, which denied the possibility of a lasting alliance of workers and farmers and came out in principle against the conception of a *coalition party* in which the Communist Party should participate. Our first practical steps to carry out our January resolution brought us into a conflict with this remnant of "Leftist" nonsense, which masks a Social-Democratic, narrow guild approach to non-proletarian masses, and which we must now clear out of the way, as thoroughly as we cleaned out the Right-wing opportunism of Lovestone-Pepper on the Labor Party question. The movement of poor and middle farmers, their struggle against the miseries inflicted upon them by the crisis and the Roosevelt policies, their hatred against the common enemy, Wall Street and the monopolists, is one of the chief factors of the proposed united-front party; there is no serious reason why the name "Farmer-Labor Party" cannot be adopted if and when that will facilitate the cementing of the alliance with the farmers' movement. The whole question of name is one of expediency, not of principle; and the attempt to transform it into a question of principle reflects the too narrow conception of the class composition of the Party.

On the question of a program for the united-front party, we

proposed a series of quite correct and fundamental demands, which already have big and growing mass support, such as unemployment insurance, civil rights, Negro rights, relief for the farmers, etc. But it has been becoming ever clearer that this is not enough; the masses have a burning desire for measures directed towards re-opening the closed factories, which brings them to support such distorted formulations of their demands as the Upton Sinclair EPIC program; they want an extension of democratic rights to enable them to bring their pressure upon the legislators more effectively, and this desire is manipulated by the reformists and semi-fascist demagogues. It is clear that the united-front party must extend its program to such issues, formulating them in such a fashion as to contribute to mobilization and consolidation of the masses instead of quieting and dispersing them as at present. We can take the feature of the EPIC program which aroused mass enthusiasm, and divest it of Sinclair's reformist robes, by putting forth the demand that the government shall confiscate every factory that closes down or dismisses a large part of its workers, and shall itself operate these enterprises, paying union wage rates. We can demand the abolition of the present unequal representation in Congress, particularly the Senate; and the abolition of the usurped power of the Supreme Court to avoid social legislation; these two demands have wide popularity, but are now the object solely of demagogic manipulation. The united-front party must bring forward a rounded-out tax program, not simply as we have done so far only on specific measures like unemployment insurance and the veterans' bonus, but for providing for the entire government budget at the expense of the rich, relieving the poor of taxation, abolishing sales taxes, and fighting unrelentingly against inflation. The program must add a series of projects for public works, designed to meet the needs of the impoverished masses, furnishing housing, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, etc., for the masses. This program must take up the fight against the tremendous corruption prevailing in every phase of government.

WE MUST PRESENT A CONCRETE PROGRAM TO THE MASSES

We have, up to the present, given the masses a perspective for such a united-front party as an effective means of bringing pressure upon the ruling class, forcing concessions from them, and organizing the masses. We must say that we have felt that the masses to whom we speak are not satisfied with this alone; without being clearly formulated, the question has always been present:

"But what then? Will we not fight for a majority? What will

we do with it? Can we form a government with such a party? What could such a government do?"

These questions we have not answered squarely, and therefore we have been at a disadvantage in our struggle with the reformists who answer them wrongly. The questions must be answered now, otherwise the masses will not believe that we take the proposed party really seriously. We can answer these question on the basis of Comrade Dimitroff's report.

We must say clearly, yes, we will fight together with all those in the united front, for a majority in all elective bodies, local, State and national. We will support such a party, whenever and wherever it wins a majority, in taking over administrative powers, so long as it really uses these powers to protect and extend democratic liberties and advance the demands of the masses. But the masses will ask us: What will be your role? Will you stand aside as critics, preaching merely for a Soviet Power for which we are not ready to fight? We answer: the Communists are even prepared to participate in such a government. We openly declare that such a government will not be able to introduce Socialism, which is possible only at the hands of a really revolutionary government—a Soviet Government—but that it can prevent fascism from coming to power, can protect the democratic liberties of the toiling masses, can fight off hunger and economic chaos, and give the toiling masses *time to learn*, through their own experience, what is the larger, more deep-going program around which they must unite in order to realize a Socialist society, and who can lead them to this only final solution of their problems.

I do not need to emphasize that the question of such a government is hardly an immediate practical question for us in the form presented in France or England. However, it may be quite practical soon in many cities and States. In another sense it is a practical question now, because the American workers will not go with any party that does not give a clear answer on the question of government.

PROSPECTS FOR A UNITED FRONT PARTY

What are the prospects for such a united-front party coming into existence? Are the masses really moving and struggling sufficiently to give it a realistic basis? Will these masses who are still far from us accept the Communists into such a movement?

We have no illusions. This will be a very hard struggle. The bourgeoisie, the top American Federation of Labor bureaucracy, the Right-wing Socialists, many liberal bourgeois politicians, not to speak of the Hearsts, Coughlins and Longs, will do everything possible to exclude the Communists from such a movement. They may even resort to illegalizing our Party.

What are the most dangerous enemies of such a party among the masses who are being radicalized? First, are the various semi-fascist demagogues, such as Huey Long and Father Coughlin. There is not yet, it must be remembered, a definitely crystallized fascist movement in the U.S.A.; there is only a multitude of fascist tendencies, as Comrade Foster described. Second, there are the bourgeois reformists of the type of Upton Sinclair, Townsend, etc., not to be lumped with the fascists, as Comrade Dutt correctly warned us, although he evidently misunderstood Comrade Foster, who issues precisely the same warning. What is true, however, is that they tend to play into the hands of fascist forces and tendencies; they play the old Roosevelt tunes, only in a little higher key, but the overcoming of the demagogy is a more complicated and difficult task. Third, is the upper bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor, most decisive of all obstacles because it has organizational strongholds among the worker-masses, and is the sworn enemy of a united-front party; it is at present merely an extension of the Roosevelt political machine, but with the crystallization of a mass party would probably try to head it in order to behead it. The American Federation of Labor bureaucracy is, as even Professor Moley, the Brain Trustee, pointed out, more connected with the State apparatus and bourgeois parties than in any other democratic country, as were the British trade-union leaders before the formation of the Labor Party. Fourth, is the grouping of "progressive third party" advocates, who held a conference in Chicago on July 4, calling for a new party without the Communists and opposed to the Communists; this grouping contains elements who could profitably be won for the anti-fascist united front, alongside of others of a clearly defined fascist tendency. Fifth, is the Socialist Party, which is increasingly divided into two camps: the Right wing is the most vicious and irreconcilable enemy of the united front, collaborating even with the open fascist Hearst to fight against the Communists and against the Soviet Union; the broad Left wing includes some convinced adherents of the united front, and as a whole reflects to some degree the demands of the masses; the Left elements and the mass of Socialist Party followers can and must be won for the united front.

Will the masses accept the Communist Party participation in such a united-front party? There is growing evidence of an affirmative answer. In the trade unions, the instructions of the bureaucracy for the expulsion of individual Communists, issued last September, was generally disregarded and in a multitude of cases openly rejected; in contrast to the pre-crisis period, when a similar order succeeded in driving almost all revolutionary elements out of

the American Federation of Labor, this one was a dismal failure. Only a few weeks ago, a threat to expel a whole union in an effort to prevent an amalgamation with the Red union in the same industry, was unanimously defied by the workers. Among the farm organizations, a more receptive attitude toward the Communists and above all an increasing hatred against fascism was sufficiently strong to bring a very significant statement from the chief reformist leader, Milo Reno. He wrote on June 25:

"I will say frankly that if I am compelled to make a choice between a fascist dictatorship, in which a few, who have gathered unto themselves the wealth created by others, supported by a military dictator which will make of all those who serve, simply beasts of burden, or the Communist idea of tearing down the whole system and then rebuilding it, I would be inclined to the latter."

Even more clear, and of similar significance, is the statement of a leading Right-wing liberal, Dr. David Sappos. Speaking on July 5, before the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia, he said:

"Nothing short of an enduring, far-sighted and courageous alliance of the liberal middle class, the Socialists and Communists, can keep the middle class and workers from abdicating to fascism, and the whole world from being precipitated into another war.

"Can the liberal middle class, Socialists and Communists unite on such a program? If they can, the future of the world is indeed rosy. If they cannot, then darkness and catastrophe stare us in the face."

The problem of bringing together into a lasting coalition united front party, all the still scattered elements of which it must be composed is a complicated and difficult task. It will require the utmost of patience, perseverance, tactfulness, and loyal devotion of the Communists to bring it to a successful consummation. It will require vigilance against Right opportunist interpretations of the line.

In the welding together of such a broad people's movement a tremendously important role can and must be played by the revolutionary traditions of America, revived and applied to the problems of the present crisis. Our Party has been struggling for some years to throw off that sectarian infantile Leftism which negates the national pride and national traditions that live among the broad masses. The Manifesto of our Eighth Convention last year, in which we boldly proclaimed our Party as the heir and continuer of the revolutionary traditions of 1776 and 1861, declared our love for our country which is being despoiled and ruined by Wall Street monopolists, was our conclusive break with past sectarianism on this question. It is

with deep joy, therefore, that we welcome the words of Comrade Dimitroff, who has shown us also in deeds how a true Bolshevnik deals with such problems.

The broadening of our conception of the United-front party, as the lasting coalition of workers, farmers, and city middle classes, to fight against threatening economic catastrophe, against political reaction and fascism, and against the threatening war, requires that we shall even more energetically pursue the struggle for *working class unity*. Such a lasting coalition requires for its success a strong and ever more united working class as the cementing, leading force. And the central problem of working class unity is that of creating a strong and united trade union movement. I want to state clearly, the decisive question in realizing such a united-front party is winning the support of the organized workers. Without that basis we cannot build a party with both feet on the ground. It would become a football for everybody to play with.

THE STRUGGLE FOR TRADE UNION UNIFICATION

Our most prized achievement of the past period is our success in the struggle for trade union unification. During the years 1925 to 1929, the A. F. of L. bureaucracy had prostituted the trade unions to the role of rationalization auxiliaries to the employers; to carry through this policy they made a war of extermination against the Communists and Left elements, not hesitating at the destruction of mass trade unions, the dispersal of hundreds of thousands of members. Out of this situation arose the independent and revolutionary unions. These new unions, arising after defeated strikes and just at the period of the onset of the economic crisis, and the consequent decline of the strike movement up to 1932, lived a difficult and precarious life. Their history is, however, one with many glorious pages. They made a permanent contribution to the development of the American working class. There were mistakes made in their development. These were especially sectarian mistakes, tending to narrow down the new unions to the advance guard. There was also a most serious neglect of work in the A. F. of L. But the independent unions played an indispensable role. They preserved the fighting spirit and traditions of the American working class during dark days when no other instrument was available for this task. They smashed the legend of the impossibility of successful strike struggles during a time of economic crisis, a legend spread by the reformists and Trotskyists. They organized and led the chief struggles that marked the turn of the tide and drew the whole trade union movement into its stream. To them belongs much of the credit for the strong re-emergence of the whole trade union move-

ment in 1933. The contributions of the independent and revolutionary unions to the protection of working class conditions, and to the preservation of trade unionism, are written imperishably in our history.

With the streaming of new hundreds of thousands of workers into the American Federation of Labor, however, with the organization of hitherto unorganized basic industries, and the rise of the strike wave and fighting spirit generally, the conditions had been created for the reunification of the trade unions in most industries and as a general rule. We must say that we did not at once understand the full significance of these changes, or immediately draw the full lessons. We had to learn from the masses. But we learned, having also the advice and assistance of the E.C.C.I. We began already in 1933, in some industries and localities, to take advantage of these new conditions to merge the divided trade union forces. During the last half of 1934, we had already developed this into a general movement for unification in all industries. During the first half of 1935, we succeeded in merging the unions in the most important industries, so that it became possible to dissolve the independent general trade union center; a Unification Committee continues to centralize the efforts of the still-existing independent unions to unite with the A. F. of L. The urge for unity among the masses made it possible to overcome the resistance of the American Federation of Labor bureaucracy to this unification, forced the admission of Communists and revolutionary workers in spite of the declared policy of the bureaucracy to expell all Communists. The artificial barriers of separate trade unions dividing the workers in the same field in fratricidal struggle has been largely broken down and eliminated.

The possibility of this unification movement arose out of the powerful upsurge in the labor movement, the big changes in the composition of the American Federation of Labor membership, and their situation, under the blows of the crisis. A flood of new members, including masses of semi-skilled and unskilled from the basic industries, helped to overcome the traditions and habits based upon the old aristocracy of labor, strengthened the militancy of the unions. At the same time, the labor aristocracy was itself hard hit by the crisis; this is especially true in the building trades, from 60 to 80 per cent unemployed for years now; while the technological advance, the development of continuous production processes, the belt system, etc., has undermined the position of the skilled workers throughout industry. One of the results is the growing radicalization of native-born workers, whose hitherto privileged position was historically a tremendous barrier to the political independence of the labor movement—a fact noted by Engels many years ago. The result is, that

even large numbers of lower and middle trade union officials, formerly the backbone of the bureaucratic machine, are beginning to reflect the radicalization of these strata, to turn toward the semi-skilled and unskilled masses, to demand complete unionization of their industries, industrial unionism, unity and solidarity in struggles. We have experienced the transformation of such lower and middle officials, in the course of a few months, from the position of expelling Communists to the position of open allies with us in serious conflict with the upper bureaucracy and employers. Comrade Florin gave interesting examples of a similar change taking place in Germany under the blows of fascism. This change has necessitated a fundamental change in attitude and approach toward such strata; where but a few years ago it would have been opportunist nonsense to look in this direction for allies, it has now become a most practical and key question of revolutionary policy. Our experience shows that such workers are key men, decisive in the factories and trade unions, in organizing and leading mass struggles.

A natural result of this successful reorientation in the trade unions has been that the Communists are coming forward, not only as the foremost champions of unity, but also the most energetic and practical organizers of the unorganized into the A. F. of L. unions. Only where our forces have appeared as the initiators of unionization from the beginning have we reaped the full fruits of deep-going and unshakable foundations of our mass influence under all attacks. In this there are direct lessons for our trade union workers of all lands.

We think the resolution should be strengthened in the trade union section, to state it is the duty of Communists to defend the mass trade unions against all capitalist and fascist attacks, and to build them, even though they are under the influence of the reformists. This would strengthen our positive work, and wipe out the sectarian distortions that have crept into our work in past years.

It is because our Party has been able to make advances in rooting itself thus among the basic trade union masses, that we have been able to extend and widen our united front among the youth, among the farmers, among the city middle classes. It is this that enables us to talk seriously, small as our Party still is, about being one of the decisive factors in the gathering together of a broad anti-fascist people's front which can check the advance of fascism in the United States, which can preserve the democratic rights of the masses now under such severe attack, which can effect some amelioration in the catastrophic economic situation of the masses, and which can provide the opportunity which the million masses require in order, through their own experience, to learn the further path they must travel before they can find the final solution of their problems.

WE MUST ISOLATE AND DEFEAT THE S.P. OLD GUARD

Now what are the special problems in relation to the Socialist Party and the proposed united front mass party? I have already indicated the task to win over those sections of the Socialists which are moving to the Left. That means to isolate and defeat the Old Guard leaders, who are consciously and stubbornly counter-revolutionary and who collaborate with open fascists like Hearst.

The World War and the October Revolution, which brought to a split the international Socialist movement, interrupted in the United States the process of emergence of the Socialist Party as the mass party of the working class at a much earlier stage than in Europe. The ruthless expulsion from the Socialist Party by its Right-wing leaders of the large majority of its members who had taken the path to the Communist International shattered the Socialist Party, but at the same time brought the Communist Party into existence in an immature condition, split into two Communist Parties at birth, without trained organizational cadres, and afflicted by all the infantile sicknesses. This condition was accentuated by the governmental repressions and illegalization of the Communists. The connection with the main mass of the American workers was broken for both Parties. The Communist Party is only now beginning to reconquer, on a higher stage, some of the mass positions in the process of being won for Socialism when interrupted by the war and the split in the Socialist movement. The Socialist Party leaders, until recently undeviatingly Right-wing in orientation, maintained a precarious position only by sacrificing even their reformist Socialist program to an alliance with the openly pro-capitalist A. F. of L. bureaucracy. This accounts for the unparalleled weakness of the American Socialist Party as an independent political factor.

There can be no doubt that the split in the Socialist movement, the long struggle between the Socialist and Communist Parties, served to repel large masses of workers who, not understanding the issues involved turned their backs on both parties and upon Socialism in general. This in turn weakened the power of Socialism to attract the non-proletarian strata around itself and gather the allies of the revolution. The Right-wing leaders have utilized this fact to instill among the Socialist workers a prejudice against the Communists as splitters and disrupters who ruined the American Socialist movement, quietly ignoring their own role as the violators of party democracy who expelled the majority of the membership who had decided to go to the Third International. This was done by the same Old Guard—the Cahans, Lees, and Oneals—who today again threaten a split against the majority which adopted the Detroit Declaration. On our

part, we Communists never sufficiently made known to the broad masses of Socialist workers the true history and character of the split. The struggle for united front with the Socialist Party and its followers, therefore, today must surmount and overcome these long-confirmed prejudices. This cannot be done merely by reciting facts and lessons from history. It must be done politically, by giving an answer to that healthy desire of the Socialist rank and file for a united proletarian party of Socialism, a desire for unity growing out of the needs of daily struggle, which the Right-wing leaders distort into an obstacle to unity.

FOR UNITED PROLETARIAN ACTION, FOR THE POLITICAL
UNIFICATION OF THE PROLETARIAT

This means that we must raise and discuss with the Socialist workers the problem of organic unity in one party of all adherents of Socialism, the conditions for such unity, and how it can be achieved. We must put forward the proposed united-front party, the Farmer-Labor Party, as a possible long step forward toward such unity, provided the Socialists and Communists find a common platform for joint participation in creating and building such a united front mass party. We must put forward the slogan of united action between all adherents of Socialism, despite all disagreements as to how Socialism can be achieved, in the struggle for the immediate interests of the toiling masses, in the defense of democratic rights and to defeat the advance of fascism; we must put this slogan in sharp opposition to that of the Old Guard leaders, which calls for a united front with the open supporters of capitalism, the American Federation of Labor top bureaucracy, with Woll, Lewis, Green, and even Hearst, against the Communists. On this question, the experiences of our French comrades are of inestimable value to us. We must and will win the support of the Socialist Party members and followers for united action, for the united-front mass party; in this task, the perspective of the ultimate organic unity of all adherents of Socialism in a single proletarian party will be of great help, while at the same time it will stimulate the political thought and revolutionizing tendencies in the Socialist Party ranks.

For this purpose it is necessary to make more intimate contacts with active Socialists, to be more discriminating between individuals and tendencies, and not to lump them all into one basket under one label. We must win their confidence by actually being of assistance to them in solving their complicated and difficult problems. It is not easy to fight for the united front in the Socialist Party. Quite the opposite of the Communist Party, where an opponent of the united front could not be long active, in the Socialist Party it is the supporters

of the united front who are being kicked out. And yet the S. P. cannot make a single step to rehabilitate itself among the masses so long as it refuses the path of the united front. This was strikingly proved, only in the past weeks, in the inglorious collapse of the majority of the National Executive Committee which had championed the Leftward-moving Declaration of Principles with support from a majority of the membership, its abject surrender under the assaults of the minority Old Guard—a debacle flowing directly out of the refusal of these self-styled Militants to take a single decisive step toward realizing the united front.

We must make it clear to the S. P. members that, without abandoning for an instant our principled position on the question of the road to power and the building of Socialism, we are not demanding of them their agreement with roletarian dictatorship, Soviet Power, and armed insurrection as a condition for the united front, for united action, for the present defense of democratic liberties and immediate economic interests. We are proposing a coalition of all anti-fascist forces, to prevent the coming to power of the most reactionary, most predatory section of monopoly capital, to prevent America from being engulfed in the world-wide wave of fascist reaction, to preserve the American toilers from a repetition of the bestial horrors suffered by the German masses under Hitler. We propose a joint struggle in which the workers will become conscious of themselves as a class, know their class interests and historical mission, and unite solidly under their leadership all other strata of the suffering toiling population, and thus prepare to lead America forward to the new society, to Socialism.

This is a program of struggle. It will not be carried out by the issuance of a manifesto, nor through spontaneous or automatic development. It will require all the abilities, resources, determination and energies of our Party. With the masses of the American workers and toilers, through the creative energies of these masses, this program can be realized in life. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. will carry on this fight to realize in the shortest possible time such a concentration of forces of the anti-fascist front that will guarantee against the victory of fascism in America. And that will at the same time be the best preparation for the proletarian revolution, the Socialist revolution.