THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN AMERICA

By JAY LOVESTONE

(We publish below the first section of the speech made by Jay Lovestone at the recent International Conference at Paris. The second section will follow in the next issue.—The Editor.)

* * *

UNDER the guidance of Lenin and thru the inspiration of the Russian revolution, we, now in the International Communist Opposition, broke with social-democracy on two main grounds. These were: the attitude towards imperialist war and the evaluation of bourgeois democracy. As revolutionists, we then maintained and continue to maintain that to make the slightest concession towards the support of imperialist war and to bend in the least degree towards the support of bourgeois democracy as a political system, as a state form, means to defend capitalism as a social system, to work for the perpetuation of capitalist rule.

Against The Poison Of Reformism

In making this break that I have mentioned, we also emphasized that it was the primary duty of revolutionists, in every country, first of all to defeat their own bourgeoisie. As a corollary of this, we emphasize with equal force, as we have always done, that an organic part of this struggle to defeat our own bourgeoisie is the task of defeating our own reformists and social-chauvinists. It is on this score that we fight with such vigor against the toxin of reformism now being inculcated into the laboring masses by the Comintern. Obviously, I am not going into any details as to the concrete tactics to be employed by the respective organizations in their struggle against capitalism and against the reformists who, in the ranks of labor, defend bourgeois rule. I am merely underscoring a general orientation.

But you will be interested, I am sure, to learn from a general point of view how the People's Front ideology and policy operate in the United States, for whom it works and against whom it works in a country like ours where bourgeois democracy as a political system is still vigorous You will undoubtedly be interested to learn something about the ravages of the poison of the People's Front in a land where only the first beginnings of a critical attitude towards and distrust of bourgeois democracy and capitalism are to be noted in working-class ranks.

We in the United States are in the initial stages of the development of a mass independent working-class movement on a national scale. We are only at the beginning of a crystallization of the class movement of the proletariat as a distinct movement, as a class-conscious force. Herein lies the fundamental, the decisive, significance of the C.I.O In its potentialities, the latter is far more than an industrial-union movement, tho far be it from me to minimize the basic import even of such a movement itself. Herein lies the real significance of the trend towards a labor party. Here is a trend towards independent working-class action; here is an accentuation of the first beginnings of revolutionary disillusionment — vague, confused, hesitant, unclear tho it be—with bourgeois, with parliamentary, democracy as a political system.

Stalinists To The Rescue Of Capitalism

But precisely at this time does the Communist Party rush to the rescue of capitalism, to bolster bourgeois democracy, to mislead the workers, to help the exploiting class perpetuate its rule. And why? On the ground that it is conceivable that we could have the working class treated even worse in the United States than it is being treated today! At a time when outstanding trade-union leaders, like John L. Lewis, who are far from being communists, are manifesting and developing a healthy critical attitude towards Roosevelt and his Administration, the Communist Party dedicates itself to the sacred cause of defending Roosevelt and his policies and program!

Take the case of Lenin Memorial Day in the United States this year. What has the Communist Party done with this day, insofar as the labor movement is concerned? In the city of Baltimore, it issues a leaflet captioned: "Why a Lenin Memorial Meeting?" This leaflet says in part: "Lenin would hail Secretary Ickes and Assistant Attorney General Jackson for their battle against the American 'Sixty Families' of fascist monopolists." This may appear to be, and is, silly. But it is also tragic. A Communist Party, a working-class party, hailing an attorney general! You know who an attorney general is; you know what his jobs are; you know what a police department, operating on a national scale, is; you know against whom such departments operate and in whose behalf they always operate in the last resort. And if, in France, Stalin's orders are to fight, not against capitalism as a system but against "Two Hundred Families," then in America the ideology is mechanically transferred to a fight against "Sixty Families." You see, we have bigger and better plutocrats in the United States and that is why we have less of them, Stalin and Browder would have you believe.

However, do not think for a moment we have here reached the depths of Stalinist degradation and degeneration. The Communist Party of the United States, in the spirit of the People's Front and on the basis of the People's Front approach and program, continues to desecrate Lenin Memorial Day. This anti-proletarian outburst bearing the imprint of the Maryland State Committee of the Communist Party continues to shriek: "And it is a fear of the spirit of Lenin that is abroad in the world today that prevents the economic royalists of America from carrying thru their threats to assassinate President Roosevelt."

I suppose that the only comment one can legitimately make on this piece of perfidy is: "Let no one else resort to assassinations. Only Stalin should and may As an expert in this business, he must have a

(*Continued on Page* 5)

America for Mooney Pardon

The following results are from a nation-wide survey of public opinion on the Mooney case, as conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion.

DO YOU THINK TOM MOONEY WAS GUILTY?

	Guilty	*Not Guilty*
United States	**47%**	**53%**
Sections		
New England States	51%	49%
Middle Atlantic States	31	69
East Central States	54	46
West Central States	52	48
Southern States	69	31
Rocky Moutain States	48	52
Pacific Coast States	52	48
California	52	48

SHOULD HE BE PARDONED AND RELEASED FROM PRISON?

	Yes	*No*
United States	**64%**	**36%**
Sections		
New England States	66%	34%
Middle Atlantic States	77	23
East Central States	58	42
West Central States	57	43
Southern States	52	48
Rocky Mountain States	65	35
Pacific Coast States	55	45
California	55	45

CZECH LIBERALS PROTEST PURGE

(We have received the following declaration on the recent Moscow "trial" from a group of oustanding authors, artists and scientists of Czechoslovakia.—The Editor.)

* * *

IN view of the new Moscow trial, we believe it to be our duty to declare publicly that the judicial methods used against former leaders of the November Revolution and outstanding scientists can not convince us in the least. We have never been able to place any confidence in the allegation that the majority of Lenin's colleagues were traitors to socialism and spies of foreign powers.

As friends of the Soviet Union and of the international labor movement, we join with the protest sent to Moscow by the French League for the Rights of Man.

(signed): Fr. Bidlo, *painter;* Boh. Brouk, *writer;* Vaclav Cerny, *writer;* J. L. Fischer, *Karl University;* Dr. L. Goerlich, *physician;* Fr. Halas, *poet;* Jar. Jezek, *composer;* Vaclav Kaplicky, *writer;* Fr. Kovarna, *Karl University;* Jan Noha, *poet;* K. Reiner, *composer;* Jar. Seifert, *poet;* Prof. Theodor Hartwig; K. Teiger, *writer;* Tiyen, *painter.*

Social Security Reform Needed

By ABRAHAM EPSTEIN

(The article below first appeared in the July 1937 *issue of the* Call of Youth, *paper of the Young Circle League. It is especially significant today in view of the discussion on amending the Social Security Act.*

—The Editor.)

* * *

THE major implications of the Social Security Act stand out best by an analysis of what is involved in the ten insurance and welfare programs embodied in the Social Security Act. Understanding is facilitated when these ten programs are grouped into the three categories into which they fall: (a) The federal grants-in-aid for state welfare programs; (b) the national contributory old-age insurance plan; and (c) the tax-credit device for the encouragement of state unemployment insurance laws.

Of the ten provisions in the Act, eight deal with grants-in-aid to states. The most important of these provide for federal assistance to states which establish systems of pensions for needy men and women over 65 years of age, for the needy blind and for needy dependent children under 16 years of age. These provisions are all essential and sound. Grants-in-aid to states afford the only practicable means of providing for present destitution because many states are unable alone to cope with these problems. Applied with great success in many fields from the first days of the republic, the passage of the Social Security Act has encouraged practically all states to take advantage of the federal grants by enacting new laws or by liberalizing their previous statutes. The inadequacy of the amounts allowed and the other deficiencies of these programs, while deplorable, present no fundamental handicaps.

Dangerous Weaknesses

The dangerous implications of the Act lie in its insurance provisions for old-age and unemployment. Both of these programs fail to meet the basic objectives sought. The Act does not provide protection for individual workers in old age because:

1. Since the average monthly insurance annuity which most workers will be able to receive under the present Act during the next twenty years will be less than $30, the present program cannot possibly meet the needs of the aged for almost a generation to come. An insured worker must earn $100 per month uninterruptedly for twenty years to get a pension of $32.50 a month. With sickness, strikes and unemployment cutting into this period, most workers will have to wait twenty-five or thirty years for such pensions. Few men or women working today will live to receive the maximum pension of $85 monthly which will go only to those who have earned $3,000 every single year for 43 years. The insurance plan provides nothing for the insured man's wife if she is not a wage-earner. The old-age insurance system cannot, therefore, meet the problem of old-age dependency for the next generation.

2. Far from enhancing national security, the present system may aggravate our existing insecurity. Our old-age insurance system does not distribute the cost of old-age dependency upon all elements of society. By levying regressive taxes on payrolls, it places the burden entirely upon the wage-earners and consumers of the nation, relieving the wealthy from their share of the social burden of old-age dependency which, thru the poor laws, they have helped to carry for over 300 years. The heavy taxes on workers wages and employers payrolls—which will be passed on to workers as consumers in the form of increased prices—can only tend to reduce further the present low purchasing power. The payroll taxes may also intensify employers efforts to reduce their labor costs by accelerating the replacement of men by machines.

3. The Act also places a back-breaking burden upon the younger and better paid workers. These workers as taxpayers have to pay their share for the non-contributory pensions, must provide fully for their own annuities and, in addition, pay higher premiums in order that those now old and in middle age may receive the small annuities to be granted to them. Higher-paid young workers entering the system when the 6% rate goes into effect in 1949 will, with their employers, pay premium rates much higher than would be required by a private insurance company for similar annuities. Thus, a worker of 20 entering the system in 1949 and earning $250 monthly could, with his employer's contribution, purchase a private annuity of $147.35 monthly as against the $85 monthly maximum under the federal plan.

4. Grave dangers also inhere in the huge reserves contemplated under the old-age insurance plan, estimated to reach $47,000,000,000 by 1980. Of course, it is not unlikely that Congress may dissipate these reserves for other purposes. If accumulated, however, these huge funds which may be invested only in government obligations will place a premium on increasing the governmental debt, not to speak of its effects on the national economy, when all governmental bonds are withdrawn from banks, insurance companies, trust funds and private investors.

The unemployment-insurance scheme established by the Act also offers little or no security to the

(*Continued on Page* 4)

Imperialism And Brazil

By ELLEN WARD

(Concluded from last week)

TO combat the rise of the Integralistas, a united front of left, liberal elements, was attempted in 1935 under the name of "National Liberation Alliance," captained by the now famous Carlos Prestes so long a prisoner, and under the leadership of the Communist Party. The program of this Alliance contained the following planks: 1. suspension of payments on the foreign debt; 2. government control of public utilities; 3. division of the large landed estates; 4. separation of Church and state; 5. the 8-hour day for labor; 6. establishment of a minimum wage; and 7. social insurance.

Before we set down what happened to this alliance and to its program, we want to call the reader's attention to the fact that the above was enunciated in the period before the People's Front madness set in to build a Tower of Babel among the workers.

In November 1935, shortly after the enunciation of the above program, two Brazilian states revolted on purely local issues of autonomy, as they have frequently done during the past century. The Alliance, with a great romantic yen for strength and power, decided to support this purely political clique revolt. As might have been expected this silly adventurism led to disastrous results. The central government was able to decimate the movement and all of its leading spirits. From this blow, the movement has not yet recovered. A few months after the jailings, the Communist Party issued an underground manifesto in which it blandly announced: "In Brazil the time is not yet ripe for a workers and peasants dictatorship much less for a proletarian dictatorship," and it urged upon the Brazilian people the formation of the Popular Front!

The U. S. A. In Brazil

Despite the aggressive penetration of European fascist ideology, the largest business concerns in Brazil are still American. The United States is still Brazil's principal market, taking 50% of all of her exports; 54% of her coffee and an even higher percentage of the better grades; 80% of her cocoa and 83% of all her rubber. From these few figures, it is obvious how much the economic welfare of Brazil depends upon the United States. And, whether landowner-capitalist democracy or military dictatorship attempts to guide the destinies of Brazil, these facts tie her to the United States, and the American State Department has known how to use the full force of its pressure. Today Hull works with greater caution and discretion in the affairs of Latin America because he must seek not to offend at a time when he is so eager to win active allies—but he succeeds just the same in making his meaning clear: the protection of American imperialist interests is first and foremost on the State Department calendar. And on this question there are no two groups in the State Department, as Harry Gannes of the Daily Worker would lead us to believe. The Stalinites have divided every department of our government into two groups: Group 1, the "economic royalists" and Group 2, those who are ready

(*Continued on Page* 6)

People's Front In America

(*Continued from Page* 3)

free hand to decide who is to be assassinated." And we might add that the Communist Party could very well say and actually does say, when it utters the above: "Lenin is dead! Long live Roosevelt!"

The Communist Party of the United States, in line with the People's Front strategy and betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles, continues: "The American Communist Party, armed with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, is rapidly forging, together with all progressives, a mighty People's Front to hurl back the 'Sixty Families' who are scheming to throttle American democracy. Fellow Americans, this is your party. . . . This is the party of a greater, happier, freer America. . . Maryland lovers of democracy! . . . The spirit of Lenin and Lincoln and Jefferson marches forward again to peace, prosperity and democracy. Communism is Twentieth Century Americanism."

People's Front Reaction

These are ugly words. The German social-democracy in its darkest days spoke with less crudeness and crassness, with less vulgarity in its betrayal of Marxism. The People's Front and its class-collaboration policies pursued by the Communist Party, only tend to diffuse the growing class consciousness and the spirit of class independence now developing in the ranks of the American workers. It is such propaganda, it is such service to the exploiters and oppressors of the proletariat, that helps beyond measure to confuse and to paralyze the workers ranks. It is the People's Front ideology and its anti-proletarian principles that tend to undermine the two basic prerequisites for the development of a class-conscious labor movement in the United States. These prerequisites in our opinion are: building up independent class organizations of the workers in the basic industries—mighty militant industrial unions—and discarding the traditional illusions regarding bourgeois democracy and capitalist prosperity.

I do not propose here to burden you with countless illustrations of this policy pursued by the Communist Party. Yet, in line with the above approach that I am proposing, let me test the policy of the Stalin puppet-organization in the United States. You should know that in the United States we have today a very severe economic crisis. This crisis is very far from having reached its bottom. We now have over twelve million unemployed. Here is a real opportunity for a genuine working-class organization, for a genuine communist party, to come to the American workers and speak substantially as follows: "Fellow workers, here is the capitalist system in America. Here it has reached its dizziest heights. Here its development has been free from feudal obstacles. But what do you find? And what do you get? Despite all the wealth and despite the privileged position of American capitalism in the world, millions of workers are permanently thrown out of the economic life, facing hunger, menaced by starvation, jobless, and in increasing despair."

What better opportunity for indictment of capitalism as a system, can a genuine communist party ask? But what does the Communist Party do? True to the People's Front, it says in reality: "Oh no. Capitalism in America has not broken down. It is just a few big bad capitalists who have gone on strike." Why the Stalin marionettes even go so far as to besmirch the inspiring traditions of the sit-down strike. These Stalinites say that the big bad capitalists, just a few of them—I suppose "Sixty Families" and maybe not all of them at that—have declared a sit-down strike in order to make the economic situation worse, to close down the factories in which the workers produce profits for them and, in this way, get revenge on Roosevelt because he is not friendly enough to them and, in their opinion, is too friendly to labor!

Roosevelt's Reform Program

You all undoubtedly have heard of the big reform program sponsored by the Roosevelt Administration. Let me say to you quite frankly that, in my opinion, President Roosevelt is far to the left of a lot of the European social-democratic leaders, like Blum and others. At any rate, whether this be so or not, the present severe economic crisis affords crushing proof that the Roosevelt reform program is bankrupt and that the reformation of capitalism, that the improvement of these conditions of the workers in any substantial sense, in any permanent sense, even under the most favorable conditions of capitalism, is impossible. Does the Communist Party point this out? Does the Communist Party bring this message home to the workers? No. In its support of Roosevelt it is pitifully sycophantic; it plays the role of a downright lickspittle and becomes more pro-Roosevelt and less critical of him than is the President himself of himself and his policies.

This is the People's Front in the United States. The American Communist Party, instead of advocating and practising even the most elementary class ideas and principles, can only estimate the present economic crisis and the breakdown of the Roosevelt reform program in the following way: "The organizers of sabotage are organizing treason. This is not an alarmist fantasy. It is simple truth. The economic royalists are preparing to overthrow the Roosevelt Administration, overthrow the vote of the American people, overthrow democracy" (Daily Worker, December 6, 1937).

Heinous crimes! Nothing to laugh at, idiotic tho it be, comrades. Immeasurable pain and tragic losses flow out of such policies!

The Presidential Message

Just a word about the message recently delivered by President Roosevelt. That was the message the President delivered at the opening of Congress. It was more than a typical Roosevelt message; it was a declaration of policy of the President of the United States. In it, he threw out more than a hint in behalf of "responsibility for labor unions." You must know that, under this slogan, the most reactionary elements are seeking to devitalize, to cripple, the trade unions by making their organizations and treasuries liable to legal seizure at the behest of employers against whom struggles are conduced. In this same message, the President also proposed a lowering of the wage-scale for workers in the building-trades industries. The New York Times, certainly an organ of big capital and not of Stalin's darlings, the smaller, good People's Front capitalists, hailed the President's message as "reassuring." The Daily Worker, the organ of the People's Front of the United States, hailed this message of Roosevelt's as "encouraging." Now, if you can find out the difference between "reassuring" and "encouraging," you will be able to learn the difference between the class interests the New York Times represents and those class interests which the Daily Worker defends today. The Daily Worker is, of course, the official organ of Stalin's corporation in the United States.

Incidentally, let me say that Roosevelt is the leader of the Democratic party, which has its big base in the Solid South where Negroes are treated to the most typical and specific American form of justice, via the rope—are lynched. Try to imagine how much support the Negro laborer and the Negro farmhand should give to a party, calling itself the Communist Party, which has so uncritical and so slavish an attitude towards the official leader of the Democratic party.

Now to the question of imperialist war.

BLUM A SOCIAL-FASCIST' NOW?

As a straw in the wind, the answer recently given editorially by the Freiheit, official Jewish organ of the Communist Party of the United States, to a reader inquiring about Leon Blum's political line, may prove significant. We quote from the April 2 issue:

"It is obviously correct to write, as you do, that Blum is carrying thru a policy which is basically the policy of Scheidemann and Noske. Whether in this way he will be able to curry favor with the fascists so that they should spare him, we do not know. Not every Scheidemann was able to escape the fury of fascism. Many of the social-democratic leaders, who earlier refused to suppress fascism and aided the storm-troopers against the workers, later on themselves learned to know the taste of Hitlerism. It is only too bad that, even among these, there are many who have not learned anything. Just as Blum has not learned anything from the experiences of Severing and Noske. It is clear that their policy can only lead the workers and progressive people to disaster."

This is plain enough. We would only like to ask one question: If Blum's policy is "basically the policy of Scheidemann and Noske," if it "aids the storm-troopers against the workers," if it can "only lead to disaster," why does the Communist Party of France support the Blum government? Why is it a partner to the People's Front on which the Blum government is based? Out of its own mouth does Stalinism stand condemned!

Another question: Is the Stalinist Comintern preparing to make another "swing to the left" now that the Soviet foreign policy on which the ultra-right People's Front course was based, has gone bankrupt? Are we going to be treated to another, even more degraded and degenerate version of the "third period," this time bearing all the marks of the preceding epoch of Popular Frontism?

Labor Notes

A GRAPHIC picture of the d
American small town is give
ducted by Fortune Magazine in C
cash income of the people of thi
ranged by income groups:

Income Group	
Over $5,000	
$2,601—$5,000	
$1,561—$2,600	
$601—$1,500	1,
Below $600	
No cash income	

In other words, in this typical town, 1,246 families out of a total of 3,054, or about 40% have a cash income below $12 a week. Remember, this means **families** not individuals. Several people may be working in the family but its total cash income does not reach $12 a week!

In examining the other end of the scale, the high-income group, we must remember that many of the capitalists who make their