

The

COMMUNIST

SEPTEMBER



A SOLUTION FOR PALESTINE

BY PAUL NOVICK

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| The Communist Party and the Professionals | WILLIAM Z. FOSTER |
| A Correct Approach to National Group Problems | IRENE BROWDER |
| Building the Democratic Front in Illinois | MORRIS CHILDS |
| Toward a Mass Party in New York | MAX STEINBERG |
| The Democratic Front in the South | FRANCIS FRANKLIN |
| Next Tasks in Party Education | A. LANDY |

ALEX BITTELMAN on *Results of the Primary Elections*



TWENTY CENTS

TWO BOOKS OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

By Earl Browder

The authoritative statement by the leader of the Communist Party on the Communist position on national and international affairs, including the constitutional crisis, the Supreme Court, intervention in Spain, the Soviet Union and world peace, trade union unity, the Negro question, and many other problems.

354 pages. \$2.25



THE UNITED FRONT

**PROBLEMS OF WORKING CLASS UNITY
AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN THE
STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM AND WAR**

By Georgi Dimitroff

This book presents the position of the Communist International on the basic issues of our time. It covers all important international developments since 1935. One of the special features of this book is an analysis of the nature of fascism and a program for combatting it.

288 pages. \$2.00



Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

The COMMUNIST

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

EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME



CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	771
A Solution for Palestine	PAUL NOVICK	785
For a Correct Approach to the Problems of the National Groups	IRENE BROWDER	797
The Communist Party and the Profes- sionals	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	805
Building the Democratic Front in Illinois	MORRIS CHILDS	811
Problems of the Democratic Front in the South	FRANCIS FRANKLIN	818
Rooting the Party Among the Masses in New York	MAX STEINBERG	829
Our Next Tasks in Party Education	A. LANDY	842
A Year of "Jewish Life"	V. J. JEROME	850
From the World Communist Press		861

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

The History of the COMMUNIST MANIFESTO of Marx and Engels

By V. Adoratsky

Director, Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute

An invaluable summary by a Marxian authority on the scientific masterpiece—**The Communist Manifesto**—in which Marx and Engels announced the oncoming proletarian revolution, gave strictly scientific grounds for its historic necessity, and foretold the inevitable downfall of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat.

32 pages Price 10 cents



WOMEN AND SOCIETY

By V. I. Lenin

A collection of speeches by Lenin on the role of women in the revolutionary movement with an introduction by the great educator and champion of the oppressed women in all lands—N. KRUPSKAYA—Lenin's widow and co-worker.

32 pages Price 10 cents



- Is Japan the Champion of the Colored Races? . . . 5c**
The Guarantee of Victory, by Georgi Dimitroff . . . 2c



Order from your local bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Tentative Conclusions on Primary Elections. Further Mass Trend to Democratic Front Inadequately Expressed. Organization of Progressive Forces for United Action Is Key Problem. Farmers and Middle Classes Claim Attention. Break Reactionary Political Machines in the South. Republican "Liberal" Face in Ohio. Who Attacks American Labor Party for "Unprincipled" Policy? Power and Principles. The Line of the Democratic Front. Girdler, Sokolsky and Lovestone Conspire Against the Unity of the C.I.O. A Calculated Move to Split Labor on the Eve of Elections and Wage Cut Attack. Be on Guard Against Splitters. Mexican Reply to Secretary Hull Offers Basis for Settlement. What Do Oil Monopolies Want? Fascist Bloc in Latin America. Trotskyism Seeks to Entangle Mexico with Fascist Bloc. Japanese Militarists Are Drawing Japan into War with Soviet Union. Our Nineteenth Anniversary.

RESULTS of primary elections thus far justify certain tentative conclusions regarding current trends in political realignment. The tendency in some circles to see in the outcome of the primary contests, Republican and Democratic, nothing more than victories of political machines is too superficial a judgment to merit serious consideration. The fact that, as a rule, the reactionary forces in both major parties had at their disposal powerfully entrenched political machines and that contrariwise the progressive forces are still displaying insufficient unity and organization, this fact undoubtedly explains why the primaries have not registered *more adequately and fully* the evident trend among the masses to rally around the banners of progress and democracy. But the trend itself is unmistakable. It is moving in larger volume and further away from the reactionaries and closer to the camp of progress. Moreover, the organized

political activities of labor, especially where C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions support the same candidate, have invariably decided the primary contest in favor of the progressive candidate.

Particularly illuminating are the results of the Democratic primaries in such places as Ohio, Kentucky and, to a certain degree, Texas.

Ohio is a major industrial state, with a large working class, a relatively strong trade union movement, and considerable C.I.O. influence. It is also a major agricultural state, with a considerable farm population. Most of the towns of Ohio are dominated by one or two of these major industries—steel, rubber, auto, coal. As a result, the numerous middle class of these towns, while drawn to labor by various common interests of an economic and political nature, is under continual and terrific pressure from the reactionary corporations which control the major local industries. We had more than a glimpse of this reaction-

ary pressure during the strike in "Little Steel," the details of which are only now being unfolded by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. This strike, and the class line-up in Ohio resulting from it, naturally had to find expression in the primaries. And how did it express itself?

Take the results in the Democratic primaries. In the gubernatorial contest in Ohio, Sawyer defeated Davey by a margin of about 30,000. Davey the anti-New Dealer, the tool of the corporations and arch-enemy of the C.I.O. and of labor generally, this man Davey was defeated, the nomination going to Sawyer who was supported by the C.I.O., by Labor's Non-Partisan League, by sections of the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods, and by the progressive Democrats.

This victory, even though by a relatively narrow margin, is of the greatest significance. Davey has tried recklessly to capitalize on all the prejudices of the middle classes and farmers against labor and the C.I.O. And there are still plenty of such prejudices. He exploited to the full all the pressure power of the governor's office and of an entrenched political machine. He enjoyed the advantage of not having been publicly rebuked by the President. His progressive opponent, Sawyer, stepped into the primary fight belatedly and subsequently carried on a far from aggressive campaign to rally the masses on a true democratic front platform. Labor itself carried on considerable activity to defeat Davey but far from adequate and its ranks were not fully united because of some reactionary officials of the A. F. of L. And yet—Davey was defeated. It is clear, therefore, that

with the fully united labor movement, having closer organized ties with the farmers and middle classes as well as firmer relations with the progressives in the Democratic Party, Davey could have been defeated by a truly sweeping majority.

A more detailed examination of the election figures of both the gubernatorial and senatorial contests in the Democratic primaries of Ohio will disclose some very instructive things. Davey received 419,095 votes whereas his senatorial mate, former governor White, received only 199,716 votes. On the face of it, this would show that the reactionary camp not only sought but actually achieved a high degree of concentration around Davey, partly neglecting the senatorial candidate. It would also bear out the charge made against the Davey machine of terrorizing recipients of social insurance into voting for Davey.

This terror was evidently sufficient to force many people to vote for Davey, but it failed to move them to vote for White. Many of them did not vote for senatorial candidates at all while others cast their votes for Bulkley. On the other hand, in the progressive camp we find that, while Sawyer, candidate for Governor, received 449,324 votes, Bulkley, candidate for the Senate, received 523,715 votes. This also would, on the face of it, indicate two things. The progressive forces did not achieve as much concentration around their gubernatorial candidate as the reactionaries and that a large number of people voting for Bulkley (74,391) did not vote for Sawyer. Why didn't they?

It is true, of course, that Bulkley

had the advantage of the President's public approval which Sawyer did not have. It is also true that Sawyer had to overcome the special reactionary concentration in support of Davey as well as the anti-C.I.O. issue raised by the monopolies, which was not the case with Bulkley, not to the same extent. Yet it is safe to assume that the 74,391 people who made up the margin by which Bulkley ran ahead of Sawyer were generally supporters of the New Deal. This means that, in their bulk, they should be in sympathy with labor and with the C.I.O. And if, notwithstanding, they failed to vote for Sawyer, this would indicate that there is still much work to be done, between now and final election day in November, to improve the relations between the workers, on the one hand, and the farmers and middle classes, on the other. It would indicate that much has to be done during this period to achieve a larger unity of action of labor itself, and to strengthen labor's ties with the progressive forces in the Democratic Party. And finally that the independent political organizations of the masses have to be keyed up to a real mass campaign of political education and organization in order to insure victory in November.

The majority of 70,785 votes by which Senator Barkley defeated Governor Chandler for the Democratic Senatorial nomination is another indicator of the general mass trend away from reaction, even when it pays lip service to the New Deal. The important thing to remember in the Kentucky primaries is the large number of disfranchised (by poll taxes and otherwise) whites and Negroes who,

were they allowed to exercise their constitutional rights, would have swelled the Barkley majority considerably. This raises once more the general question of *abolishing all voting discriminations*, especially in the South. One must not rest content with the fact that Chandler was defeated and that Barkley's nomination actually spells election in November. Chandler's machine was not broken; it was not even seriously impaired, if at all. And so long as this machine exists, having as it does strong alliances with Wall Street pro-fascist finance capital and with similar reactionary machines in Virginia (Byrd), in Georgia (George), in Maryland (Tydings), just so long will neither Kentucky nor the South as a whole be safe for progress and democracy (with a small "d").

President Roosevelt called the South the nation's economic problem number one. That is true, of course, even in a deeper sense than is generally conceived. But the solution of this problem, which is a national one, immediately confronts political obstacles in the South whose source runs down to the reactionary monopolies in Wall Street. These political obstacles in the South (some of them, at least), are the entrenched reactionary political machines in the Democratic Party. To solve the nation's number one economic problem—the South—means to remove these obstacles, to break these reactionary political machines, to enfranchise and give full democracy to the toiling masses of the South, black and white. Because without the active participation of these Southern masses the problem cannot be solved. Moreover, so long as the white and Negro

masses of the South are not reestablished in their democratic rights and their economic standards are not raised to a decent level, just so long will the South remain a danger point for democracy and progress, just so long will it remain easy picking grounds for pro-fascist adventurers and monopoly exploitation. *Only with the help of the masses can the reactionary machines in the Democratic Party of the South be broken.*

This is the job of the democratic and progressive camp of the country as a whole and of the South in particular. Barkley's victory makes the job easier. It paves the way for its accomplishment as did the earlier victory of Senator Pepper in Florida. But the job still remains and it has to be tackled at once. The fact that labor, through the C.I.O., which was seconded in this case by the A. F. of L., played such a decisive part in insuring the victory of Barkley, this fact should enable all progressive forces to proceed more confidently toward the accomplishment of a true people's democratic front in the South.

As to the primaries in Texas, especially instructive are the circumstances of the defeat of the progressive Representative, Maury Maverick. He was defeated by his reactionary opponent by only 475 votes and thus failed to secure renomination to Congress.

He has tried himself to draw certain lessons from his defeat. He sees correctly that his defeat was not brought about by the people. Despite all intimidation and slander and studied refusal by the reactionaries to face the real issues, the people voted for Maverick. He says: "All the silk-stocking precincts which I usually

carried went against me. They were the precincts afraid of the C.I.O. Nearly all the precincts usually carried by the machine went for me—the underprivileged ones." And these would have made a majority. But there were terrorism and intimidation. Besides, "I had no organization and their political machine was working with Hague-like precision." Here, perhaps, is the crux of the story. *Maverick had no organization* to rally the majority of the people behind him and to bring their votes to the primary elections. He calls it lack of organization. It is more correct to say: lack of an organized common democratic front, which may be the result of insufficiently clear realization that such a democratic front is necessary.

Compare Maverick's experiences with the victory of Jerry O'Connell in Montana. Maverick was facing a powerful and ruthless reactionary machine in the Democratic Party. No doubt about it. O'Connell was facing (and still faces) just as powerful and ruthless a reactionary machine, backed by powerful monopolies, and headed by a renegade liberal, Senator Wheeler. This latter circumstance, meaning the past liberal traditions of Wheeler, made his present reactionary machine even more formidable and dangerous. But to compensate for that, Jerry O'Connell had organization. But what do we mean by organization? He had the united and *organized* support of labor and of the progressive forces generally. These forces carried on *an organized mass struggle* against the Wheeler machine and in support of O'Connell. He had something which approaches a democratic front and so, despite all diffi-

culties, he had won in the primaries.

Maverick is right, of course, in urging all liberals to "get rid of political machines, Democratic and Republican, wherever they are." But to accomplish this end, *one needs the unity of the democratic and progressive forces*. And this really is the chief lesson from all primary elections. This is the lesson which the progressive forces of the State of Washington are learning to great advantage as can be seen from their successes at the recent state convention of the Democratic Party which condemned the anti-New Deal administration of the Democratic Governor Martin, formulated a truly progressive platform and prepared to elect genuine progressive candidates. This is the lesson—unity of the progressive forces and labor's initiative to bring it about—which must be applied between now and November to defeat reaction in the elections and to strengthen the camp of progress.

Very appropriately and correctly, John L. Lewis spoke on the results of the Ohio and Kentucky primaries as follows:

"The defeat of Governor Davey and the nomination of Senator Barkley in Kentucky constitute a complete vindication of the progressive policies of the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League. These organizations can achieve real unity among all progressive forces to elect candidates to public office who will represent the people against the greed and autocratic privileges of such corporations as Republic Steel." (*The New York Times*, August 11.)

We wish to underscore especially this thought in Lewis' statement: it is that the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League see their main task at the present time to "*achieve real unity among all progressive forces*." This is

the mandate. This is the way of the democratic front in the building of which the organizations of the Communist Party throughout the country participate most actively and energetically. All we can desire is more and broader activity along this main line.

* * *

As to the Republican primaries, it is the outcome of the Senatorial contest in Ohio that, taken with the earlier results in Pennsylvania and Minnesota, indicate certain trends among the Republican voters. While the majority of the Republicans in Pennsylvania voted for James, an open reactionary, a powerful minority supported Pinchot, in the apparent belief that the latter was a liberal and progressive. In Minnesota, the bulk of the Republican vote went to Stassen who claims to be more liberal and progressive than the Farmer-Labor Governor Benson. In Ohio, the Senatorial nomination was won by Taft as against Judge Day.

On Taft's political coloration, *The Herald Tribune* has this to say:

"While he accepts many of the objectives of the New Deal, he has been devastating in his analysis and condemnation of the methods used by the present administration to achieve its avowed purpose." (August 11.)

In other words, a liberal face to cover the reactionary substance of the Republican Party. The same as Stassen in Minnesota where, by the way, serious friction is already developing in the Republican Party between the adherents of the "liberal face" tactic and those (like Nelson) who believe in a tactic of open reaction. But here we are interested, not in the maneuvers of the high command, but in the at-

titudes of the mass of the voters, among whom are large numbers of farmers, middle classes, and sections of workers. And on this point it can be safely stated, on the basis of the Republican primaries to date, that the traditional Republican Party following among the masses (as opposed to the monopolies and their hangers-on) inclines generally in a liberal and progressive direction. And it is the task of the democratic front forces, between now and November, to win a substantial part of this Republican following to the genuine positions of progress as against the fraudulent liberal face used as a tactic by the reactionary Republican Party.

* * *

STRANGE happenings are taking place nowadays. It will be recalled that following the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party, almost the entire capitalist press of the country, including Hearst, rushed to the "defense" of Lenin and Leninism as against the "abandonment" of Leninism by the Communist Party. It was a sight to watch: Hearst-Trotsky-Lovestone (or Hitler-Mussolini-Mikado) championing true Communism in opposition to the "opportunism" of the Communist Party.

Something similar is happening now to the American Labor Party in New York. Not the same thing, to be sure, but something on the same order. The American Labor Party (A.L.P.) is being denounced as an unprincipled gang of political bargainers and compromisers. And who do you think is making the accusation? *Tammany Hall*. Yes, dear reader, the accusation against the A.L.P. is made by the

saints of pure principle of Tammany.

But these are not the only accusers. The Socialist Party and Norman Thomas, drawing inspiration from the Trotsky-Lovestone agents of fascism, are also on the accusing end. So is the old debaucher and political corrupter of the Jewish masses of this country, Abe Cahan, editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward*. And the state committee of the New York Socialist Party has even been provoked to "break off" negotiations with the A.L.P. although it still remains to be proven that there were any negotiations to break.

Last but not least, belonging to a category by itself, is *The New York Times*. Commenting on the agreement between the A.L.P. and certain sections of the Republicans to support each another's candidates for a number of state offices, the *Times* ends in wonderment and lamentation at the lack of "principle" on both sides. It says:

"The cold-blooded political deal is, of course, the whole point of the affair. It may pay the hoped-for dividends. But it reveals both factions as less interested in principle than in power." (July 30.)

"Principle and Power." We suppose *The New York Times* would be perfectly satisfied to have the A.L.P. and all progressives hold on to principle while the monopolies and reaction hold the power. Well, such a division of holdings does not exactly appeal to us. And, although we are not authorized to speak for the A.L.P. and do not intend to, yet we venture to say that such a division of social functions could not appeal to the A.L.P. either.

To our way of thinking, the A.L.P. and the whole camp of democracy need both—principle and power. *We*

use the principles to gain power and we use the power to realize the principles. A sort of dialectical relationship.

As to the merits of the issue itself, it is quite evident that the election policies of the A.L.P. are in fact the practical working out of the policy of the democratic front against reaction. This is not to say that the entire leadership of the A.L.P., even those who initiated the "coalition" proposals, are consciously following the policy of the democratic front, or that they are in favor of this policy. No, that is not necessarily so. But it does mean that the so-called "coalition" policy as developed by the A.L.P. in these elections, similarly to its policy in the last LaGuardia elections, *tends to promote the political realignment of the masses on the side of progress and democracy, tends to facilitate the break-up of the reactionary machines in the Democratic as well as Republican Parties, and helps thus to strengthen the fight against reaction in New York State as well as nationally.* We are speaking here, not of every detail of action, but of the general political line of the A.L.P., which is the decisive thing.

It is a fact, already evident to every unprejudiced observer, that the A.L.P. policy of collaboration with the progressive forces in both major parties offers the maximum possible electoral gains to the A.L.P. as such as well as to the progressive elements in the major parties. This policy has already helped the New Deal elements in the Democratic Party to come forward more aggressively against the reactionaries. The same is true of the progressives in the Republican Party. It

is also evident that in this way the A.L.P. is exerting most effective pressure towards the end that the state ticket of the Democratic Party shall not be dictated by Tammany but shall be truly progressive and democratic.

This is the only policy of principle for the A.L.P. to pursue—the principle of working class independent political action, the policy of working class initiative in rallying all progressive forces in a common democratic front against reaction and fascism.

* * *

GIRDLER the murderer, who is now being exposed by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee as one of the most sinister forces in American life, pretends to be very much concerned with what he terms "communistic influences in the C.I.O." It is this "concern" of Girdler, not with communist influence but with the C.I.O. as such whose members he has been murdering in cold blood—it is this "concern" of Girdler (and Ford, and General Motors) that has to be examined very thoroughly if we wish to find the true origin of the splitting activities of the Lovestone-Martin crowd in auto and of similar splitting moves against the C.I.O. in a couple of other points.

The World-Telegram (August 9) calls to the attention of its readers the treacherous series of articles against the C.I.O. which that paper carried last January, a series by Benjamin Stolberg written no doubt under the inspiration of the notorious Sokolsky and Lovestone (read: the National Manufacturers' Association). Calling this series of articles to our attention, it says:

"Current news dispatches from the auto-

mobile country and from the Pacific Coast indicate that Mr. Stolberg knew what he was writing about. Troubles that were simmering when Mr. Stolberg was writing have now come to a boil."

When *The World-Telegram* introduces Mr. Stolberg again and in this fashion and at this time, one can't help but feel that Girdler & Co. must have had a good deal to do first with the "simmering" and now with the "boiling."

It would seem that attempts are being made from various sides to bring to a head splitting maneuvers against the C.I.O. and against labor as a whole, maneuvers which have been carried on unsuccessfully for a considerable period of time. The *World-Telegram* refers to the auto country and to the Pacific Coast. Yes (we will add), and also the attempt of hostile and outside forces (Ryan of the A. F. of L., the *New York Post* and the *Telegram* itself) to whip up divisions and struggle in the National Maritime Union. Finally, also the fresh crop of "rumors" by the capitalist press that the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union is contemplating some sort of a move against the C.I.O. and the barrage of attack against the American Labor Party.

From all this one is bound to get the impression of a calculated and planned move by enemies of labor to intensify the divisions between the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., to precipitate internal struggle and perhaps splits in the C.I.O. itself and thus to weaken the camp of progress generally. From what source are these criminal attempts coming?

First, of course, the Girdlers, Fords and Morgans; the National Associa-

tion of Manufacturers via Sokolsky, Stolberg and Lovestone. Second, anti-New Deal Democrats and reactionary Republicans, the pro-fascist forces in politics which are seeking for victory in the coming elections. Third, the Ryan-Frey-Green forces in the A. F. of L. Fourth, certain Social-Democrats (O'Neal, Cahan) and their collaborators in the ladies' garment union. Fifth, the Trotsky-Lovestone agents of fascism and their stooges (Martin). And, sixth, miscellaneous outfits in which the *New York Post* occupies some sort of a special position.

A mere listing of these splitting forces suffices for the moment to see where the dangers come from and how to guard against them.

The important question is: why did these forces *choose this particular time* to bring to a head their splitting maneuvers? Remembering that we are dealing here with one of the manifestations of the offensive of finance capital in the present crisis, the following will help us arrive at a more detailed explanation of why reaction seeks especially *at this time* to bring to a boiling point (as the *Telegram* suggests) the tendencies of division in the ranks of labor as against *the growing forces of unity*. This explanation is:

a. To prepare the ground for wage cut attacks (in auto, steel, railroad and generally) by intensifying the divisions between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. and by attempting to split the unions of the C.I.O.

b. To pave the way for sharper attacks on the Wagner Act and on the National Labor Relations Board in the coming session of Congress, making it an issue in the elections, justifying such attacks by referring

to "strife in the ranks of labor."

c. To divide labor in the elections and thus to prevent the coming together of the progressive forces into a common democratic front with the aim of defeating progressive and New Deal candidates.

Note this: The staff correspondent of the *Herald Tribune* (reactionary Republican mouthpiece), writing from Detroit (on August 9) on the situation in the auto union, begins his story like this:

"The C.I.O.'s chances of reelecting Frank Murphy Governor of Michigan appear to be seriously jeopardized by the internal strife in the United Automobile Workers Union.

"An open break between Homer Martin, U.A.W. president, and the C.I.O.'s political organization, Labor's Non-Partisan League, was imminent today despite the fact that Martin is the League's state chairman.

"Martin's followers already have taken this step in Illinois, where they have organized the Illinois Labor Party to compete with the Non-Partisan League." (August 10.)

Disregarding his tendentious way of saying it, this correspondent relates true facts. And these show precisely that we are dealing here with a move of reaction to defeat New Deal and progressive candidates in the elections, not only in Michigan but everywhere.

d. To prepare the ground for the Dies investigation which apparently, starting out as a committee to investigate un-American activities, is pushed to launch a smearing expedition, branding all opponents of reaction as "Reds." This is part of the secret of why Girdler and his stooges are again raising the cry of "communistic influences"—to give Dies an excuse "to investigate." This—and a desire to cover up their crimes and treacheries against the people. Assisted by Martin-

Lovestone, Frey of the A. F. of L. has already given a performance before the Dies committee against the C.I.O.

To every unprejudiced person it should be clear by now that the Communist Party seeks no control whatsoever in the trade unions. The Party is interested solely in seeing the unions grow strong and united, able to protect the interests of their members and of the workers generally, and giving wholehearted support to all democratic and progressive measures for improving the lot of the American people. The Communist Party principles favor a labor movement strong and enlightened enough to take the initiative and, in time, leadership in defense of American democracy in a broad people's democratic front.

The Communist Party is a working class party and a party of workers. These naturally belong to trade unions and there they exert themselves to make the unions stronger, more united and more consciously progressive. Naturally, again, the members of the unions appreciate the constructive work of their Communist brothers and elect them to various offices. And these Communists, by general agreement, make mighty fine trade union leaders. This is all there is to the Girdler and Martin assertions about "communistic influences." If you want to abolish these "influences," Mr. Girdler (and Frey), you will have to think of abolishing the working class from which we come. And this—not even fascism will accomplish for you.

The Girdler-Martin-Frey attack on the Communist Party has a twofold motivation, as is well known from all previous Red-baiting campaigns. First

is the aim to isolate the staunchest supporters of unity in the labor movement and in the democratic camp generally; and, second, in doing so, to break the labor movement and to prevent the coming together of the growing democratic front. We have seen it work *and fail* in the Gerson case in New York only recently. We have seen its operation in the so-called anti-Comintern pact of Germany, Japan and Italy whereby the fascist brigands, under the cloak of combatting Communism, are advancing to conquer Spain, China, Czechoslovakia, Latin America and the world—if their plans work out, which they will not, for the working class of the world has not yet spoken its last word.

So, this is the fascist trick: plunge a knife into the heart of labor and the democratic front by attacking the Communist Party. And, at this moment, the reactionary aim seems to be especially the C.I.O., which they seek to weaken and split. *It can be said confidently that pro-fascist reaction is today seeking nothing less than a split in the C.I.O.*

Recall some recent history.

When the C.I.O. first made its appearance, the monopolies met it with machine guns and tear gas. But this did not stop the advance of the C.I.O. On the contrary. Through the martyred bodies of its loyal and brave members, killed by the Girdlers, the C.I.O. marched forward, becoming a powerful and decisive force for the well being, progress and democracy of the American people. It proved itself so in the industries, in politics, and in the general life of the nation. Seeing this, the reactionaries tried to "win over" the C.I.O., to make it break with

the New Deal and with the progressive forces of the farmers and middle classes. The idea was that if the C.I.O. could be moved to break with the democratic camp of the country the road would be cleared for a reactionary victory in the government and, following that, for the destruction not only of the C.I.O. unions but of all unions, including the A. F. of L. Naturally, this wild strategy could not work and did not work. Instead, the C.I.O. proceeded even more firmly on the road of progress and labor unity.

As this fact began to sink into the minds of the reactionary monopolies, with the coming of the economic crisis and the approaching elections, reaction began turning to a different scheme of tackling the C.I.O. And tackle the C.I.O. they must *because the C.I.O. is the most basic force in the camp of progress, liberalism and democracy.* As long as the strength of the C.I.O., *its unity*, remains unimpaired, reaction cannot hope for any really serious advance. Hence, reaction and its stooges (Martin, Lovestone, etc.), began to undermine the unity and cohesion of the C.I.O., trying to blow it up from within. One can trace the beginnings of this reactionary orientation to the time of the infamous articles of Stolberg in the Scripps-Howard press. *The trick was to use fake radicals and liberals and renegade Communists (Wheeler, Stolberg, Lovestone) to initiate the move.* It is this conspiracy to break the unity of the C.I.O. that pro-fascist reaction is now trying to bring to a head, to the point of "boiling."

That Girdler and Co. will now fail, as they failed with their machine guns and tear gas, as finance capital failed

with its "wooing" of the C.I.O., goes without saying. But they can do damage to the unity of the C.I.O. Momentarily, that may have had consequences for the democratic camp in the coming elections. Therefore—

Unmask the forces which are seeking to split labor and are attacking the unity of the C.I.O. Put the widest masses *on guard* against these pro-fascist forces and their agents.

Let these slogans become the watchword of every working class family and of every *honest* progressive and liberal (not to confuse with *The New York Post* and *World-Telegram*):

For the unity of labor. For united action between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. For the unity of the C.I.O. and its affiliated unions at all cost. For the unity of labor with the farmers and middle classes and Negro people in a common democratic front. For the unity of all progressive and liberal forces in the coming elections.

* * *

THE Mexican reply to Secretary Hull's note (August 3), is a reply of a true good neighbor. Honest, straightforward and offering a fair basis for the settlement of whatever claims to compensation expropriated American landowners may have upon the Mexican government. The Roosevelt administration can do nothing better for America and for its good neighbor policy generally than to accept the Mexican offer as a basis for settling its land claims.

Some people "innocently" ask: why didn't President Cardenas accept Hull's proposal to arbitrate? Isn't this a fair proposition? Well,

it may look so, but it isn't.

One reason for this is given by the reply of the Mexican government. It is, first, that there is no basis whatever in international law for Secretary Hull to propose arbitration of American compensation claims, inasmuch as American-owned land was expropriated *as part of a general land reform*, and not for the benefit of a few. Does that mean that the Mexican government refuses to indemnify those expropriated American landowners who are entitled to compensation? No, it does not mean that. The Mexican note says:

"Nevertheless, Mexico admits, in obedience to her own laws, that she is bound to make adequate indemnification; but the doctrine Mexico maintains in the premises, upheld by the most authoritative opinions of writers on international law, is that the time and manner of such payment should be determined by her own laws."

On this basis, the Mexican government makes the following proposal to Secretary Hull:

"... to name a representative who, together with the representative whom my government will designate, will fix, within a short period, the value of the properties affected and the manner of paying it."

If Secretary Hull is really interested in getting compensation for the land claims, and does not have any other motives in mind, then he is bound to accept the Mexican offer as a fair basis of settlement.

The trouble, however, is that the State Department, pressed by the oil monopolies, may have something else in mind. And the *Herald Tribune* obligingly raises the curtain which obscures these other motives. It says:

"Secretary Hull's note found its chief significance as the entering wedge of an adjustment of the larger oil problem. The small landowners for whom it spoke are more necessitous and more popular clients than the great oil companies; their claims are far less onerous for Mexico than those in respect to the oil properties, and less heavily charged with the emotional issues of political dominance. . . ." (August 5.)

And here comes the real crux of the thing:

"Once an international tribunal had upheld the principle of payment upon expropriation in this case [land cases], it would have provided both the State Department and the oil companies with some measure of protection against a wave of confiscation by other countries." (*Ibid.*)

In other words, Hull was trying to force the Mexican government to arbitrate the relatively small American land claims *in order* to commit the Mexicans to arbitration of the "claims" of the American oil monopolies. This is the interpretation of the *Herald Tribune*. Whether or not Secretary Hull had this precisely in mind, the objective effect of his arbitration proposal, which looks so innocent and fair, was exactly to open a wedge for "arbitrating" the claims of the oil monopolies.

Therefore, we repeat: if Secretary Hull is concerned with the small American landowners, and does not seek to foist upon Mexico the rule of the British and American oil monopolies, he can easily and safely accept the Mexican offer as a basis.

However, we are not all sure that this will be done. On the contrary, there are disturbing signs all around, pointing to increasing reactionary pressure upon the government for "firm" action. And the progressive

forces of the country, unfortunately, are still concerning themselves all too little with influencing the actions of the American government in accord with a genuine policy of the good neighbor.

Thus, for example, we find in a story of a Washington correspondent of the *World-Telegram* (August 10) that:

"Secretary Hull will, it seems most probable here, lay down a clean-cut definition of international law which Mexico cannot resist. Already he has received assurance from practically every other Latin American country—carefully sounded out before he sent his note—that all the other good neighbors stand behind him in isolating Mexico."

"Isolating Mexico"—that has an ominous sound. One need not take as gospel truth every word of this story. Secretary Hull may be doing no such thing as trying to align the United States with the pro-fascist elements in Latin America to isolate Mexico. But even when taken as rumor, such stories are disturbing especially as the oil monopolies are no doubt pressing for such a policy and as there may be in the State Department elements favoring it.

The same correspondent even suggests that "Internationally the fascist bloc in Europe backs Mexico."

Now, *this is a serious proposition*. It is quite true (and we were the first ones to point that out) that the fascist bloc will seek to utilize the differences between Mexico and America (and Mexico and England) *in order to enmesh Mexico into the nets of fascist intrigue against the democratic countries, especially against the United States*. And this is exactly what the fascist bloc is doing day by day: eco-

nomically, politically and in every other way. Most important from this angle are the increasing activities of Trotsky jointly with the espionage machines of the Hitler-Mussolini-Japanese bloc, in Mexico and all other Latin American countries. It is clear that Trotsky and his agents are trying to steer Mexico into entanglements with the fascist bloc. But just because this is so, the American people must be doubly insistent that the State Department does nothing to help the fascists in their game. What is needed is not the isolation of Mexico but the isolation of the pro-fascist forces of Mexico and of the whole of Latin America. And this means a true good neighbor policy. And, most immediately, it means the acceptance of the Mexican reply as a basis for settlement of the American land compensation claims.

* * *

IT REMAINS to be seen whether the lesson administered the Japanese fascist-military clique by the Soviet government will have a sobering effect upon the imperialist circles of Japan. It also remains to be seen whether the Japanese government is able and willing to compel its Kwantung and Korean armies to respect the existing Soviet-Manchurian frontier. At any rate, the Japanese government has committed itself to the Litvinov proposal that "both Soviet and Japanese forces shall remain in positions that they occupied on August 10 at midnight."

However, the big question still remains. Will the Japanese government provide clear and concise guarantees that there will be no repetition of at-

tacks by Japanese troops on Soviet territory? Will it be willing and able "to curb its militarists who, on more than one occasion already, have with the aid of similar provocations, drawn Japan into war with its neighbors"? (*Pravda*, August 8.) By recalling how the Japanese militarists, by provocative "incidents," had drawn Japan into war with China, we will best understand why such guarantees are necessary.

An interesting sidelight on the situation is thrown by the question of the border commission. For years past the Soviet government has been urging upon Japan the appointment of a joint border commission to redemarcate the disputed parts of the frontier. Not that there was any doubt where the frontier lies; formal treaties between China and Russia have clearly established that frontier. But in the face of constant Japanese incursions into Soviet territory, and in accord with Soviet policy to settle differences by peaceful means, the Soviet government urged a joint commission which could reestablish the frontier markings. But the Japanese militarists would not accept that offer. They could not reject outright the offer of a commission but insisted that Japan should have a representation of two-thirds on that commission (one for Japan and one for its puppet Manchukuo) as against one-third for the Soviet Union. This, of course, the latter did not accept. And so the thing was hanging fire.

Now, the Soviet government advanced a proposal which a government desiring peace with its neighbors would accept without hesitation. It was this:

"For redemarcation of the disputed sector of the frontier there shall be formed a mixed commission of two representatives of the U.S.S.R. and two from the Japanese-Manchurian side, with an arbiter chosen by agreement of both sides who is a citizen of a third country."

But the Japanese Ambassador in Moscow to whom Litvinov made this proposal *rejected the arbitration idea*. Why? Wasn't Litvinov a thousand times right when he told the Japanese Ambassador that:

"... the presence on the commission of a disinterested and impartial arbiter would be the best guarantee of reaching agreement on redemarcation."

Wasn't Litvinov right? But the Japanese government is apparently unwilling (or is it unable?) to give *guarantees* that a peaceful settlement and agreement will actually be reached. That has to be kept in mind in any evaluation of future perspectives.

Whatever the future may hold in store, the immediate future, one thing is evident. By repulsing energetically and effectively the latest attacks of the Japanese militarists on Soviet territory, and by its just proposals to the Japanese government for a peaceful settlement of the dispute, the Soviet government has clearly exposed the fact that *the Japanese militarists are trying to draw Japan into a war with the Soviet Union*. And in doing so, the Soviet government is not only protecting its own country but is also serving the cause and interests of world peace. More than ever, therefore, should all peace loving forces rally to the cry of: *Support the peace policies of the Soviet Union*.

* * *

COMMUNISTS, and friends of our Party generally, are celebrating this month the nineteenth anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of the United States. Our greetings and congratulations to all of them.

Such anniversaries are always the occasion for bringing to the masses the vanguard role of our Party in the progress and advancement of our class and people; the rich history of our Party as the most consistent champion of the interests and needs of the masses, as their advanced detachment who always shows the way forward and takes the heaviest blows from the enemies of the people. It is usually the occasion for more intensive building of the Party organizations and the Party's press. So it is this year.

With this addition, however. This time our responsibilities for helping the people to move forward—through the common democratic front—are greater because our opportunities are greater. We *can* do more; hence we *must* do more. More and better. Especially, in the light of the offensive of finance capital in the crisis and the splitting manipulations of the enemy against the working class and its trade unions.

And another thing. Remembering what Comrade Browder said at the Tenth Party Convention about the approach of the *twentieth anniversary* of our Party to be celebrated in September, 1939, we must already in the present celebration lay the basis for that grand occasion. The better we fulfill our tasks as flowing out of the nineteenth anniversary, the grander will be the celebration of the *twentieth* next year.

A. B.

A SOLUTION FOR PALESTINE

BY PAUL NOVICK

I. TRAGEDY

PALESTINE has become one of the knottiest problems of the struggle of the colonial peoples against imperialism and for national liberation.

Colonial struggles generally are neither "pure" nor "simple." Lenin, in his "Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up" written in 1916, speaks with withering sarcasm about those "super-revolutionists" who disdainfully regard the colonial struggle as something "impure" from a revolutionary standpoint because in the absence of a well-developed proletariat such struggles are conducted mainly by the peasantry and participated in by the middle class and even by sections of the bourgeoisie. People waiting for a "pure" struggle, Lenin said, will never participate in *any* struggle, do not want a struggle for liberation.

Stalin, in his *Foundations of Leninism*, has pointed out that in the struggle against imperialism the Emir of Afghanistan, a monarch, might play a revolutionary role while a "Socialist" like MacDonald (at that time leader of the Second International) might play a reactionary, imperialistic role.

No colonial struggle is "simple." The Palestinian problem, however, is especially complicated. In the first place, it involves a three-cornered

struggle. There is British imperialist oppression, and there are the Arabs and Jews who have been set against each other. There is also fascism, which has injected itself on both sides of the national struggle, posing both as the savior of Islam and as the supporter of "real" Herzlian Zionism (Revisionism). At the same time, the struggle in this small country with an Arab majority must have its repercussions in other Arab countries, in Asia and Africa. On the other hand, the struggle of the Jews in Palestine for security and national rights is linked with the fate of Jews in various countries, particularly in fascist and semi-fascist states like Germany, Poland and Rumania, where Jews are persecuted and pogromized.

British imperialism and fascism have kept the fires of national hatred burning in Palestine. The country has been in turmoil for years. Revolts and massacres have been occurring after intervals of relative peace. Since April, 1936, the country has been up in arms. Recently, the mutual extermination of Arabs and Jews has reached a frightful stage. Streets in Haifa, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and other cities of Palestine are witnessing scenes of most horrible bloodshed, of veritable human carnage, as the case was at the end of July when nearly

fifty Arabs were killed and scores wounded as a result of a bomb exploding in an Arab market place in Haifa, a few steps from where another bomb had taken a toll of nine lives about two weeks earlier. These and similar outrages followed months of terroristic acts against Jewish settlements. On July 12 nine Jews were killed, some of them burned to death in one of the agricultural outposts. Developments in Palestine have turned that country into a major tragedy for both Jews and Arabs.

The population of Jews and Arabs feels the terrific strain of continued warfare, terrorism, and turmoil. Many have had members of their families killed or wounded. Almost everybody feels the deplorable economic effect of the disturbances. A severe economic crisis, which began even prior to the outbreaks of April, 1936, has been sapping the strength of the country. (The extremely weak economy of the country was affected by the fascist invasion of Ethiopia.) Now Palestine is in economic near-paralysis.

Outbreaks have been the order of the day in the land for years. Even the casual visitor to that country during periods of relative peace could sense the latent menace of renewed outbreaks. When I returned from a visit to Palestine in 1932 I could not help but tell the people of my forebodings. I wrote of a burning national hatred in Palestine fanned by British imperialism and other forces. Even at that time there was a national antagonism in Palestine so violent that one felt something was bound to happen if things continued in the old way. Long before the present bloody disturbances Zionist leaders who had

heretofore been hiding the true facts from their followers were themselves drawing a picture of the state of affairs in Palestine that chilled your blood. That is, the Zionist leaders advocating the partitioning of Palestine.

A certain Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, a Zionist, writing in *The Nation* for December 4, 1937 ("Pogroms or Partition"), stated:

"I return from Palestine now with the melancholy conviction that this [the hope that the benefits the Jews were bringing to the Arabs would create a peaceful life] was an illusion; that realistically viewed the present aims of the Jews and Arabs are irreconcilable. . . . Anti-Zionist and anti-British sentiment has penetrated into every element of the Arab population. . . . This hatred of Zionism and the British has grown to such proportions, has become so intense, so articulate, so widespread, and so well organized, that it is the fundamental factor in the situation. . . . There is no doubt now that the Jews now reciprocate the feelings of the Arabs. Children in the Jewish schools are developing a militant chauvinism. . . . On the streets and playgrounds one sees drilling games and exercises designed to develop a military discipline. The Jewish colonies are well armed; the men are trained for defense. Armed guards patrol the fields day and night, and even children's picnics which I attended were guarded by police with loaded rifles. The new colonies are built like stockades with thick walls to keep out the bullets. . . . The Valley of Esdraelon, which the Jews have transformed from a swampy wilderness to a fertile garden, is a scene of peaceful beauty during the day, but at night it is like a battlefield, with armed men on guard everywhere and great lights flashing their signals back and forth to announce 'all quiet' or to warn of impending attack."

Now the "peaceful" days behind stockades and fortifications are gone. Colonies are attacked day and night. Innocent people are killed and wounded. Crops are burned, trees are

uprooted. A bomb is thrown in Haifa. A bomb is thrown from a train passing the all-Jewish city of Tel Aviv. A bomb is thrown into an Arab bus. Jewish road workers are sniped at. That is the usual run of the news from Palestine now.

II. A POLITICAL QUESTION

One may be permitted to grow melancholy. One must not, however, lose sight of the political element which is the moving factor in the entire situation. The future of Palestine depends upon the solution of its political problem.

Over and again it must be stressed that it was (and is) idle to grow enthusiastic over the things Zionism has built in Palestine and be content with that. True, swamps have been turned into fertile fields and many important and attractive institutions have been built. At what cost is beside the point for the moment. Whether Arabs have benefited by this Zionist building, what Arabs, and how many—something which Zionism has always overlooked—is also beside the point now. The fact is that in all colonies building is going on and some sections of the population are benefiting. This can never be a deciding factor, since no amount of building can sway the great mass of the population from the big political problem, that of independence.

Too many Zionist-influenced progressive people, or even Socialists, permit themselves to be swayed by the various features of economic and even "socialistic" upbuilding. Whatever the value and volume of such building—it has little to do with the main issue of Palestine, which is *political*.

Over and again it must be stressed that Palestine represents first and foremost a *political* problem, that of a colonial country. Palestine is the *only* country on the Arabian peninsula without any self-government whatever. It is idle to presume that whereas the Arabs to the North (in Syria) and to the South (in Egypt), who have some sort of self-government, are nevertheless engaged in a struggle for more independence, the Arabs of Palestine, who have no voice whatever in the affairs of the country, will be content. It will not do to assume the position that all the trouble in Palestine is merely the work of "agitators" (who happen to be ever-present in all colonial countries).

In the June, 1936, issue of *The Communist* I dwelt at length on the political problem of Palestine ("Palestine—Land of Anti-Imperialist Struggle"). Fundamentally, nothing has changed. Some points of the Communist analysis, however, which have been strongly disputed by leaders of Zionism and representatives of Great Britain, are now openly admitted.

The British Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel, in the findings of its investigation of the disturbances of 1936, threw overboard the balderdash that the British government, when issuing the Balfour Declaration (November 2, 1917), proclaiming the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, was motivated by the desire to solve the Jewish question, to realize an age-old dream of the eternal people, etc., etc. The report, submitted July 8, 1937, a document of over 400 pages, with maps and tables and valuable material, frankly admits that "the Balfour Declaration was is-

sued in 1917 in order to enlist the Jewish support for the Allies" (p. 24); that the British were afraid "Syria and Palestine might be made the base for Turco-German attack on the Suez Canal." The Peel Report admits promises were made both to the Arabs and Jews (regarding Palestine, or what the Arabs understood to mean Palestine). The Report admits that the disturbances of 1936 were in effect an open rebellion on the part of the Palestine Arabs, aided by Arabs from other countries, against British rule:

"It has been pointed out that the outbreak of 1933 was not only, or even mainly, an attack on the Jews, but an attack on the Palestine government. In 1936 this was still clearer. Jewish lives were taken and Jewish property destroyed; but the outbreak was chiefly and directly aimed at the government. . . . They [the Arabs] denied the validity of the Balfour Declaration. They have never admitted the right of the powers to entrust a mandate to Great Britain. They hold that the authority exercised by the mandatory is inconsistent with the Covenant of the League of Nations and with the principle of self-determination embodied in that Covenant. . . . The Jewish witnesses agreed with the Arabs in regarding the 'underlying causes' of the disturbances as political. . . . It should be frankly recognized, then, that the ideal of the National Home is a purely Jewish ideal. The Arabs hardly come into the picture except when they force an entry with violence and bloodshed. That does not mean, it need hardly be said, that the Jews wish to oppress the Arabs or to keep them poor and backward. On the contrary, they maintain as they have always maintained—and we do not question their sincerity—that the establishment of the National Home has been and will continue to be a positive economic advantage to the Arabs. But for the average Jew that comfortable assurance is enough. He goes on with his work and tries to forget about the Arabs. In some of the older 'colonies' there used to be some sense of kinship with the Arabs or at least that fellow

feeling which comes from working side by side. But there is little of that left now." (pp. 104-119)

The report of the Peel Commission is regarded by the Zionist leadership as one of the most sympathetic documents coming from a British investigating committee, sympathetic toward Zionism. Particularly those Zionist leaders who are favoring the plan of this commission for the partitioning of Palestine have accepted this plan favorably (at the head of these leaders is the president of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Chaim Weizmann). This very report admits that basically the grievances of the Arabs are political. Out of this analysis the Peel Commission drew the wrong conclusion that Jewish and Arab interests are irreconcilable and that therefore Palestine must be partitioned. This conclusion is, of course, incorrect.

The report makes the common mistake of identifying the interests of the Jews of Palestine with the aims of political Zionism. The overwhelming majority of the Jews living in Palestine want peace and security and the opportunity to make a living and to build up the country. They must have their national rights safeguarded, but they do not want to deny the Arabs their civil rights, something which the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate certainly do. Political Zionism, basing itself on these documents, opposes every attempt at establishing democratic self-rule in Palestine, while the Jews of the country, like the Jews everywhere, are in their majority for democracy and do not relish the rule of colonial oppressors. It is mainly the aims of these oppressors which are

irreconcilable with the interests of the population, both Jewish and Arab.

The Peel Report goes into the details of the history and the meaning of the promises Great Britain made to the Arabs and to the Jews. We are little concerned with this history, since we cannot recognize Great Britain's right to promise anybody something which does not belong to it. It is important, however, that the Royal Commission itself is forced to admit that this double set of promises is the reason for the unrest in Palestine. These promises were a means of *conquering* Palestine; so is the policy of Great Britain since 1917 a means of *holding* Palestine, the age-old policy of *divide and rule*.

The amount of frankness British imperialists permit themselves now is not limited to the statements of the Peel Commission concerning the motives of the Balfour Declaration. Listen to what a Mrs. Edgar Dugdale, niece of Lord Balfour and his biographer, told Mr. Webb Miller of the United Press last winter:

"Palestine is the key point of imperial communications and the key point to the Near East as far as 'power' (military) politics on the Mediterranean is concerned. If the Jewish state were founded we might expect that within the next ten years 2,000,000 Jewish young men and women would settle the country. Out of that number it is not impossible to expect the formation of a national defense force of 50,000 men."

(Some of the newspapers which printed the Webb series, like the *New York World-Telegram*, omitted this brutally frank paragraph, but this is how the United Press released Mr. Miller's story on December 21, 1937, a cablegram from London as of that

date. The *Morning Freiheit* of December 22 drew attention to the omitted paragraph in the *World-Telegram* story.)

In my article in the June, 1936, *Communist* I quoted from a cablegram of Mr. Augur, mouthpiece of the London Colonial Office, printed in the *New York Times* of January 19, 1936, wherein he spoke of a "Jewish militia of 50,000 men" that "may be a reality tomorrow." They seem to have settled on a Jewish army of 50,000 which would safeguard this imperialist gem—Palestine—situated at the Suez Canal, on the land route to India, and the base for the pipe line carrying the Mosul oil to Haifa as well as the base for British bombers for the entire Near East. Palestine is also the only strip of coast on the Asiatic mainland in the hands of the British facing the inflammable waters of the Mediterranean. . . .

The Machiavellian imperialist scheme to lure the persecuted Jews into a "national home" to be used as a spearhead for British domination of an extremely valuable strategic point is at the core of all the troubles in Palestine. Britain may "wish" that peace reign there—under its domination. But the policy is to keep Jews and Arabs divided and antagonized. The Histadruth (Jewish labor unions), in a memorandum submitted to the Peel Commission, stated that

". . . The government authorities have not only not encouraged joint Jewish-Arab trade union activity but have in most cases placed obstacles in the way of such activity."

This is important to remember! There simply cannot be peace in Palestine so long as the *political* status of the country remains the same. The

main enemy of peace is—British imperialism.

III. PARTITION

What caused certain Jewish leaders to fall for the promises of Great Britain?

In order to answer this question one must take into consideration the persecution of Jews in various countries, particularly in the countries of Eastern Europe, prior to 1917. Millions of Jews were looking for a way out of persecution and pogroms. Alongside of this burning desire for a way out there is a legitimate craving among Jews for statehood and, among certain sections of the Jews, particularly among the religious, a craving for Palestine, where a Jewish state was in existence some two thousand years ago.

This craving and the dire conditions of millions of Jews were played upon by Great Britain. Leaders of political Zionism, which has set out to solve the Jewish question by the return of Jews, or large sections of them, to Palestine, accepted the promises as the fulfilment of their dreams and endeavors. Was not self-determination one of the main points of Wilson's program? Was not the war fought for Belgium and other small peoples? Did not the Poles and others obtain their independence as a result of the war?

Zionist leaders accepted the Balfour Declaration, which promised on behalf of His Majesty the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, and proclaimed it as the Magna Charta of the Jewish people. Now it is admitted that that was a tragic mistake. These leaders did not take into

consideration the machinations of British imperialism, which really wanted Palestine for itself. They also did not take into consideration the fact that the nationalities obtaining their independence as a result of the war formed a majority in their respective countries, and that this fact could only strengthen the case of the Arabs, who form a majority in Palestine.

Part of the Zionist leadership now admits that it was an illusion to rely on the Balfour Declaration and on the Mandate which Great Britain subsequently received from the League of Nations purportedly in order to put the promises of the declaration into effect. But the desire for statehood and the craving for Palestine are still there. Persecution of Jews has become ever more barbaric. Many Jews are in need of a place, or places, to emigrate to and settle in relative security. This tragic condition has caused certain Zionist leaders to accept the new scheme of British imperialism to partition Palestine.

This scheme was forwarded by the Peel Commission in July, 1937. Since Jewish and Arab interests are "irreconcilable," the country must be divided so as to set aside the area where Jews constitute a majority to develop it into a Jewish state. A closer acquaintance with the facts shows the injustice, the impossibility, and the hopelessness of the plan. It shows up this plan as a new scheme on the part of British imperialism to hold and dominate the country.

According to the plan, Palestine, a country of about 10,000 square miles in area (about the size of Vermont), is to be split up in the following manner: Seven-tenths of the country

are to be added to Transjordan (which is also under a British mandate) and turned into another Arab state, in addition to the dozen or so Arab states now to be found on the Arabistan peninsula. About one-tenth of the present Palestine, including Jerusalem, is to be kept by Great Britain, as guardian for the three religions interested in the "holy city." Britain is also to keep for itself a strip of land running from Jerusalem to Jaffa, on the Mediterranean Sea. The Jews are to be given about two-tenths of the country (over 2,000 square miles in area, about the size of Delaware) to be developed into a Jewish state under British protectorate. This state will constitute a narrow strip of land along the Mediterranean, with one end of it severed by the British corridor from Jerusalem to Jaffa. In certain spots this strip will be not more than eight miles wide. Of the five cities of this Jewish state, Tel Aviv, Haifa, Safed, Tiberias, and Acre, the last four are to be kept by Britain "temporarily," under a mandate.

It is enough to outline these details to recognize the impossibility and the trickiness of the plan. The Arab people have rejected it. A majority of the Jews have rejected it. It is true that among them are to be found orthodox Zionist leaders who still cling to the Mandate and the National Home, stating openly that the Mandate must be continued "until we Jews are the majority in the whole country" (M. Ussishkin, prominent leader of Zionism, in *Palestine Undivided*, Tel Aviv, May, 1938). Dr. Stephen S. Wise, leader of the American Zionists, belongs to this group, who have, how-

ever, recognized along with the majority of the Jews that the contemplated Jewish state is economically and politically an impossibility and will not bring peace between Jews and Arabs.

The majority of opponents to the plan fear that the partitioning of Palestine will create an "Arab irritant" which will be a source of constant warfare along the relatively extended frontier of the Jewish state. This fear is shared even by such Zionists who favor partition. They also fear the militarism which will of necessity prevail in the tiny country and are doubtful of its chances to meet the relatively big military budget. (According to the plan the Jewish state will also have to contribute a relatively high sum to the Arab state.)

Objections to partition are too numerous to be all recounted here. Amongst them is the realization that the Jewish state of over 2,000 square miles will start out with a population of about 625,000 people, a density of about 300 people to the square mile. This is in excess of the density of, for instance, Poland (213) and other agricultural countries which possess natural resources and a large industry. The Jewish state, having no resources like coal, iron, timber, etc., will hardly be in a position to absorb a large immigration, if any. Then, there is the argument that the Jewish state will immediately be confronted with an Arab problem of its own. About 300,000 of the population, or about 48 per cent, will be Arab. Of the 4,000,000 dunam of cultivable lands in the contemplated Jewish state—a dunam is less than an acre—3,000,000 belong to the Arabs.

Clearly, the new scheme of British imperialism will not bring peace. It can only sharpen the struggle, in addition to burdening the Jews with an impossible project which will tax their strength economically and embroil them in military adventures. But this is precisely the purpose of the "Balkanization" of Palestine. I have already quoted Mrs. Dugdale, niece and biographer of Lord Balfour, who stated in an interview with Mr. Webb Miller of the United Press that with the founding of the Jewish state "it is not impossible to expect the formation of a national defense force of 50,000 men."

The partitioning plan has *already* had the effect of sharpening the struggle of the Arabs. It has also created more favorable conditions for fascism, which has injected itself into the situation as the savior of the Islam and the liberator of the Arab peoples from under the British yoke. All of which supplies another argument against partition. By creating this Arab "irridenta," partition will clear the decks for fascism among the Arabs.

Progressive people all over the world are vitally concerned with this situation. Are the Arab millions in Asia and Africa to become the reserve of fascism, or are they to be a source for the anti-fascist struggle? The answer to this question depends on the struggle against British imperialism, for the independence of Palestine. Only under such conditions it will be possible successfully to ward off fascism from among the Arabs.

Incidentally, fascism is trying to work both through the Arabs *and the Jews*. The Revisionists, or New Zion-

ists, who have renounced the Havlaga (self-restraint) of the Jews in Palestine and have officially launched a counter-terror against the terrorism of certain Arab groups, are working with Italian fascism, as well as with the Nazis. The Revisionists have their militant groups dressed in brown shirts following the slogan of: "Judea must be conquered by the sword." They are fascist in their ideology and in practice. In Poland their groups have been used as strikebreakers. In Palestine they are bitterly fighting the Labor and Socialist Zionists. They were accused of the murder of the Labor Zionist leader Dr. Ch. Arlasaroff, who was killed in June, 1933.

The well-informed London *Week* for July 13 stated that

" . . . Terroristic bands of both people (Jewish and Arab) are being financed from Rome and Berlin. . . . The Italians, for instance, now frankly assert that the success of certain groups of Jewish terrorists in Palestine is due to the fact (they say) that the Italian government placed at the disposal of a well-known revisionist organization a training ship."

The violent nationalism and chauvinism on both sides were bound to breed groups of "uncontrollables" and of elements who would align themselves with fascism. By doing away with chauvinism, by the introduction of peace, and by a common struggle of Jews and Arabs against British imperialism, fascism will be undermined both among Arabs and Jews.

IV. A SOLUTION

How shall this be attained?

It must be made clear at the outset that *no* solution will be easy. As to partition, not even its adherents are

enthusiastic about its outlook. Those Zionists who have accepted the scheme have done so out of despair. (The aforementioned Mr. Bernstein, in his article in *The Nation* supporting partition, terms it: "a major catastrophe.") They have no more hopes for the Mandate; they fear for the fate of a Jewish minority in an independent Palestine. They accept partition as a lesser evil, but as a major evil nonetheless. From what we have seen it will most surely turn out to be an evil bigger than the Declaration and the Mandate put together.

There is no *easy* solution, but a solution there is. It is embodied in the effort of the Communist Party and all progressive elements of Palestine for *an understanding* between Jews and Arabs. There are considerable elements among Jews and Arabs who want an understanding so that peace come to Palestine. Foremost among the Jews are—aside from the Communists—those elements who follow the line of Dr. J. L. Magnus, president of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Like most other non-Zionists (and the people of the American Jewish Committee with whom he is associated), Dr. Magnus is against partition. He is all for an understanding which, according to him, will open wide possibilities both for the Arabs and the Jews in the upbuilding of Palestine as well as other Arab lands. This will create the possibility for hundreds of thousands of Jews to settle in Palestine and in Arabistan generally. Under pressure of its non-Zionist members (Magnus amongst them) the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which is officially recognized by Great Britain, adopted at its session in Zurich, Swit-

erland, in August, 1937, a resolution favoring a conference with the Arabs. On the other hand, there are among the Arabs elements advocating an understanding. In fact, the majority of the *entire* population wants a peaceful settlement as a way out of the economic paralysis. Certain negotiations between Jews and Arabs began in 1936 and were interrupted at the behest of Britain.

An understanding which will guarantee the national rights of the Jewish minority and will give Palestine self-rule will no doubt not come about without the mediation of outside forces, whether of the League of Nations or others. It is clear, however, that the working class and the toiling masses of Arabs and Jews generally will play a deciding role in the shaping and mainly in the fulfilling of the guarantees for the rights of Jews and Arabs. These toiling masses will play the main role in forcing British imperialism to relinquish its present hold on Palestine, just as Britain was forced to do so in the case of other countries in the Near East.

There are well-meaning people who admit that they would best like an understanding between Arabs and Jews, but such a way out, they hold, is a "dream," a "utopia." They agree that British imperialism is the villain of the piece, but they hold that the struggle of Jews and Arabs together against British imperialism is mere "wish-fulfilment." This is remindful of the approach of certain well-meaning people in old Russia toward the struggle against tsarism. They regarded the struggle of Jews and Russians (and Poles and Ukrainians) side by side as something impossible. The

facts about Palestine are that Jewish and Arab Communists and other anti-imperialists *do* fight side by side, though their number is still small. And it is certainly an *immediate possibility* for Jewish and Arab workers to get together for an understanding amongst them.

The above-mentioned article in the July, 1936, *Communist* cites the following program advanced by the Jewish Communists in the U.S.A. as a solution for Palestine:

"1. All workers, regardless of race and nationality, shall be accepted into the unions of the Histadruth.

"2. Likewise, all agricultural workers, Arab tenant farmers should be organized together with Jewish tenant farmers in one body.

"3. The Zionist leaders must declare that they are for a truly democratic parliament in Palestine which should safeguard the full equality and all rights for the Jewish minority and its national development.

"4. Struggle against British imperialism, for a free Palestine.

"5. Free immigration under conditions 1 and 2. (At present there is no free immigration, since immigration is a monopoly of the Zionist organization, which selects the immigrants along Zionist lines; only the immigration of Jewish capitalists is free.)

"6. No land shall be bought without the previous consent of the peasants working the land.

"7. The rule of the church (Mohammedan, Christian, Jewish) to be abolished.

"8. The shameful transfer-agreement with the Nazi government, which has turned Zionism into an agency for Nazi export for the entire Near East, to be canceled."

Points 1 and 2 call for the establishment of real, bona fide, trade unions of all workers in Palestine, Arab and Jewish, and of organizations of Arab and Jewish farmers. Is *this* impossible? Of course not! Would the unity of the workers and farmers bring both peoples together and help eradicate

hatred and misunderstanding? Of course it would!

It is a matter of record that for generations Jews and Arabs have lived peacefully together in Palestine. When modern Jewish colonization was introduced into the country before the war many thousands of Arabs were employed in the Jewish settlements. This created bonds of friendship which would have become stronger if the practice had been kept up. The growth of the Jewish population in Palestine, which would undoubtedly have been faster than before the war, might not have been as fast as in recent years, but it would have been steadier and healthier, and the dangerous and bloody pitfalls of national hatred would have been avoided. (The 85,000 Jews in Palestine in 1914 were reduced to about 65,000 during the war; since 1919 this number was raised to the present figure of well over 400,000 as a result of immigration and natural growth. The Arab population of 550,000 grew to over 950,000.)

Because of the line of political Zionism Arabs were excluded from new settlements and gradually pushed out from places of work in old colonies. (There are still a few thousand Arabs working there.) The Histadruth, following the official Zionist line, refused to admit Arab workers as members of its unions. Picketing was practiced against city establishments or agricultural settlements where Arab workers were employed. The slogan "Buy local [*i.e.*, Jewish] products" was introduced. On the Arab side, similar methods were practiced. All this has separated Jews from Arabs, creating ever more prejudice

and national hatred. One of the first steps in the direction of abolishing national hatred must therefore be the establishment of bona fide unions of Jewish and Arab workers together, followed by farm and other organizations.

I have already mentioned the memorandum submitted by the Histadruth to the Peel Commission, wherein the complaint was made that the government placed obstacles in the way of joint Jewish-Arab trade union activity. The Histadruth correctly stated in that memorandum that "a more liberal attitude on the part of the government toward this sphere of work of the General Federation of Jewish Labor would be advantageous to the economic and social development of the country as a whole and would open up new possibilities of a Jewish-Arab understanding which would consequently lead to the establishment of lasting peace in Palestine."

Precisely so!

The Histadruth must be congratulated for this stand. But words alone, or vague "joint activity" in the face of racial practices will not do. One of the first prerequisites for a struggle against obstacles for joint Jewish-Arab trade union activity would be for the Histadruth itself to stop the practice of racial picketing and racial slogans and *to open the doors of its unions to Arab workers*. By proclaiming such a new policy the Histadruth would immediately introduce a change in the situation, whether the government agrees or not. Many sections of Arab toilers who are now pushed into the arms of the chauvinist Mufti (head of the clergy) and

fascist agents would turn away from them.

Naturally, this would necessitate the giving up of the idea of a Jewish state and of gaining a majority in the country by racial methods or with the aid of Great Britain. Most Zionists have already realized the futility and the terrible hazards of ignoring realities. The Left wing of the Histadruth, the Hashomer Hatzoir (Young Guardians), openly came out at the last World Zionist Congress for a bi-national Palestine state of Jews and Arabs on a parity basis. The acceptance of the laughable and tragic "state" Britain is now offering is in itself a rejection of Zionist aims of solving the Jewish question on a world scale. The whole matter is now reduced to two—very important—points: (1) The safeguarding of the rights of the Jews now living in Palestine, and (2) the possibility for settling Jews from the fascist countries in Palestine. Both can be attained *only with the aid of understanding*. Partition would attain neither.

The bargaining point on the Arab side is their majority. The Jews, on their side, have a relatively high economy and relatively powerful unions and other organizations. The Arabs can gain greatly from the high technics and organization introduced into Palestine by the Jews. The Arabs will have to recognize the national rights of the important Jewish minority inside a democratically governed Palestine. *Whatever* guarantees may be established through negotiations between official Arab and Jewish organizations, as well as international bodies (which negotiations will, of course, have to take place), the unity

of Jewish and Arab toilers will be one of the best guarantees for the safeguarding of such rights.

As to the securing of a place or places for Jewish refugees from fascist countries, it must first of all be emphasized that in countries like the United States, Canada, South Africa, Argentina, and Latin America generally there is more possibility for that. More German-Jewish refugees have settled in countries other than Palestine, in spite of the fact that the years 1933-35 witnessed the highest immigration to that country. If only half the effort exerted in the direction of settling refugees in Palestine had been exerted into other directions, the doors of the United States and such countries would have been opened a bit wider, admitting many tens of thousands more of Jewish and other refugees. As to Palestine, the Jewish state resulting from partitioning would hardly create possibilities for immigration, as already seen. On the other hand, we must agree with Dr. J. L. Magnus that, as a result of an understanding, Jews and Arabs would be able to engage side by side in the upbuilding of Palestine and possibly

other countries of Arabistan, or of a *federation of Arab countries*, as Dr. Magnus puts it. This would open the possibilities for the immigration of hundreds of thousands of Jews.

Again, *an understanding and good neighborly relations will not be established overnight*. But Palestine has been in turmoil for the last twenty years. Three years have passed since the eight-point program for an understanding was forwarded by the Jewish Bureau of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. Had such a program been accepted then, we surely would have been in a different situation now. *A start must be made*. Jews and Arabs the world over are interested in that. The racial and chauvinistic practices employed in Palestine are bound to reflect themselves upon the life of Jews and Arabs in other countries. All progressive people are interested that an understanding be reached. *A start must be made*. The Jewish labor movement in Palestine, because of its better organization (and higher responsibilities) can accomplish a historical task in the direction of reaching such an understanding.

FOR A CORRECT APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL GROUPS*

BY IRENE BROWDER

COMRADES, our commission is a very representative one and includes many leading comrades who know and understand the problems of the national groups. I shall attempt in my remarks to emphasize some of the more important features of our work and to direct the discussion around the vital issues confronting us.

First of all, for the purpose of emphasis, I want to read to you Paragraph 7 of the Draft Resolution on Party Building. That paragraph, in concise form, contains the essence of a long-range perspective for work among the national groups:

"The convention raises before the entire Party the urgent necessity of speedily effecting a decisive turn in all phases of Party recruiting and mass work among the national groups and organizations, in the first place among Italians, Germans, Poles, Jews, South Slavs and Spanish-speaking peoples. The National Bureau of the Central Committee and the editorial staffs of the language press must be carefully examined, renewed, strengthened, and all sectarian tendencies overcome. Together with improving decisively the mass activities of the Party among the national groups, especially through the trade unions and fraternal organizations, more attention must be given to vigorously exposing, combatting and isolating the activities and

propaganda of the fascists, and to utilizing the progressive and national revolutionary traditions and sentiments of the national groups for drawing them into the broad movements of the democratic front."

In the last six or eight months we have witnessed a change in the Party toward better work among the national groups. The Party as a whole is beginning to realize that the work in this field is very important. But only a beginning has been made. Further advance along these lines is essential in order to counteract and thwart the aims of the fascists and reactionaries who are trying to utilize the sentiments and traditions of the various national groups for their own sinister purposes.

The national groups are becoming more active in the broad progressive movements in the country. More and more they are learning from the experiences of the people in European countries that have fallen victim to fascist aggression and reaction. That is why we have fought against the narrow conception that existed in our Party for a long time—and remnants of it are still present—namely, that national groups are made up only of foreign-born people who speak only foreign languages.

* Report delivered May 27, 1938, at the Commission on National Groups, Tenth Convention, C.P.U.S.A.

The June, 1937, Plenum of the Central Committee of our Party called for a decisive turn in broadening our conception and approach. It was made clear at that time that the national groups include not only the people who came from the old countries, but also the first, second, third, and even the fourth, generations; and that, while those native-born of foreign parents are Americans, and are very proud of it, they maintain the culture and traditions of their parents. They are just as proud that they are Italians, Germans, Poles, Jews, etc., as they are that they are Americans; and it is this pride in their national heritage that the fascist and reactionary forces hope to pollute with chauvinism and national hatred.

In the United States, a national group is not a nation or even a national minority as understood in European countries. A tendency exists to identify the problems of the national groups with the general problem of oppressed nations. On the other hand, some of our comrades regard the Negro people as a national group. Comrade Stalin, in his definition of a nation, supplied us with a correct guide in dealing with this question:

"A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture."

The Negro people are a nation of 15,000,000 who constitute a basic, component part of the American people, and the problem of the Negro people is not merely that of a national group, although there exist certain problems that are common to the

Negro people and to the various national groups.

A national minority is a compact group living usually in a given territory. Historically its members constitute a basic part of the population, speaking their own language, having a common culture, maintaining their own institutions, and are subjected to persecution and political domination by the ruling nation.

The origin of the national groups in the United States is of a migratory character. As President Roosevelt stated in his speech at the Convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution, "All Americans are descendants of immigrants and revolutionists." It is a historical fact that the various national groups have played a decisive role in founding America as an independent nation. In this sense the national groups become a component part of America and are the true Americans. The present generations, descendants of foreign-born people, are native American, but because of their national ties continue to be part of the national groups in the United States.

The people of America, whether foreign-born or native American, living within the given communities, are contributing to the wealth and culture of America. In this sense they are all Americans. But many workers who came from the old country have lived here for a long time, and are reluctant to become citizens, not because they intend to return to the old country, but because they just do not see the practical need for establishing their citizenship here.

Thus they are exposed to all kinds of attacks by their enemies; they are

not able to take part in elections, they are deprived in many places of the elementary rights of Americans because they are not citizens. Especially as regards full participation in the progressive and revolutionary movement, the first consideration must be the desire and intention to become a full-fledged citizen of the United States.

As long ago as 1916, Comrade Lenin made the question quite clear. In relation to Switzerland, where there were so many immigrants at the time, Lenin proposed the following policy:

"Point 18. Introduction of obligatory Swiss citizenship for aliens free of charge. That all aliens, upon three months' residence in Switzerland, shall become Swiss citizens, unless they petition for a delay of no longer than three months, on the grounds of particularly weighty reasons. A campaign to be carried on among the masses to explain the special need of such measures for Switzerland, not only from the general democratic standpoint but also because of the fact that Switzerland, owing to the imperialist situation, has become a state with the largest percentage of aliens throughout Europe, nine-tenths of whom speak one of the three Swiss languages. The political disfranchisement of the alien workers and their consequent political aloofness strengthen the growing political reaction and weaken the international solidarity."*

Following the needs and experience of our own Party, on the basis of Lenin's teachings, the new Draft Constitution, which this convention will consider, proposes as a rule for membership in our Party that every Party member must be a citizen of the United States or have expressed the

intention of becoming a citizen in the near future.

WE MUST COUNTERACT FASCISM AND
ITS AGENTS AMONG THE
NATIONAL GROUPS

The reactionaries in our country are well aware of the fact that the national groups are a vital force in the struggle for peace, democracy and security, and for this reason have concentrated for many years among that stratum of the population, through setting up clubs, through the media of religious, sport and other organizations.

It is our task to counteract the dangerous work of the reactionaries. We must work within the existing organizations and help them to grow. We must become a basic part of these organizations and win them for the democratic ideals of the people of this country, away from the reactionary misleadership.

In speaking of the influence of fascism, we must remember their agents, the Trotskyites, and their American branch, the Lovestoneites, who constitute a danger especially in the trade unions where the memberships include a great number of nationals—Italians, Jews, Poles, and others. These agents of fascism try to get the masses of the various national groups to accept and support their disruptive policy.

We can state now that, while in the past we neglected this aspect of our work—among the nationals in the trade unions and in the organizations of the unemployed—there has been a change toward better work as regards the national group question. When I say we, I do not mean only the center and the leading comrades in the na-

* "The Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland," *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, Russian Edition.

tional groups. Party members in the trade unions, comrades in the Workers Alliance, etc., have not paid sufficient attention to the particular problem of exposing the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites before the nationals in the trade unions and in the Workers Alliance. In some cases certain remnants of rotten liberalism toward the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites have been responsible for this attitude.

Our whole arsenal of knowledge must be put into operation, must be placed at the disposal of our Party membership, to expose the agents of fascism, to drive them out of the labor movement, and to give more aid and guidance to those people who really need clarification, who are being misled by the poisonous propaganda of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites.

I will deal here with some of the main phases of our work among the national groups to which we must pay special attention.

Youth. An important part of our work is among the youth of the various nationalities. Here we must rigorously combat the danger presented by the various national bourgeois organizations with reactionary aims who act under the cover of "non-partisanship"; also, the disruptive work of the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites, as in the case of an important organization of Jewish youth, organized by the Zionists, where these enemies of labor set about poisoning the minds of 2,000 young Jewish people. This was discovered only recently, when the Young Communist League began to tackle the problem of winning the youth of the various nationalities, and they discovered the influence of the

Trotskyites among certain sections of the Jewish youth.

Women. The Party can record splendid achievements in the field of mobilizing the women around burning issues, against the high cost of living, in the campaigns for trade union organization, in the fight for peace. But we have not taken advantage of all the opportunities open to us, of the tremendous possibilities presented by the women among the national groups.

Many women belonging to the various nationalities look back to their native country or to the country of their ancestors and cannot be indifferent to the conditions they see there. The events in Central Europe, in the Balkan countries, which are already in a volcanic state, involve the women specifically, and here our task is to direct their interest into the fight against fascism.

We know that women play a big role in the church and peace organizations. Women are also the masters of the home, and consequently have a decisive influence on the entire family, whether they have a correct or a wrong approach. We must remember that a large majority of the members of Father Coughlin's organization are women—including many Polish and Italian Catholics. The church skillfully uses methods of propaganda to win the women for reactionary activity having no direct connection with religion, developing extensive cultural and social activities—educational groups, knitting circles, sewing clubs, etc.

We must come closer to these organizations, give them guidance, develop them along democratic, pro-

gressive lines. Especially must we work among those women of the national groups who are eager, but who have not found the opportunity to enter into politics, and to help them overcome those restrictions which prevent them from obtaining a broader view and which limit them mainly to smaller issues of relative unimportance. These women can become the easy prey of hostile reactionary and fascist ideologies.

Our task among the women of the national groups takes on even greater importance when we realize that the majority of the working class women of the nationalities have not mastered the English language. We can cite countless examples where the women speak only Italian—women who were compelled to leave school at a very early age and who continued to speak their native language. Then there is a special problem: Take Tampa, Fla., for example, where a great part of the working people do not speak English, but speak only Spanish. Spanish-speaking nationals cannot be considered a monolithic, national group, but a composition of national groups—the Spanish-speaking. They have peculiar problems, the problems of small nationalities. But they have common problems and a common bond—they are Americans, not people who are temporarily in the United States and will return to their native countries.

The specific issues which must be raised in our work among women as a whole have a different expression among women of the various national groups. For instance, the problems of maternity, children, schools, housing, are especially sharp in communities

where there is a concentration of national groups, as, for example, in working class Italian neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are often comparable to the ghettos of the Middle Ages. We have a ghetto in Harlem where the Negro people are concentrated; but that section of Harlem populated by Italians, only a few blocks away, is but a continuation of the same ghetto.

OUR APPROACH TO EACH NATIONAL GROUP MUST BE CONCRETE

If we begin serious work in connection with these issues, we shall find large masses of people ready to fight side by side with us for the general issues—for jobs, security, democracy and peace for all Americans.

To deal with all these problems and to win these masses of whom we speak require a correct approach—an approach that takes into account the specific needs and position of each national group—an approach that will lead us to that necessary link in order to tie up the specific problems of the national groups with the big issues confronting all Americans. For these reasons we must work out a program for each national group separately.

This program should consider the task of training cadres for educational activity—to give courses, to conduct study circles—to organize the study of the traditions of each national group and to put these traditions to proper use, not for the purpose of developing national vanity, but in order that national pride may make a truly great contribution to the cause of all humanity—in the fight against fascism. And in all our work, we must develop patience, giving considerable attention to those progressive trends that

already exist among the national groups.

What is the main issue of our Party in connection with the national groups?

We have four influential, numerically strong, national groups in the United States—four groups that constitute important political factors, as the municipal elections in Cleveland, Detroit and New York have shown. These are: Germans, 8,000,000; Italians, 4,000,000; Jewish, 4,500,000; and Polish, 4,000,000.

We must concentrate our work among these groups, developing leaders from their own ranks, rallying all their forces to build the People's Front and united front movements among the national groups; and, in turning them away from the fascist and semi-fascist influences, bring them into the building of the democratic front in America.

Italians. It is our task to organize the Italian masses in the fight against fascism by means of involving them in the democratic front movement, utilizing their revolutionary traditions both here and back home, and fighting against the tendency to use the name "Italian" synonymously with "fascist."

In advancing the slogan of unity of the Italians, in fighting for full citizenship rights and against discrimination, we must patiently struggle against the illusion, consciously spread among the masses of Italian people, that Mussolini is the people's hero of Italy, because he "re-established the greatness of Italy"; that he has thereby created respect toward the Italians, influenced the attitude of the people abroad, and improved the

status of the Italians in America.

Our task is to clarify the issue, showing that Mussolini is the servant of monopoly capital in the Italian domain, closely tied up with finance capital, represented by the Liberty League in the United States, which oppresses the masses here as Mussolini economically and politically persecutes the people of Italy, subjecting them to horrible tortures, as the Liberty League would like to do here in America.

To save the masses of Italians from the fate of their brothers under fascism, it is necessary to mobilize them around the slogan of struggle of all the American people—for democracy, security, jobs and peace.

Jewish. On the one hand, the Jewish people are a national group living in concentrated communities, speaking their own language, having their own national culture. On the other hand, there is a considerable number of Jewish origin, having no close connection with the language and culture of the broad Jewish masses, but, at the same time, subjected to the same discrimination and persecution, as fascism in a number of countries has already demonstrated. This creates a common cause for all people of Jewish origin, whether they are closely bound up with national traditions or not, around the issue of the fight against fascism and its blood-brother, anti-Semitism. On this issue, the broadest masses and all progressive forces must be rallied. This is the platform of the Jewish People's Committee, which has already become an important political factor in the public life of America.

At the same time, we must sound a

warning against the reactionaries in the Jewish field, the Zionist leaders and their helpers, the Trotskyites, who sow pessimism among the Jewish people and prevent them from taking part in the common fight of the American people, thus weakening the struggle against the enemy, fascism.

The fight against the fascist stench, anti-Semitism, is not only the issue of the Jewish people, but the issue of all nationalities, of all humanity, because historically it has always been the weapon of reaction, the weapon of the aggressors. It is especially important here in America, which was born a democratic land, to note the ever-increasing tendency of the fascist and semi-fascist forces to promote antagonisms between various oppressed nationalities by every means in their power, including anti-Semitism. In this, we see an expression of the speed of the general offensive of monopoly capital and reaction against democracy in America.

Polish. Numerically the Poles are a big group, concentrated in the basic industries, and having great political influence. In connection with the developments in the mother country, many of the Polish progressive leaders are confused and follow the path of national chauvinism. Precisely because we are the best defenders of Polish independence, it is our task to expose the policies of the present semi-fascist regime which compromises and endangers that independence.

It is necessary to clarify the real nature of the regime in Poland, in regard to which many of our Party comrades are not clear. The confusion which exists prevents them from understanding the real problems and

from organizing the Polish workers and middle classes and other strata of the Polish population, to unite them in a People's Front movement under the slogan of jobs, security, democracy and peace.

Recent developments show that the comrades have taken a correct approach in the trade union movement, especially among the automobile workers. The Polish Alliance, too, has shown the first signs of contributing toward building the American democratic front.

Germans. The Germans occupy an important place in American life, as a group of considerable size and as an integral part of the American people. At the same time, along with the general problems of the American people, they have their own specific problems, particularly the issue of the fight against Nazism. In this respect, the German comrades have developed a correct policy and activity, but still within narrow limits embracing only small groups of sympathetic and liberal Germans.

In order to unite the German section of the American people together with all Americans in the fight against fascism in general and its special Nazi brand, it is necessary to break the isolation of these small groups so that they will fuse with broad masses of the people, making the fullest use of their historical traditions, and link themselves with the main issues of American life.

At this point I should like to say a word on one of the major problems common to all national groups—the problem of anti-Semitism and of national antagonism between the various national groups. The existence of

these phenomena is a demonstration that our Party has not really rooted itself among the advanced elements of the national groups. It is true that we cannot put these phenomena on an equal plane; anti-Semitism is a historically ugly feature of the system of oppression, characteristic of the weapons used by the oppressors to create national antagonisms between oppressed nations.

One of our major tasks is the education of the national group masses, clarifying the question of nationalism, explaining the meaning of narrow nationalism. We must develop the spirit of internationalism in a Marxist sense, and show how true internationalism embraces conscious nationalism in the best sense of the term.

In all national groups, in the Party Bureaus, in the Party fractions, we meet with the problem of shortage of cadres. We often hear complaints that we have not enough people for the work. As far back as 1903, when the Bolshevik Party was being built, Lenin sharply criticized this complaint. He stressed again and again that we must look around among ourselves; that the people are here, but that we do not understand how to use them. The proper use of existing forces will give the answer to this problem.

There must also be a change in the wrong attitude on the part of some Party members, sometimes even leading comrades, who ignore the problems of the nationality from which they originated. Only through proper understanding of the importance of all these problems will the Party's influence be rooted among the broadest masses of people. Through the channels of our Party membership,

through the work of leading and well-equipped comrades, we shall be able really to build the democratic front in America.

The language press must become an expression of the life and problems of the nationalities they represent—they must become active organizers in their struggles, connecting them with general American problems and movements. The *Daily Worker* can and must give practical help.

CONCLUSION

The groups mentioned above are the main concentration groups. But this does not diminish the importance of the other nineteen national groups, especially the groups corresponding to those living in the Balkan countries. These groups suffer a twofold oppression: first, the offensive of finance capital against the American people as a whole, of which they are a part; and, second, the echoes of fascism from the countries of their origin.

In view of these problems, we must carefully work out a correct approach. Through the Central Bureau of the National Groups, the Party has formulated a program. But that is not enough. The entire Party, especially the leading comrades in the districts, must tackle these problems and solve them on a national scale by linking them with their daily activities.

While we have only made a beginning, the consciousness and understanding of our leading comrades and of the Party membership with regard to the work among the national groups, as demonstrated at our State and Section Conventions, represent a great step forward in the struggle to win the national groups for the democratic front in our country.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE PROFESSIONALS

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

ONE of the most pronounced effects of the long-continued industrial crisis and depression has been to worsen generally the economic position of the middle class, especially the professions. This fact, plus the worldwide threat of fascist reaction and war, has produced a broad current of radicalization among these strata. Not only have they become more responsive to the mass progressive, democratic movements of this period, but also many of them, accepting the socialist perspective, have become active sympathizers with and members of the Communist Party. Thus, in late years, and particularly during our recent big recruiting campaign, an appreciable number of professionals—doctors, dentists, lawyers, engineers, teachers, scientists, writers, musicians, artists, actors, etc.—have joined our Party,* notably in New York.

These middle-class professionals, when equipped with Leninist-Stalinist training, and a genuine Communist outlook, are of great service to the cause of democracy and socialism.

* The above is a broad definition of "professionals," including as it does the artistic crafts. It does not, however, include all white-collar elements, such as salespeople, office employees, etc., who are more properly wage-workers.

They, especially, can effectively carry the Party's message of education, organization and struggle into the vast ranks of the white-collar elements, strata from which fascists ordinarily draw heavy forces. They can go far toward transforming these elements into a powerful support of the democratic front. They also can, as general Party members, furnish valuable direct support to the industrial proletariat and the farmers in the struggle. Besides all this, they have the strong possibility, when political development among them reaches high levels, of doing serious theoretical work for our Party. Some of the leading theoreticians of the Socialist and Communist movements have been revolutionary middle-class intellectuals. In view of all these potentialities for service by Communist professionals, any tendencies in our Party to underestimate the importance of these elements should be combatted.

The entry of numerous professionals into the Party is a testimonial to our Party's growing influence among the broadest masses. At the same time, it presents to the Party new problems and tasks which we must become conscious of and take the necessary steps to solve before we can fully utilize our Communist professionals.

The Communist Party is the champion of all the toilers. Its role is to give leadership to the masses of workers, farmers and petty bourgeoisie in defense of their interests under capitalism and to prepare them for the eventual establishment of socialism. To do this our Party necessarily bases itself upon the working class. It is the advance guard of the only consciously revolutionary class, the proletariat; the class which must lead the other oppressed classes in joint struggle against the capitalist system. Therefore, the various problems and tasks presented by the entry of middle-class professionals into our Party all boil down to the issue of how to make use of the latter to further our central objective of broadening and strengthening the proletarian base and mass leading role of the Communist Party.

Before discussing in detail these questions, it may be well to look at a concrete example, in the tradition of our Party, of how they should not be solved. This example is to be found in the history of the American Socialist Party (as well as in that of the Socialist Parties of various other countries).

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND THE MIDDLE CLASS

The Socialist Party, as a party, never understood the decisive fact that to be the party of socialism it had to be a working class party, the vanguard of the proletariat. Hence, it also never comprehended its proper relationship toward the petty bourgeoisie. The S.P.'s ignorance of these fundamentals was manifested by the party flinging its doors wide open to an indiscriminate recruitment of middle-class ele-

ments. The consequence was that petty-bourgeois radicals, discontented and having no party of their own, flocked into the S.P.—lawyers, preachers, doctors, writers, small business men, etc. (as well as several millionaires). From the foundation of the S.P. and through all its years, these people, grace to their intellectual training and the support given them by skilled workers and farmers in the party, were able to occupy the key leading posts of the party and to dominate its policy.

In my pamphlet *The Crisis in the Socialist Party*,* I have shown in detail how disastrous this petty-bourgeois control was in the life of the S.P. Suffice it here to summarize briefly the conclusions there arrived at by stating that the middle class S.P. leaders were a great barrier preventing the revolutionary development of the party. With notable exceptions, they persistently fought against everything that made for a class-struggle policy; they were inveterate enemies of true Marxian education, and they played down all manifestations of working class militancy. Their aim was to make the S.P. into a party of petty-bourgeois reform, and the tragedy of the S.P. was that they succeeded in accomplishing their purpose.

This middle-class domination provoked an inner conflict, an expression within the S.P. of the class struggle—a long and relentless fight between the revolutionary proletarians (plus a few revolutionary intellectuals) and the reformistic petty-bourgeois leadership. In this struggle, a section of the Left

* Wm. Z. Foster, *The Crisis in the Socialist Party*, Workers Library Publishers, New York. 5 cents.

wing put forth the incorrect, sectarian demand for the exclusion of all petty-bourgeois intellectuals from the party. The class character of this internal fight was clearly discernible in the big S.P. splits of 1909, 1912 and 1919. During the latter split, in many branches the cleft took place precisely between the petty-bourgeois members and the workers.

The revolutionary proletarian elements never broke the grip of the opportunist middle-class leaders (not even until today), and this is one of the most fundamental reasons why the S.P. failed in its task of becoming the mass party of socialism and why it has now degenerated into a narrow, dogmatic, semi-Trotskyist sect.

THE PROBLEM IN A NEW SETTING

It is very important for us to be cognizant of the struggle of the proletarians in the S.P. against its reformist petty-bourgeois leadership, as a sort of horrible example of what happens when this vital question of the relationship of the party to the middle class is not settled correctly. But the lessons of the S.P. experience must be studied and applied dialectically. The problem our Party faces now in this general respect is quite different from that confronted by the S.P. in its heyday. Let us examine briefly the chief reasons why this is the case:

First, the economic and political situation, and with it the viewpoint and the very composition of the middle class itself, have profoundly changed. In the pre-War days, when the petty-bourgeois leadership was entrenched itself in the Socialist Party, capitalism was still on the upgrade.

Relatively, the middle class was prospering, and its tendency to unite with the proletariat against the common enemy, big capital, was still weak. Its spokesmen, both within the S.P. and outside, were saturated with capitalist illusions and based their reformist policies thereon. But now capitalism is on the downgrade. It is already far into decay and constantly plunges deeper into its general crisis. The petty bourgeoisie, threatened with destruction (by loss of business, by being wiped out by monopolies, by being turned into low-paid salaried functionaries, by the new terror of unemployment, by the threat of fascism and war, etc.), becomes increasingly inclined toward joint action with the working class. It also raises in its ranks, especially among the youth, more and more leaders prepared to accept the revolutionary program of the Communist Party.

Second, unlike the Socialist Party, the Communist Party's membership is largely infused with the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and it has, both in the states and nationally, a firmly established proletarian leadership. It has also absorbed the lessons of the Russian Revolution and of the present-day People's Front movements.

These conditions, the changed position of the middle class and the revolutionary composition of our Party, greatly fortify our Party against possible opportunist petty-bourgeois infiltration. The danger of our Party being seriously penetrated by reformist middle-class elements is much less than was the case with the Socialist Party in its days of expansion. But although the danger is less, it neverthe-

less exists, and has evil potentialities. Especially now that our Party is taking on a mass character and is becoming an important political factor we can expect that it will attract many opportunists and careerists, including members of the professions. The present is the time to be conscious of this danger and to take the necessary measures to forestall it.

But it would be a grave political error to consider the matter of the Communist professionals simply from the standpoint of the possible danger that opportunist elements may seep in among them. That is only the negative side of the question. There is also the positive side: the task of developing the very valuable Party building and mass organizing potentialities of Communist professionals, which I have indicated already. This is the angle from which, primarily, the problem must be approached.

THE BASIS OF OUR POLICY

Considering, therefore, the question of the relationship of the Party toward its professionals from the double angle of (1) developing their full revolutionary possibilities and, (2) avoiding the danger of reformist individuals and tendencies among them, our Party tasks group themselves roughly under three general heads:

1. *Selective recruiting:* In drawing professionals into the Party, care should be exercised to select only those individuals who show by practical work that they definitely understand the Party line, are prepared to put it into effect, and especially display a thorough readiness to accept Party discipline. It is not enough that professionals should support our gen-

eral struggle for democracy and peace; they must also accept the socialist principles of our Party. There must be selective recruiting far more than in the case of miners, longshoremen, railroad workers, etc. General Party units which proceed upon the basis of a "mass recruitment of lawyers," or of "drawing doctors into the Party on a large scale," have a wrong policy.

2. *Intensive education:* There must be special attention paid to the Marxian education of professionals entering our Party. This should have the definite goal of thoroughly Communizing their outlook and reorientating their previous intellectual training, so that its full value may be utilized in a revolutionary sense by our Party and the masses.

3. *Systematic mass work:* It is necessary also that care be exercised to draw the professionals into mass work in an organized way, both in their respective callings and in the general class struggle. Let me expand this point in some detail under a separate heading.

MASS WORK OF COMMUNIST PROFESSIONALS

(a) The foundation of the mass work of our Communist professionals must be a systematic defense of the economic and political interests of the rank-and-file membership of their respective callings. They should participate in all the many association, guilds, unions and struggles in their professions and take an active part in shaping and carrying out their programs of betterment for their members.

(b) The fight of our professionals must also be linked up with that of the masses generally. Professionals,

properly organized and with a Communist outlook, as already stated, are in a position to lend powerful aid to the masses in struggle—by speaking and writing, giving financial backing, developing the moral and electoral support of their groups, etc. They can become a strong pillar of the democratic front. The forms of such collaboration with the masses should be carefully worked out and applied.

(c) Under present-day conditions professionals, in their capacity as producers, serve chiefly the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. The workers are largely denied the possibility of procuring their services. Hence, a vital part of the work of Communist professionals must be to bring the vitally necessary services of their respective professions to the needy masses. Thus, our doctors must be the first-line champions of an adequate government health program, our lawyers must fight for free legal aid for the masses, our teachers must still further popularize education, our actors must democratize the theater, our writers must find ways to bring good literature and effective political writing to the masses, etc., etc.

(d) Communist professionals also have the very important task of advancing, and even revolutionizing the techniques and theories of their respective professions. They must take up the intellectual cudgels against the reactionaries on all front. Thus, our teachers must write new school textbooks and rewrite history from the Marxian viewpoint, our scientists must organize more effectively the battle of the materialists against the idealists in every branch of science, our doctors must introduce new methods into

medicine (the American Medical Association is not only reactionary politically, but also medically), our lawyers must challenge prevalent musty capitalist legal conceptions and rewrite our legal history, our writers must bring forward class-struggle themes in literature and the theater, etc. In short, our Communist professionals must develop a powerful Marxist-Leninist ideological front against the reactionaries and their Trotskyite-Lovestoneite stooges in every field of intellectual and artistic endeavor.

THE PARTY'S WORK TO DATE

Our Party has already done very considerable work along the foregoing general lines among the professions. Communist professionals are beginning to make their influence felt in their various associations, guilds and unions, as well as in society generally: our writers, artists and actors have long since been doing effective work in their respective spheres, our doctors are playing a more and more important role in the developing great struggle of the masses for adequate medical care, and our other professional groups are increasingly active.

This constitutes a good beginning, but it is only a beginning. The work in this general field must be much further theorized, systematized, organized and intensified. This is made all the more urgently necessary by our Party's rapidly expanding mass contacts with the petty bourgeoisie and by the entry of increasing numbers of professionals into our Party.

Special organizational forms must be developed for this work. We now have many professional units and, in some instances, sections of professionals. We

are also cultivating various mass organizations of professionals. The validity of these new forms must be studied and they must be adapted to the special tasks in hand. The National Committee of our Party requires a sub-committee to supervise the work generally in this whole field.

The question of the role of the Communist professionals, in our Party and in the class struggle generally, has

become a live one. It is cropping up in many Party districts in one form or another. It is timely that the problem as a whole should be studied carefully. Any tendency to underestimate or neglect this important task would play directly into the hands of the reactionaries and fascists, who are making strenuous efforts to win the professionals and the petty bourgeoisie generally.

Marxist Education

“Nowadays there is no longer even the semblance of excuse that it is difficult to spread Marxism and Marxist education. Our Party has already demonstrated that it is possible. Comrade Browder has given us object lessons. He has given us the object lesson of how to take our Marxist-Leninist theory, from the simplest idea to the most complicated one, and to bring them to the American worker, to the American farmer, to the American middle class person, so that he can recognize in these ideas something of his own and in this way bring Marxism closer to the masses and the masses closer to the Party.”—Alex Bittelman, *The Communist*, July, 1938, p. 628.

BUILDING THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT IN ILLINOIS*

BY MORRIS CHILDS

State Secretary, Communist Party of Illinois

THE bourgeoisie used to be able to call Communism an ideology imported from abroad, without roots in our American soil—and to a large extent they got away with it. But that time is past. Our Tenth Convention is proof that our Party expresses the best hopes and aspirations of the American people. In the fire of the great struggle of the American people, a leadership has been forged that is best expressed in the work of Comrade Browder. His report to this convention and the speech he delivered at Madison Square Garden were contributions of the greatest importance to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice in our country.

Comrade Browder has not only given us the slogan "Communism Is Twentieth Century Americanism"; he has shown us how to make it live. I know that I am expressing the feelings not only of the Illinois delegation, but of the hundreds of delegates present who have been inspired by Comrade Browder's work and leadership. Our very unanimity in the discussion at this convention and in the preced-

ing two months is proof of our acceptance, of our profound agreement with the report.

In speaking about our central task, to defeat the reactionary camp in the 1938 elections, Comrade Browder said:

"Considering the still primitive state of organization of the democratic camp, the struggle it is still conducting within the Democratic Party against the Right wing which seeks control, the presence of progressive groupings here and there in the Republican Party, the incompleteness of labor's own independent organizations, and so forth, this task calls for the utmost of flexibility in gathering together all forms of the democratic mass movement around such candidates as will most surely weld the majority together and most fully advance its common program."*

When our District Committee discussed the primaries a few months ago, we had to answer the question: "How can we, under the present circumstances, carry out the policy of uniting labor and the progressive forces in the most effective way?"

From an examination of the forces in our state, it was obvious that even if labor were united, it was not strong enough independently to win the victory over reaction. While we did not

* Speech delivered at the Tenth National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., New York, May 29, 1938.

* Earl Browder, *The Democratic Front*, p. 39. Workers Library Publishers, N. Y.

underestimate the importance of the independent role of labor, we realized that labor needed the support of the farmers and urban middle classes. Moreover, we knew, too, that labor in Illinois was split. We saw that if Labor's Non-Partisan League put candidates in the field alone, the American Federation of Labor was only too likely to come out against those candidates. The lessons of Detroit and Seattle showed us two things: first, that the unity of labor and its allies is vitally necessary; and second, that at the present time a narrow, "pure" labor policy not only splits the democratic forces, but leads also to disunity of labor; that through cooperation of labor with its democratic allies the unity of labor itself is strengthened.

Guided by the decisions of the Central Committee, we were able, in spite of the difficult situation produced by the factional struggle within the Democratic Party, to find the way in which the democratic front could be built. We saw that neither the Kelly-Nash nor the Horner-Courtney machines represented a progressive alignment, but that there were, nevertheless, progressives in both camps, and that the keen interest of the masses in the primaries reflected, even though in a distorted way, their readiness to struggle against reaction. Under these circumstances, we had to enter the battle to give direction to the people, to mobilize them in support of the progressive candidates, even though it was impossible for progressives to support either slate as a whole.

We found the solution in the selecting by Labor's Non-Partisan League and other progressive organizations of candidates on both slates as well as of

independents. Our policy was vindicated by the tremendous vote for an off-year election, by the fact that the majority of the candidates supported by the progressives were victorious; and by the impetus that the campaign has given to the alignment of democratic forces in our state.

Some difficulties arose in the minds of comrades in carrying out this policy. They were troubled by the fact that if they voted in the primaries they would be registered as Democratic voters, and although they could vote however they wished in the final elections, they would not be able for a period of two years to sign petitions to place on the ballot Communists or independents. Many comrades wondered if this sacrifice was justified. It had to be made clear to the Party membership that we were not embarking on this policy *in a half-hearted way*; that we were determined to carry through with all our energy the only correct line; that if certain sacrifices had to be made in order to unify the people, *we would make them*.

There were other difficulties. Yes, there were some who felt that it was sullyng revolutionary purity to support Igoe, candidate for U. S. Senate; slanders were spread by the Trotskyite-fascist crew that we were in a deal with the Kelly-Nash machine. But the Party and the progressives of Illinois understood that the outstanding need was the building of unity behind those candidates who expressed best the program of the democratic front, who were willing to carry on the fight in support of the interests of the people and against the offensive of reaction.

Homer Martin came to Chicago

and attempted to get the workers to boycott primaries. But the danger of this position, a position similar to that of the Socialists and the La Follette third party, was seen by the people and overwhelmingly rejected by them. In Rockford, where Mr. Martin's influence succeeded in getting some auto union people practically to desert the united committee behind Anderson, a leader of labor, that splitting policy resulted in Anderson's defeat by a mere 700 votes. It is an outstanding achievement of our policy in the primaries that, unlike Detroit and Seattle, the unity of the labor movement was preserved almost 100 per cent. The A. F. of L. and C.I.O. and the Railroad Brotherhoods, in the main, supported the progressive candidates throughout.

The election, in spite of the fact that the *Tribune*, the *Daily News*, and Hearst tried to find an anti-New Deal slant in its results, was a vote of confidence of the people in the progressive policies of the administration. Even Lucas' victory over Igoe was only possible because he campaigned under the slogan "Forward with Roosevelt," in a program of support for the New Deal, and the voters, who did not know his record, took him at his word.

The statewide victory for Horner is itself an important sign of the temper of the voters. Horner's candidates ran ahead because the people were indignant at Kelly boss rule. The central slogan of the Horner-Courtney campaign was "End Boss Rule," though they themselves are as potentially rotten a machine as the Kelly-Nash outfit. This slogan has helped to set in motion forces which will in the long

run prove the defeat of the Horner-Courtney machine and of all boss rule.

We have to keep this issue of boss rule before the people of Chicago. The Mayoralty election is only a year off and the reactionaries are already preparing for it. When Knox and Hearst encouraged Republicans to vote in the Democratic primaries this year, it was not just because of their aims in this election. They had in mind their plans for 1939. They had in mind their plot to build a coalition of reactionary Republicans and Democrats behind Courtney for Mayor of Chicago, to attempt to capture the Democratic nomination for him.

* * *

We cannot neglect this danger. The Chicago Mayoralty elections coming just before the Presidential elections of 1940 will have the greatest significance.

We cannot let the people of Chicago forget the Memorial Day massacre, the systematic terrorization by the Chicago police which goes on throughout the city. The scandal of Chicago's educational system, the graft which eats up the swollen taxation of the masses and prevents the decent upkeep of the city, are issues of which the indignant people of Chicago are well aware.

In discussing our election policy and the whole question of the democratic front it is worth noting some questions that arose in the Gary and Lake County elections. Our aim there was the same as in Illinois, that is, the unification of all democratic forces for the defeat of the reactionaries. This effort, however, was paralyzed by

a group of people, members of a steel lodge in Gary, who insisted on running a "labor" candidate who could not even get the endorsement of their own lodge, nor the endorsement of Labor's Non-Partisan League and the S.W.O.C. regional leadership.

The dangers in this situation were obvious. The antagonism between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. would be sharpened and lead to open warfare. The reactionaries would take advantage of this situation to turn it into a struggle of everybody versus the C.I.O., as they did in Detroit and Seattle. Because of these differences of opinion, Labor's Non-Partisan League did not endorse any candidate in the Mayoralty primaries in Gary.

In pursuance of their own policy, the groups supporting this labor candidate used every conceivable anti-Communist and Red-baiting trick to blackjack support for their venture. They stopped at nothing to smash the unity of the progressive forces.

This so-called labor candidate was defeated in the election. Now, these very same people who opposed the policy of unity are aghast at the vote that he got. They say that 7,200 votes cast for him tends to prove that our policy was wrong—that had Labor's Non-Partisan League given him unqualified support, he might have been elected. This reasoning is wrong. The fact that this candidate received a big vote is a healthy sign that the workers wanted to support a progressive candidate and that this support certainly could have been utilized for a more clear-cut victory of a candidate representing the democratic forces as a whole.

In East Chicago, and in Hammond,

cities in the same county, particularly in East Chicago, where our Party did such splendid work in last year's steel strike, Labor's Non-Partisan League played a decisive part in the elections. The basis for unity among the people of East Chicago was laid at the time of the strike, when the workers were able to unite not only their own ranks but the middle classes and the population generally of Indiana Harbor, in support of the strike. It was not an accident that the Indiana Harbor strike ended differently than the strike in Little Steel in other cities. If the middle classes in Indiana Harbor, if the war veterans and other sections of the population had not been neutralized or won over to the side of the workers, vigilante bands and a reign of terror would have prevailed.

The election results show the fruits of this policy. The Mayor-elect is a small business man who was very friendly to the workers during the strike, and five out of the seven victorious councilmen had the endorsement of Labor's Non-Partisan League.

The results of the primaries in Illinois contrasted to those in Gary show the correctness of our basic policy. In the situation today, our central aim must be the consolidation of all labor and democratic forces in one united movement for the defeat of reaction. Any other policy, no matter how it is labeled, leads to the victory of the reactionaries.

Norman Thomas, who a few years ago was busy "refuting" Marxism, considers the struggle for democracy a betrayal of Marxism. When he uses the phrase Marxism, he pretends to speak for something he never understood and does not understand today.

His false position can have no result but to split the ranks of the progressive movement and to betray the fight for democracy. To betray the fight for democracy is to aid the victory of fascism and so hinder the struggle for socialism as well.

These people, like Norman Thomas, say that it is useless to fight against fascism because fascism arises from capitalism and can only be destroyed by first destroying capitalism. Of course, every class-conscious worker knows that fascism is bred by the decay of capitalism—that fascism is not something apart from capitalism. But that is just why it is necessary to carry out the most effective determined struggle against fascism. What is the result of saying that, because fascism grows out of capitalism, there is no use carrying out an immediate struggle against it? Does it not mean relying on an abstract fight against capitalism in general? And that means that no actual, practical fight against capitalism will be conducted. It means falling into the profound error of separating the day-to-day struggle of the masses from the struggle for socialism. What these people fail to see is that just because fascism *is* the political form which monopoly capitalism wants today, *the defeat of fascism*, the weakening of the political power of the trusts, weakens capitalism and lays the basis for the further struggle for socialism.

The situation today is a very different one from that in 1917 to which these new found "Marxists" are always pointing, with their parrot-like understanding of Leninism. In 1917, the Bolsheviks fought against the parties which were using the slogan

of bourgeois democracy—the Mensheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc. —*because then those parties were using that slogan to cloak their own position of opposition to the extension of democracy, to the establishment of workers' rule.*

Today, on the other hand, capitalist democracy is being attacked by those *who wish to do away with all democracy.* We defend it in the United States and in all the other capitalist countries, because that defense is the road to greater power for the people, for the working class, because the immediate issue is *not* one of bourgeois democracy versus socialism, but *rather of fascism versus democracy*, which, however limited, allows a defense of the gains won in years of struggle by the working class and opens up the road to the struggle for socialism.

Perhaps those irresponsible muddleheads who are always accusing us of deserting Leninism think that Lenin, too, deserted Leninism, when just before the time of the revolution of 1905, when attacking Plekhanov and those who shared Plekhanov's views among the Mensheviks, he answered those who are afraid to carry out a struggle for democracy together with allies who may be inconsistent or vacillating. Here, too, these critics of the Bolshevik policy pretended to speak from a "Left" point of view, from a pure, holy attitude of contempt for the class struggle in real life. Of their resolution, Lenin said:

"The intellectual wing strives after wordy conditions of agreements. The *proletarian wing demands actual cooperation in the struggle.* The intellectual wing invents some measuring device for a good, fine and wordy agreement with the bourgeoisie. The prole-

tarian wing expects no goodness from the bourgeoisie but supports any bourgeoisie, no matter how bad, to the extent that it really fights against tsarism. The intellectual wing sinks to the position of petty bargaining; if you take the side of the Social-Democrats instead of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, we will agree to enter into a pact with you against the common enemy; otherwise, we will refuse. The proletarian wing adheres to the standpoint of expediency; we will support you if this should help us to deal any blow to our enemy." (*Collected Works, Volume VI, Russian Edition.*)

A strong and united proletariat which understands its central task of leading the whole of the democratic people in the struggle against fascism and against monopoly will not be "led astray" by cooperation with non-proletarian groups who are also *really* struggling for certain immediate common aims. Far from being led astray, it will consolidate its unity, strengthen its forces and attain the leadership, the hegemony of the farmers, of the middle classes in this way, and in this way only.

BUILDING THE PARTY

We in the Illinois District can be proud that we come here today with a membership over twice what it was at the time of the last District Convention. We say this in no spirit of boastfulness, but rather fully conscious of how little we have done compared with what still remains to be done. When we look around and see the tens of thousands of steel workers, packing-house workers, miners and railroadmen in our district, workers who are engaged in real struggles, who are emerging into class-consciousness in their thousands, and we think of the few hundreds we have as yet in the Party; when we remem-

ber the great farm communities of our state, and how very, very few farmers we have in our ranks, then we can see what a big task remains before us.

What is it that is missing in our Party building? In spite of the successes we have had, what still remains the matter with it? You know, when we look back at the last big drive, the results that we got then, we begin to wonder how big our Party was when the drive began. Where were four out of five of the Party members? That was a big drive—the biggest and most successful drive we have ever had—but only one out of five of our comrades played a part in it. The two thousand new people we got were all recruited by one-fifth of the membership. If the other four-fifths had brought in only one member each, instead of getting two thousand new members we would have got nearer five thousand.

The whole Party does not yet think of bringing in new people as an ordinary, regular part of everything they do. That is why only a portion of the membership helped build the Party; that is why we have all this unevenness manifested in the fact that for four months, during the drive, we got 500 new members a month, and then for two months, we do not get a quarter of that number; and then a little pressure is put on, as in the last week or two, a new drive is begun, and in a couple of weeks, just before the convention, we get as many in as in the last two months.

Building of our Party has to go on day in and day out.

We have to strengthen the foundation of our Party in the factories.

That is what our shop branches are—the very foundation of our Party. It won't do any harm to remind ourselves of the old slogan: "Every Factory a Fortress." In the recruiting drive, we did not remember it too well. Too small a proportion of our recruits come from the big factories. We have to root ourselves more firmly in the basic industries—in the packing houses, in the coal mines, the steel mills, on the railways.

The establishment of the *Midwest Daily Record* was one of the greatest achievements of our Party. We worked for it and sacrificed for it. But, comrades, we are endangering the very existence of our organ, of the voice we have to reach the masses with, by the shameful neglect we are showing, first in Illinois and throughout the Middle West.

How can we expect to build the democratic front, to strengthen our Party, without a voice? Remember how Lenin and the Bolsheviks fought to establish their papers in tsarist Russia? Think how, in illegal countries, our comrades risk their very lives to print and distribute their literature. The workers of the Middle West are eager for our paper too, if only we take the trouble to get it to them. (This goes for Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, etc.)

The cold circulation figures should be enough to make every Communist blush. This is a political question. If we understood what the *Record* means to our movement, what it means to the people of the Mid-West,

the circulation figures would tell a very different story.

Comrade Browder in his speech yesterday stressed greatly the need of a higher quality of work. He said:

"Constant improvement in the political effectiveness of our work, steadily rising quality, is demanded by the growth of our Party into a truly mass Party which can influence millions. The key to all progress is the constant struggle for improvement in the quality of our work."

It is obvious that the importance of our task and the great responsibility which we face demand that our Party work a little differently than in the past; that our branch meetings be different; that the work in the trade unions assume more of a political character, not only to give expression to the problems of the workers, but to develop their class consciousness to a higher level.

I am reminded of a statement by Comrade Lenin dealing with this question. Lenin, speaking in a self-critical tone, said:

"I used to work in a circle that set itself great and all-embracing tasks; and every member of that circle suffered to the point of torture from the realization that we were proving to be amateurs at a moment in history when we might have been able to say, paraphrasing a well-known epigram: 'Give us an organization of revolutionaries, and we will overturn the whole of Russia!' And the more I recall the burning sense of shame I then experienced, the more bitter are my feelings toward those pseudo-Social-Democrats whose teachings bring disgrace on the calling of a revolutionary, who fail to understand that our task is not to degrade the revolutionaries to the level of an amateur, but to exalt the amateur to the level of a revolutionary."

PROBLEMS OF THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT IN THE SOUTH

BY FRANCIS FRANKLIN

ONE of the most thoroughgoing component parts of President Roosevelt's legislative program is the program of agrarian reform contained in the report of his Committee on Farm Tenancy. The realization in life of the proposals there made would have the most far-reaching results in the South, the biggest agrarian region in the United States and the center of the most widespread farm tenancy. This program, as it stands, is capable of forming one of the most fundamental parts of such a People's Front program, as is required if the South is to be raised to a status of full equality and unity with the rest of the nation.

The significance of this program must be appraised against the background of the long-maturing crisis in the Cotton Belt.

1. THE CRISIS IN THE COTTON BELT AND ROOSEVELT'S AGRARIAN PROGRAM

The old plantation system of the Southeast has for some time been in a state of near bankruptcy and collapse.

The soil of the Southeast is so exhausted and eroded that only drastic measures requiring highly centralized planning can redeem it. This is a result (1) of the reckless wasting of the

soil under slavery and the system of sharecropping, which took the place of slavery, and (2) of the one-crop system of agriculture. Continuation of one-crop agriculture will only intensify this ruination of the soil. But the plantation economy is built upon this one-crop system.

As a result of soil deterioration, the quality of the cotton produced in the Southeast is constantly getting worse. The center of cotton production has shifted to the Southwest. Mississippi and the states west of the Mississippi, except for drought years, have been producing three-fourths of the cotton in recent years. Texas and Oklahoma now produce, as a rule, nearly one-half of the cotton crop.

The basis of this crisis and the resultant shift in cotton production to the Southwest is to be found in the high cost of production in the Southeast as contrasted with the Southwest. In one year, the cost of production in the Southeast will run from twelve to thirteen cents a pound, while in the Southwest it is only five cents. Even the average cost of production by regions fails to show the differences between costs on family-sized farms and on plantations or corporation farms. Not only does the family-operated farm compete with machinery and

other special advantages of capitalist farms, but also with the fifty-cents-a-day wage for farm labor. Bluntly, it means farmers who work their own crops receive prices for them based on fifty cents per day labor, which by itself is enough reason for these farmers to support the organization of farm labor.

This means that year after year the owner-operated and tenant-operated cotton farms fail to make production costs. Landlords seek to escape these consequences through greater exploitation of sharecroppers and farm wage hands. The result intensifies the cotton crisis in the Southeast, as well as for the hill farmers of the Southwest.

On the cotton farms of the Southwest, with their better soil, the old plantation economy does not exist to anything like the extent to which it is found in the Southeast. Wage-labor is much more prevalent in the Southwest. This means that new methods of cotton culture do not encounter there to the same degree the social problems which in the Southeast offer so much resistance to technological changes. As a result, cotton farming is there being mechanized much more rapidly. There is widespread use of the tractor and two-row equipment. Experimentation in the mechanization of cotton culture indicates that such mechanization will become much more widespread.

The planters of the Southeast are increasingly unable to stand competition with the cotton farms of the Southwest. The production of greater quantities of cotton in India, Egypt, Brazil, the Soviet Union, and elsewhere is also threatening the market

of the Southeast. There has thus been a marked decline in exports. There is also constantly growing competition from cotton substitutes.

The Southeastern planters are being forced increasingly into debt, are becoming ever more dependent upon the banks, and are increasingly having to sell their land. The outcome of the whole credit structure which has been built has been a tremendous concentration of land ownership in the Cotton Belt. An even larger proportion of farm lands and farm mortgage indebtedness is held by the Federal Land Banks. This is important in view of demands to liberalize this government agency to reflect the progressive policies of the New Deal land program and prohibit foreclosures.

About 30 per cent of the cotton lands is owned by insurance companies and banks. A study of five selected areas of the Mississippi Delta in 1920 by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics revealed that 81.2 per cent of the rented farms were owned by landlords owning five or more rented farms. Thus there is increasing central management of cotton farms, increasing absentee ownership.

All these factors indicate that the plantation system of the Southeast is in a state of crisis. The planters cannot improve their own precarious position without abandoning the plantation economy and the one-crop system, *i.e.*, without introducing crop diversification, mechanization of agriculture, wage labor, measures of soil conservation, and the like. But the whole system of exploitation, the whole system of oppression of the Negro people in the South, is built

upon the basis of one-crop farming and sharecropping. Furthermore, such measures by their very nature cannot be carried out adequately by individual landlords, but only by central—in this case, federal—planning. Such federal measures would threaten the whole peculiar system of exploitation in the South. The landlords as a result find themselves in a contradiction. If they move or if they attempt to stand still, their former status as a semi-feudal ruling class is threatened. Their state is one of demoralization.

Because of their precarious position, some of the Southeastern planters are beginning to introduce some technological changes—slowly and hesitatingly. Some of them are beginning to use machinery to a certain extent and here and there to replenish the soil by the planting of legumes. Other landlords are quietly shifting to the system of wage-labor. Other factors in the shift to wage-labor represent the scheming of landlords to get the greatest benefit from higher prices and to escape A.A.A. tenant regulations. Many of the cotton laborers occupy a status half-way between that of sharecropper and that of agricultural laborer. The results of these changes seem to be indicated by the increase of the productivity of cotton cultivation in certain sections of the Southeast in the past two years. However, it is for the most part only the biggest planters in the Delta country who are able to any considerable degree to take advantage of these new methods. The small landlords in the hills are for the most part completely unable to make use of them.

The system of sharecropping has

for many years been dragging increasing numbers in the Cotton Belt into an unbearable status of poverty, degradation, and semi-serfdom. In the South as a whole, the number of farms operated by tenants was 36.2 per cent in 1880; 49.6 per cent in 1920, and 55.5 per cent in 1930. In the Cotton Belt itself, the figures are much higher. More than 60 out of every 100 cotton farms are operated by tenants. In the Black Belt specifically, which forms a large part of the Cotton Belt, tenancy is still higher.

Before the Civil War, cotton cultivation was carried on entirely by Negro slaves. The number of white tenants in the Cotton Belt, however, by now far exceeds the number of Negro tenants. There are 1,790,783 tenant families in the Cotton Belt (1935 Census). Of these, 1,091,944 are white and 698,839 are Negro, and the families of white tenants are larger than those of Negroes. This means that about 64 per cent or almost two-thirds of the cotton tenants are white, in spite of the fact that in the Black Belt specifically Negro tenants are in the majority. Furthermore, *on the whole*, white tenancy is increasing while Negro tenancy is decreasing. Between 1920 and 1930, white tenants in the cotton states increased by 200,000 families (approximately a million persons), while the number of Negro tenants decreased by 2,000 families.

These figures, however, must not be allowed to obscure the special exploitation of the Negro sharecroppers or the differences between regions where Negro croppers predominate and the regions where white croppers predominate. It must be recognized first of all that there are varying degrees

of tenancy. There are cash-tenants, sharecroppers who never receive money, sharecroppers who work partly as laborers, croppers who are held on the land through debt. The worst forms of tenancy are to be found most extensively among Negro tenants. It must be recognized, secondly, that the Black Belt is not co-extensive with the Cotton Belt, although most of it lies within the Cotton Belt and forms a large part of it. On the Black Belt itself, which covers the coastal swamps and the Delta region, the Negroes form a majority of the entire population. Here the worst form of cotton tenancy, *viz.*, an extreme degree of debt-bondage, is to be found most extensively. It is true that the same form of virtual peonage is also to be found among some white croppers, but to nothing like the extent to which it exists among Negro croppers.

The Cotton Belt extends beyond the swamps, coastal plains and Delta to the hill country. It is here that the largest proportion of croppers are white. It is on these hill cotton farms, traditionally operated by white owners, that the rate of increase in cotton tenancy has been the greatest. The disintegration of this class of independent middle farmers has also contributed a great deal to the growth of tenancy among the whites in the Black Belt. Thus, while the largest number of tenants as a whole are white, the picture is by no means simple, and Negro and white croppers do not as a rule work side by side. In fact, there are systematic efforts to prevent this. Thus, while the total number of white croppers increases, they have been systematically weeded out of the biggest Delta plantations.

At the same time, outside the Black Belt, Negro tenants are being driven off the land. Where organization proceeds among Negroes, efforts are made to replace them with white tenants even in the Black Belt. Thus in the heart of the Black Belt on some of the biggest plantations, cotton farming is carried on almost entirely by Negro croppers; while in the hill country of Arkansas and other sections of the Southwest, it is carried on almost entirely by white croppers. While white tenancy increases on the whole, Negro tenancy increases in certain regions.

The important aspect of these developments is that cotton tenancy is increasingly becoming the *common* problem of both Negro and white.

According to *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy*, by Johnson, Alexander, and Embree, the earnings of cotton tenants are approximately as follows: In six widely separated counties, 43.4 per cent of the tenants were in debt before planting their 1934 crop. Average indebtedness, so far as records were available, was \$80. A study of Negro tenants in Macon County, Alabama, showed that 61.7 per cent "broke even," 26 per cent "went in the hole," and only 9.4 per cent made more than actual operating expenses for the crop season. Of some 3,000 tenant families in Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, and South Carolina, the average cash income for those who received such an income in 1933 was \$105.43, or \$1.75 per month per person for an average family of five.

It was these intolerable conditions which gave birth in 1931 to the Sharecroppers Union, which has now become a part of the Farmers Union,

and somewhat later to the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, which is now affiliated to the C.I.O. Cannery and Agricultural Workers Union. The heroic struggles of these unions in the face of the most brutal terror helped focus the attention of the whole nation upon the conditions of the sharecroppers.

The crisis in the Cotton Belt is bringing these conditions increasingly to the attention of the nation as a whole. Books by liberal and progressive Southerners, such as H. C. Nixon, Howard Odum, Charles Johnson, Rupert Vance, Charles Embree, Couch, Vann Woodward and Erskine Caldwell are to an even greater degree tackling the problem of farm tenancy and widely publicizing it. The significant factor is that they are not doing this in a vague or impractical manner. The President's Committee on Farm Tenancy, on which many such progressive Southerners served, has drawn up a general program. More and more progressive Southerners are lining up behind the agrarian program of the "New Deal" Committee on Farm Tenancy.

The general nature of the recommendations of this Committee may well be summarized as follows:

1. That the federal government, through the Farm Security Administration, buy huge acreages of land, especially from insurance companies, land banks, and other large centralized owners, and make long-term loans at low interest to tenants, in order to enable them to purchase land of their own. The aim is to convert tenants into owners under such conditions that they will not have to sell or mortgage their new holdings.

2. That service agencies for the purpose of supervising, guiding and aiding the new farm owners be established in the various localities. These should give advice, provide seed, fertilizer, and other equipment, and should aid in soil conservation and introduction of diversified farming.

3. That as a part of this wide-scale land distribution, there should be established carefully guided, experimental types of communities, such as cooperative farms; model communities with highly developed school, health, and recreational facilities; forms of cooperative marketing, etc.

The President's Committee's Report outlines such a program as the above with great detail. The following quotation is of especial interest:

"In general, the aim should be establishment of family-size farms. Families vary greatly, however, in their capacity for independent management. Farm sizes should be adjusted to these differences.

"Certain economic disadvantages of the family-size farm can be, and should be, overcome through cooperative ownership of the more expensive types of farm machinery and breeding stock, and through cooperative buying, processing, and marketing. In some cases it may be found desirable for small holders to be cooperatively associated for the employment of technical supervision. The Farm Security Administration should be authorized to aid the formation of local cooperatives, either by technical assistance or by loans.

"In some cases, cooperative groups may well be aided to acquire land by purchase or long lease for subleasing to group members. The cooperative organization would serve the function of a non-profit-seeking landlord, working in the interest of its membership. Such an arrangement would relieve federal agencies of much responsibility for management. It is recommended that such a policy be initiated also on an experimental scale."

A few such experimental cooperative farms are actually being launched by the Department of Agriculture in the Delta region of the Mississippi and Arkansas, *e.g.*, the newly-opened Lake Dick Agricultural Community.

This entire program is proposed as being carried out in conjunction with a widespread program of shifting families from sub-marginal to good land and of extensive soil conservation. Here the full importance of T.V.A. to the South in providing flood control, resettlement of farmers on better land, production of better and cheaper fertilizer and cheap electricity, institution of crop diversification programs, and so on, should be recognized and geared to strengthen the government's tenant program.

The advancement of this program must also be viewed in conjunction with the new Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. This act puts into practice again, but without many evils of the first act, the major principles of the original A.A.A. It provides for payment to farmers (with provisions that checks for tenants and sharecroppers be made directly to them and not to landlords), for reducing acreages in certain major crops, in order (1) that by producing crops in proportion to the markets, farmers may receive higher prices, and (2) that the soil may be conserved through the planting of other soil-replenishing crops. Provisions are also made for crop insurance and for guidance in soil conservation. While a policy of crop reduction in a nation of ill-fed people is far from the correct solution, it is at least necessary to protect the interests of family farms by placing the bur-

den of crop reduction on the corporation farms. The obvious contradiction of the practice of crop reduction where millions are undernourished must in itself form a powerful argument for the basic solution of the problem through socialism. While certain landlords may seek to utilize the new A.A.A. as an alternative to the Farm Tenancy Program, it must in reality be viewed as a complement to the latter.

The recommendations of the President's Farm Tenancy Committee offer an agrarian program which is sadly needed at present by the Negro people of the Black Belt and by the millions of white tenant farmers in the South. It forms one of the most far-reaching parts of the developing program of the democratic front in America. Land being the basic question for the national liberation struggle of the Negro people, it offers a relatively advanced agrarian program for the present stage of that struggle. Since this agrarian program is also in the interests of the millions of white sharecroppers, it forms a *common* program for the cause of Negro liberation and for the progressive movement of the Southern white masses. In other words, the present stage of the movement of the Negro people to obtain land is capable of becoming an integral part of the general development of the democratic front in the South.

This program also raises other interesting problems. Its proposals for making accessible farm machinery through cooperative purchase resemble to a very limited extent the tractor stations in the Soviet Union. In my opinion, we have in the past adopted

too negative an attitude toward the development of mechanized cotton-farming. With the federal government advancing such a program as this, in the present period of cotton crisis, with large centralization of land ownership, should we not actually support the establishment here and there of experimental cooperative mechanized cotton farms, accompanied by careful legal guarantees against disemployment or eviction of the present tenants?

Certainly, the major emphasis should be, as advocated by the Committee's Report, upon the establishment of family-size farms. This is the desire of the tenants themselves, who certainly do not today desire collectivized agriculture. However, certainly we should advocate the establishment in some places of experimental mechanized cooperative farms, especially in the fertile Delta region with its huge plantations, where the sharecroppers at present work cooperatively to a certain extent, but for the planters.

In this connection, Engels wrote to Bebel on December 11, 1884:

"The demand should be made that the great demesnes which are not yet broken up should be let out to cooperative societies of agricultural laborers for joint farming. The Imperial Government has no state lands and will therefore no doubt find a pretext for shelving such a proposition put in the form of a motion. But I think this firebrand must be thrown among the agricultural day laborers, which can indeed be done in one of the many debates on state socialism. This and this alone is the way to get hold of the agricultural workers; this is the best method of drawing their attention to the fact that later on it is to be their task to cultivate

the great estates of our present gracious gentlemen for the common account." *

However, in the establishment of cooperatives, clearly it would be dangerous to try to move too fast. Cooperatives within the encirclement of capitalist economy always suffer a precarious existence and are always subject to conscious sabotage on the part of the banks and other capitalist agencies on which they may be dependent, as well as from hostile elements within the government. Thus, such farms should clearly be advocated only within limits and on an experimental basis for the moment. On the other hand, it must be remembered that small family-size farms will have great difficulty in competing with the big mechanized farms and plantations. A few good experimental cooperatives will be highly influential in helping to educate the tenants and small farmers as to the need for passing forward to socialist economy.

The small farmers who still own their land, but who face disaster, must also be won for the farm tenancy program. There have been instances of small farmers encouraging their own croppers on strike to organize other croppers. These instances could be increased a hundredfold by intensive organization.

The Jones' Tenancy Bill, recently passed by Congress, marks the first step toward the realization of the thoroughgoing agrarian program recommended by the Committee on Farm Tenancy. This bill as it stands is inadequate. It calls for an appropriation during the first year of only \$10,000,000 for loans to individual land pur-

* *The Correspondence of Marx and Engels*, p. 434. International Publishers, New York.

chasers, and provides for repayment within 30 years at 3 per cent interest. It makes no provision for democratic administration or for guarantees that loans will be made to the most needy tenants without discrimination against Negroes. However, our position should be to support the Jones' Tenancy Bill while calling for amendments to increase appropriations; to democratize the administration of land purchases and loans through committees of working farmers, tenants, and croppers; to lengthen the term of loans to 40 years at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest; to give preference to those "who are most in need" instead of to persons "who are able to make an initial down payment"; to provide that benefits shall at all times maintain a balance between Negro and white sharecroppers.

It is important to remember that there are two forms of proposed solution to tenancy—a landlord's solution and a tenant's solution. The tenants themselves demand (1) good land at low prices; (2) government control of the land made available, governmental scientific guidance, and credit from the government; (3) variations and flexibility in size of farms, management, etc., to meet the needs of different conditions; (4) an adequate appropriation really to attack the problem; (5) federal control with local and elective boards of tenants to make selections of land and tenants to receive the benefits.

The program of the landlords, on the other hand, calls for (1) distribution of poor land at high prices; (2) complete independence of tenants from any governmental supervision and an unconditional title to the land

at the end of a few years. (This would make it possible for big landlords to take advantage of a tenancy program); (3) small and individual farming exclusively; (4) small, tiny appropriations, loans to the upper crust of well-to-do tenants to create a sort of aristocracy of tenants; (5) local political control, state by state, with local county boards of landowners or their agents to select tenants and lands. It must be realized that the present Jones' Tenancy Bill is not a thorough-going tenants' program, but can be utilized in the direction of a landlords' solution unless democratized through proper amendments. However, with such amendments, it can become the basis for the development of a real tenants' solution to the problem.

The emergence of the specific agrarian program outlined above is a further indication of the crisis in the plantation system. While the planters are demoralized, "unable to go on ruling in the old way"; the tenants themselves, as indicated by their formation of unions in recent years, together with ever-increasing members of the middle class in the South, are *beginning* to be "unwilling to go on being ruled in the same way." Such a development requires the rapid building and consolidation of our Party, in order that we may correctly lead the Southern people to a realization of the agrarian program which is being developed and to which they are increasingly turning. The crisis of the planters in the South certainly does not mean that they are going to submit to the realization of this program. They will resist with all the ferocity which they have always shown

toward any progressive movement—whether through Ku Klux violence, the employment of lynching, or the filibustering antics of a Bilbo. As the Wall Street hostility toward Roosevelt and his program increases, the Southern Bourbon allies of Wall Street are increasingly joining forces with Wall Street to prevent by all means the realization of that part of the Roosevelt program which most directly threatens their own rule in the South.

The Cotton Belt landlords, however, are not only in a state of economic crisis, but are also faced with serious political difficulties.

As a result of the completely reactionary one-party system which has continued almost unchallenged in the South from the days of the Populist struggles until recent years, the Southern masses for many decades have been politically apathetic. However, the emergence of the Farm Tenancy program, together with other New Deal legislative proposals, such as the Wages and Hours Bill, all of which require political action for their enactment, are causing a differentiation to take place within the once "solid" one-party system in the South. The result is that the masses are beginning to awaken from their traditional political apathy.

2. THE POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE SOUTHERN RULING CLASS

At the Philadelphia Convention of the Democratic Party in 1936, a motion was passed that, in the future, delegates to the Democratic Convention will be elected on the basis of the number of *voters* in their districts, and not, as formerly, on the basis of population. Another decision was

passed that motions in the future will be carried by a *majority* rather than a two-thirds vote. These two measures mean that the reactionary Southern Democrats can no longer hold the balance of power in the Democratic Convention—*unless they extend the franchise*—and this in itself would undermine their position.

The passage of these two measures is a real victory for the progressive wing of the Democratic Party. The Southern delegates to the Democratic Convention have been traditionally reactionary, just as have Southern Congressmen. This is primarily due to the fact that they have never represented the Southern people, but only the Southern upper classes. Thus an equal number of representatives are elected from Georgia and Wisconsin, whose populations are nearly the same; but the Georgia representatives are elected by *only about 50,000 voters while those from Wisconsin are elected by nearly a million and a half voters*. The decisions of the Democratic Convention will break the stranglehold of representatives of only a small minority over delegates really representing the masses.

The Bourbons now are in a state of dismay, not knowing in which direction to move. While the reactionary Democrats are in this quandary, many progressive Southern Democrats are advocating extension of the franchise—some calling for the complete abolition of the poll tax, others for its reduction. Leaders of the Young Democratic Clubs especially have in places been outspoken in their opposition to restrictions on voting. In this respect, as well as in relation to the cotton crisis, many of the reactionary Demo-

crats are to a certain extent in a state of demoralization. The lesson to be drawn here also is that now is the time to strike hard—now when we can deal the Southern reactionaries a real body blow.

The majority of the white people in the South are disfranchised to an extent almost as great as that of the Negro people. Here, again, we have a common need of Negro and white. If the progressives strike hard on the two fronts of winning the right to vote and agrarian reform, now while the Southern ruling class is to a certain extent in both economic and political crisis, they should be able to launch a people's movement in the South embracing both Negro and white.

The blow delivered at the reactionary Southern Democrats in the last Democratic Convention was just one aspect of the growing political realignment in our country. This was a blow struck in the interests of the Southern people, as well as of the American people as a whole, even though it emanated mainly from progressive Democrats in the North. The Southern people are showing by their increasing support of Roosevelt's legislative program that they are well aware of the fact that the progressive forces, no matter in what section of the country they are to be found, are their true allies.

In response to this support, Roosevelt has now carried the fight for progress into the heart of the South itself through his Gainesville, Georgia, speech, in which he challenged the low wage scale in the lower South and denounced the remnants of feudalism as a form of fascism. This has just been supplemented by the Report of

his Committee on the South, which lays the basis for a real democratic program for the South.

The fight between the forces of progress and reaction in the South is being waged almost exclusively within the framework of the Democratic Party. Here, more than anywhere else, the fight within the Democratic primaries is decisive.

The reactionary Democrats from the South of the variety of Harrison, Smith, Garner, Bilbo, Ellender, Glass, and Byrd, have been working hand in glove with the most outspoken Republican supporters of finance capital. They are attacking the New Deal Democrats with ever-growing bitterness. Yet they do not break with the Democratic Party, although in a moment of rage one of the South Carolina Senators denounced the Democratic Party as now being "controlled by Negroes." They do not break, because they know that the traditionally Democratic South would completely repudiate them. This and their desire to keep the Democratic Party from becoming a party of progress still hold them within the fold of the party of Roosevelt.

This fact, namely, that the reactionary Democrats are traitors within the ranks of the Democratic Party, must be impressed upon the mind of every Southerner. Every effort must be made to repudiate them within the Democratic primaries.

In order to accomplish this, it is of the utmost importance that the Negro people of the South obtain the right to participate in the primaries.

The struggle of the Negro people for the franchise is not just simply a struggle for the right to vote,

but specifically and in addition for the right to vote in the Democratic primaries, from which in a number of states they are now directly excluded as Negroes.

The white Southerners and progressives throughout the nation must be brought to realize that if they are to defeat the Wall Street-Bourbon Democrats, who are holding the whole South in its present state of poverty and backwardness and who by their reactionary hooliganism are disgracing the South in the eyes of the whole world, they must win all possible allies for the cause of progress in the primary elections. They must recognize that the Negro people will vote with them against reaction.

A demonstration of this was given by the Second Southern Negro Youth Conference held in Chattanooga, Tennessee, on April 1-2-3. This conference, which represented a real movement of the Negro people in the South, not only called for the right to vote in Democratic primaries, but proceeded to adopt a legislative program which would have the support of the Negro masses if they were given the full rights of citizenship. This program is not merely in the interest of the Negro people, but one in the interest of the entire South. It calls essentially for a progressive New Deal program for the South—the Wages and Hours Bill, the Jones' Tenancy Bill amended in accordance with the original proposals of the Boileau Bill, legislation to incorporate the recent proposals of the President's Committee on Education,

housing legislation, the anti-lynching bill, etc.

The work of the Southern Negro Youth Conference demonstrates clearly to the Southern white people that the fear of "Negro domination" is purely a myth; that just as in the Reconstruction legislatures Negro representatives adopted the most progressive legislation in the interests of both white and Negro people (free public education, civil liberties, etc.), which the South has ever known, so today the Negro people, if possessing full rights of citizenship, would actually be the most progressive force within the entire South and would, in the interest of the white people as well as of themselves, aid the Southern people as a whole to attain such prosperity and democracy as the white people by themselves can never achieve.

Lack of democracy in the South is not merely the concern of the Southern people, but of the whole nation. It is the lack of democracy which year after year returns the *same* reactionary Representatives and Senators from the Southern states, thus giving the Southern Congressmen seniority rights. Because of these seniority rights, *the chairman of every major Congressional committee, with one exception, is a Southerner*. It is these reactionary committee chairmen who have been most effective in hamstringing the whole New Deal legislative program. Getting rid of these reactionary committee chairmen by winning the battle for democracy in the South is one of the major tasks confronting the entire American nation.

Note: A following article will deal with the relationship between the Negro liberation movement and the growing democratic front in the light of the living developments in the South dealt with above.

ROOTING THE PARTY AMONG THE MASSES IN NEW YORK

BY MAX STEINBERG

*Organization Secretary, Communist
Party of New York State*

WE HAVE defined as the major objective for our Party today the welding of all the progressive forces into the democratic front to assure the defeat of reaction and to secure the maximum contribution to the well-being of our people.

In the light of this task, let us now analyze our achievements in New York State since the last convention. During that period our Party grew from 15,814 to approximately 30,000. In such important centers as Binghamton and Buffalo our Party membership has doubled. Together with 10,000 members of the Young Communist League, we have now some 40,000 organized Communists in the State of New York. Of the 30,000 Party members, about 600 are carrying out the supreme task of defending democracy with their very lives on the battlefields of Spain.

The registered Party membership on our rolls has grown by 10,569. We have at present 860 branches, as compared to 650 at the last convention. We have Party organizations in every county of our state, with functioning county committees in twenty centers. We have 244 industrial branches, as contrasted to 92 in 1936; these branches cover 171 local unions in 50

industries. Our membership in these industrial branches has grown from 1,827 to 6,377.

In the concentration and special groups we have increased our membership from 517 to 1,424. Our women membership has almost doubled, increasing from 5,142 to 9,883. Our Negro membership has grown from 1,039 to 1,841. Our membership among the native-born has more than doubled, growing from 6,942 to 14,059. Last, but not least, in the trade unions we have increased our membership from 8,649 to 15,159.

Furthermore, we have increased our *influence* to even greater proportions than our numbers, and it is our task now to extend further this influence and lay the basis for a more rapid growth of the Party.

These achievements were made possible through the efforts of our entire membership. However, great as our achievements may be, they do not yet nearly correspond to the existing favorable objective possibilities.

We have at present 13,827 members in 262 neighborhood and town branches; 6,377 members in the 244 industrial branches; 4,755 in 315 shop branches; and 1,424 in various concen-

tration branches and special groups. In addition to the 600 in Spain and about 300 seamen who are on the high seas, some 1,500 more members are expected to register within the next few months. In May, 1,000 joined our Party. Exclusive of those not yet registered, we have on the rolls, as of April 30, 26,383. All further references in this article are based on this figure. Our average dues payments are 22,068.

We have at present 11,149 industrial workers, representing only 42.2 per cent of our membership. Building the Party in industry is of decisive importance. To the degree that our Party grows among this stratum of the American working class can we become a factor in the building of the democratic front and participate more fully in the politics of our country.

This low percentage of industrial workers in our Party is due primarily to insufficient attention on our part to the important question of concentration in basic industry and the weakness of our industrial branches in recruiting. The message of the *Open Letter*, addressed by the National Committee of our Party to our membership in 1933, which emphasized the importance of building the Party among the decisive section of the American working class, holds good even to a greater extent today.

CONCENTRATION

To overcome this weakness we must set up concentration branches to carry out planned, organized activity in basic mass production industries.

In examining our work in concentration industries, we find that in long-shore we have increased our member-

ship by only 19 per cent since 1936. In utilities, we show hardly any increase. In railroad, too, we find an insignificant increase, which indicates that not only did we not *concentrate* on that industry, but that we even neglected to pay the same attention to it as we ordinarily give to our other Party organizations. In the last five months, our state committee has taken some steps to improve this situation. A special Party organizer has been assigned to this work.

As a result of our Party's excellent participation in the strike of the shipbuilding workers in Brooklyn, we grew there by 150 per cent. Had the bitter struggles been won, there would have been even a much greater gain for our Party, and for the shipbuilding workers generally.

In the Lackawanna steel mills we have a Party branch. Our comrades were the leaders in building the union during the great steel workers' organizing drive, and, during this period, commanded the respect of the workers. Yet no real efforts were made by our leading committee in Buffalo to aid the comrades in Lackawanna and to build the Party there to such proportions that it would not only have imbued the union with added strength, but would have prevented the situation now existing, where Red-baiting has developed and the union has been weakened. The Erie County Committee has taken measures to remedy this situation by sending a full-time organizer to work with the comrades in Lackawanna. Our state committee, too, will have to assist very much more in this work than in the past.

In such industries as trucking, util-

ities, shipbuilding, railroad, textile, auto and steel, our task still is to help build and strengthen the trade unions, while we build the Party at the same time.

We must also take special cognizance of the weaknesses in our work in the marine industry. The building of the Party among the seamen and longshoremen must become first and foremost the responsibility of the state committee, as well as of the marine workers themselves. If our Party comrades in the marine industry will continue to neglect the bringing forward of the Party's position on the day-to-day issues of the people as a whole and especially of marine workers; if they will not increase their activity in bringing forward the full Party program and build the Party, they will find that the union will not only be attacked by the enemies from the outside but that the enemies will utilize the forces within the union to attack the organization, its leadership, its membership, and weaken the union itself.*

INDUSTRIAL COMPOSITION

In dealing with the industrial composition of our membership, we must give special thought to the problem facing us in the light industries where our Party has always stood out in the forefront of the workers' struggles. At our Ninth Convention we had 1,186 food workers, working among approximately 75,000 of some of the most progressive workers in New York City. In the last two years, these 1,186 Communists increased their ranks by no more than 597.

In another industry, long noted for the militancy and progressiveness of the workers, in the needle trades, where our Party, during many years of bitter struggles and victories, has given the best forces and made real contributions, we find an even worse situation. Here the rate of recruiting shows a marked decrease compared to past years. And while we can register an increase of 620 needle workers since 1936, we must also note that while our Party as a whole has increased by 66 per cent, in the needle trades the increase has only been 30.2 per cent.

Do our comrades who function day in and day out in their trade unions think as Communists, in terms of the vital political issues of the day; in terms of bringing forth the program and independent role of our Party on such issues as jobs, unemployment, Negro discrimination, Spain, China, collective security, trade union unity, and the ultimate way out—socialism?

Do our comrades think in terms of convincing the workers of the great role our Party is playing in all the present struggles, in such a manner as to counteract the poison which the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites are spreading daily among these workers? How are we Communists struggling against the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites? The results show that the struggle is all too insufficient. Our comrades seem to have too long a perspective on Lovestoneism, especially among the dressmakers, figuring that some time in the future the union will be rid of them. Meanwhile the comrades go about their daily work, leaving the workers in the main to the "education" of the Lovestoneites in the union with their propaganda against the

* The correctness of this warning has been confirmed in the course of the recent elections in the National Maritime Union—Ed.

unity of the workers and the People's Front in the struggle against reaction. We can rest assured that had Party education been developed among the workers, the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites and the Trotsky-infected "militant" Socialists would soon find themselves despised by all the workers. The workers would chase them out of their ranks, while the honest elements, of course, would leave the Lovestoneite camp. If this had been our work, naturally our Party would have grown ten times as strong in numbers.

In the building trades today we have a membership of 1,740, compared to 1,511 two years ago—a growth of a little over 200. At a time when the painters have expressed their hope and confidence by electing Communists to office, throwing overboard the reactionary Zausner; when there is a great movement among the building workers generally for the right to work, for W.P.A. jobs, etc.; in these favorable conditions the *percentage* of building trades workers in our Party has decreased, from 9.5 per cent two years ago to 6.6 per cent today. Our comrades in the building trades, especially among the painters, must realize that, unless they develop a real educational program among the workers on all the immediate issues of the day from the standpoint of the union itself, and the Party's position on these issues, as well as its full program, they will find themselves weakened, not only in the struggle with the employers, for which they should be prepared at all times, but in struggle with the agents of the employers within the ranks of the union, in struggle against the poisonous influence of the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, who are out

to disrupt the unions under the disguise of militant phrases.

We have cited only three industries where the tempo of Party building among the industrial workers has slowed down. This decline holds generally in all industries. In all the light industries combined, the Party membership relative to our total membership has decreased by 7.1 per cent, while in heavy industry, including communications and transport, where the Party has grown from 1,297 to 1,876, the proportion to the entire membership has decreased from almost 10 per cent to 7.1 per cent.

Our white-collar comrades, however, by building the Party among an element that offers a fertile field for Trotskyism and Lovestoneism, have proved that their struggle against Trotskyism and Lovestoneism was conducted in a much more effective manner. We can say to our white-collar comrades: "Good work, comrades. Go to it, with more impetus, with even greater force and ever higher gains." But to our entire Party we must add: "Comrades, all of our might and effort must be concentrated henceforward on building the Party among the industrial workers in every community in our state. We know that our white-collar and professional worker comrades will be a great factor in throwing in their forces to the realization of this task."

RECRUITING

In examining the recruiting and building of our Party generally, we find that immediately after the Ninth Convention we averaged 700 recruits per month. In 1937 our average was 975, and for the first four months of

this year our average has been 1,031 recruits. Now we confidently expect to increase this pace; we look forward to a membership of 50,000 within a year, of whom at least 65 per cent will be industrial workers.

When we look at Buffalo, Syracuse, Schenectady, Binghamton, and the other counties upstate, we see our Party beginning to emerge from the stage of infancy. We feel confident that in the upstate sections we shall soon witness an accelerated growth proportionate to that in New York.

So far, in our work generally, we have promoted recruiting through special drives initiated by the National or State Committee. These have had a two-fold purpose: to increase the tempo of recruiting, and to train our Party membership in the habit of recruiting as a day-to-day task. However, since we have not yet succeeded to any great extent in achieving the second objective, we still need periodic Party building drives in order to create this consciousness on the part of every Party member and instill in them the revolutionary understanding of the need of building the revolutionary vanguard, the Party.

SHOP BRANCHES

As mentioned above, we have 315 shop branches, a gain of 30 since the last convention. We have in them 4,755 comrades operating among 300,000 workers. Of the 315 shop branches, 27 are in basic industry—heavy metal, power, steel, etc., with 269 members. In other strategic industries, such as textile, General Electric, traction, longshore, trucking, communications, post office, and meat packing, we have an additional 22 branches with 290

workers; 87 branches are in the light industries, food, needle, metal, etc., and 179 among the white-collar and professional workers.

There has been hardly any increase in the number of shop branches in the important industries, and only a small increase in all industries throughout the state.

Without any hesitation, we can state that had we been more alert to the need of building the Party in these important industries, our Party would today have thousands of workers in these industries. To cite an example: There is a big power plant on the B.M.T. subway system. A sit-down strike took place in this plant, in which our comrades played an active role. Our comrades were in the forefront of the struggle and remembered that the best guarantee for building the union was a strong Party. The strike resulted not only in building the Transport Workers Union, but in a considerable increase in the Party branch.

On the other hand, the growth of the Party in traction generally has in no way measured up to the tremendous achievements of the union, or to the growing political consciousness of these strategic workers. We re-emphasize: Our Party must begin to discuss with the workers in the industries the significance of every political struggle taking place in the country.

While in some instances the insufficient building of the Party is due to hesitancy, in many other cases it is sheer neglect, as in General Electric in Schenectady.

Where the problem is properly understood and real efforts made, it is possible to build the Party. In Syra-

cuse, known as an open-shop center, it was possible to build a steel branch as we started to build the union. The Party there is still very small; nevertheless, it has registered a real effort to build the Party simultaneously with building the union. This continues after the union has been established. On the other hand, in Rochester, where our Party members were largely instrumental in organizing the steel union, no recruiting was done—not even a small shop branch organized.

In orientating our Party at this time toward renewed efforts among the industrial workers, we wish to stress an important medium which our Party must utilize in this work, that is, the issuance of shop papers by all the shop branches. Our shop papers need not be limited to a discussion of the current economic and political problems of the country or specific problems of the shop, important as this is, but must become an educator by propagating the final aims of our Party, pointing to the achievements of the Soviet Union as the living example of what the workers and farmers will gain by establishing a government of their own.

INDUSTRIAL BRANCHES

Let us take a painters' industrial branch in Yorkville, one typical of our industrial branches. There are 75 members in this branch, with an average attendance of between 35 and 40. On the surface, the branch seems to function efficiently. It has an executive committee of nine comrades who plan the activity. Open membership meetings are held once a month and political discussions twice monthly. The agenda for the month of April

included: (1) Distribution of the *Daily Worker* in a Painters' Club in Harlem. (2) Discussion on recruiting. (3) Discussion on types of leaflets to be distributed in the union. (4) Preparation for participating in the section "Free Thaelmann" meeting. (5) Participation in the anti-lynching demonstration at Union Square. (6) Support for the O'Connell Bill.

However, in spite of the plan, the branch held no open membership meeting that month and did not succeed in activizing the membership around the issues discussed by the executive committee. On two occasions the comrades were called to general fraction meetings. The third week the comrades attended a conference of industrial branches organized by the section.

What should be the life of such a branch? In the first place, nothing should prevent it from holding its regular meetings. Once and for all our Party organizations must begin to look upon themselves as honest-to-goodness American organizations, and not so lightly suspend a regularly authorized meeting. We would resent it strongly if a leader of a trade union did this, and we would protest. It does not matter how important other meetings may be, we must never call off our branch meetings. Such procedure only disorganizes our basic Party organization, impairs the political content and continuity of its work, and prevents our membership from advancing their political understanding of the issues of the day.

Second there should be regular discussions on major political issues, such as wages-and-hours legislation, anti-lynch legislation, the Recovery Pro-

gram, the coming elections, and the Constitutional Convention. These discussions should be definitely related to our work in the trade union. Such an agenda will guarantee a high attendance, high recruiting, and a minimum of fluctuation.

Above all, we should avoid the danger of turning our industrial branches into trade union fractions that concern themselves only with trade union problems. Occasionally it may be necessary to evaluate the activity and the participation of the membership in the life and struggle of the union. However, today the workers in these unions are for the most part on the progressive side of the road. What is, therefore, of greatest importance is that our Party organizations, working in these industries, concentrate on the *political* education of the workers in order to advance the movement for the democratic front. Our branches should be chiefly concerned with the vanguard role of the Party, with the work of our painter comrades as Communists in bringing that role to these workers.

When we first organized the industrial branches our chief argument was that they would serve as a means of building shop branches and would improve our concentration in industry. This objective, however, has not yet been realized. We must re-emphasize the importance of entrenching and building our Party in the shops, mills, and factories, especially where large numbers of the workers are employed. This should be the direction toward which our eyes must be turned, finding and utilizing every possibility for building the basic organization of the Party *in the shops*.

TERRITORIAL BRANCHES

We shall now review briefly the work of our territorial branches, which have matured greatly since the last convention and have begun more and more to take on the character of political organizations based on American tradition and custom. This is true particularly in the city of New York, where the branches operate within Assembly District lines. The problem of building our Party in the community, as with our shop and industrial organizations, depends basically on the ability of the branch to react to vital political issues in organizing the masses, and to bring forward the vanguard role of the Party.

Let us examine some recent experiences in branch work.

The Central Park branch in Rochester is making headway in concretely applying the line of the Party in the immediate locality. This branch advanced far lately as the result of a correct approach to the Italian people, who constitute the largest single group in the city. The branch has helped build the American Labor Party, and is developing a movement to unite the Italian organizations for the coming election campaign, in support of the progressive Congressman Kelly, whom the reactionary Gannett is out to knife. In addition, as a result of the initiative of our comrades, some fourteen Italian groups gathered in a conference around the program of the Committee for the Protection of Foreign-Born. This conference received favorable comment from leaders of the Italian Civic League, the dominant federation of its kind in the community.

The branch is also active around

the vital issues of relief, W.P.A., and jobs. As a result, it is gathering momentum and is growing. The work of this branch, furthermore, is an example of what can be done among the German people, the second largest single group in Rochester, as well as among other groups.

In Manhattan, the Avenue C branch of the 6th Assembly District is another outstanding example of good Party work. The branch operates in a territory predominantly Jewish and relatively well organized, with many social clubs, synagogues, and other institutions. It maintains close contact with most of these groups and has been, in addition, instrumental in helping to build a local of the Workers Alliance, a Tenants Union, and a club of the American Labor Party. Mass meetings are regularly held in the neighborhood. The branch conducts an open forum weekly and issues leaflets to popularize both the forums and mass meetings. As a result, the attendance at the branch meetings is well over 80 per cent, dues payments exceed 90 per cent, the meetings are conducted efficiently, and a great number of the comrades are involved in Party activity. During the last Party Building Drive, 65 new members were recruited by the branch, and since the close of the drive, an additional nine.

These examples can be multiplied. There is the Black Rock branch in Buffalo; the Milton Herndon branch in Upper Harlem, and many others. Many were reported at the splendid State Party Builders Congress held last November.

On the other hand, there is the example of a branch in Bronx County, which, while registering close to 100

per cent of its membership, and collecting over \$1,000 in the financial drive, recruited only 40 members in a period of two years. Why is this? The branch organizes regular discussions, introduces many novel methods to involve the membership in these discussions, frequently holds socials, and has developed an air of friendliness and comradeship in the branch; as many as thirty visitors attend its meetings at one time. Yet its orientation is inward. It does not root itself in the neighborhood; the life and needs of the people are not made the major subjects for discussion and activity. With its good method of work and its ability for organization, this branch should apply itself to organizing the unemployed in the struggle for relief, and to developing a movement in the neighborhood around local issues; on this basis, it would emerge from its relative isolation and establish itself as a major political factor in the community.

Clearly, the fundamental problem lies in the ability of the branch to become a community organization, aware of the issues of the community and establishing intimate ties in the whole life of the community. The solution requires first that every member of the branch actually live in the branch territory. The Election District group, composed of comrades living in an election district, which is a recognized American political form of organization, is an effective means by which we can organize the most fruitful work in the territory. However, the work in the Election District group depends on the role which the branch as a whole plays in the territory, in organizing the workers for struggle around basic issues.

Our branches should without delay proceed to organize these Election District groups. We must distinguish the Election District form of organization from the old work groups which we set up in the street branches a number of years ago and through which we tried to "break" into the territory. One such group was assigned to build the Unemployed Council, another a tenants' block committee, etc. These old groups were not effective years ago and at this time this form of division of work is artificial and ineffective altogether. Whereas in the past the street unit took in a tremendous territory, today the Party branch operates within a concentrated area of a few blocks. Therefore the problem of the branch is to organize the activity of the Election District groups so as to establish ourselves on the friendliest and most intimate terms with the people in the neighborhood on the basis of common interests and needs.

This approach eliminates the strain of mechanical assignments of scattered tasks. The comrades working in the Election District groups can build around themselves a natural following of their own neighbors with whom to be in constant contact. The sale of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker*, of Party literature; the distribution of leaflets; discussion and action on political problems and local issues, if properly organized, will also follow naturally. In this way the Communist Party can best establish its citizenship in the community.

In connection with this, and as part of the activity of the branch, contact can be established with the organizations in the community, the churches, the Y's, the settlement houses, etc., all

of which include many hundreds and even thousands of people who can be rallied for the support of the democratic front. In this way we will establish, through our branches, a broad field of mass work which is the guarantee for building the Party and uniting the people around common objectives in the struggle for jobs, security, democracy and peace.

The Election District group will also constitute the basic apparatus in our work in the coming crucial election campaign. How we shall clarify the basic issues in the campaign, and rally the masses for effective struggle against reaction, will depend on our ability now to set these groups into motion.

In order to develop maximum activity in the community, the State Committee has also decided to involve the members of the shop and industrial branches in neighborhood activity, under the direction of the Party captain in the Election Districts where the comrades live. This becomes increasingly necessary, as well as possible, since we all agree that in the present situation in the labor movement we no longer need tightly organized fractions in the trade unions and other mass organizations. Since this will release comrades from unnecessary meetings in the fractions, they will have more opportunity to participate in the life and activities of the Party in the neighborhoods through their contact with the Election District group. Many of these comrades, coming as they do from the factories and trade unions, can contribute a great deal to the building of the local political organizations, particularly the American Labor Party, utilizing the time at their

disposal in the best interests of the labor movement and our Party.

The Election District system will thus surely improve considerably the functioning of the entire branch; will result in better dues payments, attendance, and certainly in better assignments and execution of tasks.

FLUCTUATION

Our fluctuation is so alarming that we believe it requires fuller elaboration and analysis.

Since our last convention we recruited 20,716 members, which number, if added to the 15,815 on the rolls then, would make a total membership of 36,531. During the same period, however, we lost 10,147 members. This huge loss represents workers in many industries and from many walks of life, recruited in the course of strike struggles, unemployed activity, the struggle for Negro rights, civil liberties, etc. Our smallest loss relatively was among our women comrades. True, there, too, the loss was considerable. Nevertheless the increasing rate of recruitment among women and the decreasing fluctuation are encouraging. We must aim for even greater improvement in this field.

The greatest fluctuation occurred among our Negro membership, where we lost 1,518, or 64.5 per cent of the membership we had on the rolls. While we recruited 2,320 Negroes into the Party since the last convention, the net growth is but 802.

How can we reconcile this comparatively small growth and heavy fluctuation of our Negro membership, in the face of the tremendous popularity of the Party in Harlem and other Negro communities, in the face of the Party's

mass influence? Surely we cannot assume that the Negro people are passive, or accept without resistance the miserable lot imposed on them by the white ruling class. On the contrary, the movement for Negro rights is developing with greater momentum from day to day. Our Party actively participates in initiating these movements. Look at the Harlem Legislative Conference; the job campaign; movements developed in Stuyvesant Heights, in Westchester and Queens Counties; the progressive position taken by the Negro people in the 1936 elections, and in the recent campaign. What then is the answer?

There are many factors to be considered. Some of them result from the objective situation which, in the whole system of discrimination, creates special problems in connection with the consolidation and growth of the Party, which we have not yet learned fully to master. At the same time, the progressive movement, particularly in the trade unions and even among the unemployed, lags considerably in developing struggles around the special issues affecting the Negro people.

Our own Party, working among the white workers and masses generally, in the trade unions and other organizations, is not coming forward energetically enough in the struggle for equality to the point where the role of the Party in this struggle is apparent to the broad masses of the Negro people.

More than ever, precisely because the Party is such an important factor in the progressive movement, it is essential that we educate and organize the white workers to display greater initiative in the struggle for Negro

rights. We must recognize that the problems which the Party faces in Harlem and other Negro communities are not independent of, or divorced from, this general struggle. How we work in the trade unions, in the unemployed movement, everywhere, definitely affects the problems of Party growth and activity in Harlem. We have somewhat neglected, in the recent period, sharply and constantly to raise the Negro question among the masses and, as part of this question, to help advance our Negro comrades, the Negro workers, into leadership in the Party and other organizations on the basis of true equality. This neglect must be wiped out at once.

Our Party organization must also work out more effective forms and methods to correspond with the traditions and organizational experience of the Negro people. Just as we created the branch as the American form of organization, so we must incorporate into the branch life in Negro communities those traditions that are best adapted to communicate the line and policies of the Communist Party, and in this way reduce to a minimum the great turnover in our Negro membership.

We have dealt at some length with a special problem which is of the utmost concern to our entire Party. But how can we generally explain the loss of more than 10,000 people who had at one time or another declared their intention of becoming Communists? Can we say that they are not fit material for our Party and therefore that *they* are to be blamed? It is clear that we are the ones who must take the responsibility for this. With all our good intentions, we have not yet

learned how to work efficiently in our Party, how to deal with our individual recruits, how to make them feel comfortable and at home in our ranks. We have not yet learned how to adapt their revolutionary enthusiasm and militancy and cultivate these further in the Party. We have not yet learned sufficiently how to follow up new members once they join our organization.

We tend to consider the job finished when the application card is filled. We permit the recruit to sit at our branch meetings and let him try as best he can to decipher many of the things that we discuss and, in most instances, with little or no assistance. Our conversation with him is often limited to asking the comrade what assignments he is willing to accept. He usually does, eagerly, and assumes burden after burden while still groping for a clear understanding of his role in the Party. If he does not appear at branch meetings, no one notices or bothers much until registration comes around. Then we become alarmed and begin a frantic hunt. By that time we cannot find him.

Is it any wonder, then, that the largest percentage of the lost members are those whose membership averages one and one-half years in the Party? Our first-year recruits obviously require the maximum consideration if we are to eliminate the large fluctuation.

METHODS OF WORK

More American efficiency is necessary in our work. We in the Party can learn a great deal from methods and systems employed in the organizations of our trade union movement and in the business institutions. These

institutions do not permit fluctuation without making every effort to hold on to their membership or clientele.

If we learn how to apply efficient organization; if we learn how to follow up our individual members, especially new recruits; if we give constant attention to these comrades at and between meetings, and help them absorb the program and experience of the Party; if we are careful not to overload these comrades with assignments, and give major consideration to guiding them in their present activity; if we improve our administrative apparatus in the membership and finance departments, then we can rest assured that we shall retain our members.

Our State Committee, while giving consistent leadership to our Party in all phases of political life, has found it necessary to pay special attention to methods of work in organization and in the building of an efficient apparatus. Of course, there are many weaknesses that can be pointed to in the work of the State Committee itself, but we are steadily learning to improve our work. We found it of the utmost importance to build up a membership committee and also to place in charge of this committee a very able and politically mature comrade, Bee Wells, whom we sent to the National Training School. Our counties and sections are beginning to follow this example of work in the State Committee.

Above all, let us in the branches organize the assignment of activity on the basis of what the worker in our Party naturally performs in his day-to-day life before he enters the Party, but now with a greater political understanding. Our Party should con-

cern itself with raising the level of understanding of its membership so that the very things our comrades are doing will be improved tenfold and a hundredfold through greater understanding, more forethought, and more enthusiasm.

TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

We have made definite headway in the direction of training our personnel and equipping them with a fuller understanding of all these complex problems. Within the limits possible, we have given personal attention to the leading people of our counties and sections in the state. In addition, we have forged ahead in extending the education of our members throughout the state. The program of our training schools has been extended. Since the last convention we have held 13 full-time training schools of 8 to 10 weeks' duration, attended by 284 students from every part of our state. There have been graduated 717 students from state part-time training schools. We conducted special Party schools for trade unionists, special women's schools, and special schools for the development of Negro personnel.

In addition, 1,328 students went through section training schools, and 289 students attended full and part-time county training schools. A special school in the Spanish language was conducted in Harlem, a three-month training course in the Italian language, two six-week courses in Greek, two in Russian, and one eight week-end training school in German. This achievement was made possible by a serious application of the decision made at our last convention. We shall exert even greater efforts now to ex-

tend and improve both the quality and quantity of our schools.

We ought to bring before the entire Party the urgent need of further study of the basic revolutionary theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, as a guarantee and prerequisite for better leadership and the solution of the problems facing the toilers of America. When we speak of learning the basic principles of our great leaders, we can point with pride to the life, teachings, and writings of our own Comrade Earl Browder, who, through his practical, revolutionary activity, emerges as the American disciple of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

In connection with personnel and our whole political and educational activity, we must take major responsibility to safeguard our Party and the interests of the working class by driving out of the labor and progressive movement the disguised agents of fascism, the enemy of the working class and our people, the enemy of the Soviet Union—the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites. More vigilance, more alertness throughout the Party are necessary to drive these traitors completely out of the labor movement.

Great tasks and great responsibility lie before us. We live and work in a period of the greatest decisive battles for human liberation history has known. Though fascism is on the offensive, the forces of progress grow. This is a battle for the very preservation and advancement of human progress, of the civilization of the world. These battles are not divorced from the American scene. On the contrary, the whole civilized world looks to America today. We American Communists face the task of mobilizing the American people to influence the course of events toward greater progress and democracy, to assure that our country will be a decisive factor for welding the forces of peace and progress, against fascism and decay.

We will be able to carry through our responsibility if every one of us pledges and resolves to work unceasingly for the practical application of our revolutionary tasks. Ours is a difficult job. But the American people are moving forward with great strides, and are maturing politically. We must provide the leadership and the organization.

OUR NEXT TASKS IN PARTY EDUCATION

BY A. LANDY

NO PARTY attaches so much importance to the education of its members as the Communist Party. This follows naturally from the very character of our Party as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class. It flows from its Marxist-Leninist principles, its theory of scientific Communism, and its recognition that enlightenment, knowledge, science and truth are indispensable to the material and intellectual liberation of the working class and oppressed humanity.

It is impossible to win the masses for correct policies without education. It is impossible to conduct any struggle without enlightenment, without combatting prejudice, dispelling illusions, exposing demagoguery and showing the consequence of wrong theories.

The entire work of the Party rests on the recognition that its own activity, far from being a substitute for the struggle of the masses, must help the masses in this struggle to learn from their own experiences, to draw the necessary conclusions from their own mistakes and to see the next steps required by the struggle. In this sense, every single Communist, regardless of his specific task in the Party, must not only be an educator of the masses, but must help equip the Party and himself to meet this responsibility. In this sense, too, the entire work of

the Party is educational and the educational work is the task of the entire Party.

During the past three years, corresponding with the Party's political maturity and its establishment as a vital force in American life, a really serious and significant turn has been made with regard to inner-Party education. The entire Party is hard at work educating the necessary cadres training Marxist-Leninist forces, developing its leading personnel. Full-time training schools, part-time training schools, week-end schools and a variety of other schools have been developed. An efficient apparatus for this work has grown up, a great deal of experience has been accumulated and, what is equally important, the determination to extend the work has reached out to every district and section of the Party.

But even with regard to this aspect of Party education, it must be said that only very good *beginnings* have been made. The best example of this is the work of the New York District, which has made most progress in this type of education. According to the report of the New York Education Department, 2,445 selected comrades have studied in 106 schools during the past two years, including part-time, section, county and full-time state training schools. This represents

only 12 to 15 per cent of the total New York membership. In addition, a break-down of these figures shows that improvements have to be made in the direction of greater attention to the training of branch organizers, extension of the system of training schools of all types with greater regard to the availability and preparation of competent teachers, and greater control of the curriculum to see that it meets the living, practical needs of the Party and helps to train practical leaders theoretically grounded.

EDUCATE THE ENTIRE MEMBERSHIP

However, while this phase of our educational work is finally beginning to receive the attention it merits, *the task of educating the mass of the Party membership still remains to be done*. With respect to inner-Party education, this is now our major task. All circumstances have combined to make the education of the entire membership particularly urgent at the present time.

1. Today we have a mature Party whose influence is a vital factor in the life of our country. There is hardly any section of the Party which does not have serious responsibilities in relation to the masses. At no time, therefore, has it been so important for the whole membership really to *master* the Party's policies and on the basis of this to get some grounding in its *theory*. The program of the democratic front, for jobs, security, democracy and peace, requires, to use Comrade Browder's phrase, that our whole Party become "master agitators among the people" for the whole program and the slogans expressing it.

2. The overwhelming part of our membership is new in the Party. More than half of its 75,000 members have joined its ranks during the past two years. These new masses have been won in the struggle against war and fascism, for democracy and peace, for their immediate economic needs, for the democratic front and the People's Front. But the struggle alone does not automatically produce Marxists-Leninists. Mere admission to the Party is still a long way from the mastery of Bolshevism. To help the Party membership and particularly the new members master Bolshevism, to make them into conscious Communists and enable them to participate more effectively in the life and decisions of the Party, is a necessity made all the more urgent by the present level and tempo of the struggle, by the general maturity and influence of the Party.

3. With the perspective of 100,000 members by the end of the year it is necessary to be alert to the fact that we are now dealing with a Party that has *large numbers* in its own ranks. To absorb them, to help them overcome alien concepts, to equip them with the full power of Marxist-Leninist thought and weld them into an ideologically homogeneous and monolithic force is a task whose very scope demands immediate attention.

4. The demagogy of reaction and fascism, the disruptive activity of its Trotskyite-Lovestoneite agents, and the necessity of helping the masses to master the full meaning and costly lessons of Social-Democratism make it imperative for *every* Party member to be firmly anchored in the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This is all the more necessary because the Party

membership today is involved in living politics, is in the very midst of mass problems requiring independent judgment, flexibility and tact on the basis of strict adherence to principle.

The thousands of new forces that have gone through our training schools during the past three years make it possible for us now to undertake the organization of elementary schooling for the bulk of the Party membership. The main thing is to make the fullest use of their abilities and their training.

MASTER THE DECISIONS OF THE TENTH CONVENTION

As a beginning in this direction, the National Committee has worked out a five to six month plan of study of the decisions, policies and program adopted by the Tenth Convention of the Party. The idea behind this course is to reach every single Party member, help him master the main decisions of the Tenth Convention and in the course of this give him a more fundamental grasp of the underlying principles of Marxism-Leninism. Such a living, practical approach to the study of Marxism-Leninism, in which theory is studied in connection with the concrete policies of the Party, is absolutely essential, if the entire membership is to be mobilized for more effective work.

For this purpose five major questions have been selected for study: (1) The Economic Crisis, as the crux of all political problems today; (2) The Offensive of Reaction and the Building of the Democratic Front; (3) The Party and the American Democratic Traditions; (4) The Relation of the Democratic Front to the

Struggle for Socialism; (5) The Role of the Communist Party in the Developing Democratic Front.

To involve the entire membership in an organized study of the Tenth Convention it is necessary to base such a course on the Party branches. Conducted in the branches, it will be possible to reach most of the members, make study methods and procedure feasible, and concretize the course in terms of the branch problems, experiences and possibilities of work. Aside from this, the branches must be the starting point of our educational work, if this is to be a means of developing an active, political life in the Party and not an exercise in scholastics.

The systematic study of the Tenth Convention is no substitute for the discussion of current questions and campaigns. This must go on as usual in the branches. By extending the study course over a period of five to six months it is possible to set aside one branch meeting a month for discussion of current questions and one for the study class. The important thing is to avoid crowding out the study course on the ground that other work is more pressing. This will be prevented if the Party *leadership* initiates this course on a high political level, helps to develop real enthusiasm for it among the Party members, and carefully prepares the necessary staff of teachers and study leaders. No leading comrade should be exempt from teaching this course. Without this we cannot talk seriously of helping the membership master the policies and program adopted by the Tenth Convention or vouch for the political quality of the course.

THE CHANNELS OF PARTY EDUCATION

The successful fulfilment of this course will help us answer the question as to how to educate the *mass* of the Party membership. It will be the first large-scale effort in this direction. For this reason, the quicker we take hold of it, the quicker we will begin to solve *in a practical way* the problem of developing political thought and political life in our Party branches. In saying this, it must be emphasized that the mass of the Party membership will be educated not by a mere multiplication of formal classes. *The regular political life of the Party must be the main channel of such education, the only framework within which it can take place.* This requires that less be left to chance, more be planned and prepared. And though some beginnings have been made here and there, the full force of our efforts has not yet been felt in the place where the education of the membership counts, the Party branches.

Branch discussions and educational meetings, Party conferences and conventions, the Party press and current literature, in short, the Party's daily political life is the vital road to the schooling of our membership. The more our individual members and Party organizations are involved in the solution of political questions, the more they tie their studies to these problems, the more will they learn and grow and mature.

Outside the process of meeting and solving problems, outside the course of practical struggle and experience there is no actual road to political learning. Only, this must be given

concrete substance by seeing that the example of the more developed comrades is used to guide and stimulate the rest of the membership. It must be augmented and guaranteed by the systematic study of Party principles and policies.

It would be a mistake to assume that branch and Party life as such, unaided by other measures of systematic education and conscious attention to the development of people, will automatically educate our membership. Our past experience is sufficient indication that this is not so. What is needed is more attention to actual politics and to the mechanics of mastering politics. And the first condition for this is to marshal all leading political forces for steady and persistent education of the members in every form. In such an approach, organized study in and around the branches, but study starting and ending with the Party's policies and tasks, is an important element.

For, after all, to speak of raising the political level of our membership, of getting the branches to "talk politics," is to get them to *think* politically; and thinking means study and theory as well as experience. Otherwise the mass of the members acquire only the "conclusions," the finished slogans advanced by the Party, without acquiring the basis for thought or learning how to think as Communists. Our policies and teachings are not something to be learned by rote; they must be thought out and tested by politically-minded, thinking people. For, they are only as effective as the people that fight for them.

Why have we made such slow progress in educating the mass of our

membership? Among many reasons, four deserve particular attention.

1. The leadership of our Party organizations have not paid sufficient attention to the *specific features* of this problem or to the organization of those *measures* without which progress is unthinkable. Too often the matter has been left to happen by itself, while all the leading forces have been absorbed in the problems of mass work, and the "decisive" sections of the Party with them.

The tendency to operate primarily with these "decisive" sections and "peaks" of the Party, resulting in insufficient attention to the Party branches as such, has only helped to dilute the political life of the lower organizations. They have not been drawn sufficiently into that intense political life which has been so characteristic of our Party during the past three years and which is the essential channel for the education of all our members.

Finally, even those more "decisive" sections of the Party, those with the greatest ties among the masses and confronted with the most complicated political and economic problems, have not been sufficiently involved in systematic political discussion and study.

2. As a result, the lower organizations have been short of competent political discussion and study leaders. The educational work of the Party, particularly of its lower organizations, has not been sufficiently enriched by the knowledge, experience and practical help of the leading political forces. As long as the political education of the branches is left exclusively to the comrades assigned as educa-

tional directors, where such comrades have been assigned, there is bound to be a mechanical separation, a minimum time allowed for political discussion and study, and in many cases complete neglect of this vital task.

3. This does not eliminate the necessity of establishing a special educational apparatus throughout the Party. Such an apparatus, if properly developed, trained and helped by the leading committees, is the *indispensable* instrument for the *organization* of the Party's educational work. In the main this apparatus still remains to be built.

4. Despite the good beginnings in the education of selected forces, insufficient attention has been paid to the selection and education of branch leaders. If the majority of our branches were manned by more politically mature and experienced organizers, not only the political initiative and work of the branches would be developed but the political education of the membership would receive more attention in the course of this work.

These are some of the directions our efforts will have to take if we are to develop serious educational work in the branches. An effective preparation of the Tenth Convention study course will bring us face to face with some of these shortcomings and will take us a considerable way in the direction of overcoming them.

EDUCATING THE NEW MEMBERS

It is impossible to discuss the elementary schooling of the mass of the Party membership without considering the special question raised by the large number of new members in our

Party. According to the figures presented to the Tenth Convention of the Party, more than half of the total membership is comparatively new. This accounts for the erroneous tendency to identify the need of elementary education with the new members only, while implicitly exempting the "old" members. Actually, new and old members must be given an elementary grounding in Marxism-Leninism if they have had no such grounding before.

During the past year our Party has made particular efforts to provide the new members with some sort of education. In some districts separate new members' branches have been organized with political discussions and study as the main activity of the branch for the first six to eight weeks. In other districts serious efforts have been made to establish new members' classes, with attendance at these classes the sole assignment of the new members for the first month or two. While it is too early to formulate any definitive conclusions regarding our experiences, it is necessary to establish certain features of our approach to this problem.

Up to the present the New York and California districts have had the best experience with the education of new members. On the other hand, in the Chicago district, for example, the new members' classes have so far not proved a success. But even in the New York district, which recruited thousands of new members during the recent drive, it is only during the past five or six months that at least one new members' class has been functioning regularly in every section. With all this, less than 50 per cent of

the new members were enrolled in these classes and a much smaller figure actually completed the course. More than half of the new members recruited during the drive plunged right into the current work of the Party without even the benefit of an introduction.

In the past our failure to organize new members' classes was attributed to lack of attention and organizational weaknesses. The partial successes of California and New York in this work indicate that there was some justification in this criticism. However, it would be a mistake to attribute our shortcoming to purely organizational weaknesses. The question must be asked to what extent our *approach* to the problem is responsible.

In this respect, two corrections in some of our current practices would seem advisable. The first is of an organizational character. Our Party is a political organization, and people join it because of its political aims and activities. It is therefore necessary to avoid separating the education of the new members from the activity and life of the Party branches. Despite some of the advantages of keeping the new members away from branch meetings for a number of weeks and despite the difficulty of getting the branches to refrain from immediately loading the new members with numerous tasks, ways and means must be found to make the branch and its life the center of education from the very first day.

The second and main problem, however, is to be clear as to what constitutes the education of new members. Elementary grounding is elemen-

tary grounding, whether a member is new or old. Every Party member must understand the Party's policies and enough Party theory to behave like a Communist. The only question is whether it is advisable to plunge the new member into a study of the Party's principles the moment he joins the Party. Experience shows that it is better to allow the new member a month or two to get acquainted, to acclimatize himself, to have many of his questions answered before plunging into systematic study, elementary as that may be.

It is more important to clear up any questions or doubts about what effect his membership in the Party will have on his personal life, his family, his present activities in the union or mass organization, how much it will cost him, and a host of similar matters, than it is to plunge right into a study of all the ramifications of Party structure and organization and elements of Party theory.

It is more important to inspire him with a desire to become a regular reader of our press and to study Marxism-Leninism than to try to cover the whole range of principles of Communism in the first six to eight weeks of his membership in the Party. A series of discussions, but without the formal manner and procedure of the class room, which will help to prepare the new members for more intense activity and participation in Party life should be the character of new members' "education." This means *initiation* rather than elementary education, and for such initiation it is enough if the theoretical considerations are confined to a first acquaintance with the Preamble to the

Party Constitution. For the rest, it is sufficient to give new members a bird's-eye view of the Party he has joined, the branch in which he will work, the meaning of voluntary discipline and a running introduction to the Party's mass work. This approach will also eliminate any conflict between attendance at new members' "classes" and participation in the Tenth Convention study course. The new member will take part in the study course just as any other member of the branch.

The organization of the Tenth Convention study course does not eliminate the necessity of developing a systematic and uniform course for elementary education which can be used in study circles and classes all over the country. The pedagogical question still remains as to where elementary education begins and where it ends; what must be covered in such a course and what must be omitted. *However, the question for us is still how to make a practical beginning in all this.*

That is why, together with the Tenth Convention study course, the launching of a publication program by the National Committee which will include texts for new members' classes, elementary education classes, diverse functionaries' classes and self-study guides, taking into account the material and experience accumulated by every district, and based upon the mastery of the Party's policies and program, will do more to unify and stimulate the education of the Party membership than any amount of general discussion. Fortunately, such a program is already under way.

NEW METHODS

During the past period efforts have been made in various places to improve political discussions and political education by utilizing new techniques and new methods. These include skits dramatizing a question for fifteen minutes before undertaking political discussion; political spelling bees; Professor Quiz competitions; questions and answers, film strips, charts and other visual aids; phonograph records; and movies. It is of the utmost importance that all these devices be employed and their use be made more general throughout the Party. Such techniques are particularly useful for the smaller communities remote from the main Party centers. The National Education Department is working seriously on this problem, with the perspective of employing these techniques on a large scale.

The main thing to keep in mind, however, is that all these techniques and devices are only an aid to politics and not a substitute for it. The main task in the education of the Party membership remains that of getting

every Party member to read the Party press, to study the Party documents, to develop the habit of self-study, to absorb the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

If the district organizers and section leaders will hold monthly political discussion meetings with the Party functionaries in which they review the political problems and questions of the month in line with Comrade Bitelman's "Review of the Month" in *The Communist*, they will prepare the necessary personnel to lead political discussions in the branches. In this way they will take the most important step towards developing political life in the Party, for no substitute has yet been found for politically-thinking people.

If the Party leadership will hold frequent *political* discussion meetings with the membership on a section or territorial scale, they will really make the regular Party life the main channel for the education of the membership and stimulate it to undertake further systematic study. This is the direction which our efforts must take.

WE WANT NEW READERS FOR
THE COMMUNIST

A YEAR OF "JEWISH LIFE"

BY V. J. JEROME

JEWISH LIFE, the English language monthly published by the Jewish Bureau of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party, represents a welcome trend away from regarding the problems of the foreign-born communities merely as those of language, toward seeing them more broadly and more deeply as those of national groups. The new, decisive turn in the policy of the Party registered at the June, 1937, Plenum of our National Committee, took cognizance of the national groups as a cluster of communities, not only of immigrants speaking foreign tongues, but of their English-speaking descendants, even to the third and fourth generations.

These groups, Americans by birth, naturalization, or as producers of the country's wealth, partake actively in its current life and changing atmosphere. Predominantly proletarian and lower middle class, subjected to terrific exploitation and smarting under oppression—economic, political, and social—they are naturally a dynamic force in the progressive movements of our day; not, however, without a certain hesitation and inflexibility.

Rebuffs and browbeatings at the hands of chest-thumping "Americans," super-patriots, Ku Kluxers, open-shoppers, and strikebreakers,

tend to keep alive the influence of their own national chauvinists, here and in their homelands. It makes some among them receptive to the latest slander of the democratic front and of socialism, whether from the mouth of Hitler or Jabotinski.

Furthermore, the political backwardness and prejudice of many well-meaning native Americans, not yet overcome by the growth of progressive organizations, by unionization, and by the increasing influence of the Communist Party, lead to some feeling of isolation on the part of the national groups, some defeatism as regards full participation in American life.

It is in view of all this that a periodical such as *Jewish Life* has a special, indispensable function.

* * *

In the first issue we are given the following as perspectives of the magazine:

"To present a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international Jewish scene with special emphasis on the Jewish question and the national question in the U.S.A.

"To educate the membership of the Communist Party and the Jewish masses generally in the fundamental aspects of the national and Jewish questions.

"To create a broad Jewish People's Front, as part of the American People's Front,

which will fight for the rights of the Jewish people and against discrimination and anti-Semitism.

"To mobilize the Jewish workers and toilers to recognize their leading position in the Jewish community.

"To bring the Jewish people into the closest solidarity with the progressive movements and the oppressed minorities in the U.S.A.

"To build the Communist Party among the Jewish masses, the Party in the vanguard of the struggle for socialism, which alone will fully and completely solve the problems of all national groups."

Jewish Life has now been published for a twelvemonth. Its first year's output constitutes a promising initial effort toward fulfilling these tasks. By its very coming into being it has succeeded in stirring interest among sections of Jewry in what Communism has to say in regard to the Jewish question. Its continuous publication demonstrates that the magazine fills a need. It has, above all, contributed considerably in breaking down the national nihilism which has in times past pervaded many Jewish and other Communists, and against which Dimitroff spoke at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

A survey of the principal contents of the year shows considerable range. The largest single category of articles is devoted to the discussion of anti-Semitism—in Germany, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Austria, Latin America, and the United States. Prominent, too, is the topic of Zionism, with the closely related Palestine Partition Plan. A number of articles and editorials treat of current campaigns and their reflection in the various American Jewish organizations, as well as the International Congress

Against Racism and Anti-Semitism.

The position of the Communist Party in relation to the Jewish question is dealt with in several articles and statements. We get surveys of the status of Jews in the Soviet Union; the relation of the Jewish question to the general issues of peace and democracy—with considerable stress on the conflict in Spain. In several of its issues, the magazine engages in struggle against Trotskyism. Every number contains reviews of books which cover, in the main, topics among those here listed.

* * *

In the important sphere of combatting and exposing enemy ideology the magazine has brought forward a number of valuable contributions.

Thus, the editorial, "The Situation in Palestine," in the January issue is a clarifying picture of the role of Zionism, British imperialism, and Italian fascism on the Palestinian scene today. Particularly effective is its refutation of the argument advanced by Zionists that since Mussolini has a part in fomenting Arab discontent against Britain, the Arab national movement is fascist, and that therefore the Communist support of that movement constitutes support of fascism.

The editorial points out the error of confusing the reactionary Arab effendis—native oppressors of the Arab peasant—with the people themselves. Furthermore, the editorial reasons, the Communist Party's advocacy of Arab-Jewish unity coincides with a definitely existing sentiment among the two oppressed peoples for such cooperation—a sentiment that both

Britain and Italy are insidiously endeavoring to undermine, since each envisages a growth of its own strength in consequence of Arab-Jewish antagonism.

Excellent, too, showing up Zionism as an agency of British imperialism, is "A Letter From Palestine," by Yehuda Almoni, in the November issue. The writer demonstrates how enterprises carefully made known locally as Jewish are under the economic control of "imperialistic capitalists clipping their coupons in London clubs." He points out too that, notwithstanding some support for British imperialism by the clique of semi-feudal landowners and other carriers of favor, the great mass of Arab workers and peasants stand solid behind the Arab national leadership, fighting against the partitioning of Palestine.*

The article points to the declarations of the Arab leaders assuring the Jewish community equal political rights, full protection of their minority status, cultural autonomy, under a democratically-elected regime. The charge of insincerity advanced by the Zionist leaders, obviously to prevent discussion of these proposals, is here effectively blasted.

Their objection that the proposals do not provide for continued Jewish mass immigration is shown to have no validity; the economic crisis and the attendant mass unemployment suffice to make impossible the Zionist program.

* The article "What Next in Palestine?" by "British Resident," is an excellent critical evaluation of Britain's plan for partitioning Palestine. It appeared in the June issue, being a reprint from the (British) *Labor Monthly* for April.

The writer takes to task the reactionary leadership of the Histadruth (Jewish Labor Federation) which offers to lessen the crisis by means of its notorious plan for "Conquest of Labor," namely, the replacement of Arabs working for Jewish employers by Jewish workers. This displacement has been carried out through ominous violence. It has done little to solve the unemployment among the Jewish workers; but it has gone far toward inflaming Arabs against Jews.

The article concludes with the program of the Communist Party of Palestine, which alone provides a basis of a unified struggle against the perfidious policies of division conducted by British imperialism, against the intrigues of fascist Italy, against the misleadership of the Zionist pawns of British imperialism, and against the oppression by the effendis. We repeat here the three-point program as cited from *Kol Ha'am* ("Voice of the People"), the illegal Communist Hebrew organ:

1. "Formation of a democratic representative government with a guarantee of equal rights to the Jewish 'Yishub' (community) together with the abandonment of all Zionist policies of 'conquest.'
2. "Maintenance of the present relative numerical strength of the Jews and Arabs.*
3. "Enactment of effective land laws guaranteeing the land of the peasants and the rights of the tenant farmers."

A fine, clear note is struck in the

* Point 2 is designed to meet the objection of the Arab population to the Zionist-stimulated and Zionist-controlled immigration aimed at creating artificially a Jewish majority.

July issue by Maurice U. Schappes in his review of John Haynes Holmes' *Through Gentile Eyes*. Proceeding from the thesis suggested in the subtitle of the book, *A Plea for Tolerance and Good Will*, Dr. Holmes makes of the Jew an object to be tolerated—the good Christian's heavy burden:

"If the Jew is aggressive, cunning, unscrupulous, materialistic, worldly, it is largely because Gentile persecutors have made him so. These familiar features of Jewish life . . . are evidence also, in the higher sense, of the failure of the Jews as well as the fault of the Gentile."

(Really, the liberal minister, certainly a friend of the Jews, writes here almost as one, some of whose best friends are Jews. If this is his image of the Jew, then surely he carries tolerance too far and is a spendthrift of good will.)

Schappes hits at this patronizing self-righteousness by pointing out that evidently, "the appeal cannot successfully be made to the generosity of the Gentile—it can and must be made to the self-interest of the Gentile workers, farmers, and middle class people."

Actually, involved in this discussion is the basic attitude back of Dr. Holmes' thesis, that anti-Semitism is chargeable, not to social antagonisms deriving from the fundamental contradictions of capitalist class society which find their acutest expression in fascism, but to a subjective factor—the original (yet acquired) sin of "Jewish traits." In this he plays into the hands of fascism, which likewise charges anti-Semitism to the Jew—to his blood, and inherited traits inseparable from it!

In the same issue Comrade H. I. Costrell, Secretary of the New York State Jewish Bureau of the Communist Party, presents the Party's position on this matter in words that deserve repetition:

"Our Party must combat every tendency to place responsibility for anti-Semitism upon the Jews. The Jews have no apologies to make. As long as there are bankers and exploiters we refuse to make a special campaign to drive out Jews from being bankers and exploiters. The Jewish masses cannot be held responsible for the existence of their exploiters. It is capitalism that is responsible, and against it our struggle must be directed. The same approach must hold true toward the Negro people. We cannot and must not place responsibility for the wiping out of white chauvinism and discrimination upon them by telling them to be 'good' Negroes. Anti-Semitism, just like white chauvinism, is a means by which capitalist reaction tries to divide the people and foist its rule upon them. No concessions must be given to this evil practice and ideology."

An outstanding contribution is Comrade M. Katz's "The Jewish Press and the Moscow Trials," in the April issue. A satire upon the bourgeois and pseudo-Socialist Yiddish dailies of New York for having taken Trotsky to their bosoms since his expulsion from the Communist Party and the Soviet Union, the article concludes with a trenchant analysis of the degradation of the *Jewish Daily Forward*. We miss here, however, what the subject calls for—the positive side of the picture, a mention of the Communist Party organ, *The Morning Freiheit*, and its role of clarifying the issues of the trials for the Jewish masses.

Not so effective, in fact an example of inadequate treatment of enemy ideology, is the manner in which Jew-

ish Life reacted (rather, failed to react) to the fascism-furthering article on anti-Semitism by the Trotskyite Sidney Hook in a recent issue of the *Menorah Journal*. In that article, Hook proceeds to sabotage the whole movement for combatting anti-Semitism by counseling its severance from the people's movement against fascism, on the grounds that the anti-fascist People's Front was inspired by the Comintern. Hook is, of course, following in his "learned" way the entire Trotskyite camp in endeavoring to weaken the forces against fascism and anti-Semitism.

The Hooks have suddenly taken to writing as Jews. For Trotsky, desperately clutching at any and every contention, demagogically exalts himself to the role of "Jewish martyr," by claiming that the Soviet government (by implication, Gentile) set out in the trials "with the almost open object of making the internationalists appear as Jews without ideals and law." This, of those whose internationalism was that of international espionage; this, of those who would turn Birobidjan over to the tender mercies of Hitler's Japanese allies!

As the gathering counter-anti-Semitic consciousness courses into the general anti-fascist stream, as the realization grows among all Jews that there is no "good fascism" (witness Italy), but that fascism is by its very essence anti-Semitism, the Trotskys and Hooks rush into their labor of sabotage.

For who but a political degenerate could couple the socialist state, which has eliminated anti-Semitism from what was once the classic land of pogroms, with the barbarous Nazi

"Aryanism"; who but such a traitor could presume to counsel his fellow Jews "that they must avoid Stalinism as an evil only one degree removed, if at all, from Hitlerism"?

Reference is made to this article in an all-too-brief editorial paragraph in the March issue of *Jewish Life*. Aside from stating that the consequences of Hook's advice would be passivity for the Jews in the face of anti-Semitism, it does little but restate his position.

This method of stating the enemy's viewpoint with but a scornful expletive of our own all too often does duty in our journalism for effective, painstaking refutation. At bottom, of course, it means a sectarian approach, taking the agreement of all readers for granted so that cogent reasoning is not considered necessary; it means reckoning without the ideological speciousness of the enemy.

* * *

Linked to this shortcoming in rebutting the enemy is the magazine's weakness in presenting the Communist position, *conclusively*, in regard to the vital questions of the hour, as they affect the Jewish masses.

Of course, it was not to be expected that within one year's time the magazine should have coped fully with all the tasks it assumed. The newness of the undertaking; the limitations of space; the lack of participating forces; and, it should be added, insufficient support by the Party as a whole—all are circumstances which we must consider.

In keeping with its formulated program, the magazine set out to "educate the membership of the Communist Party and the Jewish masses gen-

erally in the fundamental aspects of the national and Jewish questions."

Although there are a number of articles dealing with issues of the day affecting American and world Jewry, it has not yet presented a single expository article setting forth the Leninist-Stalinist position either on the national question as a whole, or on the Jewish question, whether in its world aspects or as related to the American scene.

This is clearly a serious omission, if we bear in mind that one of the main purposes of this magazine is to warn the Jews who have been misguided either by nationalism and Zionism, or by theocratic exclusivism and the political indifferentism which they foster. Both ultimately lead to cowardly, hopeless retreat before the waves of anti-Semitism in the U.S.A. as in other capitalist lands. Obviously the magazine *Jewish Life* cannot expect to lead the Jewish masses in the direction of their true interests until it fully equips the Jewish Communists, and its other readers too, with the ideological weapons of Marxism-Leninism in the sphere of the national question.

Closely related to this aspect of the question is the influence of nationalism upon the American Jewish youth. For, especially since the advent of Hitler, a defensive and retaliatory Jewish consciousness has sprung up among large sections of Jewish youth, which is being channelized increasingly toward nationalism, Zionism, and chauvinism. One is therefore surprised that not a single article has appeared in *Jewish Life* dealing with any section of American young Jewry. Here are so many organizations of

Jewish young men and women—the Y.M.H.A., the Y.W.H.A., the Young Zionists, the Jewish college fraternities, the youth societies of temples and synagogues, cultural organizations, the youth auxiliaries of predominantly Jewish trade unions and benevolent organizations, etc. Precisely from these organized sons and daughters of American Jewry must the forces of the Jewish sector of the democratic front be gathered, amongst them must the guiding principles of Lenin and Stalin on the national question be disseminated.*

Similarly, the specific appeal to Jewish women is not sounded, although the important Council of Jewish Women and the various Jewish women's organizations and auxiliaries provide broad avenues of approach toward unified progressive action.

Particularly serious is the absence of reflection of Jewish trade union life. Workers in organizations like the United Hebrew Trades, the decisive leadership of which is reactionary—reformist and bound up with the corrupt *Jewish Daily Forward*, need the guiding principles upon which the program of *Jewish Life* is founded. The Jewish Communists in these organizations need direct stimulus from *Jewish Life*.

This failure to deal prominently with the struggles and aspirations of Jewish trade unionists denotes, it must be said, a basically insufficient recognition of the place and role of the working class in developing the American democratic front and thus forwarding

* It is gratifying to note that the August, 1938, issue, beginning the second year of publication, features an article "Jewish Youth in the United States," by Phil Schatz.

the interests of the national group as a whole.

All these omissions indicate a tendency to an abstract approach to an abstractly conceived audience. One cannot think of the democratic front of the American people as one undifferentiated generality; it must be rallied through appeal to concrete living classes, groups and categories. The publication that calls these forces together must always behold them as they exist. They are not just Jews; they are Jewish garment workers, carpenters, bakers, housewives, small businessmen, professionals, students, and the magazine, in the course of its month-to-month appearance, besides presenting generalized articles, must also include topics which embrace the specific problems of these various groups. This is how the democratic front will be built.

* * *

A reflection of this abstract approach is the magazine's insufficient functioning as organizer. A good beginning was made by presenting, in the second issue, the appeal for unity addressed by Comrade Earl Browder to all workers who have been influenced by Zionism. This signal article by the General Secretary of the Communist Party presented in sharp outline the common ground upon which, notwithstanding political differences, the Jewish people in America might meet for joint struggle against fascism, reaction, and anti-Semitism. But subsequent numbers of the magazine have not resounded this keynote vigorously, nor made it a basis for a plan of concrete action.

Consider the issue of Poland. A

highly informative article, "The crisis in Poland," by Comrade M. Katz, appeared in the October number, sketching with admirable analysis of social forces the historic background of anti-Semitism in Poland. It is followed by a declaration of the New York State Jewish Bureau of the Communist Party, "Pogroms in Poland must be stopped!"—a stirring summons to action, repeatedly urging united efforts by all American Jewry, for solidarity with the baited and pogromized Jews in Poland. This appeal is vital, coming at a time when the wave of pogroms encouraged by state anti-Semitism in Poland was rising alarmingly, when the American Jewish masses were exercised over the fate of their Polish fellow-Jews. But to have been fully effective, it should have concluded with specific proposals for immediate action, around which to rally the American Jewish people—and the non-Jews of America. *But the manifesto offers no specific proposals around which to unite.* Let us note especially that Poland is not just another country with a Jewish problem, but that it harbors a fifth of the world Jews; that their heinous oppression arouses waves of passionate sympathy among the American Jewish masses. Let us note that the struggle for the ending of anti-Semitism in Poland is inseparably bound up with the struggle for the decisive defeat of the semi-fascist regime which has brought the politics of that land increasingly into alliance with the so-called anti-Comintern triangle.

Hence, the definite organization of solidarity of American Jews with their Polish brethren becomes of para-

mount importance for the New York State Bureau of the Communist Party and its organ.

Why does not our press bring forward and emphasize certain glorious democratic precedents in American history?

It was at the time of the Kishinev massacres in tsarist Russia, pogrom after pogrom. Theodore Roosevelt was President, and John Hay Secretary of State. As an expression of the American people's loathing for that horrible barbarity, a petition was drawn up by American citizens for transmission by our government to the government of Russia. Realizing that it lacked a diplomatic basis for submitting such a document unless the tsar would consent to receive it, our State Department cabled the tsar that such a petition was in preparation and sought to know if he would accept it. Of course, the tsar declined. But the progressive purpose was served by the action of our government in sending, and publishing, the cable. The whole country approved, and the shame of tsarist Russia was emphasized in the eyes of the world. No one said that this act of stern reproof would "bring about war."

And let us remember that the year before, utilizing the opportunity of a proposed convention for a naturalization treaty, State Secretary Hay, at the request of the President, forwarded to the Government of Rumania a vigorous protest against the persecutions of the Jews in that country. When the Rumanian government answered defiantly, our State Department sent the famous "Hay Note to Rumania"—a circular letter of protest to the signatories of the

Berlin Treaty of 1878—Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, Austria, and Turkey. Thereby the United States brought worldwide attention to Rumania's violation of the well-known Section 44 of that treaty, designed to guarantee the safety of the Jews.

The American tradition of siding with the oppressed must be kept alive; incidents recalling it must be treasured and made a part of common, popular knowledge—and precedents to action.

* * *

Let us take, as another major instance of neglected opportunity, the treatment of the Jewish People's Committee. Repeatedly, in various articles and editorials, we find this organization cited for its struggle to unify the centralized Jewish mass organizations, for common action. But so far no article has appeared giving a full length portrayal of the J.P.C., its program, its development, the struggles it has led, the achievements it has to its credit. This would have been pertinent, especially in connection with the National Unity Convention which that organization called for March 12-13.

We find in the March issue of *Jewish Life* an editorial devoted to the convention; but neither in that issue nor throughout the year do we get a "build-up" article in behalf of the J.P.C. We do not get a report of the convention as a main feature in the April issue. The article of G. Golden, "Views of American Jewry," speaks in passing of the convention, telling us that 846 delegates representing 963 organizations embracing

over a quarter of a million Jews "participated in the broadest convention that the Jewish People's Committee has yet held." All the more reason—the Jewish People's Committee being plainly, then, the solidifying force in American Jewry today, the organization offering the clearest and most consistent program in the interests of the Jewish masses—all the more reason for its convention being accorded a report in the columns of *Jewish Life*—and the J.P.C. a recruiting appeal.

* * *

One must note the absence of a clearly formulated program of demands as a basis for rallying the Jewish masses. It is true, as the editorials and articles repeatedly declare, that the Communist Party furnishes a program for struggle for the rights of the Jews. This program is implicit in the general program of the Party in behalf of all of America's oppressed. It is particularly brought forward in the vigorous emphasis given by the Party's recently held Tenth Convention to the need for guiding the struggles of the national groups, for economic betterment and against the imposition of social and political disabilities.

In the magazine itself, in the April and May issues, appear two statements, both by the New York State Committee of the Communist Party. The October issue contains an article by Comrade I. Amter, "The Communist Party and the Jews." These are ringing declarations of the need and the existing basis for united struggle of all sections of the Jewish population together with all the progressive

forces against fascism and Judophobia. Particularly devastating is their attack upon the cowardly hush-hush policy of certain bourgeois Jewish leaders, making clear that "passivity to the struggle against anti-Semitism and the fight for the rights of the Jews is objective support to fascism."

But these notable documents do not end, as they should, with the concrete aspects of this program in terms of the special needs and demands growing out of the actual struggles of the American Jewish masses as a *national group*.

Indeed, these special demands have still to be worked out. Every issue of *Jewish Life* should contribute something to their study and formulation. Nothing better comes out of any Party periodical than an effective slogan, activating united protest and struggle.

It becomes necessary, in other words, to state what Communism in action proposes, and to state this in terms of a program with concretely formulated demands—demands which, taken together and pressed through to victory, in unison with the other forces of the democratic front, would end all discriminatory practices against the Jewish people. And it is necessary to demonstrate how the Party leads in the fight for the fulfillment of these demands, day by day.

Then, indeed, will everyone who reads be convinced of the declaration that the Communist Party is the leader in the struggle for Jewish rights.

* * *

It is in order here to offer a few remarks on the style of the magazine.

If we are to admit that style is the man, then our style must be the militant, challenging man. Thus viewed, the tone and method of the magazine must in themselves be alive with the dynamics of our movement. With a more buoyant, vigorous presentation, the generally adequate substance of the issues under review could have attained far greater usefulness. Much of the solid material is weakened by stodginess in treatment, by a certain lack of self-confidence, which lessens the magazine's authoritativeness and appeal. Nor can we separate this formal aspect from the abstractness which has hampered the formulation of concrete, fighting demands. We take, for example, the article "The Road to Jewish Unity" (July issue), which gives a sound analysis of the necessary steps to unity for the Jewish organizations. In it, Comrade J. Arnold writes thus of the stricture on admission of new organizations, adopted by the recent Pittsburgh Convention of the American Jewish Committee, B'Nai Brith, American Jewish Congress, and Jewish Labor Committee, which excluded the Jewish People's Committee, representing a quarter of a million Jews:

"In this connection the necessity of a *five-sixths* vote for the inclusion of additional organizations smacks of a tendency to limit the participant bodies. In the interests of true unity this clause should be liberalized."

True, we should welcome even the one-sixth margin as a victory for the democratic front forces and as a step from which to press further for unity; but to say that this huge five-sixths boulder in the doorway "smacks of a tendency to limit," smacks, we would be inclined to say, of an understatement

that can only have the effect of leaving the boulder there for some time to come. Here is a place to speak more lustily, backed by the dignity of our position and the consistency of our work for unity.

This same mildness is evident in regard to the treatment of the sabotage on the part of the American Jewish Congress leadership of President Roosevelt's efforts to facilitate the admission of Austrian refugees. What is more scandalous than the surreptitious letter of the A.J.C. leadership to Congressman O'Toole urging him not to introduce his bill in behalf of Austrian refugees on the grounds that such admission of Jews would lead to anti-Semitism here? But the magazine merely complains editorially that "Jewish leaders are slowing down this plan to aid the Austrian and German Jews and no other constructive and practical program is brought forward." (May issue.)

Here was a real opportunity to expose the efforts of the A.J.C. leadership to make hay for Zionism while the Nazi sun shines by deflecting the refugee stream to Palestine, and incidentally relieving the rich Jews of America from the burden of financial aid for their poorer "co-religionists" from abroad. Really, the Spanish couplet holds:

"Entre Dios y el dineiro
Lo segundo es lo primero."***

And we would be justified in letting fly a few sparks in our treatment of this question.

* * *

* The text of the letter appeared (in translation) in *The Morning Freiheit*, May 8, 1938.

*** "Between God and money
The second is the first."

Having rendered, by its first year's effort, a distinct contribution to the study of basic and current Jewish issues, *Jewish Life* has need to improve toward greater scholarship and authoritativeness, on the one hand, and toward a more attractive, lively, and popular style, on the other. Leading Marxist authorities, Gentile as well as Jewish, should come forward as contributors to the magazine. Cultural features could be introduced, giving the magazine more variety of material, and more sparkle—some short stories, poems, a theatre and motion picture section with mature, well-considered discussion of anti-Semitism as mani-

festated in these fields; some of the exciting material on the revolutionary and progressive traditions of American Jewry might be the basis for absorbing short biographies of leading figures in our country's life and letters.

Freed from the constrictions above noted, clear-eyed with the Marxist-Leninist view of the Jewish question, consistently guiding and advancing in the forefront of struggle, and with the support and active assistance of the leading Party committees and functionaries for its wide distribution, *Jewish Life* can see a broad and ever broader path stretching before it.

Selection of the Marxist Book-of-the-Month Club

The key book in the 1938 elections!

THE PERIL OF FASCISM

THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

BY A. B. MAGIL AND HENRY STEVENS

320 Pages. Price \$2.00

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CUBA WILL ADOPT A MORE POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD COLONEL BATISTA.

THE PARTY WILL DEMAND RECOGNITION AND INCLUSION IN THE ELECTORAL REGISTER

(News Release of the Communist Party of Cuba to the Cuban Press, July 25, 1938)

THE Tenth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba has just concluded its session in the city of Havana with an attendance of forty-five delegates from all parts of the Republic.

Of transcendent importance are the resolutions of this plenum, which has analyzed all aspects of our national life and traced the line of activity of the Communist Party under the central slogan of struggle for a Constitution which will assure democracy, betterment of the people's conditions, and defense of the national economy. In addition the plenum approved the amendment of the Statutes of the Party to adjust them to the new advances of the revolutionary movement, voting to submit the amendments to a national referendum before they should be adopted definitely. This is closely related to the decision of the Party to petition for legalization in the Provincial Government as an association and in the

Superior Electoral Tribunal as a Party representing a great part of the Cuban population.

Although it has not been recognized officially hitherto, the Communist Party is carrying on great activity with reference to the Constituent Assembly and counts on the approval of the toiling masses and a strong influence among them, which greatly increases the importance of its resolutions.

Analyzing the present situation, the Communist Party, at its Tenth Plenum, has come to the conclusion that the people can win a peaceful victory in the forthcoming Constituent Assembly by means of exercising the electoral right, but on condition that one united Party of the Revolution be organized and that collaboration with the progressive and democratic delegates be established in the Constituent Assembly. For this purpose it is necessary to begin immediately to explain to the masses a project of constitutional bases for protecting the aspirations of the people, who want democracy, better living conditions, and liberation of Cuban economy.

The plenum analyzed, also, the changes which have been effected in Batista's position and recognized that *Batista has begun to yield in favor of the Constituent Assembly and other popular demands*, by which we may be sure that Batista is on the point of ceasing to be the center of reaction,

the role which he played until a short time ago.

The plenum accepted the report of Blas Roca, General Secretary of the Party, according to which these changes in the attitude of Batista are due principally to the intense mobilization of the masses which is being effected in Cuba. Other factors which have contributed to these changes are the economic difficulties of the government, the course of legal activity pursued by the revolutionary movement, the pressure of the democratic policy of the United States, the rank-and-file origin of Batista (a former sergeant), and the examples of Mexico and China which have demonstrated the possibility of realizing a policy in favor of the popular and national interests.

The plenum considered that the fascist and ultra-reactionary elements grouped around Pepin Rivero, Montalvo, Casanovas, etc., are beginning to criticize the democratic steps of Batista and trying to provoke an atmosphere of alarm, disorder, and hatred among the Cubans, which will permit them to keep the people from uniting and will also permit them to justify the use of violence against the revolutionary movement to prevent the peaceful triumph of the people in the Constituent Assembly.

Taking these changes into consideration the plenum was of the opinion that the principal enemies against which the people must defend themselves now are the forces behind Pepin, who is promoting the union of all the reactionaries. The Communist Party believes that it is necessary to form around them a political atmosphere which will stifle their cam-

paign of hate, disorder, alarm, and civil war.

With reference to Batista, the plenum considers it indispensable to take a more positive attitude toward him, compelling him, by means of it, to take yet more democratic positions, in order that real guarantees for the exercise of democratic rights shall be established; the juridic personality of the *Federacion de Trabajadores* be recognized; that Decree 732, making radio transmissions impossible, be revoked; that the living conditions of the masses be improved by action against the exploiting trusts, etc.

"At the same time that we proclaim the practice of such a policy," said Blas Roca in his report, "our resolution indicates the necessity of continuing to criticize any intention of dealing with Batista—or anybody else—behind the people's back. Our Party believes that those who wish to promote the welfare and the happiness of the people must not hide, but must carry out their whole policy in the light of day.

"Any agreement between political forces, to be fruitful and progressive, to serve the ends of liberty, must be made with the popular consent on bases of complete sincerity, uncompromised by equivocal maneuvers or stratagems. Hence, if asked whether at this time we were disposed to come to an agreement with Batista, we should answer, openly, before all the people, that that would depend entirely on his attitude toward the central problems of democracy, the Constituent Assembly, the betterment of the people, the liberation of Cuba. He is the head of the government, and not the representative of a political party out of power. From the head of a political party out of power we require such action as is possible to realize by means of propaganda, popular mobilization and public opinion; but of the head of a government, who has power to act, we cannot content ourselves with asking only promises. *We must condition our attitude toward him or our relation with him, according to what he does.*"

The plenum decided also that all the activity of the Communist Party should center around the problem of attending constantly to the mobilization of the masses for their immediate demands, such as enforcement of the Social Laws against the evictions of farmers, discrimination against Negroes, the high cost of living, high rents, the gasoline and meat trusts, the toll law, etc.

To complete this policy the plenum decided to intensify the recruiting campaign, which is producing very good results, as in Havana alone, during the last three months, 1,400 new members have been recruited into the Party.

TO COMMEMORATE KARL MARX AND SUN YAT-SEN

Hsin Hua Jih Bao, daily organ of the Communist Party of China, Hankow, May 5, 1938

ONE hundred and twenty years ago, on May 5, 1818, a great man was born, Karl Marx, the creator of scientific socialism, expounder of the theory of proletarian revolution, and the ardent supporter of the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples.

In 1921, ten years after the first Chinese Revolution, on May 5, the first President of the Chinese Republic, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, was inaugurated at Canton as Extraordinary President of the Republic, thereby laying the foundation of revolutionary political power in South China.

May 5 is the most memorable day of the working masses of the world

and of the Chinese people. Karl Marx was the most ardent friend of the Chinese people. He was the first theoretician and statesman who analyzed the Chinese problem and Chinese society with the scientific method. He strongly opposed the sale of opium to China. He expressed his deep indignation against the Opium War and the invasion of China by the allied forces of Britain and France. He warmly greeted the Taiping Rebellion, the opposition of the Chinese people to foreign aggression. He studied scientifically the foreign trade of China and the social economic structure of Chinese society. His studies enabled him to sound warnings against the foreign aggression in China, and to point out the aim of the struggle of the Chinese people—"The Chinese Republic—liberty, equality and fraternity."

This far-sighted thought of the genius Karl Marx was first realized in the first Chinese Revolution of 1911 by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who founded "the Chinese Republic." But unfortunately, not long after that, the revolution met defeat. The Manchu autocratic government was succeeded by the rule of feudal militarists; but Dr. Sun Yat-sen persistently continued the struggle for a real Chinese Republic, and in 1921 he founded his revolutionary power in South China.

The prophetic insight of Karl Marx and the life-time goal of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, a Chinese Republic of liberty, equality, and fraternity, has not yet been realized. This task, which has to be completed in the process of the war against Japanese imperialism, has been left to us. In our victory over the Japanese invad-

ers, we will establish a new China of independence, liberty, and happiness, as indicated by Marx and Sun Yat-sen.

In discussing the greatness of Karl Marx, Lenin pointed out:

"Marxism is not a principle of narrow sectarianism, isolated from the broad highway of the development of world civilization. The genius of Marxism lies in the fact that it gives answers to all problems raised by the progressive thought of mankind. Marxism was born in the continuation of the principles of the great representatives of philosophy, political economy and socialism." (*The Three Sources and Three Components Parts of Marxism.*)

Similarly, Dr. Sun Yat-sen declared: "It can be said that the theory expressed in the writings of Karl Marx is the synthesis of human thought of the last thousand years."

The Communist Party of China, the Party of Chinese Marxists, is the pupil of the great theoreticians of world scientific socialism, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. Because of this, the Communist Party of China is able to inherit, not only the results of the movement of world scientific socialism, but also the best thought and the revolutionary tradition of our ancestors. Dr. Sun Yat-sen was a great theoretician and revolutionary

of modern China. The Chinese Marxists fight for the realization of the revolutionary thought of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. In our present struggle against Japanese imperialism, the rich treasury of scientific socialism, left by Karl Marx, will enable us to arm our minds and to acquire precise social scientific knowledge. Our task is to widen the study of Marxism and to learn the experiences and the lessons of the international working class movement to enable us to fight for the liberation of the Chinese nation.

The revolutionary Three People's Principles enunciated by Dr. Sun Yat-sen formulate the fundamental needs of the Chinese nation—national independence, democratic freedom, and the well-being of the people. We are striving our utmost to deepen the study of the Three People's Principles, to encourage the revolutionary spirit of these principles and to achieve their realization.

Today the Chinese people are engaged in a life-and-death struggle against Japanese imperialism, to build up through this struggle an independent, free, and happy China. This is in keeping with the teachings of Marx, in harmony with the will of Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

Speeches and Documents of the Tenth National Communist Party Convention

The Democratic Front: For Jobs, Security, Democracy and Peace, by Earl Browder . . .	10c
Resolutions of the Tenth National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A.	3c
Constitution and By-Laws of the Communist Party of the United States	5c
Communist Election Platform 1938	1c
A Message to Catholics, by Earl Browder . . .	1c



Order from your local bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

CUT ALONG THIS LINE AND MAIL TO

Date.....19.....

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

Please enter my subscription to **The Communist** beginning with the.....19..... issue

Name

Address

City State

Regular subscription \$2.00 per year for 12 monthly issues
For Canadian and foreign subscriptions add fifty cents

NEW BOOKS

On the  **INTERNATIONAL** List

Just Out!

THE PERIL OF FASCISM

The Crisis of American Democracy

By A.B. MAGIL and HENRY STEVENS

This banner book of the season is a guidebook
to the contemporary scene . . . \$2.00

HISTORY OF THE CIVIL WAR IN THE U.S.S.R.

A large, 9" x 12" volume, full of illustrations, maps, charts, etc.,
many in color.

An authoritative history of the events leading to the Great
October Revolution.

A splendid gift volume. \$3.25

Now Ready!

LIFE OF LENIN, by P. Kerzhentsev 1.75

A new, popular, and authoritative biography.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, by V. I. Lenin 2.00

Volume X in the Selected Works of Lenin.

NEGRO LIBERATION, by James S. Allen05

Revised, expanded. 48 pages.



Order from your local bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.